

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Wednesday September 9, 2015 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

**Chairperson:** Maria Huot  
**Members:** William McBride  
Cristina Lanahan  
Erin Daniele

**Village Attorney:** Jeff Turner  
**Building Inspector:** Kelly Cline  
**Recording Secretary:** Linda Habeeb

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

**Jake Hoppa, Auburn Line Park ~ Fence**

**Present:** Jake Hoppa

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/27/15.**

**Discussion:** Mr. Hoppa explained that his Eagle Scout project will convert a small portion of Village property into a small-scale park with several elements to be implemented by the project's end, including an educational aspect tying to the Auburn Railroad Line, as well as benches, trashcans, and a walking path. He explained that the space will be between the entrance to Roberts Kitchens and Pittsford Farms Dairy. He stated that he is proposing installing split-rail fencing in the rear of the property. He submitted photographs of the site for the Board to review. At the request of Chairperson Huot, the applicant also presented drawings with the location for the installation of the fence and the dimensions for the proposed fence.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The applicant is proposing to install a split-rail fence, benches, and a stone or brick walking path on a small public area owned by the Village.
2. The fence posts will not exceed 4 feet in height.
3. The corner fences will be 9 feet apart.

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of the fencing, as submitted, with the distance between the posts to be 9 feet.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan yes;- Daniele - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2015.**

~~~~~

**Paul Zachman, 10 South Street ~ Fence**

**Present:** Paul Zachman, Boardwalk Design Inc.; Ani Pierson, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/19/15.**

**Discussion:** Mr. Zachman stated that the proposal is for installation of a free-standing pergola in the rear of the yard and a privacy fence along a portion of the rear property line. Mr. Zachman stated that the pergola and fence will be minimally visible from the public way. He submitted documentation with the location, materials, and dimensions for the fence and pergola.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The applicant is proposing installing a 20' x 15' fence and a pergola measuring 6' x 6' in the rear yard.
2. The fence and the pergola are minimally visible from the public way.
3. The fence and pergola will be made of pressure-treated lumber, stained a dark color to match the existing deck.
4. As established by the architectural drawings, the pergola and fence are in proportion to, and match the architectural character of the house.

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve application for installation of the fence and pergola, as submitted.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - Daniele - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2015.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Janice Curran, 33 Boughton Ave ~ Garage**

**Present:** Linda Williams, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/10/15.**

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing a modification to an approved application for a mudroom addition to the south elevation of the house. The proposed change is from a hip roof to shed roof. The new roof and pitch will match the existing roofline and architectural style of the front gable of the house.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The applicant is proposing to modify the roofline from the hip roof to a shed roof.
2. The new roof and pitch will match the existing roofline of the front gable of the house.
3. The proposed roofline matches the architectural style and character of the house.
4. The siding will match the existing siding profile and materials.
5. The roof trims and finishing lines proposed will match the existing style of the roof.
6. The south elevation will offset the corner of the front elevation by 6-8 inches.

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for a shed roof for the mudroom addition, with the conditions as stated at the meeting.

**Vote:** McBride - yes; Huot - yes; Lanahan - Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2015.**

~~~~~

**Alysa Plummer ~ 66 South Main Street ~ Window**

**Present:** Alysa Plummer, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/25/15.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing replacing an existing vinyl bay window with a wood frame box bay window on the south elevation of the house. The replacement window will be on an addition that was added in 1994. All materials for the proposed replacement window will match the house.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The applicant is proposing to replace an existing vinyl bay window with a wood box bay window located in the south elevation of the house.
2. The applicant submitted architectural plans that include elevations with detailed information about the materials.

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a wood bay replacement window, as submitted.

**Vote:** McBride - yes; Huot - yes; Lanahan - Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2015.**

**Michael Trojian ~ 31 West Jefferson Rd. ~ Deck**

**Present:** Michael Trojian, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/25/15.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a deck in the rear of the house that will connect to an existing enclosed back porch entrance. The material for the deck is pressure-treated lumber. The proposal also includes addition of a trellis at the corner of the house to provide privacy.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The proposal is for installation of a deck in the rear of the house that will connect to an existing enclosed back porch entrance.
2. The proposed deck will match the height and materials of the existing deck.
3. The lattice will not be attached to the house. It is a provisional structure.

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

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - Daniele - yes. Motion carried. *This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2015.***

~~~~~

**Christ Episcopal Church, 12 Locust Street ~ Garage Door**

**Present: John Stewart**

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/17/15.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that the existing wood garage door on the detached single-car garage has deteriorated beyond repair. They are proposing replacing the door with a galvanized steel door with a wood-grain finish. Board members explained that it would be more in character with the house for the garage door to be painted with a flat paint, instead of the faux-grain finish as proposed.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The proposal is for replacement of the existing, deteriorated single-car garage door with a new steel door.
2. The door will be painted with a flat paint and will not have an embossed wood grain finish.

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a galvanized steel garage door, as submitted.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - Daniele - yes. Motion carried. *This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2015.***

**Tom Hartzell, 6 North Main Street ~ Window  
Present: Tom Hartzell, owner**

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/2/15.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he has installed a new window on the south side of the building, located at 6 North Main Street. The window is an all-wood framed and sash unit, measuring 37.4" in width and 55 inches in height. The window matches the two existing windows on the building. He also noted that the gutter conductor pipe that runs down in front of the shutter will be relocated to the right side of the shutter.

Mr. Turner advised the Board that this application should be reviewed as if the window had not already been installed.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The applicant installed a new window on the south side of the building, without having received APRB approval.
2. The window is an all-wood framed window that matches the existing windows on the building.
3. The gutter conductor pipe will be relocated to the right side of the shutter.

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the installed window on the building at 6 North Main Street.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - Daniele - yes. Motion carried. *This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2015.***

**Information only:**

**44 Sutherland Street**

**Present: David & Tina Mattia, Homeowners; Jon Schick, Architect**

**Discussion:** Mr. Schick explained that when the Mattias purchased the house, the intent was to remove the 1975 garage addition and then renovate what remained of the original house. He stated that in August of this year, the homeowners received reports documenting the existence of numerous types of mold damage, including known pathogens, both airborne and on surfaces. The reports indicate that the mold exists in the house from the basement, all the way through to the attic. Estimates to mitigate the mold range from \$70,000 – \$200,000. Moisture content in the existing wallboard, throughout the house, ranges from 100% saturation in the basement, 80% in the garage, and 45-65% on the second floor. He stated that the entire house would need to be completely gutted, any insulation removed, and all structural components either replaced or surface mold mitigated. These reports and photographs of the damage were submitted for the Board to review.

Mr. Schick went on to state that it is his opinion that the existing house does not possess any significant social, economic, cultural, or political history, and has very little in the way of architectural detail or style. He continued by stating that the value of the property, as is, has been extremely diminished with the discovery of the extensive mold and moisture infiltration. It could not be resold in the condition that it is in now, without divulging the mold and mildew or first mitigating the conditions. Chairperson Huot stated that the social, economic, cultural, and political significance of the house is at the center of the APRB's role under the Village's historical preservation laws and regulation, and as a Historic District, the discussion extends to the relation of the building to the rest of the houses in the Village.

Mr. Schick explained that this describes how the homeowners arrived at the conclusion to propose demolition of the existing house and rebuilding of a new home. He presented a preliminary concept plan for new construction of the house.

Board members questioned the homeowners as to the reason that this damage wasn't discovered prior to purchasing the house. They explained that the house was owned by a person who hoarded items and that it was difficult to move around and view the areas of existing mold.

Mr. Turner stated that according to the Village Code, demolition may be permitted only after the developer of the site has submitted and obtained approval for his plans for new development, including APRB approval for new construction. No structure may be demolished unless the APRB finds that preservation of the structure is not warranted under general standards set forth in the Village Code, or the owner has demonstrated that the structure has deteriorated to the point that it has lost total functionality as a habitable space or in the case of a business, its ability to meet the needs of its actual function for productivity. Furthermore, if the problem at discussion for demolition can be mitigated and the owner cannot economically afford to preserve the structure, he/she has to offer to sell the parcel upon which the structure is located; if unable to find a purchaser at the fair market value who would agree to preserve the structure on the parcel, demolition will be under consideration.

Board members agreed that the next step would be for the applicants to submit a formal application for demolition for the next APRB meeting.

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