

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – September 9, 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.

Member Watt noted that the Towpath Bike Shop had installed a type of spindle that is different from what was approved by the Board.

**1. Anne & David Ferris – 27 Monroe Ave – Front Stairs**

**Present: David Ferris**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on August 23, 2004, and building inspector approved on August 26, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicants are proposing replacing deteriorated wooden front stairs with wooden stairs. The proposed stairs will be painted, pressure-treated wood. The metal handrail will be replaced with wood handrails on both sides. Balusters will conform to existing ones currently on the porch. The railing will have a straight spindle with a flat cap top. It was noted that the ball finials in the submitted drawings were not to be included as part of the application.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to accept the application as submitted, noting that the handrail will have a flat cap post to match existing.

**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 September 9, 2004.***

**2. Michael Sander – 89 S. Main St. – Fence**

**Present: Michael Sander**

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on August 24, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing adding a fence to connect two existing fences on either side of the backyard of his residence. The new fence will be an all-natural, wooden fence, in the same height, style, and materials as the existing fence. It was noted that the application is amended to include a gate at the end of the driveway, which will be made of the same material as the fence.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application, as submitted, with the additional indication of a gate, made of the same material, positioned on the South Main Street facing portion, centered at the end of the driveway.

**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 September 9, 2004.***

### **3. Jeffrey Davis – 61 W. Jefferson Rd. – Fence**

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on August 30, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes replacing the existing, board-on-board portion of the fence in the rear of his property with black aluminum fencing to match the existing portion of the fence. The fence will not have a gate.

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

- 1) The house was built in 1955.
- 2) The house is located outside the central Village area in proximity to the Courtenay Circle subdivision.
- 3) Metal fence is similar in style and appearance to wrought iron.

**Motion:** **Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for a fence, as submitted, and to approve the existing fence surrounding the pool.**

**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 September 9, 2004.***

### **4. Arthur Pires – 70 State St. Window replacement**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on 8/25/04, and building inspector approved on 8/25/04.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing the existing wood windows with vinyl units with internal white grilles. The proposal also includes the addition of black vinyl shutters to all the replacement windows. The applicant stated that in consideration of the fact that the treatment of the existing façade of the house is currently a vinyl-coated clad material, the proposed modifications are in character with the existing architectural features and enhance the appearance of the structure. The applicant stated that since the proposed windows would match the current building façade, this was a unique situation which would not destroy the architectural integrity of the structure.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced, or where replacement is necessary, replaced in kind, with the same materials. He further noted that it has been a consistent policy of the Board to deny applications for vinyl windows. Member Watt stated that windows are a significant architectural feature and a permanent part of a structure that should be maintained, whenever possible. She stated that there were two concerns: The materials used to replace the original wood, and the introduction of a new style window, with the addition of the grilles. The Board further stated that efficiency can be obtained with wood windows, and made several suggestions for the applicant to investigate. The Board also suggested that the applicant contact Historic Pittsford to set up an architectural consultation for alternatives to the proposed vinyl windows and shutters. It was also

agreed that the Board's architectural advisor would be consulted for an opinion as to the use of aluminum-clad windows and whether shutters are consistent with the time period of the house. The Board decided to leave the application open, pending the applicant's gathering additional information.

#### **5. Kevin & Shannon Quinn – 6 Sutherland St. – Window replacement**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped 8/25/04, amended on September 9, 2004, and building inspector approved on 8/26/04.

**Discussion:** The applicants are proposing replacing all the windows on the residence with Marvin Ultimate Insert double-hung windows. All sizes and styles will remain the same. The proposed windows will be aluminum-clad wood windows.

The Board noted that the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced, or where replacement is necessary, replaced in kind, with the same materials, where possible. The Board further stated that the windows on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor are unique and are of greater architectural significance to the house.

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

- 1) 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows are one-over-one configuration.
- 2) 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows are eight-over-one configuration with true divided lights and a distinctive architectural feature of the house.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the application, as amended on September 9, 2004, for all-wood (no cladding), double-hung replacement windows for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floor only. The 3<sup>rd</sup> floor window replacement application is held open pending the architectural consultant's review.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – abstain. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2004.**

#### **6. Tim Wilmot – 1 Stonegate Lane – Addition**

**Present:** Mr. & Mrs. Wilmot  
Roger Johannson

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on 8/25/04, and building inspector approved on 8/26/04.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing construction of a two-story addition that will connect the main house to the existing garage. They propose filling in a 10' x 15' area between the 2-story frame house and the garage. The first floor of the proposed addition will include a covered porch, a door, and a window. The ground floor will be used as a mudroom, and the upper level will be a hallway connecting the house to the space above the garage. The applicant presented a summary of all the window and door changes in the proposed plans. The proposed mudroom door is part of the new addition, will be made of steel, will have two vertical panels (Design "B" on the submitted plans), and will be painted to match the addition. The applicant will supply a cutsheet with the

specific dimensions. On the second floor, the plans propose extending the rear portion to accommodate the low ceiling; and there will be two dormers added at the rear extension. On the front elevation, the plan includes the construction of a column in front of the porch on the left side of the door. The siding will be cedar.

In addressing a past violation, the applicant stated that he is willing to replace the windows which are visible from the public way with wood windows. The elevations that are open to public view are the South, the East, and the front portion of the West elevation.

### **Findings of Fact:**

- 1) The house was built in 1855.
- 2) It is located in the center of the Village, surrounded by historic structures.
- 3) The original windows were of all-wood construction.
- 4) There have been various previous alterations to the structure that have significantly altered the structure over time.
- 5) The secondary door is part of the new addition, is a temporary piece, and will be painted, with a flat finish.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application for an addition, as shown on drawings A200 and A201, with the revision date of 9/7/04, based on the ***findings of fact***, and with the conditions that:

- (1) The new mudroom entry door on the South elevation will be steel, Model E289, with a flat finish, with no faux wood grain, and will be painted one color;
- (2) The proposed windows on the elevations within the public view, which are: windows on the East elevation, identified as # 5, windows on the South elevation, identified as # 6, and windows on the West elevation, identified as # 4, will be simulated divided lites with exterior wood-applied muntins;
- (3) The applicant will provide a cutsheet for the windows and door.

**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 September 9, 2004.**

### **7. St. Paul's Lutheran Church – 28 Lincoln Ave. - Addition**

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

**Present:** Kevin Marrin – Representing La Bella

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an open application to incorporate changes to their plan as the result of a previous meeting. The applicant presented revised drawings of the Lincoln Avenue entrance. The proposed windows will be all-wood casement windows with two separate sashes, and will have clear, insulated glass. The applicants will supply a photograph of the door and a cutsheet of the arbor.

The proposal calls for removal of the chimney. The applicants stated that the chimney is not functional, not historical, not original to the building, and not significant.

The proposed plan includes a small fence as a replacement for the Lincoln Avenue pergola. The proposed fence will be a picket fence with posts at gateway entrances, and copper metal caps. The purpose of the fence will be to identify the entrance from different directions. The applicants will provide a photograph of the metal caps.

A diagonal sign, facing both streets, is also proposed. The sign will be self-lit with fluorescent lighting.

The applicants will return on 9/16/04 with a full set of complete drawings reflecting the changes discussed at this meeting.

**8. Mr. & Mrs. Ciulla – 19 Sutherland St. – Addition**

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on August 26, 2004.

**Present:** Ken Bracker - Architect

**Discussion:** The applicants are proposing construction of an addition for the rear portion of the residence. Mr. Bracker presented plans indicating the areas affected: kitchen, garage, and bedroom. The proposed addition will use the same materials to match the existing materials for siding and roof shingles. The proposal includes replacing all the windows with vinyl-clad windows. The Board pointed out that the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that historic 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 plans call for the kitchen window to be a casement window. The proposal also includes increasing the size of the porch area. The proposed garage door will be made of steel, 18 feet wide, with a flat (not faux-wood) finish. The right side elevation above the garage has a one-foot overhang. The applicant agreed to supply a cutsheet with dimensions for the garage door.

Findings of Fact:

- 1) House was built in 1935
- 2) Rear portion of the house was a subsequent addition and not original to the house

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to accept the application, with changes, submitted 9/9/04, provided that the windows be wood, Marvin Ultimate, double-hung windows and that the lites have exterior-applied wood dividers, and conditional on the Zoning Board's approval. It was noted that the garage door is not included in the approval.

**Vote:** Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 9, 2004.***

\*\* The applicant must submit additional details for the garage door, for which the application remains open.

**9. Deb Napier – 17 Sutherland St - Addition**

**Present:** Deb Napier

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting a change from a previously-approved material for her garage. The material approved was board and batten, and the request is to change to a hardy board material. The Board questioned whether the finish on this new material would be smooth or textured. It was decided that the Board would consult with its architectural advisor, and the applicant would return to the next meeting.

**10. Pierson – 10 South St. – Addition (Information Only)**

**Present:** Trip Pierson

The applicant is proposing building an addition for his residence. The original structure had additions built in the 1940's. The proposal would require the demolition of parts not original to the house. The Board questioned the historical significance to the area being demolished. The applicant would reuse the existing wood windows. The Board stated that the applicant will need approval from the Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals for the area variance.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 11:30.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary