

accurate side elevation drawings depicting the change of materials, number of treads, tread height, width, risers, and distance from stair to ground if the treads and risers changed significantly in number and size from what was previously submitted and approved.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the use of brick on the stairs. The brick sample is to be approved by inspection.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01.

Retaining Wall – For Information Only:

Discussion: Mr. Newcomb proposed to construct an interlocking block retaining wall at the Phoenix Building on the east side of the property bordering the Starbucks parking lot. There was a smaller retaining wall there previously; however, it has deteriorated due to building settling and water drainage issue. There are two Gingko trees where this wall is to be built.

The Board expressed a strong preference for the use of natural stone rather than an interlocking block which is a new building material that the Board felt should not be used with a historic structure. The Board had suggested that Mr. Newcomb counsel with a landscape architect regarding the best materials and design for the retaining wall with sensitivity given to the historic aspect of the property, its highly significant location in the Village, and the two Gingko trees. The Board also advised Mr. Newcomb to secure the opinion of a landscape architect or arborist regarding the Gingko trees to obtain ideas on proceeding with the construction of a retaining wall without damage being sustained to the trees.

4. Sissy's Pride Inc. – 9 South Main Street – Sign

Present: Mary Ann Hendricks

Application: Submitted and date stamped 7/19/01. Building Inspector approved 7/20/01.

Discussion: The owner is seeking approval to add “Sissy’s” to the Country Gallery storefront sign. The “Sissy’s” sign will be 64” W x 27” H. The black letters will be 6 ¾” H and will match the “Country Gallery” sign which is 27” H x 83” L.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Held, to approve the addition of “Sissy’s” to the storefront as described and painted to match the letters as the pre-existing sign.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01.

5. Robert Smith – 11 Elmbrook Drive – Storage Shed addition

Present: Robert Smith

Application: Submitted and date stamped 7/23/01. Building Inspector approved 7/23/01.

Discussion: The owner is proposing to construct a 6’ x 8’ x 8’ wood storage building, vinyl sided to match the house. Door opening is 5’ x 7’; window is 18” x 23”; ridge vented; mounted on 4” x 4” x 6’ skids. It will be located at the rear of the property at the north wall of the garage. It will be unattached. Mr. Smith amends his application to have the structure built using T111 vertical wood boards in place of the vinyl siding. Roof is to be shingled.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk to approve the application as submitted and amended to T111 wood siding with all other details.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01.

6. Jonathan and Megan Phillips – 21 Maple Street - Porch railing extension

Present: Mr. and Mrs. Phillips

Application: Submitted, date stamped and Building Inspector approved 7/25/01.

Discussion: The owners stated this circa 1925 home previously had wrought iron railings that were not necessarily original to the home. Their intention was to restore the railings to wood, consistent with the original home.

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

Findings of Fact: 1. The balusters, spacing, and height match the existing porch. New railing in wood painted to match existing rail.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01

7. Jeff and Sarah Koopus – 14 Locust Street – Chimney

Present: Jeff and Sarah Koopus

Application: Submitted and date stamped 7/30/01. Building Inspector approved 7/31/01.

Discussion: The owners stated the chimney on their 1823 home was deteriorated and was a structural hazard. Upon inspection for review, the Board stated the new chimney looks appropriate for the house as built.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk to approve the chimney as built.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01.

8. J. Daniel Subtelny – 11 Austin Park – Garage Alteration

Present: Harold Filbert, Contractor

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and Building Inspector approved 7/25/01.

Discussion: Mr. Filbert is proposing to alter the garage door to eliminate the hazardous condition that exists when exiting the kitchen. The garage door rail cuts in front of the kitchen door. Mr. Filbert proposes to maintain the existing 16-foot garage door opening; however, change the garage door to a 12-foot door and the installation of a 30-inch mandoor on the left side. There will be a partition between the mandoor and the garage door. The partition will be vinyl sided to match the existing house. The proposed white garage door will be a “Wayne Dalton, Thermogard II steel insulated door” with a Quantum opener. The white mandoor is a “Therma-Tru steel insulated door with a top window lite, model #262.”

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Held, to approve the application as submitted for true insulated steel door with no lites in the garage door. There will be vinyl siding between the garage door and the mandoor to match the existing.

Findings of Fact: 1. 1961 home. 2. Pre-existing vinyl sided home. 3. Mandoor with one lite, glass upper half, design to be as shown in the application. 4. Replacement materials in kind.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01.

9. Andrew Chatman – 2 Boughton Ave. – Glass door replacement

Present: Andrew Chatman

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and Building Inspector approved 7/20/01.

Discussion: Mr. Chatman was cited with a violation notice by the Building Inspector for the installation of replacement Anderson double pane vinyl glass doors on the rear of the home without prior approval. The original 1870 home had the rear addition built in 1975. The prior wood door was rotted and had no locking mechanism.

The Board has decided to **hold open the application** to research details and to discuss this matter with the Trustees.

10. David and Jill Werner – 34 Church Street – Single restoration

Present: David and Jill Werner

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and Building Inspector approved 7/25/01.

Discussion: The owners are proposing to remove the cedar siding and to restore the entire 1820’s home to the original narrow slat clapboard siding. Upon removal of the cedar siding from the front facade, the applicants will decide whether to continue the restoration process to the balance of the home. The owner stated the dimension of windows was lost with the cedar application. The Board is asking the applicant to choose style appropriate detail for the corner treatment of the home. If any details or corner treatments are added which are not original to the house or a reproduction of the original details, further review is required by the Board prior to installation. The Board is further

asking the applicant to provide the Board with photos of similar style homes out of historic manuals for documentation of the restoration process.

Motion Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to approve the removal of the siding to reveal/restore the original siding and trim work to match the existing. If there is a change to trim work, applicant will come in for approval.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01.

11. Roger Powers – 25 Schoen Place – Restoration/Alteration – Building #4

Present: Roger Powers

Contractor: Rochester Colonial

Application: Submitted and date stamped 7/25/01. Building Inspector approved 7/31/01.

Discussion: Mr. Powers is renovating the Grain Mill but not replicating it to its original appearance. There will be no changes or alterations to the *West* elevation at this time. For the *East, North and South elevations*, new 3' x 5' double hung insulated glass windows throughout the mill will be all natural primed Ponderosa pine wood with four inch casings will be added as specified in the application. Siding on the structure will be changed from metal siding to 1' x 6' tongue and groove and stained/painted barn red in areas as stated in the application. Face and corner trim moldings to match the existing are also proposed. For ventilation purposes, sliding doors are proposed for the East and North elevation of the mill. *North elevation:* A working hinged wooden transom window is proposed above the open barn door. Applicant is also seeking approval for a 30' deck with an overhang canopy with an additional 34' canopy to cover the handicap access to the basement. The roof/canopy would be constructed to match the proposed structure on the south side. Posts for structural considerations will support the canopy. *South elevation:* A pressure treated, wood porch/deck with an asphalt shingled roof and a wood canopy supported by rods., cable, or chain, will be painted/stained to match the existing building. Also approval is sought for a broken pre-existing elevator head "shack" for the roof of building #4. This structure would be used to house exhaust fans and motors.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to approve the application as submitted withholding a decision on the "open door" for review.

Findings of Fact: 1. Buildings as constructed were vernacular, functional in character, originally light industrial, simple in form and materials. Varied in the fenestration, 1930's circa, multiple alterations over the years, various levels of disrepair. Based on those findings, subsequent issues, general **motion** to approve proposed alterations as submitted in keeping material and scale and character with original building. Structurally restoring building to more unified materials. Withhold "open door" issue for further review. Windows with simulated divided lights, primed wood exteriors. Materials and dimensions as specified in application. Existing vents incorporated lights for security approved.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; - Watt – yes *Motion carried*
This decision is filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 8/6/01.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Mary Marowski, Recording Secretary