

Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Special Meeting – Thursday, June 17, 2004 at 7:30 P. M.

PRESENT: Members: Scott Latshaw
John Limbeck
Marcia Watt
Ken Willard
Excused: Steve Melnyk
Board Liaison: Robert Corby
Attorney: Jeff Turner
Building Inspector: Skip Bailey
Board Consultant: Blake Held
Recording Secretary: Linda Habeeb

The meeting was called to order by Member Watt at 7:30 P.M.

1. J. Napier – 17 Sutherland Street – Addition

Present: Mrs. Napier, Owner, and Earl J. DeRienzo, Architect

Application: Submitted and date stamped May 26, 2004. Building inspector approved May 27, 2004. Revised drawings submitted and date stamped June 14, 2004.

Discussion: Mrs. Napier was requested by the Board on June 7, 2004 to submit revised drawings with changes to the dormer-style roof, garage door with sidelights, garage door lighting and the EFIS. The revisions include all wood double hung windows (interior and exterior) with mullions in between. They are changing the EFIS to stucco. The unattached garage will now be constructed with board and baton on all sides and with no sidelights at the entry door. The second floor of the garage will be utilized for storage space and therefore will be no higher than four feet. Dormers on the garage have been changed to a hip roof as previously suggested by the Board. The owner is currently trying to match the leaded glass in the existing living room windows for the addition. The Planning and Zoning Board have approved garage size requirements. The Board raised some concerns regarding the height of the garage. The owner stated that the height of the garage peak would be lower than the house peak. Following further discussion, it was agreed that the garage height will not exceed the height of the proposed rear addition to the house. Mrs. Napier also presented a cut sheet for a lighting fixture for the garage.

Findings of Fact:

- The house was built in 1928. It is an early 20th century Four Square Stucco Home.
- Revised roof style on proposed dormers is consistent with original house.
- Revised plan showing rectangular windows is consistent with original house.

Addition and Garage:

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the revised drawings of June 14, 2004 showing the proposed addition in the rear of the home with dormer with a hip roof, all wood windows (interior and exterior) with exterior muntins, and stucco applied as indicated in the new drawings; the garage located as indicated on the site plan no less than 3' from the property line and having all wood windows, dormers with hip roof, and an all-wood door to be installed as depicted, provided that the garage height shall not exceed the height of the rear house addition.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

Lighting:

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to accept the ‘Montfort Outdoor Lantern’ (LW199) in dark bronze to be installed in the location depicted in the drawings.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

2. Alan Burruto – 27 Courtenay Circle – Fence

Present: Alan Burruto

Application: Submitted and date stamped 5/28/04. Building inspector approved on ?

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to replace a 6' board on board wood privacy fence next to the rear patio with a 'solid board (with sunburst top)' vinyl fence and to enclose the backyard with a 4' split round wooden rail fence. The Board advised the homeowner that the installation of a vinyl fence is unlikely to be approved

and inquired if the applicant would consider a replacement wood fence. The resident amended his application for an all wood fence. The replacement 6' privacy fence will be a 'concave board (with gothic post tops)' and will extend 24' beyond the house to the rear property line. The split 'round rail' fence which will abut to the privacy fence, will follow the rear property line and return to meet the rear corner of the house.

Findings of Fact: House built in 1962.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application for a wood fence located at 27 Courtenay Circle. The patio portion will be a 6' wood fence in the style submitted with application, which will extend 24' behind the house, and the remainder will be a 4' split round rail fence, in wood, as submitted, which will abut to the 6' fence, will continue to the rear property line, and return to the rear corner of the house, as indicated in the application. It is the owner's option to either leave the 6' portion of fence natural or stain it white.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; *Limbeck – abstain*; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

3. Lauren's Salon and Spa – 4 North Main Street – Sign

Present: David Graf, Owner

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved May 28, 2004.

Discussion: Mr. Graf is proposing to install a sign in the same location and in the same dimensions as the previous owner's sign (Morgan Vidal). The proposed 12"H x 24"W sign (Lauren's Salon & Spa) will be constructed of high density urethane, have a dark green with wood grain background, be edged with gold trim, and have gold letters outlined in red.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to accept the sign as submitted in the same size, location and materials as the previously existing Morgan Vidal sign.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

4. E. J. DelMonte – 41 North Main Street – Spandrel Glass

Present: John DelMonte and John Tengeress

Application: Submitted and date stamped April 21, 2004.

Discussion: The applicant is seeking approval for spandrel glass in the railroad buildings as depicted in the drawings and identified in the plans with the letter "B". This meeting follows a site visit on May 5, 2004 and a careful review of a written report prepared by the architectural consultant to the Board.

Findings of Fact:

- The Station House was built ca. 1860. The Freight House was built ca. 1863.
- The railroad buildings are significant historic structures and are among the most prominent buildings in the Village. They are significant contributors to the character of the Village. (The structures figure prominently in "Landmarks of Rochester and Monroe County" by Paul Malo (Syracuse University Press, 1974).)
- Both structures are late Victorian eclectic style and are highly characteristic of train structures of their time.
- The windows and visible doors in each structure are original wood with original glass, and are in good condition (with the exception of certain individual window glass panes which have been broken during current construction).
- The windows in the brick station house are tall, narrow, double-hung units with two lites over two. On both structures the muntins are characteristically thin – not easily replicated today because the typical quality of wood available for this purpose is less structurally able to perform the same task in so thin a profile.
- The original glass has character achieved through age alone. This can not be replicated and should be preserved. To change out glass would likely cause significant damage to original sashes and frames.
- The spandrel glass is a product significantly altered from what we consider "common" window glass and needs to be a minimum of ¼" thick as a result of its processing. The existing glass of the windows is approximately 1/8" thick and set in the previously described thin muntins. The glass has gained the "patina" of age – having the gentle waves and ripples of old glass. It is also likely quite brittle. Any attempt to remove this glass and replace it with the much heavier, thicker spandrel panels will most likely lead to the breakage of the glass and the supporting muntins. Furthermore, the sashes would have to be re-milled to accept the thicker panes.
- Alternative measures to replacing the glass to achieve the same effect as spandrel glass are available.

Applicable Pittsford Village Code Sections: § 210-61. **Standards for Review**

A. Alterations and Additions and D. Additional General Standards

Motion: Based on the foregoing, Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to **deny** the application to replace the glass in the original "B" windows and doors of the railroad buildings, as depicted in drawing A4, stamped received 4/21/04, with spandrel glass. The Board further directs the applicant to replace all broken panes of glass in kind and take all due care to protect and preserve the existing "original" windows and doors and to prevent further breakage. The Board recommends that in order to achieve the desired results the applicant paint out removable panels and place them behind the existing original window units.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

5. Mark Bergin - 84 South Street – Roof

Present: Mark Bergin

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

Discussion: The resident is proposing to replace an old tin roof with asphalt architectural shingles on his 1896 farmhouse. The addition, garage, gazebo, and carport currently have shingles that will be replaced with the new architectural shingles. The barn will not be done at this time. The Board decided this change was appropriate for the residence.

Findings of Fact:

- Original farmhouse was built in 1896 (as per Building Structure Inventory).
- Currently there is a tin roof.
- Rear addition to the home is 10 years old and has an asphalt roof.
- Carport and gazebo each have an asphalt roof.
- Shingle roof is appropriate for style of the home.

Motion: Based on the above findings, Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application as submitted.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

6. Megan Reichman – 10 Elm Street – Windows

Present: Ms. Reichman, owner; Marty Mincer, FJB Associates, Contractor

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

Discussion: Mr. Mincer, agent for the homeowner, is proposing to remove all existing wood windows and aluminum storms and replace them with SCHUCCO vinyl replacement windows. He further stated that the home is currently vinyl sided. The Board stated that vinyl replacement windows would not be appropriate on the 1905 house since vinyl was a non-existing material at that time. The Board referred the homeowner to Historic Pittsford for an architectural assessment of the current windows and other repair or replacement options. This application is being **held open** pending such report.

Findings of Fact:

- House built ca. 1905.
- Existing windows are all wood.
- Vinyl is not a material that was used for windows at the time of construction of the home.

7. L. R. Pisarek – 15 Austin Park – Siding

Present: Ted Rozestrater, Rozestrater Bros. Siding Inc., Contractor

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

Discussion: Mr. Rozestrater, agent for the homeowner, stated that the owner would like to replace the wood shingles on his 1962 home with vinyl siding. The Board stated that vinyl siding is not a recommended material

used on Village homes since vinyl siding was not a building material used at the time of the home's construction and sited §210-61(C) regarding repairs. The Board has kept this *application open* pending resubmission of other siding or renovation options.

Findings of Fact:

- The house was built in 1962.
- The current siding is wood shingle.
- The current shutters are wood.
- The house was designed for application of wood siding.
- Section 210-61.C of the Code of the Village of Pittsford provides: Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible. In the event that replacement is necessary, the material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.
- Vinyl is not a material that was used for siding at the time of construction of the home.
- The proposed vinyl siding does not match the current siding material in composition, texture, design, manner of application, or other visual qualities.

Motion: Based on the findings, Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to **deny** the application to replace wood shingles with vinyl siding and to make other related alterations.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

8. Benjamin Zombeck – 11 Wood Street – Fence

Present: Benjamin Zombeck

Application: Submitted and date stamped May 26, 2004. Building inspector approved May 27, 2004. Revised drawings submitted June 17, 2004.

Discussion: The resident was requested by the Board at the June 7, 2004 meeting to submit revised drawings depicting the specific dimensions of the 3'h wood picket fence, the arbor, and the lamppost. The applicant has stated the pickets for the fence will be 2 5/8"; there will be a gate section across the driveway on Wood Street. All corner posts will have end caps and be 4" x 4". The lamppost, previously depicted on the original drawings, is no longer part of the application. The arbor will be at the head of the driveway.

Findings of Fact: House built in 1910.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the 3'H wood picket fence as depicted in the revised drawings of June 17, 2004. The arbor will be constructed on the west side of the property at the head of the driveway in the configuration shown in the drawings. Fence and arbor will be painted or stained white.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

9. Towpath Bike Shop – 3 Schoen Place – Porch

Present: Mike Franzen, Manager

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and Building Inspector approved on May 27, 2004. Revised drawing submitted and dated stamped June 15, 2004

Discussion: The Board had requested that the applicant submit revised drawings depicting the changes discussed at the June 7, 2004 meeting. Drawing revisions included changes in the width of the pillars, a wider door, a narrower window, posts set in concrete and framed to match the existing posts and stained gray to match the existing building. Added changes included a 7'6" clearance from the base to the overhang for the height of the porch. Pillar dimensions will be 8" deep and 8" wide and a beam added for support. Trim being 1" w x 8" h will be added.

Findings of Fact:

- The building was renovated in 1970 and had an addition built in 1986.
- The main part of the building is early 20th century.
- The proposed materials are consistent with the existing style with other buildings and porches within the Village.
- Village Code requires porch height of at least 7'6."

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the revised application for porch drawings for the eastern side of the building with posts being 6" x 6", the height of the porch being 7'6", and an 8" deep beam added. All beams, posts, and trim, stained to match the existing.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

10. Robert Michaels – 71 State Street – Addition

Present: Robert Michaels, Owner; Robert Corby, Bero Associates, Architect

Application: Submitted and date stamped May 27, 2004. Building inspector approved May 28, 2004.

Discussion: The owner is proposing an additional car bay and an unheated storage area to be located at the rear of the 1977 house. All materials will match the existing. The existing door and window located at the current south elevation will be relocated to the new south wall. Anderson wood windows will match the existing windows. Steel doors will be painted in the same color as the existing doors. The owner is also proposing to screen the transformer in the front yard with a 4' high wood picket fence with posts turned down.

Findings of Fact:

- The house was built in 1977.
- The style and materials proposed are consistent with older homes on the street in regards to massing, orientation and roof slope.
- Proposed changes are consistent in style and materials.
- Proposed fence is appropriate to screen mechanical equipment (transformer).

Motion: Based on the findings, Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the application for the addition and the installation of the fence as submitted. The fence will be 4'H, painted or stained white to match the house and the existing trim color. The addition with the new door and window will match the existing. Cutsheets of the door and window and additional fence dimensions need to be provided.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

11. Jeff Mason – 45 Schoen Place – Building signs - For Information Only

Present: Jeff Mason

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to install four new signs located underneath the eaves. Each sign will be 2'h x 5'w. They will have a dark green background to match the trim. Individual business owners will make separate applications regarding the contents of each sign. The applicant has amended his proposed application from 'for information only' to an actual application.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve four 2'h x 5'w signs as depicted in the location depicted in the photo and subject to individual business' information.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – yes; Watt – yes; Willard – yes **Motion Carried**
The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 17, 2004.

12. Mark Schenkel – 70 South Street – Addition - For Information Only

Present: Mark Schenkel

Discussion: The homeowner is seeking information regarding the appropriate windows for installation into the new addition (whether they should be double hung or casement). He is also seeking to have the siding have a 4" reveal. The designed side entrance appears to be an entranceway that bridges the main home and the addition. The Board discussed possible enhancements to the entranceway/connector portion of the design. The Board suggested seeking the advice of the Board's consultant and a **site visit** to discuss possible options for the proposed addition.

13. Michael Trojian – 31 West Jefferson Road – Barn – For Information Only

Present: Michael Trojian

Discussion: The owner stated that he is considering converting the deteriorating existing 1876 barn into a garage. He has sought the counsel of Bero Associates regarding the preservation issues. He is proposing to wrap the barn in Tyvek and to cover the exterior of the barn with plywood and tongue and groove. This will give the appearance of a new barn on the exterior while preserving the barn on the interior. He is planning on saving the sliding doors, however, plans on eliminating the door on the back of the barn. Two windows are

proposed for the side of the garage with a small window in the peak of the roofline. He will maintain the asphalt roof for the barn. Drawing dated June 17, 2004 depicts all proposed changes.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 P. M.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary