

Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – October 6, 2003 at 7:30 PM

PRESENT:

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Members: | Blake Held Steve Melnyk Trip Pierson Marcia Watt (7:40 P. M.) Ken Willard |
| Attorney: | Jeffrey Turner |
| Board Liaison: | Robert Corby |
| Recording Secretary: | Jennifer Latshaw |
| Building Inspector: | Skip Bailey |

Chairperson Held called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

1. Chris Ike- 5 Green Hill Lane – Fence

Present: Chris and Laura Ike

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved 9/25/03.

Discussion: Resident is submitting an addendum to a previously approved fence application (9/8/03).

Submitted revisions include an amended survey map depicting the revised location of the fence, gate style, and a wire choice to be used as backing for a round (amended) split rail fence (photo submitted). The fence will be flush with the back (rear) elevation of the home as previously recommended by the APRB. Fence posts will be four foot high with rails standing at three and a half-foot high. House was built in 1952.

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

Findings of Fact:

1. House built in 1952.
2. Amended application is for a round rail system with a secondary wire backing.
3. Gate on either side of fence.
4. Fence is now located at the back of the house.
5. Wire fencing over time will be unobtrusive, will rust, and be less noticeable.
6. Fence style is characteristic of the age of the home.

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

The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

2. Estela Meyer – 4 Stonegate Lane – Fence

Present: Ronald and Estela Meyer

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved 9/26/03.

Discussion: Mr. and Mrs. Meyer are proposing to install a wood picket fence with a backyard access gate on the garage side of their house to match the existing fence on the opposite side of the house. The fence will begin at the rear of the home and terminate at the rear property line. The fourteen-foot long fence with backyard access gate will be in the same style and material as the existing fence. The house dates to 1963 and the existing fence is approximately three years old.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Melynk, to accept the application for a fence and gate with the same size, style and material as the existing fence. The fence will also be painted.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

3. Marsha Wetzel – 10 Austin Park – Deck

Present: Marsha Wetzel, Ali Putney (sign interpreter)

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on 9/24/03

Discussion: Ms. Wetzel proposes adding a deck to the back of her 1886 home. It will be a wood deck rather than a traditional porch. It will be well below the main floor level of the house and will be plus or minus six

Architectural Preservation and Review Board Minutes of 10/06/03

inches above the grade for much of its perimeter and eighteen inches above grade where the ground drops off. The posts would be made of wood in the Colonial Spindle design shown on the submitted designs. The existing steps would stay. Board Members commented that the deck is more akin to a patio than a traditional porch. However, it was determined that a rail around the deck is necessary due to the areas where the drop changes to approximately 18 inches. Current building code states that surfaces less than thirty inches above grade do not require a handrail. The board agrees it is an uncomfortable height without rails.

All corner posts will be made of wood and turned. The Board stated the straight balusters and turned corner posts with caps would be more appropriate with existing design elements of this house. The Board concurs that although the deck is a modern structure, the current front stoop rails are similar in style and the design would be more consistent with the character of the home and the style in the Village. It was suggested that latticework or landscaping be incorporated to mask the concrete footings where there is an 18 inch opening.

Motion: A motion was made by Member Pierson and seconded by Member Willard to approve the application as submitted for the deck as follows:

1. The deck must be constructed only of wood.
2. It resembles the silhouette of newels and tops from Therma-Porch Railings.
3. It is the same style as the Chesterfield 4 ¼ inch post.
4. It is painted.
5. Straight, 2 x 2 balusters are used as shown in the Fiberon brochure.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Held – yes; Watt – yes; Pierson – yes. **Motion carried.**
Decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

4. Mary Maxwell – 30 Eastview Terrace – Deck

Present: Mary Maxwell

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on 9/25/03.

Discussion: Ms. Maxwell proposed the replacement of a deck that was on this site, but was already taken down due to safety issues. She would like to replace the deck with Trex composite wood decking that would be reddish or cedar colored to match the existing brick on the house. The same design and placement of the deck would be used, except for reducing the new deck by one foot to make it even with the existing sidewalk. This would be a one-level deck. Due to the fact that the yard terraces in the back, the height at the house would be level with the sidewalk with barely a step up. At the back of the house, the deck would be five feet off the ground. The railing type for this deck would be 2 x 2 spindles that are five inches on center. Material to be used will be “Choice” decking which is a composite wood that does not require staining or painting. Concerns were sited regarding the proposed rail system. Usually an interlocking system is installed without screws and nails, which gives a very different appearance from wood rails. It was decided the Building Inspector will ensure that the contractor install the rail system in the same manner as a wood system.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk to approve the application as submitted with the contingency that the wood composite rail system is applied in the same manner as wood, using nails or screws.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Held – yes; Watt – no; Pierson – yes. **Motion carried.**

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

5. Jamie Bracy – (r-house) – 11 State Street – Sign

Present: Jamie Bracy

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved 9/25/03.

Discussion: Mr. Bracy is proposing to replace the existing banner with a wood grain (sandblasted effect) sign (International (ERA) Collection), white face with golden yellow border, and raised inner border. Sign dimensions are one foot high by fourteen feet long, fitting into the space of the previously existing sign.

Motion: Member Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt to approve the application for the sign as submitted.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

6. Jim Murray – 50 State Street – Sign

Present: Jim Murray

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved 9/25/03.

Architectural Preservation and Review Board Minutes of 10/06/03

Discussion: Mr. Murray proposes to replace the current Rick's Prime Rib House sign with a new sign depicting the name change of Schoen Place Prime Rib and Grill. This sign will be placed in the exact location as the existing sign. The material to be used is plastic lettering to be painted black. The part of the sign that reads "Prime Rib and Grill" will be curved as shown on the submitted diagram.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk to approve the application as submitted for this sign.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

7. Great Northern Pizza Kitchen – 14 South Main Street – Sign/Awnings

Present: Robert and Chris Desino

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved 9/26/03.

Discussion: (Awnings) The owners proposed the installation of three awnings on the south elevation (Church Street) of the building and one awning on the west elevation (South Main Street). These awnings would hang two feet, six inches out from the building. The design will be a two-color system with a vertical pattern of Mulberry and Concord Grape. All window trim will be painted light gray and the cornice would be a dark plum. The Board stated some concern over painting the cornice and trim anything but white. This building was built in the 1960's in a Colonial Revival style, which would call for brick with white woodwork. Attorney Turner stated that this board can not regulate color without a change in code from the Board of Trustees.

The three side awnings, when installed, will cover the lintels and keystones over each of the side windows but will not destroy these architectural elements. An awning for the northwest window was also discussed. This awning would similarly mask the keystone and lintel, a more prominent architectural element, on the front facade. Village Code 210.61 (a) was cited regarding the contemporary design and distinctive features.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson to approve the proposed awnings on the south side of the building (Church Street) which will extend two feet, six inches out.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – no; Held – yes; Watt – yes; Pierson – yes. **Motion carried.**

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

Discussion: (Signage- West and South Elevations) The owners stated that on the west elevation, they are faced with a tree that obstructs the view of the front of the building. On the corners of the building next to the front and rear entrances, the brick quoins makes it challenging to hang a sign flat against the facade. They propose placing an auxiliary sign at the rear or east entrance as shown on the photos submitted. They are also proposing a building mounted sign on the south and west elevation. The material of the signs will be 1 ½ inches thick foam with a carved wood appearance. In discussion, it was decided a hanging sign in lieu of the two signs (at the west and south elevation) would be more appropriate, however this will need approval from the Planning and Zoning Board. The APRB will draft a letter to the Planning and Zoning board in support of this style of sign upon receipt of an acceptable design. The temporary banner will remain until an approved sign scheme is installed.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, that the signage issue for the west and south signs be *held open* until further approval.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

Discussion (Signage – East Elevation):

The Board discussed the overall size and placement of the sign at the rear entrance of the building. It was decided that the sign could remain, providing that it will be centered under the light and not overlap the quoines.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to approve the sign on the east elevation at the rear entrance to the building as submitted, provided the sign will be centered under the light fixture and sized accordingly so that it will not overlap the quoins.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

8. Mike and Nancy Mooney – 18 Eastview Terrace – Addition

Present: Tony D'Arpino – Signature Homes

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved 9/26/03.

Architectural Preservation and Review Board Minutes of 10/06/03

Discussion: Mr. D'Arpino submitted a proposal for enclosing the existing porch on the 1929 house (marginally visible from the west). Three double hung wood windows will be installed in the porch. Existing rough opening for the window is 37 ½ inches. The exterior of the porch will be cedar shake. Two awning windows were proposed. The awning window on the side elevation was discussed and later removed from consideration by the applicant's representative due to board comments that it is stylistically inappropriate. It was determined that the rear elevation is not visible from the public right of way and therefore not within the purview of this board. Shutters are proposed for the window on the front elevation of the home to match existing shutters on this elevation. There will be no shutters on the side elevation of the home. The existing shutters are not likely original to this house, however they are an acceptable treatment to a house of this era.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to approve the plan submitted providing that the:

- a. Window on Eastview Terrace elevation is shifted to the left and will be located 16 inches from the outside corner.
- b. The wood window will have wood shutters matching those on the house and affixed in the same manner as the existing windows.
- c. Reveal of cedar shingle from the corner shutter will be a minimum of 4 inches.
- d. North elevation window will be shifted from the corner and an additional double hung window will be added 16 inches from that window.
- e. All siding will match existing cedar siding.
- f. All Lincoln windows will have exterior muntins as shown in the documentation provided.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

9. Jeffrey Mason – 45 Schoen Place – Demolition / New Construction.

Present: Nathaniel Development, Architect and Mr. Mason

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved 9/25/03.

Discussion (Demolition of 45 Schoen Place): The Planning and Zoning Board had stated that a condition of the approval for demolition of 45 Schoen Place would be the rebuilding of a new structure. The APRB stated that the 1960's building which has had multiple additions and alterations, has no historic significance to the Village and that, due to the extent of the fire damage, it was not salvageable. Therefore, demolition of the existing structure will be approvable upon acceptance of a design for its replacement.

Motion: Chairperson Held made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to approve the demolition of the burned structure at 45 Schoen Place contingent upon an approved replacement.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

Findings of Fact:

1. Village Code 210.61 e)
2. Original building dates from 1960's.
3. Fire damage precludes repair.

Discussion (New construction) The architect provided plans for the new construction. Facing the Northfield Commons Campus, it is a two-story building and a one story building facing the canal. It is a wood sided structure with a steep roof and porch along the canal elevation. All windows will be aluminum clad, double hung, with clear glazing. Submission of landscaping, drainage, lighting, and the placement of handicap parking still need to receive the approval of the Planning and Zoning Board.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion seconded by Member Melnyk, to approve the plans as submitted.

Findings of fact:

1. SEQR Type II Action, 617.5 (c) (2). No further action is necessary by the APRB. This is a replacement of a commercial structure in kind. (4000 square feet)
2. The 1960's building located at 45 Schoen Place was destroyed by fire and suffered extensive damage, therefore, preservation is not warranted. (Village Code 210.61e) Demolition is granted. The new building, as previously presented (9/8/03), will have an eight foot deep front porch and a 2000 square foot upper level. The siding will be cedar board on board, wood columns, fiberglass shingled roof, dormers on front, and Pella windows. Proposed building is consistent in character with other buildings on Schoen Place.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on 10/06/03.

Architectural Preservation and Review Board Minutes of 10/06/03

Minute Review:

8/4/03:

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

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

The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/6/03.

8/13/03:

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

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

The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/6/03.

9/8/03:

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

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

The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/6/03.

9/23/03:

Motion: Member Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to accept the amended minutes.

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

The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk 10/6/03.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 PM.

Jennifer Latshaw, Recording Secretary