

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – March 1, 2004 at 7:30 P.M.**

PRESENT:

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Chairperson: | Steve Melnyk |
| Members: | Marcia Watt John Limbeck Trip Pierson Ken Willard |
| Attorney: | Jeff Turner |
| Building Inspector: | Skip Bailey |
| Recording Secretary: | Jennifer Latshaw |

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 7:45 P.M.

1. Brian and Michelle Trott – 29 E. Jefferson Road - Fence

Present: Brian Trott

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on February 13, 2004.

Discussion: The Trotts propose the installation of a metal fence and gates to match period wrought-iron fencing on both side yards of the property in order to separate the front and rear yards and increase safety for the child. The fence on the east side of the house would be a 12 foot gate on the driveway with a maximum height of three feet. On the west side of the house, the fence would be four foot high approximately ten feet out and then change to five feet in height where the land slopes down. The top of the fence would all remain even.

The fence would be black aluminum with finials on top of each picket and would mimic wrought iron fences made around the time the house was constructed in 1928. There is currently no other wrought iron to match this fence to on the property. The finish will be painted on. Mr. Trott stated that they are not looking for privacy, only security. They are not proposing to run the fence between the properties at this time. They are only proposing the fence across the front. The Trotts also propose a stone wall under the west side fence where the land slopes away in order to close off the gap that will be created. Mr. Trott proposes using moss stone which is dry stacked and will make the fence appear as though it sits directly on the wall.

The Board discussed the material used for the fence as aluminum is not commonly used in the Village. They agreed that from a distance and in the black color it is a good replica to period style wrought iron fencing. There is nowhere in the existing code that specifically addresses materials for fencing. The construction of the fence follows the same manner as wrought iron, in that it is bolted together.

Finding of Fact:

- House built in 1928.
- The pieces of this fence are constructed in similar fashion as a traditional wrought iron fence.
- The aluminum fence is similar in appearance to a traditional wrought iron fence.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck to approve the application for the fence as submitted with the condition to supply a sample of the moss stone before the next month's meeting. A picture or actual sample may be submitted and Board members will vote at the next meeting. The applicant allows the Board to move without his presence.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 1, 2004.

2. EJ Del Monte Corporation – 41 North Main Street – fence

Present: John Tengaras - architect

Application: Submitted, date stamped on February 17, 2004 and building inspector approved on February 18, 2004.

Discussion: Mr. Tengaras proposes the removal of an existing chain link fence that measures four feet in height. This would be replaced with commercial grade aluminum picket fencing. The fence needs to be replaced along 110 feet of canal front in order to allow the Fire Department access to the train trestle. This fence is along the entry drive near the restaurant and helps to deter cars from the canal area.

The fence will be four feet in height to match the existing chain link height. It will be painted white to match the other white details around the hotel and restaurant such as doorways, trim and the flagpole. The fence will also have shrubbery along it.

A Board member brought up the concern that the white color of this fence takes away from the aluminum having a traditional appearance like wrought iron, which is traditionally black. It does not match nearby hotel railings that are painted black or dark green. Mr. Tengaras noted that they would like to have the fence match the rest of the details that are currently white and this building is newer in construction.

Findings of Fact:

- Built in 1970's
- This fence would replace a chain link fence.
- The Planning Board has approved the location and height of this fence.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck to approve the application for the three rail, white aluminum fence as submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – no; Pierson- yes. Motion carried.

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 1, 2004.

3. Christopher Bove – 8 Wood Street – window replacement

Present: Christopher Bove

Application: Submitted, date stamped and building inspector approved on February 20, 2004.

Discussion: Mr. Bove appeared before the Board as a result of a Notice of Violation for vinyl windows that are located on a second story enclosed porch. The previous owner had installed the windows and it was not disclosed at the time of the sale. Mr. Bove purchased the house one year ago. The windows are vinyl with wood clad on the exterior. No vinyl shows on the outside except for the muntins.

This same application was submitted by the previous owner, Pam Wright, for these exact windows. The application (certificate #917) was denied and the windows were supposed to have been changed to wood. As a result, the Board cannot accept this application because there is still a violation order in effect for this property.

Mr. Bove was advised that these windows need to be replaced to wood windows with one over one divided lights. The space was formerly a sleeping porch and would not have had the existing muntins. Mr. Bove must re-apply at a later date with a style that is approvable. Until then, he may work with the Building Inspector on a suitable timeline for replacement of these windows.

4. Hall Sixty – Six Associates (Sign for Talbots) – 66 Monroe Avenue - sign

Present: Michael from Clinton Signs

Application: Submitted, date stamped on February 10, 2004 and building inspector approved on February 19, 2004.

Discussion: This application is for the free-standing sign in front of the Talbot's building that advertises Talbot's as well as Forsythe Jewelers. This sign was previously approved based on drawings that were submitted. However, the sign and the drawing approved do not currently match. Skip Bailey pointed out that there are many details that are not identical to the drawing such as the width of the siding used, different trim and the oval placards are not spaced evenly. Michael of Clinton Signs stated that the drawings and kit come from a national sign company in Pennsylvania and then his company puts it together.

After discussion by the Board, it was agreed that at the very least, the placards could be dropped down in the siding area in order to space them more evenly. Michael stated that if the Talbot's placard is lowered, there might be visible holes. He would try to lower that one, but would leave it alone and lower and center the Forsythe Jeweler's sign as well. Skip Bailey stated that the sign is currently in compliance in terms of the overall height off the ground.

Michael will submit a digital picture of the completed sign to the Village when it is completed.

5) Great Northern Pizza Kitchen – 14 South Main Street – signs/ lighting

Present: Rob Desino

Discussion: Mr. Desino presented the Board with a possible new sign and lighting idea for the front of his business. However, since the last time they were before the Board, the Mayor, Robert Corby examined the tree in front of their building and stated that it could be removed. The tree had been hit before and was not in great shape. It could instead be replaced with a type of tree that would have a higher canopy, which would enable people to see a sign in the front of the building. The original plan had been to mimic the sign on the old bank by writing the name in letters across the bay window soffit area. Mr. Desino agreed that this was the best idea for sign placement and did not ask for approval of the new one submitted tonight.

The other issue discussed was the screening of the mechanicals on the roof. In the original plans, these were supposed to be screened. The architect is currently sketching out possible ideas including a possible parapet to hide these.

This application will be held open until Mr. Desino comes back to the Board with a lighting plan, design for the mechanical screening and final sign details for the bay window.

6) Canandaigua National Bank – 18 State Street – demolition/addition/ lighting for new ATM

Present: Chris Ragus – architect

Application: Submitted, date-stamped and building inspector approved on February 19, 2004.

Discussion: Mr. Ragus presented plans for Board approval for demolition of the existing ATM and canopy, the addition of a new ATM and remote teller next to the bank and lighting for the new area. This project was prompted due to the Town Library Project and parking reconfiguration. Canandaigua National agreed to move the ATM next to the building in order to make room for more parking at the rear of the bank in the Public parking area. As a result, they propose an 8'8" addition to the south of the existing building with a canopy spanning over the ATM and remote teller lanes. The height of the canopy would be 12 feet which is the standardized clearance height for ATM lanes. A second smaller canopy is proposed at the existing accessible entrance door on the west side of the building. This door will become a more prominent entrance and the canopy will mark it as such.

The addition and the canopy will use the same clapboards and columns as the existing original building. They will use the same colors and character as the original as well.

There is also a window change on the west side of the building shown on drawings submitted on March 1, 2004. The window would provide a better view of the teller lanes on that side of the building.

The Board discussed some concerns with the proposed plans in terms of the scale of the proposed addition and canopy height. Compared to the building, these seem rather large in scale even though they sit to the rear of the building and at an angle.

The Board agreed to table this discussion until they can have Blake Held, the Board's architectural consultant look further at these designs. They feel that his opinion is necessary for a building that has such architectural presence in the Village. After a memo has been submitted with his opinion, the Board will reconvene and discuss this application further. Mr. Ragus requested a meeting as soon as possible in order to keep up with the timeline that the library has presented them with.

7) Talbots – 66 Monroe Avenue – screening

Present: Robert Barkstrom, architect

Application: Submitted, date-stamped and building inspector approved on February 13, 2004.

Discussion: Mr. Barkstrom proposes landscape screening for exterior equipment at the new Talbot's addition. He also proposes the installation of latticework below the open deck to conceal ductwork. The latticework would be pressure treated wood stained gray to match the clapboards. The areas around the mechanical equipment would be screened with four foot planting material.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Willard to approve the application for screening and landscaping as submitted.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 1, 2004.

8) Roger Powers – 25 Schoen Place – window replacement, demolition, foundation

Present: Roger Powers

Application: Submitted, date-stamped and building inspector approved on February 18, 2004.

Discussion: Mr. Powers proposes changes to building #4 at 25 Schoen Place. These changes include:

- Replacing all old metal siding with 4"/6" wood tongue and groove vertical siding to match existing siding at east end of the building. This will be stained barn red.
- Remove rubble and protruding foundation at east end of building. Replace footer and reconstruct with concrete block to match foundation at west end of building.
- Cover all new and old concrete block with masonry/epoxy material to match the foundation on the east side of the building.
- Install one additional double hung window in second story at west end of the south elevation. The window would be all wood construction to match neighboring windows and made by Rochester Colonial. Dimension of this window would be 34 x56 inches)
- Install a wood double hung window in foundation wall at the west end of the building to match those at the east end. Rochester Colonial would make this and dimensions would be 34 x 56 inches.
- Install a double hung all wood window on the first story in place of the existing barn sash. This window will be centered between the existing windows rather than identical to what is there.
- In west elevation foundation wall, install an additional basement sash to match the existing one. Dimensions are 26 x 24".
- In west elevation, install a double hung wood window to match existing on the first story and two on the second story to match existing. These will be all wood construction by Rochester Colonial and measure 34 x 56".
- Convert wood / metal exhaust hood into a light fixture on the west elevation. The light fixture would not be visible.

Findings of Fact:

- 1) **The barn sash is not a significant architectural feature due to continuous relocation of the opening over the years.**
- 2) **The existing barn has a variety of windows and no clearly established architectural pattern.**

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard to accept the proposal as submitted with the amendment of the barn sash window to indicate a double hung window identical to the other first floor windows with the dimension of 34 x 60 inches. This approval is contingent upon the receipt of cutsheets for the windows and the epoxy material provided to the Building Inspector.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 1, 2004.

For Information Only:

Roger Powers – 25 Schoen Place – Building #3 – Addition

Discussion: Mr. Powers submitted plans for a possible renovation and addition to building #3. This would include a proposed eight-foot addition to the west and a proposed eight-foot addition to the north. This building was the original scale building and Roger would like to restore it and renovate it for used space. He presented before and after pictures to the Board for feedback. The Board agreed to have Blake Held review these and give Roger feedback so that he may continue on with plans for this project.

MINUTE APPROVAL:

January 5, 2004:

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

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes. Motion carried.

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 1, 2004.

February 2, 2004:

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

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 1, 2004.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 10:35 P.M.

Jennifer Latshaw, Recording Secretary