

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Monday October 5, 2015 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson: Maria Huot
Members: William McBride
Cristina Lanahan
Erin Daniele
Scott Latshaw

Village Attorney: Jeff Turner (absent)
Building Inspector: Kelly Cline (absent)
Recording Secretary: Linda Habeeb

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

Conflict of Interest Disclosure

The Village Board of Trustees has passed Local Law 15, which law requires disclosure of conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest prior to each meeting of boards with discretionary approval authority. Chairperson Huot asked if board members had a conflict of interest with any of the applications before them, and Board members indicated that they had no conflicts of interest to report.

~~~~~

**Zeke Little, 50 State Street ~ Sign**  
**Present:** Zeke Little, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/15/15.**  
**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing relocating the existing sign on building #18 to Building #14 in the Northfield Common complex. He said that the sign measures 7 feet in length and 2 feet in height, and the material is wood. He submitted drawings and photographs of the proposed sign.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The applicant is proposing relocating the existing sign on Building #18 to Building #14 in the Northfield Common complex.
2. The sign is made of wood and is 7 feet in length and 2 feet in height.
3. There are no changes to the actual sign except for the new location on building #14.

4. The new location of the sign is based on a drawing presented by the applicant.

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

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - yes - Daniele – yes; Latshaw - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.**

~~~~~

Nadia Igumenshehera, 39 South Main Street ~ Sign

Present: Nadia Igumenshehera, Business owner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/21/15.

Discussion: The applicant stated that she is proposing relocating an existing sign from the building at 20 South Main Street to the building at 39 South Main Street. She submitted documents and photographs with the location, materials, and dimensions of the proposed sign.

Findings of Fact:

1. The sign is an existing sign made of high-density urethane foam.
2. The sign measures 7 square feet.
3. The sign will be centered between the second-floor window and the awning.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for relocation of the existing sign, as submitted.

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - yes - Daniele – yes; Latshaw - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.**

~~~~~

**Laurie Wilby, 24 Locust Street ~ Windows and Fencing**

**Present:** Laurie Wilby, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 1/7/15.**

Windows:

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing replacing all the vinyl windows in the house with Kolbe wood sash replacement windows with exterior applied muntins. She stated that the original window frames will be preserved and the windows will have the same dimensions as existing.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The windows in the house will be replaced with Kolbe wood sash replacement windows.
2. The double-hung windows will have six-over-one sash configuration with 5/8" wide exterior applied muntins.
3. The window openings and original window frames will be preserved.

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

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - yes - Daniele – yes; Latshaw - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.**

Fences:

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing installing a 3-foot-high wood picket fence in the front and side of the house, and a 6-foot privacy fence in the rear and side of the house. The picket fence will have 2¾" pickets spaced 1¾" apart and will be the same style fence as the existing fence at 21 Boughton Avenue. The privacy fence will have 5½" boards spaced 3" apart with 4 x 4 posts cut off at the top rail and will be installed 2 feet from the property line.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The applicant is proposing installing a 3-foot-high wood picket fence that is the same style fence as the existing fence at 21 Boughton Avenue.
2. The distance between posts will be distributed evenly.
3. The setback is 18" from the sidewalk.
4. The approval is subject to the applicant's submittal of documentation related to the placement of the fence on the First Presbyterian Church's property.
5. The applicant is also proposing a 6-foot-high fence to be located in the rear and side of the house.
6. The fence will be the same style, dimensions, and proportion as an existing fence located at 10 Lincoln Avenue.
7. The side of the fence that faces the church will be aligned to the house on the applicant's property.
8. The fence in the rear will be installed inside the property line.
9. The side of the fence toward the garage will be installed inside the property line.
10. The gate for the rear fence will be a simple latch gate that is consistent with the style of the fence.
11. The gate for the picket fence will be flanked by two posts in the same style as the posts supporting the fence.
12. The approval of both fences is subject to the applicant's submitting drawings with the exact location of the placement of the fences on the property and in relation to the house.

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of the two fences, with the conditions as stated in the findings of fact.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - yes - Daniele – yes; Latshaw - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.**

~~~~~

Dave Cameron, 34 E. Jefferson Road ~ Windows, Siding, Garage Door

Present: David Cameron, Homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/18/15.

Siding:

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is proposing replacing the vinyl siding on the house with new vinyl clapboard siding, with cedar shake siding on a front portion of the house. Member Huot stated that this is not an in-kind replacement, in that they are proposing changing the profile of the siding with the cedar shake siding. She further noted that this completely changes the character of the house. Board members discussed whether this proposal for a mixture of vinyl textures is appropriate for this house. Member Lanahan stated that the proposal adds a detail that was not there before, but it is not an inappropriate detail. Member Daniele stated that there is evidence that this is appropriate for the house, and Board members noted that there are examples of a mixture of textures in houses of this era.

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicant is proposing removing vinyl siding on the house and replacing it with new vinyl clapboard siding, with the same profile as the existing siding.
2. The proposal is to replace the siding on a portion of the front of the house with 7” reveal vinyl cedar shake.
3. The original house had a larger reveal and the material was shingles.
4. New wood bead board ceiling will be installed under the front porch area.

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

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – no; Lanahan - yes - Daniele – yes; Latshaw - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.

Windows:

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing four street-facing windows with vinyl double-hung windows with grids, and replacing the picture window with a vinyl picture window with two double-hung windows with grids on either side. Member Lanahan stated that the proposal will change the grid configuration of the existing windows, which will change the appearance of the windows. She explained that windows are a significant, defining architectural feature of a house,

and while there is more leniency with materials in postwar homes, the appearance of the existing windows should be maintained.

Findings of Fact:

- The proposal is to replace the front picture window with two double-hung divided windows and four double-hung vinyl windows matching the style of the original windows of the house, which are 2- over-1 horizontal muntins.
- Muntin configuration is an essential architectural feature of this period house.
- The replacement of the 4 double hung vinyl windows must match the profile of the actual windows and muntin configuration, which is 2- over-1 horizontal muntins.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of replacement windows, contingent on the applicant's submittal of specification sheets for the windows.

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – no; Lanahan - yes - Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.**

Garage Doors:

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing two white aluminum garage doors with two steel garage doors in a dark color. The applicant stated that the existing doors are deteriorated and in need of replacement. Member Lanahan stated that the "carriage" style of garage door proposed is not an appropriate style of door for the garage or the house.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal is for replacement of two garage doors with an insulated steel door, with a smooth surface, and with either 4 windows with no divided lights, or no windows, and no hardware.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of two replacement garage doors, contingent on the applicant's submittal of specification sheets for the doors.

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – no; Lanahan - yes - Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.**

~~~~~

**David & Tina Mattia, 44 Sutherland Street ~ Demolition**

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

**Discussion:** Mr. Schick stated that at the end of last month's meeting, the Board suggested that the homeowners submit an application for demolition of the house located at 44 Sutherland Street. He also stated that the Village was charged with soliciting a proposal from an independent Fungi (Mold) Evaluation Consultant to secure a second opinion describing the levels, types, and severity of the mold that exists in the house, as well as the health hazards and recommendation for mitigation and associated cost.

He stated further that the homeowners have received a price to mitigate the mold of \$94,695 from Steven Nardozi, from Rochester Environmental. The cost for restoring the house to "pre-loss condition" with "in-kind" materials, once the mitigation is complete, is \$250,500. The total is \$345,195. He explained that the total cost to mitigate the mold, coupled with the poor design and construction of the 1975 addition, the limitations of the unusual construction details in the existing basement and crawl space, as well as the lack of general architectural detail on the house, make demolition and new construction a sensible solution to pursue. He said that the degree of mold in the house overwhelms any attempt to mitigate and renovate the house.

Paul Mahoney, of Envoy Environmental Consultants, reported that his visual impression is that mold is leaching through many rooms of the house. There were numerous areas of visible fungi overgrowth identified throughout the residence during the site visit. He stated that air and surface samples were sent to Microbiology Laboratory for analysis.

Mary Ellen Holvey, Senior Industrial Hygienist, stated that Envoy reviewed the data collected from the August 5, 2015 sampling event. The fungi levels in each area sampled were above the recommended levels, indicating that there is an amplification source of fungi overgrowth within the residence. The walls are notably wet and provide conditions conducive to fungi overgrowth. It is suspected that the poor exterior drainage has contributed to the water intrusion. She stated that all areas of the residence impacted with water and fungi overgrowth require remedial activities to address these issues.

Member Lanahan noted that basements of homes typically contain some mold. Ms. Holvey agreed, but stated that this level of mold is extreme. She reported that there is a significant amount of contamination in the house, and that the potential to clean it is unlikely because it is so widespread. Member McBride questioned whether the house could be remediated to a healthy level. Ms. Holvey stated that the concern is that the amount of work to be done to get it to that level may never be attained because water that has impacted this house for this period of time has completely damaged it. It would be very difficult to remediate to a healthy level. Member Daniele questioned whether this level of mold will impact neighbors in the area. Ms. Holvey stated that it will not impact the neighbors because the source of moisture is inside the house. Board members asked about the safety of workers during the demolition, and Ms. Holvey replied that the workers would need to wear protective equipment during demolition. Mr. Schick stated that it would exceed the value of the house to attempt to renovate it.

Member Huot stated this is a Type I SEQRA action pursuant to SEQRA § 617.4(b)(9), an unlisted action on a site proposed for nomination and adjacent to a State historic site. The Secretary will

mail out the letters requesting that the APRB be named lead agency to the involved and interested agencies. The Village has identified the name of a consultant (Mr. Duford) to conduct an independent analysis of the mold in the house, the charge for which will be paid by the applicants, if they agree.

Betsy Brugg, of Woods Oviatt Gilman, LLP, stated she respectfully disagrees with the Village attorney's recommendation to pursue a Type I SEQR action. She stated that this demolition is not relevant to SEQR review. She stated that this is a unique situation that will not create a precedent for other cases of proposed demolition that will come before the Board. Board members explained that the historic application of "replacement-in-kind" means replacing with the exact same structure that was there before.

Member Huot stated that the Board will follow the advice of their counsel. The involved and interested agencies have 30 days to respond to the APRB's request to be lead agency for this application. This will allow their consultant to conduct his review of the mold in the house and report his findings to the Board. She reiterated that the Board needs to understand the depth of the damage to the house before they can make a determination about demolition.

**Motion:** Member Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to accept Mr. Duford's proposal, and more information is requested about the cost of the estimate.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – no; Lanahan - yes - Daniele – yes; Latshaw - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.**

**Motion:** Member Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to declare that the Village APRB will be lead agency for this issue according to SEQR § 617.4 (b) (9), an unlisted action on a site proposed for nomination and adjacent to a State historic site.

Mr. Schick presented preliminary plans for the design of the proposed new house. The proposed house is approximately 10 percent larger than the existing house. Materials that are being considered are stone at the base, board-and-batten siding, and wide 8-inch clapboard. Member Huot noted that garages in the Village are rarely located in the front of the house. The homeowner stated that it was her preference to have the garage in the rear. Mr. Schick stated that since the lot is very narrow, locating the garage in the rear of the house would not be feasible. Member Lanahan stated that this is a design challenge that the Mr. Schick should make every effort to meet.

#### **Member Items:**

#### **Minutes:**

**Motion:** Member Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the July 6, 2015 minutes, as drafted.

**Vote: McBride - yes; Huot - no; Lanahan - yes - Daniele - yes. Motion carried. *This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.***

**Motion:** Member Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the September 9, 2015 minutes, as drafted.

**Vote: McBride - yes; Huot - no; Lanahan - yes - Daniele - yes. Motion carried. *This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 5, 2015.***

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Chairperson Huot 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.