

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – October 4, 2004 at 7:00 P.M.**

PRESENT:

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

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

1. Sara Neary – 30 S. Main Street – Sign

Present: Sara Neary

Application: Submitted and date stamped on September 22, 2004, and building inspector approved on September 23, 2004.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the existing sign with an 18” (h) x 48” (w) wood sign. The proposed sign will have a burgundy background with gold, vinyl lettering. The application also proposes gold lettering for the glass on the door, covering less than 20% of glass area, as allowed by Village Code. The Board noted that the Village Code does not permit telephone numbers on signs and that it would have to be omitted.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by member Watt, to accept the application, as submitted, with the revision that the phone number on the door window will be omitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 4, 2004.***

2. Jennifer Gordon – 73 N. Main St. – Garage Door

Present: Jennifer Gordon

Application: Submitted and date stamped on September 22, 2004, and building inspector approved on September 23, 2004.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing removing the existing two sets of swing doors on the garage and installing a steel overhead door. The existing doors are not deteriorated, but the applicant proposes replacing them because she is not able to turn around in the driveway and is required to back her car into the street. In 1996, the APRB approved the demolition of the garage, but it was not demolished. Member Watt stated that replacing the doors with an overhead door is an alteration, adding a contemporary design feature to the structure. The Board pointed out that the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, or where replacement is necessary, replaced in kind, with the same materials as were available when the house was built, in this case, in the 1800’s.

Some distinguishing characteristics of the house are that it was built in the 1800's and that it is visible from Main Street.

The Board left the application open, pending the applicant's investigation of wood door options, and the Board's consultation with the architectural advisor.

3. Craig Miller – 8 Stonegate Lane – Garage Door

Application: Submitted and date stamped on September 22, 2004, and building inspector approved on September 23, 2004.

Discussion: The applicant proposes replacing the existing wood garage door with a steel door with glass panels and a stamped "wood-grain" finish. The applicant stated that the hardware on the door is deteriorating, and because of the width of the door, the current wood door sags in the middle.

Member Watt pointed out that the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, or where replacement is necessary, replaced in kind, with the same materials. She further stated that preservation literature strongly recommends a flat, painted finish for steel doors, rather than an embossed finish, if steel is used as an alternate material.

Some distinguishing characteristics of the house are that it was built in the 1940's and it is not on a main thoroughfare.

The application will remain open pending the applicant's investigation of wood options for the door and/or supplying supporting evidence from more than one contractor that the existing door is not repairable or that wood is not a viable option.

4. E.J. Del Monte – 43 N. Main St. – Fence, Lights, Sign

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

Present: E.J. Del Monte

Discussion:

Fence: The applicant proposes installation of a 150-foot, black, aluminum picket fence, 2 feet in from the curb, to match the existing fence on the South side of the Hotel.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to accept the application for a fence, as submitted, noting that it is a black, aluminum fence, and conditioned on the approval of the Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 4, 2004.***

Light: The applicant proposes the installation of 5 wall sconces, in the same style as the previously-approved lights on his property. He submitted a photograph and details of the proposed light.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to accept the light fixtures in 5 locations, as indicated on the application, subject to the approval of the Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 4, 2004.***

Sign: The applicant proposes installing a 6’ x 4’ sign with a white background and gold and black letters, with white pillars in a brick base. The proposed sign will have a small bar across the top with a halogen light. The applicant will submit the design specifics of the light.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the sign, as submitted, subject to approval by the Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals. The application will remain open with respect to the lighting for the sign. The applicant will submit specifics of the lighting for the sign when available.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 4, 2004.***

If the Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals requires a change in the size of the sign, the applicant agreed to come back to the Board. The Board also discussed possible other signage for the Spa facility and noted a strong preference to keep signage off the building.

5. Rufus and Barbara Falk - 7 Elmbrook Dr. - Window replacement

Application: Submitted and date stamped on September 22, 2004, and building inspector approved on September 23, 2004.

Present: Rufus Falk
Dan Culhane (Kolbe Windows)

Discussion: The applicant proposes replacing deteriorating windows with wood windows with exterior muntins. The applicant requests replacement of 7 windows: 3 on the side, 2 on the front, and 2 in back. The Board determined that the 2 windows in back are not visible from the public way and are therefore not considered for review.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application to replace 5 wood windows with 6-over-6 Kolbe wood replacement windows, with applied wood exterior muntins, as submitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Watt – abstain. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 4, 2004.***

6. Arthur Pires – 70 State St. Window replacement

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

Discussion: This is a continuation of an application proposing replacing the existing wood windows with vinyl or aluminum-clad 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 appearance of the structure. The applicant stated his opinion that since the proposed windows would match the current building façade, this is a unique situation which would not destroy the architectural integrity of the structure.

Mr. Pires submitted a letter to the Board in support of his application and a list and photographs of Village houses from the late 1800's and early 1900's, documenting the use of both window grilles and window shutters as architectural treatments used during this period. Mr. Pires stated that based on his discussions with the Board's liaison, the Board has justification to approve the upper grilles on the windows. He further stated that hardy board is not a material that is available for shutters, and he pointed out that shutters are not a permanent feature of the house.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that based on the comments from the Board's architectural consultant, aluminum siding on the house does not cause the windows to become less architecturally significant. The consultant also stated that aluminum siding will never become historic. Chairperson Melnyk stated that it has been a consistent policy of the Board to deny applications for vinyl shutters.

The Board decided to consult further with the architectural advisor and to hold a special meeting to resolve these issues.

7. Sarah Johnson & James Johnson – 78 N. Main St. – Renovations

Application: Submitted and date stamped September 22, 2004, and building inspector approved (for porch) on September 23, 2004.

Present: Sarah Johnson & James Johnson
Barbara & James Lehman (owners)

Discussion: The applicants are proposing complete remodeling of the interior first and second floors, and replacement of all windows and doors. Also included in the proposed renovations is new wood siding and trim for the exterior and proposed front porch.

The house was built circa 1820 – 1830. The Board stated that based on the architectural consultant's comments, the proposed crown molding would not likely have been used during the appropriate time period. Also, the proposed shutters do not properly relate to operating shutters in their size, or placement alongside the windows, rather than partially covering the jamb casings. The Board noted comments from its consultant that the front elevation would likely not have had a front porch during the period, as it would not be consistent with the architectural style of the time. Also, the sills would be of a greater thickness than that which is proposed. The Board discussed the use of casement windows on the second floor. The applicant stated that this is required by the building code. The Board expressed concerns related to the design of the porch roof, columns, and railings.

The Board is leaving the application open, pending submittal of revised plans based on the issues discussed.

Minutes:

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the August 2, 2004 minutes as amended.

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

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the August 10, 2004 minutes as amended.

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

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 10:00.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary