

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – February 2, 2004 at 7:30 P.M.**

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	Steve Melnyk
<b>Members:</b>	Marcia Watt John Limbeck Trip Pierson (excused) Ken Willard
<b>Attorney:</b>	Jeff Turner
<b>Building Inspector:</b>	Skip Bailey
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	Jennifer Latshaw

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

**1. Michael and Wendy Devine – 8 Rand Place – window replacement**

**Present:** Michael Devine

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on December 1, 2003.

**Discussion:** This application was the result of a notice of violation for window replacement without approval from November 20, 2003. All thirteen windows in the home were replaced with a “Marvin” full wood interior / exterior window. They were replaced exactly as before. There are no divided lights on the new windows, which was how the old windows were as well. The applicant stated that a review by G & G Window repair attests that the windows should be replaced.

**Finding of Fact:**

- House built in 1895. Second oldest house on Rand Place. Built for Mortimer Rand.
- Existing windows were wood, single pane. They are large windows in most cases with no divided lights (single over single).
- House is vernacular Victorian in design; being Queen Anne in formal characteristics but spare of ornamentation.
- Windows were replaced in kind and style with no divided light.

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

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

**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 2, 2004.**

**2. Sheila Fustanio – 1Grove Street (Pickle Factory) – Window Replacement**

**Present:** Sheila Fustanio and architect

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on January 21, 2004.

**Discussion:** Ms. Fustanio proposes replacing a window on the second story of the building. Currently one window exists and two are proposed for the space. The original window was wood. The windows adjacent to this window are Anderson vinyl-clad windows, previously approved by the APRB. Ms. Fustanio and her architect stated that they could make the window wood or vinyl to match the other ones. All of the windows on the second floor are vinyl-clad, double hung windows without muntins. The first floor windows however, are more authentic and are all wood.

After the windows are installed, wood siding will be blended in with the existing and painted to match. The Board discussed whether it was important for the windows to match with the existing or match to the original that was on the building. It was agreed that the windows should match the ones

surrounding it on the second floor. There are approximately fifty other windows on the second floor that are also vinyl-clad.

**Findings of Fact:**

- Built in 1913. Several additions and alterations since then.
- The building is spare of ornament. Materials and “Style”, vary with period of additions. There is a mix of concrete block, wood siding, glass block, awning windows and double hung windows present on the Grove Street elevation alone.
- The proposed windows (replacing one double hung with two) would maintain the prevailing character and rhythm along the second floor of this elevation.
- The new windows should match in dimensions, casing (material and dimension) and operation with the existing surrounding second floor units.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:  
210-61. Standards for Review  
Paragraph A: Alterations and additions. Summary: alterations should be made consistent in character with the original structure and design.  
Paragraph C: Repairs. Summary: repair rather than replace. In the event that replacement is necessary, use same design and materials.
- Former constitution of this Board approved vinyl-clad as found.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck to approve the application for window replacement as submitted with vinyl-clad windows to match existing.

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

**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 2, 2004.**

**3. Timothy and Catherine Downs – 4 Elmbrook Drive – alteration/window replacement.**

**Present:** Mrs. Downs

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on December 18, 2003.

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an application for window replacement and exterior alteration of a doorway overhang from the January ARPB meeting. Mr. and Mrs. Downs provided more detailed drawings and dimensions as a result of the last meeting. A new awning is proposed over the side door of the house. The roof shingles would match the existing. This awning would protrude one foot from the existing house. The window to the right of the door will be removed and replaced with a wood window from “Marvin” and exterior applied muntins to match the existing. There would be three over one divided lights in the new side by side windows. The new windows will be wrapped with aluminum trim to match existing.

The Board concurred that this was not a significant feature because it is on the side elevation of the home.

**Findings of Fact:**

- House built in 1931 with additions in 1969.
- House is currently aluminum sided. This application of siding is presumed to predate the ARPB ordinance.
- Proposed side entry canopy alteration is necessary to make room for the desired window alteration.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard to approve the application as amended for window replacement based on the drawings submitted and date-stamped January 22, 2004 and window design drawings submitted and date-stamped February 2, 2004.

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

**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 2, 2004.**

**4. Great Northern Pizza Kitchens – 14 South Main Street – signs and lighting**

**Present:** Rob Desino

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on September 26, 2003.

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an application for signs and lighting for the new restaurant on South Main Street. Since the last time with the APRB, Mr. Desino met with his sign company to work on ideas and came back to the table to ask for ideas. Many of the options discussed at the last meeting were too costly and could not be explored further. Mr. Desino presented the idea of using a hanging sign in the entryway that would be suspended by chains. This would cover some of the column detail, however, it would not be applied directly to it. The logo and the lettering would be restricted only to the sign. Skip Bailey reminded the Board that although a variance is necessary for projecting signs, hanging signs are allowed. Mr. Desino proposes using a canopy style lighting to light the sign. At this time, he will meet with his sign company to work on drawings. They will be submitted for all members to look at before the next meeting.

This application will be held open until revised drawings are submitted.

**FOR INFORMATION ONLY:**

**5. Roger Powers – Schoen Place – exterior alterations**

**Discussion:** Mr. Powers brought in photographs of possible work to be done on the warehouse buildings along the canal. On one of the main buildings, Mr. Powers noted that the foundation has shifted and no longer supports part of the building. He would like to take this section out and rebuild the foundation. Also, the building's foundation is currently a mix of concrete block and stucco-like material in other areas. He proposes trying to use a matching material for all of the building by using all concrete block and then applying a stucco material to all of it. It was agreed that using a stone facing would be attractive, however it is not of the appropriate age for these buildings.

The Board stated that the concept of repairing the foundation and trying to keep it somewhat consistent would be an acceptable idea once drawings were submitted. Mr. Powers will begin to work on drawings and gathering possible product ideas for the foundation and submit these at a later date.

**MINUTE APPROVAL:**

**January 12, 2004:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Willard to approve the minutes as amended.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 2, 2004.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 8:55 P.M.

---

Jennifer Latshaw, Recording Secretary