

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

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	Steve Melnyk
<b>Members:</b>	John Limbeck Ken Willard Marcia Watt Scott Latshaw
<b>Attorney:</b>	Jeff Turner
<b>Building Inspector:</b>	Skip Bailey
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	Linda Habeeb

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

**1. Rosen Dental Group - 25 S. Main St. - Sign**

**Present:** Marci Mendola-Pitcher

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on May 26, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval of two signs for her dental practice. The signs will be made of high-density foam, the colors will be burgundy and gold for the borders and hunter green for the background, and they will not be lighted. The signs will be placed on the front and south side of the building. The signs are the same dimensions as the existing signs, but those signs are larger than allowed by Code. As a result, the applicant's proposed signs need to be reduced in size to 3.8 square feet. The applicant will submit a finalized drawing of the sign.

**Findings of Fact:**

- Proposed sign is of materials consistent with others of similar type.
- Proposed sign to be mounted on face - a typical treatment for this purpose.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

**§ 210-61. Standards for Review**

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the signs, made of high-density foam, in the color and configuration submitted, with the picture of the child being optional, in the colors stated on the information sheet submitted, but being in compliance with the ordinance requiring that the size of the sign should not exceed 3.8 square feet in size.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**2. Jean Bolton - 7 Schoen Pl - Sign**

**Present:** Gary Steel

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on May 12, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval of a window sign and a building sign for her business. The window sign will be 24" x 19" with 23K gold window lettering (under 20% of glass area, as allowed by Code). The building sign will be 28" x 61.51" (11.95 sq. ft.) carved-in (incised) 23K gold leaf letters and border on high-density sign resin panel finished in two-part dark brown acrylic coating, and will be placed on the right side of the door.

**Findings of Fact:**

- Proposed sign is of materials consistent with others of similar type.
- Proposed sign to be mounted on face - a typical treatment for this purpose.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

**§ 210-61. Standards for Review**

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

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

**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**4. Benjamin Zombek - 11 Wood St. - Fence**

**Present:** Benjamin Zombek

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped May 26, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval of a fence to enclose his property. There is currently a partial fence in the backyard area. He is proposing a 36"(h) pressure-treated wood picket fence, with three gates: one gate in the front of the house, one gate from the sideyard to the backyard, and one gate with an arbor at the head of the driveway. He is also proposing a free-standing lamppost at the corner of the property facing Wood Street and the driveway, and an arbor at the head of the driveway. The Board discussed that the spacing between the pickets should be less than 2 5/8 inches, that the pickets should be no greater than 3 feet in height, and that the posts at the corners are 42 inches with caps on corner posts, and painted white. The Board requested that the applicant submit a drawing with additional detail, indicating the pickets detail, placement and specifics of the lamppost, and a detailed drawing of the arbor.

**Findings of fact:**

- House built ca. 1910
- Proposed fence style - picket - is consistent in style with the house, and is consistent in style with previously approved fences within the Village.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

**§ 210-61. Standards for Review**

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve proposed style and location of the fence, providing that the spacing between the pickets is less than 2 5/8 inches, the pickets are three feet in height, and the posts at the corners and at the gates are 42 inches with caps on the corner posts and at the gates, and painted white, pending submittal of additional details.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**5. Jennifer Mack – 12 Maple St. – Deck**

**Present:** Jennifer Mack

**Application:**

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval for a wooden deck in the back of the house. The proposed deck will have 2"x2" Baluster handrails and 4"x4" columns placed at the corners. The railing will be painted white or stained to match other railings of the home. There are stairs coming down from an existing porch which will need to be replaced. The bottom of the stairs will be inside the edge of the deck and will not extend past the house. The Zoning Board granted a variance for a setback for the rear lot to accommodate the size of the deck.

**Findings of fact:**

- House built ca. 1914. Altered in later 20<sup>th</sup> C. with addition to East.
- Proposed deck in rear of house; little of deck visible from street.
- "Decks" are not characteristic of architecture from this period.
- Deck form, having chamfered corners, is clearly 20<sup>th</sup> C. (21<sup>st</sup> C.)
- Deck rail treatment is sympathetic to railing of existing house.
- Deck does not negatively impact existing structure.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

**§ 210-61. Standards for Review**

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application, as submitted, for construction of a deck at the rear of the property in the dimensions shown in the application, and as in the approved application to the Zoning Board, with the corner posts to have proposed caps as indicated in the application, and the railing and posts to be painted or stained to match the other railings.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**6. Anna & Chris Harrington - 37 Courtenay Cir. - Shed**

**Present:** Anna & Chris Harrington

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped May 25, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 25, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicants propose installing a vinyl-sided storage shed in the Southeast corner of their backyard. The proposed shed will be separate from the main structure, set on a wood frame, with the dimensions of 8' wide by 12' long and 7' in height. The Board asked the applicants' reasons for choosing vinyl siding for the shed and whether they had considered other materials; the applicants stated that the reason they chose vinyl was mainly for the maintenance.

**Findings of Fact:**

- House built ca. 1960.
- Proposed prefabricated shed is consistent in scale with similar sheds throughout village.
- Shed is located remotely on property, distant from street and due to the grade at the rear of the property is barely visible from the street.
- Design of shed is sympathetic to the house and characteristic of sheds from the period of the house design.
- Vinyl siding and shutters are not consistent in character with the materials commonly used within the village for similar structures.
- Structure will not be built on a permanent foundation.
- Structure is located in the Courtenay Circle area, which was developed in the 1960's, and while not widely used, vinyl was an available material.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

**§ 210-61. Standards for Review**

**Motion:** Based specifically on the findings of fact, including: that the house was constructed circa 1960's; that the house is located within the Courtenay Circle development, which was developed in the 1960's, and while not widely used, vinyl was an available material; structure is a shed outbuilding separate from the home; shed will be located at the rear of the property, in the location stated in the application, and has very limited visibility to the public way; the shed will not be built on a concrete pad and will be of a somewhat temporary nature, Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to install a shed at the location proposed in the application.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**7. Cynthia Seymour - 6 Boughton Ave. - Front steps**

**Present:** Cynthia Seymour

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped May 27, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes repairing the brick front porch and stairs, which are decayed and crumbling, and reinstalling and repairing the wrought-iron railing. The stairs and porch will be repaired with either salvageable red brick from the original stairway or new gray cobblestone pavers.

**Findings of Fact:**

- House built ca. 1910.
- Façade shows evidence of subsequent remodelings; specifically, the one-story addition to the north of the entry door, and the different exposure sidings of second and first floors.
- Entry canopy with plain brackets, the existing brick steps and metal railing all appear inconsistent with the period of design of the house. These are also later alterations to the house.
- In lieu of a conjectural restoration of the entry, replacing the existing in kind is permissible.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

**§ 210-61. Standards for Review**

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to accept the application to replace the crumbled brick in the stairs with brick and cobblestone pavers set in mortar.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

***Held open*** for the railing repair.

**8. Mathew Wahl – 19 Golf Ave. – Window**

**Present:** Mathew Wahl

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped May 18, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes replacing the front window on the far left side of his house with an aluminum-clad window to match the other windows. The Board pointed out that there is a significant distinction between vinyl and aluminum-clad windows. The new window will be deeper and narrower, measuring 6' 9" x 5'(h) – the height of the new windows being reduced by 10 inches. All the shutters will be the same width (approximately 12") and will replace the existing shutters, with some clapboard between the shutters and the door.

The Board stated that the house has had significant renovations, and that the current materials are consistent with the house.

**Findings of Fact:**

- House built ca. 1957.
- The historical remnants of the original 1957 structure have been previously altered to the current state of being virtually nonexistent.
- Existing house is vinyl sided.
- Existing house has unique substantial renovation, and the original window is no longer consistent with the house.
- With the exception of the proposed window replacement, the home currently has all aluminum-clad windows either installed prior to requirement for approval, or with approval of subsequent new addition applications allowing for architectural consistency.
- Proposed window is consistent in scale and design with the period of the house.

- Proposed window is consistent in style and material with prior alteration and new addition application.
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:  
**§ 210-61. Standards for Review**

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to accept the application for the proposed new window, conditioned on the fact that it be aluminum-clad, not vinyl, and that the interior grids be removed from the second-floor window and such new window to have shutters to match the new height of the windows.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. Melnyk – abstain. **Motion carried.**  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

#### **9. Towpath Bike - Mike Franzen - 3 Schoen Pl - Porch Entrance**

**Present:** Mike Franzen

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes installing an entrance door and covered overhang on the side of the building to avoid having the front door open directly onto the street. The proposed overhang will be supported by posts with raised concrete pillars. The roof will be in the style of the existing overhang roof on the front of the building. The air conditioner will be moved to the rear of the building.

The Board commented that the 4" x 4" posts for the canopy support are visually too weak and recommended substituting 6" x 6" posts. It was decided that the application would be **left open** until the next meeting, and that the applicant will return with dimensional drawings with specific measurements for the door and the sidelight.

**Held open** until 6/17 APRB meeting.

#### **10. David Cameron - 28 Washington Ave. - Windows**

**Present:** David Cameron

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped May 10, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes to replace two awning windows with 2 double-hung windows, measuring 30"w x 48"l and made of wood, and to install new shutters. The new windows would be the same width as the old windows, but taller, bringing the windows down. He also proposes enlarging the existing basement egress window to conform with the Village Code. The window would be casement style, which is consistent with the other windows.

#### **Findings of Fact:**

- Double-hung windows are consistent with other windows on the structure.
- Village Code requires basement egress window for current use.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the application, as submitted, for two wood windows on the north elevation and an egress window, also on the north elevation, in the dimensions given, contingent upon cutsheets being provided, the material of the windows being wood, the top window being six lites, the egress window being a casement window, and shutters being extended to match the height of the windows and to match existing shutters.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**11. J. Napier - 17 Sutherland St. - Addition**  
**Present: Earl J. DeRienzo (architect)**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped May 26, 2004. Building inspector approved on May 27, 2004.

**Discussion:**

The applicant proposes a one-story addition (with attic) to a single-family residence, to include a future detached garage at the rear of the residence. The new living space will be 676 square feet, including 283 square feet in the attic area. All aspects of the new work (windows, roofing, siding, trim, etc.) are to match the existing. The applicants stated that the majority of the addition would not be visible from the road.

The Board expressed a preference for the use of true stucco, as opposed to the proposed use of E.I.F.S. (Exterior Insulation and Finish System). They also suggested a hip roof instead of the proposed dormer-style. There was also discussion of the arched top window for the rear addition. with the Board expressing a preference for a rectangular window.

It was decided that the application would be **held open**, and the applicant would return before the Board at the next meeting with a revised plan addressing some of the concerns expressed at this meeting:

- Hipped roof vs. dormer style
- True stucco vs. E.I.F.S.
- Detailed column drawings
- Windows - provide cutsheets
- Garage: Wood doors vs 2 steel doors
  - Side lite window
  - Lighting for garage

**Findings:**

- Built ca. 1928.
- A classic example of an early 20<sup>th</sup> C. Foursquare house.
- Addition, while using materials and some forms that appear consistent with the original, differs stylistically with the original.
- Massing of some elements is out of scale with the original (Chimney, dormers, rear window).
- Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections:

**Minute Review:** May 3, 2004

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the May 3, 2004 minutes as submitted.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**Minute Review:** May 5, 2004

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the May 5, 2004 minutes as submitted.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2004.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 10:45.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary