

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Monday June 6, 2016 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

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

Village Attorney: Jeff Turner
Building Inspector: Floyd Kofahl
Recording Secretary: Linda Habeeb

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

Conflict of Interest Disclosure

Member McBride stated that he will recuse himself from the discussion and the vote for the Courtenay Circle application because he has a family relationship with the applicant. All other members stated that they had no conflicts of interest with any of the applications before the board.

Michelle Kuzniarek, 50 State Street ~ Sign

Present: Michelle Kuzniarek, Business owner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 5/12/16.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing a wood sign on the business located at 50 State Street. The sign is the same size as the previous sign and it will be installed in the same location on the building as the previous sign. The applicant submitted photographs and documentation with the details of the proposed sign.

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicant is proposing installing a sign on the business located at 50 State Street.
2. The proposed sign is a plywood sign with engraved lettering.
3. The proposed sign is the same size (2.5'x7'), and will be installed in the same location, as the previous sign.
4. The sign is Village Code compliant and is consistent with the style of other signs on the surrounding businesses.
5. The installation of the sign will not damage any architectural element of the building.

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

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.**

Megara Nearing, 4 Courtenay Circle ~ Garage Door

Present: Megara Nearing, Homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 5/23/16.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the existing 1960's garage door with an insulated steel door, with four window inserts, and no decorative hardware. She presented documentation for the door, and proposed either the Stockton or Thames window inserts. Board members discussed these alternatives, and determined that the Thames style window was the more appropriate style for this garage and house as the Stockton would be more appropriate for a Craftsman style home.

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicant is proposing replacing the existing garage door with a steel door (Amarr Oak Summit OS2000).
2. The window inserts will be Thames style.
3. The garage door will be painted white to match the house.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the application for installation of a garage door, as submitted, with the change of window style to Thames.

Vote: McBride – abstain; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.

The applicant is also proposing replacing the existing basement window with an egress window, and installing an escape window well, in conformance with New York State Building Code. The proposed window matches the windows in the house.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal is for installation of a basement egress window.
2. The window is a wood-frame window with a vinyl cover, which is a correction to what is stated in the application.
3. The installation of the window will have no effect on the architectural character and/or style of the house.
4. The window will be minimally visible from the public way.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the installation of an egress window and an escape window well, as stated in the revised application.

Vote: McBride – abstain; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.

~~~~~

**John Schultes, 41 North Main Street ~ Sign**

**Present:** John Schultes, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 5/11/16.**

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing increasing the size of the length of the windows on the northwest side of the building located at 41 North Main Street. He is also proposing replacing the exit door with a solid steel replacement door. The door transom will be removed and filled in with the same siding as the building and will be painted to blend in.

***Findings of Fact:***

1. The applicant is proposing changing the length of the windows on the northwest area of the building due to a change of function.
2. The windows will be increased in height (see drawing submission for dimensions) not in width, and will maintain the same separation between them.
3. The exit door will be replaced with a solid steel door, and the transom will be filled in with the same siding as the building and will be painted to blend in.
4. The light will be centered above the new door.

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

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.**

~~~~~

Greg Barkstrom, 50 State Street ~ Lights

Present: Greg Barkstrom, Director of Real Estate

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 5/20/16.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal for installation of two pole lights in the Northfield Common property. He stated that the proposed light is a recessed fixture with downward light, and the lights are dark-sky compliant. He submitted a specification sheet for the lights.

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicant is proposing installing two light pole fixtures in Northfield Common.
2. The style of light is similar to the existing lights at the Grain Silo and other areas of the complex.
3. Specification sheets of the lights were submitted for the record.
4. This approval will be subject to the approval of the Planning Board.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of two lights, as submitted, subject to the approval of the Planning Board.

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.**

The applicant is also proposing replacing a deteriorated front door on Building G in Northfield Common. The proposal is to replace the existing wood door with a fiberglass door. Board Members stated that since the existing door is made of wood, it should be replaced with a wooden door.

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicant is proposing replacing a damaged front door on Building G in Northfield Common.
2. The proposed style of door is appropriate for the building.
3. The proposed door will match the drawing submitted by the applicant.
4. The existing wood door will be replaced with a wood door.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a front door, with the modification that the door will be a wood door, not fiberglass.

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.**

~~~~~

**Terry Masci, 12 Stonegate Lane ~ Addition**

**Present:** Terry Masci, Contractor

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/22/16.**

**Discussion:** The applicant presented a proposal for construction of an addition on the rear of the house located at 12 Stonegate Lane. The applicant stated that the proposed addition has been granted site plan approval from the Planning Board. Board members noted that the addition is minimally visible from the public way. It was also noted that the proposed location for the skylights in the addition will not be visible from the public way. Member Huot noted that the materials and details of the addition will match the house.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The applicant is proposing construction of an addition on the rear southeast corner of the house located at 12 Stonegate Lane.
2. The addition will be minimally visible from the public way.
3. The materials and details of the addition will match the details of the house as detailed in the submitted drawings.
4. There are two skylights proposed for the addition. Skylights are not permitted in this period houses, but these skylights are not visible from the public way, and therefore, the APRB does not have jurisdiction over that portion of the proposal.

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

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.**

~~~~~

Christine Rodriguez, 10 Eastview Terrace ~ Siding/Garage Door

Present: Christine Rodriguez, Homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 5/23/16.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal to replace the existing siding on the house with James Hardy lap siding. She explained that there is currently widespread paint failure on the existing siding, and

that she is concerned about lead in the paint. She stated that the cost of abatement to retain the siding is unaffordable.

Ms. Rodriguez also submitted a report from Bero Architecture indicating that based on their analysis, the cause of the paint failure is flexible latex paint applied over layers of old rigid oil paint, moving with temperature and pulling old paint layers away from the substrate. The report stated that the wood shingles on the house appear to be in very good condition. No areas of rot, mildew, or other deterioration were observed during the inspection. The shingles are a character-defining feature of the house and it is recommended that they be retained. The Village of Pittsford Building Design Standards state that original exterior wall finishes are very important and should be protected, repaired, and maintained. *"Replacing original siding can be acceptable if the original material is deteriorated beyond reasonable repair, or catastrophic exterior paint failure can be traced to a house envelope moisture vapor problem"* Based on the inspection, there is insufficient evidence of the need to replace the siding. The report also states that homeowners should be aware that there have been problems with this James Hardy hardie shingle siding, and that there is an ongoing class action lawsuit.

Board members discussed whether the siding is a distinguishing and contributing architectural feature of the house. Member Huot stated that the siding is not inherent to the style of the house, which makes it a contributing, but not distinguishing feature of the house. Mr. Turner explained that per Village Code, if the feature is a contributing, but not a distinguishing architectural feature of the house, then it can be considered for an alteration. Alterations allow for replacement rather than repair and allow for substitute materials that are of equal or better quality. Board members stated that hardie siding is a material of better quality than the existing siding on the house.

Findings of Fact:

1. The house is a Colonial Revival style home, built in the 1930's.
2. 1930's Greek Revival style houses are distinguished by, among many other things, either clapboard, shingle siding, or brick.
3. The existing cedar shingles are contributing but not a distinguishing architectural feature of the house.
4. Replacement of cedar shingles with clapboard siding allows one of this structure's distinguishing features to remain in place.
5. This change, under the code, is considered an alteration, which allows for replacing the material with a better or similar quality material.
6. Clapboard siding is a material of similar quality to existing siding on the house.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to permit replacement of the cedar shingle siding with cedar shingles, wooden clapboard, Hardie shingles, or Hardie clapboard with a painted, smooth surface. If replacing with clapboard, corner boards must be installed following the details of the house pictured in page 21 of the Pittsford Village Preservation guidelines. The reveal for the clapboard siding should be 4-1/2".

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.**

The applicant is also proposing replacing two garage doors with a steel door, with flat recessed panels. The doors are not original doors. Board members stated that the style of doors is appropriate for the house.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal is for installation of two garage doors with 16 solid, recessed flat panels.
2. The door will be painted, with a smooth surface, and with no windows.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the installation of two garage doors with 16 solid, recessed flat panels, painted, with a smooth surface, and with no windows.

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 6, 2016.**

Minutes:

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the 5/2/16 minutes, as revised.

Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Latshaw – yes; Daniele – abstain. **Motion carried.**

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Chairperson Huot adjourned the meeting at 9:15 pm.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary