

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – October 1, 2001 at 7:30 PM**

PRESENT: **Chairperson:** Blake Held
 Members: Steve Melnyk
 Ken Willard
 Excused: Trip Pierson
 Marcia Watt
 Attorney: Jeffrey Turner
 Board Liaison: Robert Corby
 Building Inspector: Skip Bailey
 Recording Secretary: Mary Marowski

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

1. George and Diane Drechsler – 31 Lincoln Avenue – Porch railings

Present: Mr. & Mrs. Drechsler

Application: Submitted and date stamped 9/7/01. Building inspector approved 9/13/01.

Discussion: House was built in circa 1885. Previously the home had a wrought iron railing which was removed and had not been replaced. Resident is proposing to build a wooden stair banister railing on their front porch. The style and design will match the existing porch railing.

Findings of fact: 1. Proposed railings to match existing. 2. Proposed newel post to match existing. 3. Balusters to match existing.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to approve the application based on the findings and Secretary of the Interior Standards #9.

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

 The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/1/01.

The resident raised the question of replacing his basement windows with block windows. The Board stated that this would not be an acceptable style for the era of this home.

2. Jeffrey Mason – 50 State Street – Northfield Common – Sign

Present: Jeffrey Mason

Contractor: Sign-A-Rama

Application: Submitted and date stamped 7/9/01. Building inspector approved 8/24/01.

Discussion: Owner had stated the “Northfield Common” sign is being relocated as approved by the Planning and Zoning Board. It will be two sided and lit by external lights. The sign will be on a new stone base, but otherwise posts and sign surface will be the same as is currently visible.

Findings of fact: 1. Pre-existing sign. 2. Slight alteration in the small lettering. 3. New location previously approved by the PZ Board. 4. Treatment of the sign will be identical to the current treatment with the exception of two-sided signage.

Motion: Member Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Held, to accept the application as submitted.

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

 The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/1/01.

3. Peter Crooker – 15 Sutherland Street – Window replacement

Present: Peter Crooker

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved 9/14/01.

Discussion: House is circa 1915. Mr. Crooker is proposing to replace a south facing kitchen casement window with a double hung aluminum clad wood bay window manufactured by Marvin. The proposed bay window unit will be placed in the existing opening. The unit will have three 16” single over single windows in it and be 45 degree. The projection will be 17 3/8”. The roof treatment and clapboards will match the existing home. A 5½” facing board and a 1 ½” x 3” bead board under the sill will follow the bay. The Board stated that based on the

Secretary of the Interior Standards #5, #6, and #9, the use of aluminum is not an appropriate choice for windows on the house. Mr. Crooker *amended his application* to reflect a wooden window replacement unit. The three openings will be similar in style to the bay window on the other side of the home. The existing windows do not have divided lites.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the amended application as submitted for exterior primed wood windows with no muntins based on the material information submitted and the criteria set in Secretary of Interior Standards #9.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/1/01.

4. Mitchell and Barbara Messina – 6 High Street – Addition

Present: Mitchell Messina

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved 6/26/01.

Discussion: The Planning and Zoning Board has approved the proposed addition and re-subdivision of #2, #4 and #6 High Street. The owners are proposing to construct a two-story addition on the site of their patio at the rear of their home. They have presented revised drawings to reflect the railing detail, latticework and window placement as requested by the APRB at the 9/6/01 meeting. The addition will be consistent in architectural detail and scale in regards to the roofline, siding, windows, railing, framing, materials, and all other details as with the existing home. The door for the proposed addition will be wood, in a wood frame, measuring 30” x 6’8” single pane. The south elevation will have a square awning window. The north and east elevation, in public view, are consistent in size and scale to the original home. The Board stated the addition is clearly distinct from the original house but is consistent in treatment for siding, windows, framing, and material with the original house. It is further differentiated from the original home by the size of the openings as indicated on the south elevation.

Findings of Fact: 1. The addition is distinct from the original house. 2. Criteria in the Secretary of Interior Standards #2, #5, #9, and #10 are met.

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

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/1/01.

5. Stephen DeNoto – 18 ½ Washington Road – Door Replacement

Present: Stephen DeNoto

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved 9/6/01.

Discussion: Mr. DeNoto is seeking approval for an already installed wood door with fiberglass facing to replace the previous deteriorated door. The door is set back in the addition and can not be easily seen from the sidewalk.

Findings of Fact: 1. The door being replaced is on the 1940’s addition. 2. The additions predate the APRB. 3. The addition is not historic in character. 4. The Board has previously deemed doors to be an often and readily replaced element on a house, unlike windows or other more permanent character defining architectural features of a house. The door replaced on the addition was not original and had no historic significance.

Motion: Member Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Held, to approve the door as installed. This approval is based on the findings of fact and the Board’s prior policy towards doors. It is further stated this door is not an addition to the original structure and is not very visible from the street.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/1/01.

6. David Levy – 43 Monroe Avenue – Windows replacement

Present: James Ghostiaw, Builder, Brooks Construction Co.

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved 9/17/01.

Discussion: House was built in 1989. The owner is proposing to remove the three separate existing vinyl clad windows and replace them with four grouped Anderson Terratone vinyl clad windows. These windows are barely visible from the street. No other changes are proposed.

Findings of Fact: 1. House was built in 1989. 2. Existing windows are Anderson brown tinted vinyl with removable interior muntins. 3. The three separate windows will be replaced with 4 grouped double hung windows as shown in submitted drawings. The new windows will match existing in manufacturer, material, color, and style. All other trim will match to the existing trim which is wood.

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

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/1/01.

7. Dan Hertzson – 71 South Main Street – Garage Renovations

Present: Dan Hertzson

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved 9/17/01.

Discussion: Resident is proposing to renovate the detached garage located at the rear of the property to a glass studio as depicted in the submitted drawings. On the east elevation, a concrete slab will be placed in front of the existing garage doors. These doors are deteriorating but applicant states they are repairable. The window on the north elevation is not original and will be infilled or covered. A 36” louver will be installed as close to center as possible. The studio will be cedar shaked. Galvanized ½” round replacement gutters were suggested.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application as submitted with the provision that the louver is centered (as much as possible) and all other details remain the same. The removal of the non-original window is optional.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Willard – yes *Motion carried*
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/1/01.

8. Valerie Coushine – 34 Boughton Ave – House/Garage attachment – For information only

Present: Mr. & Mrs. Coushine

Discussion: Residents are proposing a physical connection between the house and garage. The existing space between the structures is approximately three feet. The barn is approximately 30 years old, is pre-existing and non-conforming, and sided with T111. Several suggestions regarding the rooflines were discussed. The residents will return to the Board with a proposal.

Minutes:

June 4, 2001:

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the amended minutes.

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

July 9, 2001:

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

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

Member Watt had arrived at 9 PM.

August 6, 2001:

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

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

September 17, 2001:

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

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

Adjournment:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

Mary Marowski, Recording Secretary

