

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

**PRESENT:**

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

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

**1. Alain Hairstylist - 45 Schoen Place - Sign**

**Present:** Alain Benhamou

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved July 19, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval to install a 24"(h) x 60"(w) x 2" (thick) sign on the front of his business. The proposed sign is made of high-density urethane and painted with white letters on a green background.

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

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes.

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

**2. Twin Partners - 4 S. Main St. - Sign**

**Present:** John Galbraith

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved July 20, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes installing a 30"(h) x 19½"(w), building-mounted sign at his business. The proposed sign is made of wood, painted, and will be centered between the "Point of View" sign that is currently on the building and the shutter of the window.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application for a wooden, painted sign, as submitted, which sign will have a border similar to the "Point of View" sign, and which will be centered between the "Point of View" sign currently in place on the building and the shutter of the window.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes.

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

**3. Fleet Bank - 9 N. Main St.**

**Present:** Patty Ransco

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped 7/14/04, and building inspector approved July 21, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval to install six "Bank of America" signs in place of the existing "Fleet Bank" signs. The proposed signs on the N. Main Street façade will be replaced in kind, with flat-cut metal aluminum letters, and with the existing lighting remaining. The proposed sign on the North elevation will be a wall-mounted sign. For the proposed sign on the side of the ATM facing Monroe Ave, the Board stated that it cannot be an internally lit sign. The color of the proposed new signs is white background with blue lettering.

The Board discussed the signs on the North elevation of the ATM drive-through with the applicant, noting that currently three signs are located on this elevation. The applicant stated that they are seeking approval for only one sign on this elevation, and that if additional signs are needed they would return to the Board for approval.

Member Watt stated that Fleet Bank is currently not in compliance with the Village Code because of an unscreened parking lot on Main Street, where a portion of the fence has been removed. The represented present stated that she was from the sign company, not Fleet.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for new signage replacing existing Fleet signs with new Bank of America signs, as submitted and date stamped 7/14/04, the two signs on the Main Street elevation to be replaced in kind; the sign on the North elevation having a permissible change of material from wood to metal; the drive-through structure on the South façade will not have lighting, and the North elevation conditioned on removal of three existing Fleet signs and installation of 1 sign, having text as indicated on Message face A on the sample drawings.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Melnyk - abstain; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 2, 2004.

#### **4. John Hessney - 50 State St. - Sign**

**Present:** John Hessney

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped July 23, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval to install a 1'(h) x 2'(w), wood sign on his business. The proposed sign is green with gold lettering, and will be placed on the edge of the building, where the Shadee Lady sign was previously located by the prior tenant. The Board stated that the applicant will need to provide drawings indicating the materials and specific dimensions of the sign.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application for a 1'(h) x 2'(w), green with gold lettering, wood sign, in the location of the old "Shadee Lady" sign, contingent on the applicant's submitting drawings of the sign indicating materials and specific dimensions.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes.  
**Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 2, 2004.

**5. Marty Coddington - 19 E. Jefferson Circle - Window**

**Present:** Marty Coddington

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

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes replacing the existing wooden picture window on his residence with a double-hung, white, vinyl replacement window to match the existing size and configuration. The applicant indicated that he was requesting vinyl window replacement because this was the only window on the house that was not vinyl, and because he was interested in energy efficiency. The Board stated that the house was built in 1955, and that the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards provide that architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, or where replacement is required, replaced in kind, with the same materials as the original, where possible. The Board further stated that efficiency can be obtained with wooden windows. The Board also noted that the current windows are not double-hung style and that replacement windows should match existing style.

The Board decided to leave the application open, pending the applicant's investigating other options, including repair.

**6. St. Paul's Lutheran Church - 28 Lincoln Avenue - Addition**

**Present:** Bob Healy - La Bella Associates PC

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

**Discussion:** St Paul's Church was originally constructed in 1884, and additions to the church were made in 1928, 1965, and 1970. LaBella Associates was retained in 2003 to create a master plan for the church campus. Goals of the master plan were to enhance educational, fellowship, and administrative areas of the campus. In addition, the church wanted to create a central gathering area that was visible and easily accessible from both the parking lot and Lincoln Avenue. **Access to the church from Lincoln Avenue is currently behind the church house and parking lot, and therefore, visitors have difficulty finding the entrance. The church would like to expand the linkage to create an easily identifiable entrance, thereby utilizing the courtyard between the church and house to build a welcoming, handicap accessible entrance linking the Lincoln Avenue sidewalk to an enlarged gathering space. The proposed Lincoln Avenue entrance will have a canopy covering the walkway, and the courtyard will be landscaped. The Board had expressed concern with the peaked structure competing with the tower of the church on the Lincoln Avenue elevation. The proposal now includes a false mansard - a flat surface above the peak.**

On the West elevation, facing the parking lot, there will be a change in the door style from a square to an arched top. The proposed doors have wood panels on the bottom and glass on the upper portion. There

will be a vestibule door on the interior. The Board stated that the applicants will need to submit a photograph of the existing door and a cutsheet indicating the dimensions and details of the door, in addition to a description of the construction materials. The roof will also be reshingled, and a description of the shingles will need to be submitted.

On the South elevation, a new door and an arbor are proposed. The proposed arbor will extend out 10 feet, will be painted cedar, and will not be pressure-treated. The Board stated that it would need a cutsheet of the proposed door and arbor indicating the details of the door, including dimensions, description of the construction materials and the shingles.

The applicants presented 3 options for the Lincoln Street elevation. They stated that the materials for the proposed addition would match the existing, with wood windows and wood clapboard.

The applicants stated that the brick chimney on the building was added in the 1920's and is not original to the building. It is not a dominant element of the structure and is not in disrepair, but needs some maintenance. It is not functional, and the applicant would like permission to have it removed.

The applicants met with the Planning Board, who questioned whether the Village sidewalk could be used for the handicap entrance instead of adding another sidewalk, and it has been determined that the proposed ramp can be eliminated and there will just be a gentle slope. All the entrances, except for the Washington Avenue entrance, will be handicap accessible.

The applicants are also requesting approval to replace the sign that identifies the church with another sign that is easier to use when changing announcements.

There will be a small fence, creating a framework around the entry to the courtyard at Lincoln Avenue. The parsonage house will be converted into administrative offices.

The board questioned whether the stained glass windows on the exterior walls of the original church will be preserved, and the applicants responded that the windows would be preserved intact.

The Board decided to leave the application open pending the applicants' returning to the next meeting with final plans and further information about the sign and the fence.

#### **7. Mark Schenkel - 70 South St. - Addition**

**Present:** Mr. & Mrs. Schenkel

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped July 22, 2004.

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of a previous discussion of the homeowners' rear addition. The Board had expressed concern about the "connector" piece dividing the addition from the main house, and Mr. Schenkel submitted drawings showing different concepts to minimize the

distinction between the addition and the existing portions of the house. The applicants submitted new drawings with their proposal, A1, submitted 8/2/04, which include new, all-wood, Marvin windows with casements. The roofline will be flush with the roofline of the addition. The proposed side door will have a wood frame with glass panels and trim to match existing. The applicants will submit cutsheets for the windows and doors.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to accept the applicant's proposal, as per drawing A1, submitted 8/2/04, as submitted.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes.  
**Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 2, 2004.**

**Information only:**

**8. Pittsford Town Hall - Mike Garland -**

**Present:** Mike Garland  
Virginia Searl

**Discussion:** The Town of Pittsford is planning a roofing replacement project at the Town Hall, scheduled for bidding in mid-August. The project is primarily replacement in kind of roofing materials, flashing, and skylights. Alternates will include replacement of the existing storm water disposal system, wood cornice repairs, replacement of missing or damaged slate on the east side turrets, installation of a lightning protection system, and repairs to the existing non-historic chimneys on the northeast and southwest. The Town would also like to include an alternate to remove the existing chimneys to the roofline. The new roofing will then cover the existing roof penetration. The applicants stated that the chimneys are not historic and represent holes in the roof. The Town representative stated that the difficulties in providing and maintaining proper flashing at the chimneys are not balanced by their historic importance. The chimney on the front (NE) is not original, but rather a later functional requirement, and therefore, its removal appears consistent with the Village Code. The historic turret is compromised by the chimney's location. The turret will be restored to its original condition if the chimney is removed. The chimney on the back (SW) is possibly original to the building, and the Board questioned whether this one could be repaired. The Board stated that removing the rear (SW) chimney would detract from the original structure, and that the policy is to repair rather than replace, whenever possible.

**9. Pittsford Flour Mill - Schoen Place**

**Present:** Bob Corby  
Al Longwell

Mr. Corby presented a brief history of the Pittsford Flour Mill. The mill was built in 1880, and from 1882 until 1939 was used as a flour mill, and then was used for grain and bean storage until 1996. Additions were added in 1915, 1925, and in the 1960's. It is the most visible building in Schoen Place, and because of its age and visibility, the Flour Mill is the central building of the complex. The

grain elevator is the newest building, and because of its size and visibility, it also plays a major role in the complex. The proposed plan retains the flour mill for offices with an entrance toward the parking area and Schoen Place. There would be eight floors of office space in the grain elevator with an entrance from Schoen Place. The proposal would rehabilitate the exterior of the Flour Mill to the original siding.

The proposal includes demolition of the warehouse, the lower silos, the shed, and the loading dock. The warehouse is a concrete block building which was built around 1915 and has a full basement. The loading dock is not fully visible from the public street or the canal. The tile silos are unsafe and covered with a reinforced concrete jacket which is difficult to renovate.

Demolition and the hardship provisions of the Village Code were discussed.

**Information only:**

**10. Tim Wilmot - 1 Stonegate Lane - Addition**

The applicant is proposing building an addition connecting the house and garage. A detached garage was built in 1983. He proposes filling in a 10' x 15' area between the house and the garage. The garage is set back 20 feet.

The back is not visible from the public way. The house was originally a barn. The applicant stated that filling in the area between the garage and house was the only option, and that they are trying to match the different rooflines. The proposed windows will be wood with exterior-applied muntins.

The Board provided general comments on the proposed addition.

**Minute Review:** June 17, 2004

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the June 17, 2004 minutes, as amended.

**Vote:** Limbeck - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes.

**Motion carried.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 11:00.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary