

Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – May 3, 2004 at 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Steve Melnyk
Members:	John Limbeck
	Trip Pierson
	Ken Willard
	Marcia Watt (excused)
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Building Inspector:	Skip Bailey
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

1. Lynn Crawford (Austin Harvard Gallery) – 50 State St. – Signage

Present: Lynn Crawford

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on April 22, 2004.

Discussion: This application is for 2 signs for a business in Northfield Commons. The proposed sign for the front of the building is wood, 6 feet wide by 2 ½ feet high, with carved metallic gold on-gloss background. It will be centered under the eaves, approximately 6 inches below the light. The existing sign from the front façade will be moved to the right side of the rear of the building, as depicted on the photo submitted. This sign is 6 feet wide by 2 ½ feet high, made of plywood, gold on black.

Findings of Fact:

- Building built or altered in late 20th Century. It maintains much of the architectural character of this section of the district.
- Proposed sign is of materials consistent with others of similar type.
- Proposed sign to be mounted on face – a typical treatment for this purpose.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the application as submitted, based on the findings, for two wooden signs, placed as indicated in the application, both being black background with gold lettering.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

2. Robert Michaels (The Cottage) 34½ State St – Signage

Present: Susan Exford

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

Discussion: The applicant requests approval of two signs. One sign measures 42" x 24" and will be placed to the left of the entrance to the building, in the location of the former Friday's Child sign. It will be made of wood and have a white background with black and burnished gold design and lettering. The second sign is a directory sign, measuring 7 ¾" x 53 ¾", with a white background and black and burnished gold design and lettering.

Findings of Fact:

- Building built or altered in late 20th Century. It maintains much of architectural character of this section of the district.
- Proposed sign is of materials consistent with others of similar type.
- Proposed sign to be mounted on face – a typical treatment for this purpose.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to accept the signage, as submitted, the material being wood, with a white background with painted-on gold with black outline lettering and design, measuring 42 x 24 inches; the phone number will not be on the sign, and it will be hung to the left of the entrance door on the current mounts. The directory sign, also made of wood, will have burnished gold detail, white background, and black outline on the letters and design. Adopt findings submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

3. J.T. Ambrosi – 5 Austin Pk – garage door replacement

Present: Mr. Ambrosi

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on April 15, 2004. Building inspector approved on April 21, 2004.

Discussion: The applicant proposes to replace a worn-out wood door on a garage with a fiberglass door that will be painted green.

Findings of Fact:

- House built ca. 1958.
- House is currently vinyl sided.
- House is located in a less publicly prominent location and does not directly impact any more historically significant structures.
- Replacement doors of alternative materials have been previously approved by this board based upon individual circumstances of those applications.
- Doors are recognized by this board to be an often and easily replaced feature of a house.
- The era of the home, styles and materials in use at the time of the home's construction are not inconsistent with the proposed style and material of the replacement door.

Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

§ 210-61. Standards for Review

B. New Construction. Summary: New construction should be made consistent in character with the architectural styles of historic value in the district.

C. Repairs. Repair rather than replace deteriorated architectural features.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to accept the application as submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Pierson – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

4. Chas Inzinna (Soho) – 1 N. Main St – Sign

Present: Chas Inzinna
Rob Redondo

Application: Submitted and date stamped January 7, 2004. Building inspector approved on April 21, 2004.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing to replace their front and rear-entrance business signs, as presented in the application.

Rear Sign Discussion:

The rear sign will be circular, with a 27" diameter, giving it a surface area of 3.97 square feet, painted with acrylics with a gold background and black letters, and constructed of ½-inch wood.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the application for the replacement sign, as submitted, it being made of wood, 27" in diameter, with gold painted background and black painted letters.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

Front sign:

The proposed front sign will be 10 feet long by 2 feet tall and made of solid wood. The lettering and frame will be raised ½ inch and painted gold, and the background will be brick-colored. It will be placed in the right corner where the existing sign is.

Finding of fact:

- A striking feature of the structure is the broad white frieze that spans the Main Street elevation and wraps to Monroe. This feature is not original to the structure and represents, in itself, a major design change from the original character of the building. While this feature would now be discouraged, it has become a distinguishing characteristic of the building over time. See § 210-61, D. (2) and (3).

Other findings of fact pertinent to the discussion are:

- Building constructed ca. 1886.
- Building, at the main intersection of the Village, is among most significant and most visible in the Village.
- The proposed sign along Main Street is to be placed in the Frieze panel of the building. Its color and shape run contrary to the board's previous attempt to have the signage along this frieze appear consistent with each other and a part of the panel.
- Separate signs placed upon the frieze have been allowed, though the earlier attempt of the board was to encourage the use of the frieze itself as the "Sign" backing and have raised, applied letters. The next goal in lieu of this was to have the signs have a white background to "disappear" against the frieze.
- The circular sign for the rear, while not directly facing the street, is fully visible from Monroe Avenue.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

§ 210-61. Standards for Review

B. New Construction. Summary: New construction should be made consistent in character with the architectural styles of historic value in the district.

This discussion was **held open** pending full board discussion.

5. Robert Healy – 67 S. Main St – Driveway and porch stair renovation

Present: Mr. & Mrs. Healy

Application: Revised photos and drawings submitted and date stamped April 21, 2004.

Discussion: This is a continuation of an application from November 3, 2003, held open pending submittal of a plan to complete the porch steps. The applicant is proposing to build a new Celtic wall and bluestone cap porch steps and side piers to replace existing wood steps and lattice base. Applicant is proposing to create a new landscape planting bed at the north foundation wall of the house, relocating the pavers to the median of the driveway replacing the existing grass.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the application, as submitted, *based on the findings* that:

- 1) Steps are an often replaced element of older homes. Examples of varying wood designs, stone and other masonry, even cast concrete steps exist throughout the Village.
- 2) Proposed bluestone treads over an engineered masonry block system, while a newer device, is consistent in scale and character with other steps within the Village.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

6. Christopher McCarthy – 54 Heatherhurst Dr – Fence

Present: Christopher McCarthy

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector approved on March 3, 2004. Revised drawings submitted 5/3/04.

Discussion: This is a continuation from the 4/5/04 meeting, at which time the Board expressed the need for more detailed information regarding the transition of the fence and requested that the applicant provide a drawing of the gates to show the exact design. The applicant supplied photos of the proposed fence and gate.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to accept the application, as submitted, showing the details of the transition from 6' to 5' to 4', contingent upon the applicant's providing photographs of the proposed column cap, with dimensions, to the building inspector for the file. Application is approved as submitted in the drawings provided 5/3/04.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

7. Richard & DeAnn Schenkel – 83 South St – Fence

Present: DeAnn Schenkel

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on April 20, 2004.

Discussion: The applicant submitted an amended application to erect a 4-foot, (left natural) Gothic Space Board fence with 1½" spacing in between boards. The posts will be 4' x 4' and the

tops of the posts will be flat, as depicted in the photo submitted on 5/3/04. The gate will be located between the house and the shed. The proposed fence will be located in the side yard, on the south perimeter of the property, as depicted on the survey map.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Pierson, to accept the modified size of the fence, relocation of the gate in the rear, and the different style of the board, as discussed at this meeting.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

8. E.J. Del Monte – 41 N. Main St – Window and Spandrel

Present: Mr. Tengeres

Application: Submitted, date-stamped and building inspector approved on April 21, 2004.

Discussion: Mr. Tengeres presented samples of the spandrel glass that he is proposing to install in the windows of the railroad buildings. Harmony Solar Bronze (24-8028) is being proposed for all “A” windows located in the connecting portion between the two railroad buildings, as depicted in the drawings. Solex Green glass (26-8008) is proposed for the all other “B” windows located in the railroad buildings. He also proposes removing a window on the east elevation of the hotel.

Motion: Member Pierson made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the Harmony Solar Bronze spandrel glass for four “A” windows on the East elevation, as submitted, and for the elimination of the northernmost window on the east elevation of the hotel, as shown on the drawing.

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

This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 3, 2004.

The Board agreed to set up a **special meeting at the site** with an architectural consultant to discuss the approval of the windows in the “B” portion of the drawing, which will be voted on separately.

9. Mark & Molly Schenkel – 70 South St – Addition – For information only

Present: Mr. & Mrs. Schenkel

Pat Meredith – Representative

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector approved on April 21, 2004.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing the addition of an approximately 8' x 26' front porch. The subframe of the porch would be pressure-treated, and the porch will be 2" above ground level. The spindles and railing will be Colonial style. Roofing material will be rubber membrane and shingles will match the house. They also discussed replacing the second-story single windows located above the porch with double windows. Replacement windows will be 1 over 1. The bay window and the level of the porch ceiling would remain the same.

The Board stated that the applicants would need to provide more specific detail about dimensions, material, location of windows, etc., before approval can be granted.

10. Jeffrey and Susan Holmes - 6 Elmbrook Dr. - Garage

Discussion: Cutsheet received for brackets on face of garage, as requested by Board (4/5/04 meeting).

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 9:45.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary