

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

PRESENT:

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

Member Lanahan called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Melissa Zell, 6 Elmbrook Drive ~ Fence

Present: Melissa Zell, homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/26/13.

Discussion: The applicant stated that she is proposing installing fencing to enclose a portion of the yard at the house located at 6 Elmbrook Drive. She stated that in the front yard areas, the proposal is for a 36" aluminum fence installed a minimum distance of 18" from all sidewalks and roadways, and for all side yard and backyard areas, a 36" split rail fence, with two rails and 36" posts backed with galvanized welded wire fence. She submitted documentation showing the location, dimensions, and material for the proposed fences.

Board members discussed whether installation of an aluminum fence, rather than a wooden fence, is appropriate at this location. The Board determined that since the house is located in a partially wooded area, the transparency of an aluminum fence is appropriate for the property and the neighborhood.

Findings of Fact:

The house is a Cape Cod style house built in the 1930's.

The location is unique in that the house is located in a wooded area with a stream running through it.

The lot and location are appropriate for the lot and location within the context of the Village.

The house is located on a corner lot in the Village.

The fence will be partially obstructed by a hedge.

Motion: Member Lanahan made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of the fence, as submitted.

Vote: McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 7, 2013.

John Schultes, 41 North Main Street ~ Landscaping and lighting

Present: John Schultes

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/4/13.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing renovations of the landscaping between the Del Monte Hotel and the canal path. The proposal is to remove the hedge and install new landscaping, four pillars, and low-voltage ground lighting. He stated that they are also proposing removing the existing fence. He presented proposed plans indicating the location of the landscaping and the installation of the stone pillars. He submitted photographs and details of the natural stone pillars and proposed lights. He stated that the lights are low-voltage, 20-watt halogen bulbs. Member Lanahan stated that the proposed lighting is utilitarian, which is appropriate for this setting. Board members suggested that the cap on the pillars be increased in size, and that the stones and grout be flush.

Motion: Member Lanahan made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application, as submitted, with the condition that the size of the cap on the pillars be increased at least 3 inches, and up to 4 inches.

Vote: McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 7, 2013.

Dieter Le Roux, 96 South Main Street ~ Window

Present: Dieter & Hellen LeRoux

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/26/13.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing replacing the existing casement window in the kitchen of their house, located at 96 South Main Street. They submitted photographs of the existing window, which is damaged and nonfunctional. Board members noted that the window is unique in that it is an in-swinging casement window, with no locking mechanism.

Findings of Fact:

The existing casement window is nonfunctional, with no locking mechanism.
The existing window is unique, in that it is an in-swinging casement window.

Motion: Member Lanahan made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a wooden casement window, with simulated divided lights, with the same dimensions and details as the existing window.

Vote: McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 7, 2013.

Kevin Morton, 5 Elmbrook Drive ~ Doors

Present: Kevin Morton, Contractor

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/26/13.

Discussion: Mr. Morton stated that the owners of the house located at 5 Elmbrook Drive are proposing replacing the front entry door to the house, the garage door, and the windows. He

submitted plans for replacing the existing front door with the same size three-light, two-panel, stain grade door with stained glass inserts. They are also proposing replacing the existing 16-panel paint grade garage door with a "Carriage" wood overlay door, finished to match the existing wood on the front porch. The proposal for the windows is to remove the existing storm and window units and install matching-sized Kolbe traditional double-hung windows, with wood construction, true divided light panels with painted exterior muntin bars.

Board members stated that the leaded glass in the proposed replacement door would not be appropriate for this style of house. They suggested that clear or wavy glass would be more appropriate. They also commented that it would be more appropriate for the garage door to have plain glass rather than the proposed "faux" glass.

At the June 3, 2013 APRB meeting, the replacement of all of the windows was granted based on the age of the house (it is a post-war house) and the lack of quality window construction. The applicant stated that he is proposing changing the style of window from 8 over 8 (which was previously approved) to a craftsman style with different windowpane divisions. The Board determined that the change of style was not appropriate, and that though the construction of the windows is not deemed necessary for preservation, the style is, and therefore, the original 8 over 8 style should be maintained.

The application will remain open.

Peter Yackel, 17 Maple Street ~ Addition
Present: Peter Yackel, Contractor

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/26/13.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal for a rear addition for the house located at 17 Maple Street. The addition will enlarge the kitchen and allow for entry into the house from the garage. He stated that the house is vinyl-sided, and that all exterior materials will match existing.

Board members suggested that the eastern wall of the addition should line up with the garage. The applicant and the owner agreed to revise the proposal to include this change.

Findings of Fact:

The house is a 1950's house with a detached garage.

The addition is in the rear of the house, to connect the two buildings.

Only a small portion of the addition is visible from the public way.

Motion: Member Lanahan made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the revised application for construction of an addition, with the amendment that the western wall of the addition will line up with the garage, and with the condition that all materials, windows, and details will match the existing house and roof.

Vote: McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 7, 2013.

Claudia Groenevelt, 64 State Street ~ Fence & Railing

Present: Claudia Groenevelt, Homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/26/13.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal for (1) Fencing for the rear yard; (2) Shutters for the front and side windows; and (3) Replacement of the porch railing on side porch.

Fence

The applicant stated that she is proposing installing a 60-foot length of board fence with a lattice top on a portion of the west property line; a 3-foot-high wrought-iron fence and gate to close off the area on the west property line between the house and the 6-foot fence; 38 feet of 3-foot-high wrought-iron fencing along the lot line in and around the existing shrubs at the other end of the 6-foot fence on the west lot line; and a 4-foot board fence and arbor on the left side of the driveway, attached at the left front corner of the garage running toward the house and attaching at the end of the porch railing on the side porch.

Board members noted that the fences in the rear of the property are minimally visible from the public way. Member Huot suggested that the fence at the driveway be kept separate from the porch stair railing. Board members stated that the elliptical fence proposed is not an appropriate style of fence for this setting.

Exterior Shutters

The applicant is proposing replacing the existing vinyl shutters on the three front windows of the house and adding shutters to the windows on the side of the house. She submitted a photograph of the proposed shutters, which will be functional, custom-made, board-and-batten shutters.

Board members stated that the barn-style shutters proposed by the applicant are not appropriate for the style of house; they suggested that the applicant install a more appropriate panel-style shutter. The applicant agreed to this modification.

Side Porch Railing

The applicant stated that the existing railing is not appropriate for the style of house. The proposal is for installation of a simple railing with rectangular spindles 3 inches wide and 1 inch in depth.

Findings of Fact:

- ❖ The house was built in 1905.
- ❖ The Village is in receipt of a letter from the Town of Pittsford building inspector stating that the 60-foot fence is longer than was approved.
- ❖ The fences in the rear of the property are minimally visible from the public way.
- ❖ The existing porch railing is not functional or stylistically appropriate for the house.
- ❖ The existing shutters are vinyl and not the appropriate style for the house; the panel-style shutters are more appropriate.

- ❖ The 4-foot board fence at the driveway will be kept separate from the porch stair railing; they will remain as separate structures.
- ❖ After the appropriate space is taken for the stairs, the remaining distance back to the garage will be divided such that the gate will be centered on the fence.

Motion: Member Lanahan made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the revised application, with the following conditions:

1. The 4-foot fence will not encroach on the stair railing of the house, but will remain separate by a minimum of 2 inches;
2. The gate on the 4-foot fence will be 4 feet at the edges; the semi-circle, elliptical shape to be 3 feet at its center, and will not have a full circle;
3. The gate will be centered on the remaining distance between the porch stairs and the garage;
4. The other fences will be installed as proposed in the application;
5. The shutters will be replaced on the 3 front windows, and added elsewhere on windows at the owner's discretion;
6. The shutters will be a solid panel style without louvers;
7. The porch railing will have 4 x 4 posts and 1¼-inch balusters that are 4 inches on center, with a 2¼-inch top rail and 1½-inch bottom rail, and the balusters will stop at the bottom rail; there will be 2 4 X 4 posts that divide the length of the porch railing.

Vote: McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 7, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Member Lanahan adjourned the meeting at 11:00 pm.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary

Village of Pittsford documents are controlled, maintained, and available for official use on the Village of Pittsford Website, located at <http://www.VillageofPittsford.org>. Printed versions of this document are considered uncontrolled.
Copyright © (2010) Village of Pittsford.