

Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting - February 7, 2005 at 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chairperson: Steve Melnyk
Members: Ken Willard
Marcia Watt
Scott Latshaw
John Limbeck

Attorney: Jeff Turner
Building Inspector: Skip Bailey
Record Secretary: Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 7:10.

1. Lisa Jordan (Mona Lisa's Villa), 50 State St - Sign

Application: Submitted and date stamped 12/22/04, amended on 1/27/05, and building inspector approved on 12/28/04.

Discussion: This is a continuation from a previous meeting, where the application was held open pending the applicant's submittal of the colors for the sign. The applicant submitted a color sample of a sign with a new design which included a telephone number. The Board informed the applicant that Village Code does not permit telephone numbers to be displayed on signs. It was noted for the record that the Building Inspector's approval was granted to the first sign, which did not include a phone number.

Motion: Member Watt made a ***motion***, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application, as amended, with the form of sign date-stamped 1/27/05, provided that the phone number is omitted, in accordance with Village Code, and that the words in red immediately above the phone number "where beauty and elegance come together" shall be lowered and centered in the space created by the omission of the phone number, and further provided that the materials shall be as stated in the original application and as reviewed and approved by the Board at the prior meeting, and the applicant shall provide a copy of the final sign to the Village for our records.

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 February 7, 2005.***

APRB Meeting
2/7/05

2. Mario Arena ~ 26 Eastview Terrace ~ Door
Present: Mario Arena

Application: Submitted and date stamped 10/27/04, amended on 1/10/05, and building inspector approved on 10/29/04.

Discussion: This is a continuation of an application in which the applicant proposed enclosing a breezeway between the garage and the house. The Board had approved the application with the exception of the style of the breezeway door, which part of the application remained open pending the applicant's submittal of the specific details of the proposed door. Board members had indicated to the applicant that the door on the addition should not be a replica of the front door of the house, but should be a secondary door. Chairperson Melnyk stated that an entry door is typically more ornate than a secondary door, but that in this case, he was of the opinion that the door chosen by the applicant as the secondary door on the addition was more ornate than the main entry door. Other Board members were of the opinion that the door was sufficiently differentiated from the main entry door. The door is made of steel, with a contemporary design, and Board members stated that the door should be painted to give the appearance of wood.

Findings of Fact:

1. The house was built circa 1925.
2. The door is part of construction of a new breezeway to an existing garage and is not a replacement door.
3. The door is located in an addition to the original house that is clearly differentiated from the original house.
4. The Board required the addition to be set back 12 inches to show differentiation.
5. The house is located on a side street in the Village which is a dead-end street.
6. The style of the door is a contemporary design, is compatible in size, scale, and, when painted, other visual qualities
7. The applicant submitted photos of interior doors with a leaded glass pattern similar to the contemporary door.

Based on the foregoing, member Watt made a ***motion***, seconded by Member Limbeck, to accept the portion of the application as regards the door, provided that the steel door shall be painted in its entirety including the "frame" surrounding the glass.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Melnyk - no; Watt - yes; Latshaw - no. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 7, 2005.

3. Del Monte Spa, 43 North Main Street - Door
Present: Michael Mercier

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 1/19/05.

Discussion: The Board stated that the applicant had removed and replaced an original door and transom window immediately above the door on the historic building, and further, that the applicant should have

approached the Board prior to replacing the original door and shown evidence that the door was not repairable. The Board questioned the applicant as to what was done with the original door and the transom. Chairperson Melnyk stated that the building is one of the historically significant buildings in the Village, and that applicants are encouraged to repair rather than replace architectural features on historic buildings, or where replacement is required, to replace in kind, with the same materials as the original, where possible. The applicant stated that the reasons for replacement of the door were that the door was deteriorated and that the new door is an emergency exit. Board members pointed out that currently, the door is blocked by snow, which prevents its use as an emergency exit.

The applicant argued that the door was replaced in kind. The Board noted that although the replacement door is wood and an effort was made to replicate features of the original, it is not an in-kind replacement because it is a different height than the original. Further, the glass dimensions appear to be diminished and not in proportion to the original.

The record is clear that the applicant is aware of the requirement to come before the Board prior to the removal of historic architectural features (or any other exterior changes) and, based on the detailed drawings submitted, it is clear that the applicant had ample time to submit an application prior to replacement.

Member Limbeck made a motion to deny the application pending review from the person at Del Monte Lodge who made the decision to replace the door. This motion was not seconded or voted on.

Motion: Member Watt made a *motion*, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to hold the application open pending the applicant's submittal of information about the removal of the original door and the transom above the door, and photographs of the original door.

Vote: Limbeck - no; Willard - yes; Melnyk - yes; Watt - yes; Latshaw - yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 7, 2005.**

4. First Presbyterian Church, 21 Church Street - Reconstruction

Present: Virginia Searl, Architect - Bero Architecture

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 10/21/04, and amended on 2/7/05.

Discussion: The applicant presented the following proposed changes to the previous conditionally-approved application.

1. Metal louvers are proposed at the new mechanical room on the lower floor. (A-10, A-11.2, A-20.1, A-20.2, A-20.4, and A-20.5) The applicant stated that the proposal is for three metal louvers: two on the East and West sides in existing window openings and one on the North side.

Board members questioned whether the applicants had considered alternatives to the louvres, and stated that they will request that the Board's architectural advisor comment on the louvres.

2. The existing handrail at the lobby, north entrance, is deteriorated and is proposed to be replaced. The material for the guardrail will match the existing railing. The handrail interior to the guardrail at the steps will be as shown on 1/A-11.1, A-20.1, and A-20.3.
3. An emergency generator is proposed on the south side of the building west of the south vestibule entrance. The proposal is to screen it with a fence to match the adjacent existing board-on-board fence. (2/A-11.1, A-11.3, and A-11.4).
4. The columns at the new Locust Street entrance were originally proposed to be wood. They are now proposed as fiberglass. (2/A-11.1).
5. The gutters and downspouts at the new roof canopies were originally proposed to be copper. They are now proposed as aluminum to match existing. The shapes are the same.
6. The concrete stoop at the lobby, north entrance, will be raised approximately 6" moving the step down away from the doorway. The existing stone bases under the columns and pilasters will be removed. The columns and pilasters will remain in place and the concrete will be placed under them. (A-20.3).
7. The lower floor windows in the East Wing, the south side below the leaded glass windows, and below the historic portion of the building are scheduled to be replaced. When the building was cleaned and asbestos abatement completed, we were able to access these areas and evaluate the condition of the windows. Most of the windows suffered substantial damage from the fire and firefighting activities. Refer A-20.1 and A-20.6.

The applicant stated that there will be an evaluation of the windows to determine if they are salvageable.

Finding of Fact:

- ? A fire at the Church caused substantial damage, necessitating much of the repair and refurbishing of the Church.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a *motion*, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve Items # 2-6, as submitted, and Item # 7, conditioned on inventory/evaluation of the windows with at least one Board member present, and to hold open Item #1, pending further review with the architectural consultant. It was noted that the list submitted by the applicant was renumbered, so that the second #3 is #6 and the second #4 is #7.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Melnyk - yes; Latshaw - yes; Watt - abstain. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 7, 2005.**

5. Roger Powers, 25 Schoen Place - Addition

Present: Theodore Powers
Roger Powers, Jr.

APRB Meeting
2/7/05

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 1/20/05.

Discussion: The applicants are seeking conceptual approval for an addition and renovations to Building # 1 at 25 Schoen Place. The applicants stated that the exterior construction will match the existing, and that a portion of the building at the West end is proposed to be removed and reattached to the addition portion of the building. The siding on the proposed addition will be wood to match the siding on the original building. The scale and scale house will remain.

The Board stated that the applicant will be required to return before this Board and to obtain site plan approval prior to beginning construction.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Board gave the applicant a copy of the architectural advisor's comments and requested that the applicants incorporate architectural differentiation in the final plans.
2. All existing windows will be used, and new windows will match existing windows.
3. The applicants will return before the Board with complete construction plans including all dimensions and materials.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a *motion*, seconded by Member Latshaw, to conceptually approve the submitted plans, in which the front door will be moved to include 4 inches minimum of clapboard, plus trim, and contingent upon submittal of complete construction drawings, including all materials and dimensions, and contingent upon site plan approval.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Latshaw - yes; Watt - yes; Melnyk - abstain. *Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 7, 2005.*

6. Michael Newcomb, 15 S. Main Street - Door

Present: Michael Newcomb

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 1/7/05.

Discussion: The applicant proposes replacing the front door, the small transom window over the door, the front display window, and the side display window on the residence. The applicant stated that the transom is deteriorated and the metal frame is rotted, and he proposes replacing the window with a wood window with true divided lites. The proposed door will be made of steel. It was stated for the record that the second drawing of the door in the plans is for purposes of supplying an example and is not part of the proposal.

Findings of Fact:

1. The building was built in the 1950's.
2. The applicant has stated that the existing transom wood window is deteriorated beyond repair.
3. There have been alterations to the picture window.

4. Interior muntins were added to the existing door.
5. These characteristics are not original to the building; however, the character of the divided lites has now become part of the building and is consistent with surrounding buildings, and therefore should be maintained.

Motion: Member Watt made a ***motion***, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application, as submitted, the existing transom to be replaced with an all-wood true divided lite window, lites to match existing, replacement of headpiece to match existing, installation of a new steel frame, installation of a steel door with wood true divided lite window unit, the door to be painted one color to create the appearance similar to a wooden door, all other aspects to be as indicated in the application.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Latshaw - yes; Watt - yes; Melnyk - abstain. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 7, 2005.***

7. Michael Newcomb, 30 S. Main Street - Demolition of barn
Present: Michael Newcomb

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 12/29/04.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing demolishing the barn in the rear of 30 South Main Street. The applicant stated that the barn is in severe disrepair, and the insurance company will not continue to cover the property in its current condition. The applicant stated that the building cannot be utilized because there is no access and no parking. Mr. Newcomb further stated that he is not requesting the removal of the shed to the left of the barn.

The Board stated that the standards for demolition are very high, and suggested that the property be evaluated by a structural engineer. Member Watt noted that the property is visible from Church St. It was also pointed out that the proposed demolition is a Type I SEQOR action, requiring completion of the Full Environmental Assessment Form.

8. Michael Newcomb, 10 Jackson Park - Doors
Present: Michael Newcomb

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 1/14/05, and building inspector approved on 1/19/05.

Discussion: The applicant replaced two wood doors with two metal doors. The applicant stated that the doors were deteriorated and not original to the residence. Chairperson Melnyk stated that the applicant should have come before the Board before replacing the doors. Board members questioned the applicant as to why the previous wooden doors with windows were replaced with solid steel doors. The applicant stated that he replaced the doors with solid doors in the interest of the privacy of the inhabitants of the residence.

The Board decided to leave the application ***open***, pending the architectural advisor's opinion as to what type of door is compatible.

9. Pittsford Flour Mill, Schoen Place - Rehabilitation

Present: Robert Corby, Bero Architecture

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 10/6/04, and building inspector approved on 10/13/04.

Discussion: Mr. Corby presented drawings showing the proposed final exterior of the Mill building. He stated that the irregular rhythm of the windows is part of the historic character of the building and should be preserved.

Mr. Corby presented the following arguments in support of the proposal to install painted clad wood windows in the Mill Building:

- ? The historical period of significance for the Flour Mill is 1939 - 1950. During this period, the Mill reached its peak operating capacity and achieved its current physical form.
- ? The proposed windows will match the opening size, location, exterior frame detail, and muntin configuration of the existing windows.
- ? The APRB has permitted substitute materials when the applicant has demonstrated that the materials were available during the property's historic period.
- ? Metal-clad windows, often referred to as "kalamein windows," have been available since the early 20th century. Promotional information for metal-clad wood windows published in the 1925 "Sweet's Architectural Catalogue" has been submitted with this application. During the first half of the twentieth century, metal-clad windows gained popularity as a means of achieving better durability and reduced maintenance. Because of the higher cost, the use of metal-clad windows was usually limited to commercial, industrial, institutional, and high-end, multi-family residential structures. In the Village, the Nothnagle building was outfitted with metal-clad windows when it was remodeled in the 1920's.
- ? Permitting clad windows on this application would not set a precedent for 19th century buildings or 20th century residential and commercial structures because the local use of metal in the early 20th century was limited to commercial, agricultural, and industrial structures. While metal-clad wood windows would be inappropriate for a 19th century house or store, they might be appropriate for a mid-20th century industrial complex.
- ? While during the 19th century, most construction in the Village of Pittsford was built exclusively of stone, brick, and wood, the first half of the 20th century witnessed the introduction of numerous alternatives: galvanized metal cladding on the existing Flour Mill window sills, galvanized metal siding on several of the early 20th century Schoen Place mill buildings, steel windows at the Pittsford Farms bull barn and dairy, and homosote siding on the Mill. During the historic period, experimentation with new materials, particularly metal, was common.

- ? An exact duplication of historic windows is impractical because mass production methods have changed. Weighted and pinned sash operators have been replaced throughout the industry by vinyl jamb liners. When the large residential window manufacturers began promoting the use of aluminum cladding in the 1970's, the appearance of clad windows differed significantly from comparable wood units. Today, the availability of simulated exterior muntins and greatly improved profiles has reduced the apparent difference in appearance between the two products to the seams of the cladding visible at the sash corners.
- ? Vinyl windows or vinyl-clad windows, due to color, texture, and profile, are visually very dissimilar from all historic windows produced in the 20th and 19th century in Pittsford and therefore, would be inappropriate in any historic structure in the Village.
- ? Restoration of the Mill would require replacing the homosote siding, the truck dock, blower tubes, and steel pipes. In rehabilitation, also known as adaptive reuse, compromises are permitted to accommodate modern programmatic requirements. In past applications, the Board has allowed substantial changes to historic buildings to accommodate modern uses. Examples include the ATM canopy and porch at Canandaigua National Bank, the alterations of openings on the façade of the former Thornell Garage to accommodate Starbucks, the adaptation of the Schoen Coal sheds to accommodate retail shops, and the relocation of the garage at the Canal Lamp's bed and breakfast. All of these projects were successful, because the alterations left the most important historic character-defining features of the property intact.

Mr. Corby stated his opinion that because of the applied exterior muntins, the proposed windows are a reasonable facsimile of wood windows.

The Board stated that the applicant is proposing altering a significant feature of the historic structure. Board members expressed concerns with setting a precedent for future applications coming before the Board. Chairperson Melnyk referenced # 6 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, stating that deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced, and where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. The Board suggested consulting the architectural advisor, and conducting an inventory to determine which windows can be repaired.

Chairperson Melnyk made a ***motion***, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the details of the Flour Mill proposal, as indicated by elevations on drawing #04110.MD-12, submitted 2/8/05, exempting the material of the window applications, and conditional upon receipt of working drawings providing details of all exterior elevations.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard - yes; Melnyk - yes; Latshaw - yes; Watt - yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 7, 2005.***

APRB Meeting
2/7/05

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary