

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – January 4, 2001 at 7:30 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Blake Held
Members:	Steve Melnyk Trip Pierson Marcia Watt Ken Willard
Attorney	Jeffrey Turner
Building Inspector:	Skip Bailey
Recording Secretary:	Mary Marowski

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Blake Held at 7:30 PM.

1. Peter Cowgill – 4 Stonegate Lane and Ron Meyer – 6 Stonegate Lane – Fence

Present: Peter Cowgill and Ron Meyer

Contractor: New York State Fence; 858 Manitou Road; Hilton , N. Y. 14468

Application: Submitted and date stamped 12/20/00. Approved by the building inspector 12/20/00.

Discussion: Mr. Cowgill and Mr. Meyer are submitting a joint application for the replacement of a badly deteriorated fence along their adjoining property lines. The proposed white vinyl fence (maintenance ease) is to be installed behind and within the hedgerow and evergreens that divide the properties. Most of the fence is not visible from the road; however, a gate and an approximately eight foot section of the fence that comes across the front of the property is somewhat visible to the public way.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, providing that the portion of the fence located along the property line and within the hedgerow and evergreens is not subject to APRB approval and denying the application for the white vinyl fence and gate section perpendicular to the hedgerow, based on the following *findings of fact*: 1. The portion of the fence located along the property line and within the hedgerow and evergreens is not visible to the public way. The only true visible portion of the fence is an 8-foot fence including gate section across the properties. 2. The fence is distant from the street (approximately 130 feet). 3. The intent of the residents is to have the fence along the property line overgrown with hedges. 4. The Cowgill home was built in the 1940's and the Meyer home was built in early 1960's at which time vinyl was not an available construction material.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – abstain; Watt – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*

Due to the denial of the use of vinyl fencing, the applicants have amended their proposal to request the installation of a wooden fence.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to approve a wooden fence pending the approval of the type and style.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*

2. Mr. & Mrs. Mulcahy – 31 West Jefferson Road – Windows

Present: Mr. & Mrs. Mulcahy

Contractor: Rochester Colonial Windows; 1794 Lyell Ave/625 Jefferson Road, Rochester, N. Y.

Application: Submitted and date stamped 12/20/00. Approved by the building inspector 12/22/00.

Discussion: Mr. & Mrs. Mulcahy have contracted and had installed seven vinyl windows. These windows were installed without prior approval of the APRB and therefore have been sited a "Notice of Violation" by the building inspector.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to deny the installation of vinyl windows based on the Secretary of Interiors Standards applicable to the renovation of homes erected prior to the use of vinyl as a building material.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*

3. Lake Plain Associates Inc. – Sunoco Station – 9 Monroe Avenue – Fascia Sign

Present: George Fetterhoff, Project Manager

Application: Submitted and date stamped 6/21/00. Approved by the building inspector 5/31/00.

Discussion: This application was presented and tabled at the July 13, 2000 APRB meeting. The resubmitted proposal indicates a graphic application will be installed over the garage door section of the building. Individual yellow letters spelling “Sunoco” will be in applied on a blue background . Proposed “Sunoco” sign shall be a maximum of 30 square feet.

Motion: Member Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Held, to accept the application as submitted. *Findings of fact* state the direct application of the sign on the fascia will give the appearance of a painted application.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*

4. Sign –A – Rama – 11 State Street – Signs

Present: Frank Dzikuch

Application: Submitted and date stamped 11/20/00. Approved by the building inspector 12/27/00.

Discussion: Applicant proposes to replace two signs with the exact color and dimensions as the existing signs. Material to be used is a synthetic wood grain to be painted. Each sign will be 6” x 20” sand blasted dark green with gold leaf lettering and edging. One sign will be for “The Bloom Agency” and the other will be “Clearwater”.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to accept the application as submitted including the following *findings of fact*: 1. The signs will be the same color, design, and size as the existing. 2. The replacement signs, when painted, will be similar in appearance to previously approved signs. 3. The building was constructed in the 1960’s. 4. The sign is not an architectural feature. 5. Signage of synthetic materials has been previously approved.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*

Minutes: December 5, 2000

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to approve the minutes as submitted.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes *Motion Carried*

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 .

Mary A. Marowski, Recording Secretary