

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Special Meeting held on Tuesday October 26, 2004 at 7:15 P.M.**

**PRESENT:**

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>Chairperson:</b> | Steve Melnyk   |
| <b>Members:</b>     | John Limbeck<br>Marcia Watt<br>Scott Latshaw<br>Ken Willard (absent) |
| <b>Attorney:</b>    | Jeff Turner  |

***Preservation***

|                             |              |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Consultant</b>           | Ted Bartlett |
| <b>Recording Secretary:</b> | Linda Habeeb |

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

**1. Pittsford Flour Mill Project - Schoen Place**

**Present:** Robert Corby – Architect for Bero  
Al Longwell, Owner and Developer  
Michael Newcomb, Owner  
Ted Bartlett, Crawford & Stearns – Architectural Consultant to APRB

Mr. Corby summarized the reasons for demolition of the silos: (1) they are deteriorated and pose a safety hazard; (2) they are not adaptable to a new use; (3) they are partially concealed from view, so that the visual impact of demolition would be minimal; and (4) they impede emergency access around the grain elevator.

***Motion:*** Based on the reasons presented by the applicant, Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to allow the demolition of the tile silos, subject to final approval of plans for development of the Flour Mill and Grain Elevator; provided, however, that if the Building Inspector determines that safety requires it, the demolition of the silos can occur before final approval of plans for construction.

***Vote:*** Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 26, 2004.***

Mr. Corby went on to discuss the reasons for the requested demolition of the warehouse. He stated that because of the existing parking shortage, it is a priority to provide a sufficient amount of parking space on-site. He stated that the reasons for the demolition are that the warehouse is located in the rear of the site and is therefore not as visible as other structures in the complex, and that in order to have a viable commercial use of the Mill and the grain elevator, current Village Code requires a number of parking spaces in excess of what can be accomplished with the warehouse in place. The applicants stated that they had attempted to purchase the land behind the Mill from RG&E for

parking, but were unsuccessful. Mr. Corby stated that the owners have attempted to develop a proposal that will not exacerbate the existing parking situation.

Member Watt pointed out the importance of photographic evidence of the structures before demolition occurs, and Mr. Corby stated that there would be photographic documentation of both the inside and outside of the structures.

Findings of Fact:

1. The warehouse is located behind the Mill, in the rear of the property, and therefore is less visible than the other structures.
2. Based on discussions with RG&E and the topography of the property, the RG&E property located behind the warehouse is not viable to be used for parking and is currently not available for purchase.
3. Current Village Code requires a number of parking spaces in excess of what is currently available on the site, and based upon the representations of the applicant, the site is not commercially viable without that parking.
4. Block used in the construction of the warehouse can be preserved.

*Motion:* Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to allow the demolition of the warehouse structure, under Village Code § 210 E(1)(a), provided that the demolition permit will not be issued until all of the approvals required of the applicant for development of the Flour Mill and Grain Elevator have been granted; provided that the owner will supply a minimum of 100 of the salvageable block, and that photographic evidence, both interior and exterior, will be provided to the Village, per SHPO's Standards.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 26, 2004.

Mr. Corby next presented plans for the Mill building. A 10' by 13' addition is proposed at the southeast end of the mill. The applicant stated that the addition is needed to house mechanical equipment and an entrance to a bank that will occupy half of the first floor.

Member Watt pointed out that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation state that new additions should be avoided, if possible. Mr. Bartlett, the Preservation Consultant, stated that rehabilitation standards do permit additions in certain circumstances, and that the style should be designed to be compatible, yet distinct. The Board then discussed the applicants' design needs and the rehabilitation standards. Mr. Corby stated that because the southeast wall of the mill is currently blank, no significant features will be obscured by the addition. The addition is set back from the front façade to ensure that it appears as an addition.

A new entrance is proposed near the center of the front façade. The canopy and doors of the new entrance recall the design of the original entrance to the mill that has been removed. The new entrance location is aligned with the existing windows above it so the current rhythm of bays will be maintained. The proposed entrance stair recalls the existing stair at the office. The existing truck door at the façade will be replaced by a window, the design and spacing of which will match the others on the façade and which will restore the façade to the condition that existed prior to 1953. The Board members questioned whether it would be possible to retain the historic 1800's door. Mr. Bartlett stated that this door is the only historic feature on the front.

The plan proposes removing the loading dock on the back of the Flour Mill. The applicants stated that the current loading dock lacks a foundation, is deteriorated, and is largely concealed from public view by the mill. Only the east end of the loading dock is visible from the street and canal. The proposed new rear entrance incorporates a shed-roof canopy and handicapped ramp to the parking area. To provide handicapped access to the building, the grade to the rear of the building will be raised at the parking lot.

Findings of Fact:

1. Security and access dictate a second bank entrance for the ATM machine.
2. The addition will store mechanical equipment.
3. No character-defining features are being radically changed or altered by the addition.

In order to provide a second means of egress into the rear of the property and to provide adequate emergency vehicle access between the grain elevator and the Mill, the plan proposes removing the later two sections of the office at the northwest end of the Mill.

Findings of Fact:

1. The part of the office being retained is the original portion, dating back to the 1800's.
2. By preserving the original section, the Mill will retain its characteristic two-piece mass and character-defining form.

The Board decided to leave open the Flour Mill portion of the application for future consideration.

*Motion:* Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the renovation of the grain elevator, as submitted in the final drawings, based on all the findings, including the narrative provided by the applicant, and recognizing that the applicant has addressed the issue of the canopy previously raised by this Board.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. (Member Watt was not present for this vote)

*Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 26, 2004.

## **2. Debbie Napier – 17 Sutherland St.**

**Present: Debbie Napier**

The applicant is proposing changing the previously-approved dormers over the garage to a narrower dormer which more closely reflects the style of the residence.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the suggested change on the configuration of the dormers over the garage and the substitution of Marvin-wood Ultimate double-hung windows, in lieu of what was previously proposed.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. (Member Watt was not present for this vote)

***Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 26, 2004.**

## **3. James Johnson (for Lehman) – 78 N. Main St. – Renovations**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped September 22, 2004, and building inspector approved (for porch) on September 23, 2004, and revised on 10/26/04.

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

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an open application for renovations to the residence at 78 N. Main Street. The Board had suggested changes to the proposed plan, and the applicants presented revised drawings in which one window was moved, the roof on the porch was lowered, and the columns were changed to single wood columns. Also, the window casings were removed, the sill was thickened, and baluster detail was added. The applicant stated that due to the 2' drop from the front porch floor to grade, it will be necessary to have a porch railing to meet Village Code requirements. The applicant stated that the proposed porch will be stained mahogany wood, and the ceiling of the porch will be bead board.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to approve the application based on revised drawings, submitted on 10/26/04.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. (Member Watt was not present for this vote)  
**Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 26, 2004.**

#### **4. 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 open application proposing replacing 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 had previously stated that in consideration of the fact that the treatment of the existing façade of the house is currently an aluminum-coated clad material, the proposed modifications are in character with the existing architectural features and enhance appearance of the structure. The applicant stated that since the proposed windows will match the current building façade, this is a unique situation which would not destroy the architectural integrity of the structure. The applicant 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. Corby stated that a possible criterion for making the determination would be that if a building is *individually* eligible for the National Register, then the windows should be preserved as historic. The applicant's house is part of a Historic District, but not considered individually historic. Mr. Corby further stated that a guideline would be to encourage alterations that restore the residence to the original configuration during its period of significance.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application for 6-over-1 double-hung, wood windows, with exterior-applied muntins, and to allow the applicant to put wood or hardiplank shutters on the residence, installed over the casing and in a size that is functional.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. (Member Watt was not present for this vote)  
**Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 26, 2004.**

**Adjournment:**

Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 9:45 PM

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary