

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – November 1, 2004 at 7:00 P.M.**

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	<b>Steve Melnyk</b>
<b>Members:</b>	<b>Ken Willard Marcia Watt Scott Latshaw John Limbeck</b>
<b>Attorney:</b>	<b>Jeff Turner</b>
<b>Building Inspector:</b>	<b>Skip Bailey</b>
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	<b>Linda Habeeb</b>

**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

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on October 6, 2004, and building inspector approved on October 13, 2004.

**Discussion:** Chairperson Melnyk summarized what has occurred regarding this project: At the previous meeting, the Board approved the demolition of the warehouse and the tile silos, subject to certain conditions, and approved the application for the grain elevator.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that the discussion would involve the conceptual design for the Flour Mill. Mr. Corby stated that the door on the lower left side of the Mill building is not original to the building and is not a significant architectural feature of the structure. Member Watt commented that the Rehabilitation Standards allow for flexibility in accommodating a current use, but she questioned whether the proposal had moved too far from the original design. Mr. Corby stated that the original mill had only one entrance, and therefore, this proposal was returning to the original design.

Member Watt stated that the cornerboard distinguishes the original 1800's mill structure from the later 1920's portion of the building. She further pointed out that the applicant's earlier proposal included the cornerboard and the sign in its original position. Mr. Corby stated that the applicants had since revised their view as to what was appropriate, and that they had made a conscious effort to create a uniform treatment across the façade of the structure. Mr. Corby further stated that they had attempted to preserve as much of the building from different periods as possible. Chairperson Melnyk noted that the spacing of the proposed windows on the addition is different from the original.

Mr. Corby stated that gutters will be a new feature added to the building, and that the applicant will submit cutsheets for the gutters, windows, doors, stairs, and roof.

**Findings of Fact:**

- (1) This is a significant historical structure in the Village located on the Erie Canal.
- (2) This is a rehabilitation project under the Preservation Guidelines, allowing for some flexibility to accommodate its proposed new use.
- (3) The Flour Mill will no longer be used for agricultural purposes.
- (4) The form, scale, proportions, and shape of the entrance canopies and east addition are compatible with the essential form of the existing building.
- (5) The modified fenestration on the rear façade is consistent with the type, scale, and spacing of the building's existing window openings.
- (6) The proposed alterations between the front and the rear façade preserve the historic difference between these two building faces.
- (7) The new addition at the east elevation is consistent in design and scale and does not destroy, damage or obscure the character-defining elements of the historic building and will be differentiated from the historic structure.
- (8) The first floor office portion on the north elevation of the Mill is being retained; the portions of the office subject to demolition are additions.
- (9) The foundation will remain as is, differentiating the 1800's portion of the Mill from later portions.
- (10) The spacing and fenestration of the windows on the newer addition are different from the spacing on the original Mill, this lending another historical marker between the old and newer portions of the Mill.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve, in concept, the proposal for the rehabilitation of the Flour Mill, as shown on the drawings dated 9/16/04, subject to the applicants' providing full architectural drawings providing details as to materials, windows and doors, including trim, rooflines, gutters or spoutings, railings, lights, signage, rods, citing dimensions and reveal, and any and all similar design features, and is subject to the applicant's providing photographic documentation of the building's current condition with black and white prints, complying with the NYS Office of Parks and Recreation Historic Preservation Documentation Guidelines. The full set of architectural drawings and details shown therein shall be subject to Board review and approval.

**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 November 1, 2004.***

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to amend the motion from the 10/26/04 meeting, which approved the demolition of the tile silos, to include the bridge connecting the warehouse and Mill, and also to include the loading dock on the Flour Mill, which have been determined to be unsafe by the Building Inspector.

**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 November 1, 2004.

## **2. James Murray – 50 State St. – Sign**

**Present: James Murray**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on October 15, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes replacing the existing sign (Rick's Prime Rib) on the Schoen Place side of his business. He plans to frame-in and paint the existing sign, using a red background with black raised lettering. He also proposes adding goose-neck lights, which will be painted black.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application for a painted sign with a red background and black applied letters to match existing, and with a wooden frame, painted to match the building trim, and with two black, gooseneck-style lamps to light the sign, as submitted, a picture of the light to be entered into the record.

**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 November 1, 2004.***

### **3. Abraham Silmi – 4 North Main Street – Sign**

**Present: Abraham Silmi**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on October 8, 2004, and building inspector approved on October 19, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant proposes installing stud-mounted letters, stating “T-Mobile” above the window at 4 North Main Street. The colors for the letters are magenta and gray, and the letters will be flush to the fascia board. The applicant inquired about the use of a neon “open” sign and was informed that such signs are no longer permitted in the Village, and that under Village Code, all neon signs are now prohibited.

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

- 1) The fascia board is 24” in height.
- 2) The letters are 18” in height.
- 3) The letters will be applied in the center.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the application for a sign, in a plastic-like material, in the colors of magenta and gray, applied flush to the fascia board, as indicated in the application, and not internally lit.

**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 November 1, 2004.***

### **4. Merilee Sercu – 31 North Main St – Sign**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on October 15, 2004, and building inspector approved on October 21, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installing a 12” x 12” redwood sign at the side door of the building at 31 North Main Street. The colors for the proposed sign are a blue background with gold leaf lettering.

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

- 1) The side entrance overlooks the bike path.
- 2) The material of the sign will be redwood.
- 3) The size of the sign not to exceed 12” x 12”

**Motion:** Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the sign, as submitted.

**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 November 1, 2004.***

**5. Debbie Napier – 17 Sutherland St - Garage Door**  
**Present: Debbie Napier**

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing changing the previously-approved wood garage door to a steel door in either the Amarr Tuscany T2 or T5 style, as submitted on manufacturer's brochures. Chairperson Melnyk stated his feeling that there is a temporariness to garage doors, in that they are not a permanent architectural feature, that allows a wider latitude in materials. Board members questioned in what manner the muntins on the door with the windows were applied, stating that exterior-applied muntins were preferred. Board members also requested a sample of the finish before the door is installed, stating that the steel door should be smooth, with no texture, and painted a flat color. Member Watt expressed concerns regarding the appropriateness of steel as a garage door material.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The garage is new construction and is located in the rear of the house.
2. A flat steel door with a painted finish resembles a wood door in texture and appearance.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by member Willard, to allow the applicant the option of selecting either the Amarr T2 or T5 or the Renaissance 163T door, with the conditions that any door selected will have a flat, nongrain finish and be painted flat colors, and any windows will have exterior-applied muntins, and the applicant will submit a sample and cutsheet to the Building Inspector prior to installation.

**Vote: Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – no; Latshaw – yes.** *Motion carried.*  
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on November 1, 2004.

**6. 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:** This is a continuation of a previous application, in which the applicant proposes removing the existing two sets of swing doors on the garage and installing a steel overhead door. The existing doors are new and 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. The report from the Board's architectural consultant stated that the questions to be asked when evaluating the proposal are "How prominent is the structure?" and "Will the changing from a double to single-bay opening permanently alter the structure?"

**Findings of Fact:**

- 1) The location of the structure is toward the outer limits of the Village.
- 2) The structure is behind the house and not fully visible from the public way.
- 3) The current doors are not original.
- 4) The garage was previously approved for demolition, but was not demolished.
- 5) For modern usage, the two-door design is inadequate to turn around a vehicle.
- 6) The original garage doors have been removed.
- 7) Changing to a single bay will not significantly alter the architectural form of the structure.

**Motion:** Based upon the *Findings of Fact*, Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application for the Amarr T1 garage door, with the condition that the steel door have a flat finish (not embossed with faux grain) and that the door be brush painted to a matte finish.

**Vote: Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – no; Latshaw – yes.** *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on November 1, 2004.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck amended the motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to include Alpine and Blue Ridge handles, as shown on manufacturer's brochure submitted with application.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – abstain; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on November 1, 2004.

## **7. First Presbyterian Church – 21 & 25 Church St. – Addition**

**Present: Virginia Seal**

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on October 8, 2004, and building inspector approved on October 19, 2004.

**Discussion:** The applicants are proposing replacing the chain-link fence that was destroyed by fire on the east side of the church. The material, height, and post spacing will match the existing fence. In addition, four double-hung windows in the center portion of the complex on the second floor were destroyed by the fire, and the proposal includes replacing them with all-wood, double-hung windows to fit the existing masonry openings. Also, stained glass windows on the second floor of the south elevation will be replicated in kind. The original windows on the first floor will be repaired and reinstalled. A circular window in the gable on the south elevation was destroyed in the fire, and it will be replaced with a custom wood window to match the original.

There are two items of new construction proposed on the south elevation of the building. The church proposes installing a new canopy over the door at the stair entrance on the east side. The proposed canopy is similar to the canopy at the west side. And the proposal includes a new entrance at the Locust Street parking lot. The proposed entrance will have two doors with sidelites and transom, similar to the existing entry on the north elevation, to replace the existing single door. A new open porch is also proposed to transition from outside to indoors. Some changes to the interior at this entrance are proposed to provide better accessibility for the handicapped. All doors and windows at this entrance will be custom, fabricated in wood. The columns and roof trim will also be wood. The applicant stated that copper gutters are proposed to be installed on the new portion.

Chairperson Melnyk questioned the applicant as to what the historical reference for the design was. The applicant replied that it was a Classical influence and that they were also attempting to reference the existing entrance on the North side.

The applicants further stated that they are in the process of developing a proposal for a change in the Locust Street parking lot. The proposed plan would raise the grade in the parking lot and replace two catch basins, correcting some drainage problems. The applicant will return with further details and will also be required to present the proposal to the Planning & Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, that based on the Finding of Fact that the church was damaged by a fire, which necessitated many of the in-kind repairs, to approve the replacement, in-kind, of the chain-link fence; the four double-hung windows on the second floor of the South and North elevations of the church; the in-kind replacement of the

circular window on the Locust Street elevation; the replication of the stained glass windows on the Locust Street elevation; the proposed new canopy, as indicated in the drawings submitted; the stairway door on the far East side of the Locust Street elevation; and the entrance renovation on the main door of the Locust Street elevation, as submitted in the application and supported by drawings (A1-A5, dated 10/20/04), and with the condition that cutsheets be provided for the doors and windows, and contingent upon the Planning & Zoning Board's approval.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – abstain; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***  
**This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on November 1, 2004.**

### **8. Debbie Davis – 30 South St. – Addition**

**Present: Debbie Davis**

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 10/22/04.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing a 10' x 16' second-story bedroom addition to the residence. The proposal includes the installation of two all-wood windows in the back of the house to match the existing windows. The applicant will provide cutsheets for the windows.

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

- 1) The residence was built in 1858
- 2) The addition is on the rear of the house
- 3) The house has been previously altered
- 4) The addition follows the original roofline
- 5) The addition is located in an area which has low visibility

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for a second-floor addition to the original rear portion of the house, as shown, such addition extending the original second-story portion of the house to the rear by 10 feet, and all windows, siding, trim, and soffits to match existing windows, and the windows to be all wood and to have exterior-applied muntins, subject to the applicant's providing cutsheets for the windows.

**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 November 1, 2004.**

#### **Minutes:**

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the September 9, 2004 minutes as amended.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the September 16, 2004 minutes as amended.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the October 4, 2004 minutes as amended.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; 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