

**Village of Pittsford**  
**Architectural and Preservation Review Board**  
**Monday July 7, 2014 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

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

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

**Adam Militello**, 6 South Main Street – Sign

**Present:** Adam Militello, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 6/23/14.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a sign on the brick wall next to the door of his second-floor business, which is located at 6 South Main Street. He submitted documentation with the dimensions, material, and location for the proposed sign.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ✓ The sign will be mounted on the wall adjacent to the door of the business.
- ✓ The sign is an appropriate size for this building.
- ✓ The installation of the proposed 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; **Daniele** - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on July 7, 2014.

**Pittsford Canal Associates**, 30 Grove Street – Generator

**Present:** Representative from Spall Management

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 6/19/14.**

**Discussion:** The proposal is for installation of a generator on the south side of the building at 40 Grove Street. The applicant stated that the generator will be installed in an area near where there is other utility equipment on the property. He also submitted documentation showing the location and type of landscaping that will be used to screen the generator. The applicant agreed to revise the landscaping plan to reflect modifications suggested by the Board.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ✓ The generator will be installed in the rear of the building in close proximity to other utility equipment, facing the canal path.
- ✓ The installation of the generator will not obstruct any significant architectural features of the building.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Daniele, to approve the revised application for installation of a generator, to include modifications to the landscaping plan.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on July 7, 2014.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Christ Episcopal Church, 36 South Main Street – Door**

**Present:** Ken O'Neill, Finance Manager

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 6/23/14.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that the proposed project is for the addition of an exterior doorway on the building's south wall along Locust Street to provide access to the church's wheelchair lift. He stated that the existing lift will remain to provide access to the storage area. The door will match the existing doors on that side of the building.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ✓ The proposed door entryway is for handicap accessibility.
- ✓ The door will match the existing doors.
- ✓ The proposed door entryway will have architectural elements similar to other features of the building and is an appropriate style for the building.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a door entryway, with the condition that an extra trim cap be added to the new door, and that the door match the existing doors.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on July 7, 2014.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Sami Mina**, 14 South Main Street – Signage, Fence, Lights  
**Present: Sami Mina**, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 6/23/14.**

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installation of signage on the business located at 14 South Main Street. The building inspector determined that the proposed signage exceeds that which is allowed by the Village Code. Mr. Mina revised the application to propose two signs: one to be installed on the left side of the front façade, and one for the Church Street (south) façade of the building.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The applicant modified the application to propose two signs: one to be installed on the left side of the front façade, and one for the Church Street (south) façade of the building.
- There will not be a sign installed over the front door.
- The installation of the signs 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 installation of two signs, as per the revised application.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on July 7, 2014**

The applicant is also proposing installation of a 4-foot-high wood fence with brick posts on the side of the building to enclose an outdoor seating area. Board members expressed concern with installing a 4-foot fence in that location, and suggested that a 3-foot fence would be more appropriate. The applicant agreed to revise the application to propose a 3-foot fence, with 42-inch brick columns that will match the building.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ✓ The application has been revised to propose a 3-foot fence with 42-inch brick columns.
- ✓ The fence will be centered on the columns.
- ✓ There will be lights on the inside of the fence.
- ✓ The fence will have a metal gate on the South Main Street portion.

- ✓ The fence caps will be limestone.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the revised application for installation of a 3-foot fence, with 42-inch brick columns with limestone caps, both to match the existing building, with the conditions that the details of the metal gate be submitted for review and approval prior to installation, and the approval is subject to Planning Board approval.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. Motion carried. **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on July 7, 2014.**

The applicant is also proposing installation of additional screening for existing mechanical equipment on the roof of the building. Board members discussed this proposal, and determined that if the equipment is not higher than the existing equipment, and the applicant is simply rebuilding existing screening as is, APRB approval is not required. Chairperson Zachman further stated that if there are changes to this proposal, then the applicant will have to come before the Board for approval.

The applicant stated that he is also proposing installation of a door on the north side of the building, with two lights to be installed on either side of the door. He submitted cutsheets with the details of the proposed door and light fixtures. Chairperson Zachman suggested that the door trim be Crosshead with bottom trim, and not the Keystone trim as this is applied trim on to the brick and should resemble other applied trim on the building and not the limestone lintels.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ❖ The proposed door is a commercial entry door to service an enclosed patio seating area.
- ❖ The door will match the existing door on the rear of the building.
- ❖ The light fixtures are appropriate and compatible with door.
- ❖ The installation of the door 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 revised application for installation of a door with the Crosshead trim.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on July 7, 2014**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Scott Dueker**, 7 Elmbrook Drive – Addition

**Present:** Scott Dueker, Architect

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 6/19/14.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that the proposal is for installation of an addition to the rear/side of the house located at 7 Elmbrook Drive. The Board reviewed the submitted plans, and Mr. Dueker stated that the siding for the addition will be wood clapboard to match the house, and the windows will be wood windows. Chairperson Zachman stated that the proposed addition is minimally visible from the public way.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ✓ All external elements of the addition will match the existing house.
- ✓ The windows will be wood windows that match the windows in the house and have externally applied muntins.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for an addition, with the condition that the windows have externally applied muntins.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on July 7, 2014.

***Information only:***

**Karoline Trojian, 31 West Jefferson Road ~ Siding**

**Discussion:**

Mr. & Mrs. Trojian stated that the siding on their house is deteriorated and is exhibiting catastrophic paint failure, and has numerous areas where the siding has been incorrectly repaired or needs replacement. They presented photographs of the house and stated that they are seeking information about siding the house with hardie board siding.

Chairperson Zachman stated that the standards that the Board would apply to determine if this is a good solution are whether the siding is in poor condition, with catastrophic paint failure and no interior vapor barrier. He stated that in this situation, hardie board siding would be a good solution to the problem.

**Member items:**

Mayor Corby discussed with the Board the installation of glass block windows on Village homes. He communicated that the Trustees were hesitant to modify the code in dealing with the prevalence of unapproved glass block basement window installations in the village. Chairperson Zachman suggested that the APRB re-evaluate the standards applied to glass

block installations in an effort to balance the needs of the village residents and the preservation efforts of the APRB. The village building inspector, John Limbeck, indicated that the Trustees suggested that he survey the prevalence of glass block window installations for the pre-war era buildings in the village. Members of the APRB agreed that the information gained from the survey should be taken into account for future discussions on the subject.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the 6/2/14 minutes, as drafted.

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

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 9:30 pm.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary