

Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Special Meeting – September 23, 2003 at 7:30 PM

PRESENT:

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

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a. m. by Chairperson Held.

1. First Presbyterian Church – 21 Church Street – Building restoration

Present: Virginia Searl

Application: Submitted and date stamped 8/27/03. Building inspector approved 9/3/03.

Discussion: Mrs. Searl stated the church had received a grant for external repairs. Slate on the steeple had been replaced two summers ago. The asphalt shingles on the spirelet will be removed and replaced with slate shingles matching the existing slate on the steeple. The existing striped feature on the spirelet will not be restored. Currently there is a weather vane with a copper cap. Bright copper cone with throat and collar on top is being proposed and is also awaiting SHPO approval. A cricket will be installed to divert the water away from the tower wall on the main roof (east side). The cricket will be have a copper roof (grey). The quatrefoil windows were improperly installed and will therefore be removed and reset appropriately. A blue tint glass (in kind) will be installed where the damaged glass exists. In the tower, the belfry floor and roof are leaking. Copper roofing will be installed. The roofing material will only be visible at the stone sill of the louver openings. It will extend over the top of the sill and down the side to divert water away from the tower wall. On the southside of the church, the chimney brick is deteriorating and will need to be replaced in kind. All other restoration work for the church will be done in kind.

Motion: Member Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the building restorations as submitted and noting the following: 1. Asphalt shingles will be replaced with slate. It will include a copper cone cap and ball. 2. Cricket is a structure consistent with the architecture and is only marginally visible. 3. In kind replacement of glass. 4. Deteriorated brick will be replaced in kind. (samples left at Village Hall for Board members review).

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

The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 9/23/03.

2. Wilma and Renard Beaty – 17 W. Jefferson Road – Fence

Present: Mrs. Beaty

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved 8/27/03.

Discussion: Mr. Beaty had come before the APRB on 9/8/03 seeking approval for the completion of a black vinyl coated chain link fence running along the property perimeter behind his house. A building permit for most of the fence installation was previously issued by the code enforcement officer, Skip Bailey, (permit # 1821), since he deemed these portions not visible from a public right of way. Neighboring residents complained that portions of what was already constructed are visible from both West Jefferson Road and Village Grove. The Board held the application open pending further review by all Board members.

At the continuation of the application, Mrs. Beaty was present. Chairperson Held began with a review of the precedent concerning what constitutes a “public right of way”. Previously, it has been

determined by this Board, that a “private road” such as Village Grove is still considered public since it is plowed by the Village and automobile and pedestrian traffic are not restricted.

Chairperson Held polled Board members as to whether existing portions of the installed fence were visible from either West Jefferson or Village Grove. All stated “yes” for both locations. A discussion amongst Board members followed over the interpretation of Section 210-60 A (1) of the Village Code. In essence, the question was whether a structure’s being at all visible near it in its entirety falls within the purview of the Board or if only those visible portions of the structure (fence in this case) are to be reviewed by the Board. Member Watt argued the latter while Chairperson Held stated this would result in a “patchwork” approach which is contrary to the intent of the Code.

Members then commented on the appropriateness of a six foot high chain link fence within the Village. Member Melnyk commented that the fence has an institutional or commercial look inconsistent with the residential setting of its installation. The dates of construction of the applicant’s home and surrounding homes are consistent in era with the use of chain link as a fencing material.

It was also discussed that the APRB typically reviews applications “blind” as to whether the appropriateness of work has already been done. In this instance, Chairperson Held stated the APRB should equally disregard the prior issuance of a building permit.

Findings of fact: 1. Village Code, Section 210 57, -58, -60. 2. The home was built in 1953 and is of contemporary design. Surrounding properties were built in the mid-1980’s. 3. The proposed exterior design and authenticity to surrounding area is of a commercial institutional vinyl look not appropriate to the residential area. 4. Large portions of the fence along the property line on Village Grove and on West Jefferson Road can be seen from the public way and is therefore, inappropriate due to the visibility criteria set forth in the Village Code.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to reject the application for the completion of installation for the 6’ black vinyl coated chain link fence.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 9/23/03.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to deny the original installation of a black vinyl-coated chain link fence, since a portion thereof is visible from the public rights of way.

Vote: Held – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes; Watt – no; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 9/23/03.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 A. M.

Mary A. Marowski, Recording Secretary