

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting - April 4, 2005 at 7:30 PM**

**PRESENT:**

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

**Attorney:** Jeff Turner  
**Building Inspector:** Skip Bailey  
**Recording Secretary:** Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 7:30.

**1. David Baldwin, 3 S. Main St. ~ Sign**

**Present:** David Baldwin

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 2/25/05.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing the existing sign on the building with a wood sign with the same dimensions, colors, and style as the existing sign. The applicant stated that the proposed sign is a single-sided sign, measuring 20"h x 72"w, with a blue background and white letters. The Board pointed out that under the Village Code, website addresses are not permitted on signage.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the application for a sign, as amended to remove the Web address, as per Village Code § 119-7, which states restrictions as to what can be included on signage.

**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 April 4, 2005.**

**2. Trina Petrone, 56 N. Main St. ~ Sign**

**Present:** Trina Petrone

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 3/14/05.

**Discussion:** Applicant proposes installing a wood, building-mounted sign, measuring 71"w x 36"h, on her business. The proposed sign will have applied letters, the material of which will be supplied to the Village Office in the near future.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application for a wood sign, as submitted, with the condition that the applicant will provide the material of the lettering to be used on the sign to the Village Office.

**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 April 4, 2005.**

**3. John Kowalczyk, 25 State St. ~ Sign**

**Present:** John Kowalczyk

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on 3/23/05, and building inspector approved on 3/30/05.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installing an oval sign with a flat black background and gold lettering, measuring 6'w x 2'l, on the front of his business at 25 State St. The material for the sign is proposed to be high-density foam. The Board informed the applicant that he would need to supply a color rendering of the sign for the record. The applicant stated that he was not requesting approval for the awning portion of the application at this time, and the Board stated that that portion of the application will remain open.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application for a high-density foam sign, with a flat black background with gold-leaf lettering, as noted in the materials submitted, and with the approval being conditional on the applicant's submittal of a color rendering of the proposed sign. The application will be held open for the awning.

**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 April 4, 2005.**

**4. Tom Mitchell, 67 State St. ~ Dock**

**Present:** Tim Curtain

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on 3/23/05, and building inspector approved on 3/24/05.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing constructing a dock on his property. Board members questioned the applicant as to whether he had obtained approval for the dock from the Canal Authority, and the applicant stated that his hearing was scheduled for 4/7/05. The proposed dock will be made of treated yellow pine, measuring 20' by 8', and will have straight spindles. The proposal also includes two benches along the east and north ends of the property.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application with the amendment that the spindles on the dock will be square and also will be located on the western elevation; the rail and benches will match the neighbors' on the east and north ends, the east bench to be integral to the structure, and the risers will be placed in accordance with the fall of the property; the gate will match the photograph provided by the applicant; and the approval is conditioned on the applicant's providing the dimensions of the gate and stairway.

APRB Meeting  
April 4, 2005

**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 April 4, 2005.**

**5. Sam Arena, 19 Maple St. ~ Fence**

**Present:** Sam Arena

**Application:** Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on 3/31/05.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installing a wood picket fence on his property. The proposed fence will be 3' in height and will be made of pressure-treated yellow pine and stained or painted white. The spacing between the pickets will be as shown on the submitted drawings. The applicant amended his application to include an additional gate.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the amended application to include an additional gate to be located directly in front of the Maple Street door, all the gates are to be of the single style, and the entire fence to be stained or painted white, and the fence to be installed 18" from the sidewalk, as allowed by the Village Code. The approval is conditional on the applicant's submittal of the width of the gates.

**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 April 4, 2005.**

**6. 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, and amended 4/4/05.

**Discussion:** Mr. Corby stated that the applicants have identified an all-wood window that is acceptable to them as a replacement window for the Mill. However, applicants are requesting that the Board reconsider clad windows for the rear elevation of the Mill building.

Board members expressed their view that, under Village Code Section 210.61(C) governing Repairs, replacement windows for the Mill building should be all wood. Further, the Board expressed a strong interest in maintaining a consistency in the type of windows across the entire building, stating that the Flour Mill is a valuable and significant historical resource within the Village, and that consistency of material is an important aspect in the rehabilitation project. Board members noted that the windows and the window fenestration are a key architectural feature of this building. While many changes have been made over the years to the building, the wood windows have been a consistent element that has not changed and should be maintained.

Mr. Corby presented a sample of the Kolbe wood window proposed to be installed in the Mill building. The window has a factory applied paint coating, would be installed with trim to match, and will be painted an antique white color. Mr. Corby noted that the sash widths on the Kolbe

window more closely replicate the original Mill windows than do the windows of other manufacturers previously shown to the Board.

Findings of Fact:

1. All of the existing windows on the Mill are all wood windows;
2. Code Section 210.61C governing "Repairs" is applicable and states that "In the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.";
3. The windows and the window fenestration are a key architectural feature of this building;
4. While many changes have been made over the years to the building, the wood windows have been a consistent element that has not changed and should be maintained.

**Motion:** Based on the foregoing discussion of Board Members and the findings of fact above and those previously made by this Board with respect to the Mill, Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, for approval of all-wood Kolbe replacement windows for the Pittsford Flour Mill to be as illustrated on the drawing submitted by Bero Architecture, in the color designated as Alabaster (#9), with all exterior trim to match the alabaster white color and with a 7/8" muntin width, and conditioned on the installation of this type of window on all four elevations of the Mill building.

**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 April 4, 2005.**

Mr. Corby stated that the applicants are requesting final approval for demolition. The Board completed the Short Environmental Assessment Form.

**Motion:** Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, that based on the SEQR environmental assessment form submitted, and upon the factors previously determined in this matter, the Board finds that there will be no significant environmental impact, and allows the applicant approval to demolish the structures identified for demolition in the application.

**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 April 4, 2005.**

**8. Del Monte Spa, 43 N. Main Street ~ Door**

**Present:** Michael Mercier  
John Tengeres

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an open application where the applicant had removed and replaced an original door and transom window immediately above the door on the historic building. The Board stated that the applicant should have approached the Board prior to replacing the original door and shown evidence that the door was not repairable.

APRB Meeting  
April 4, 2005

The Board further stated that the applicants are currently in violation of the Village Code.

The applicants apologized for replacing the original door prior to seeking approval from the Board, and stated that it was an oversight on their part and not an intentional act of violation. They presented photographs comparing the old and new doors. They stated that the reasons for the replacement of the door were that it was deteriorated beyond repair, and that the door is an emergency exit door. Mr. Mercier addressed Member Limbeck's concern that the door was obstructed by snow, stating that the area will be properly maintained in the future.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that the original door was a significant architectural feature of the building, and that if the applicants had come before the Board with the proposal for this door, they would have been required to replicate the original door. He further stated that the changes are not consistent with #2-6 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Member Watt asked what interior issues prevented the applicants from replicating the original door. The applicants stated that the contractor constructed the doors to replicate the interior doors, without considering the impact these changes would have on the exterior of the door.

The Board stated that the primary areas of concern are the door height and the glass proportions on the door, pointing out that the door is 6 inches shorter and the windows are significantly different in shape and size. Member Limbeck questioned the applicants as to whether they could modify the transom and add a piece to the door.

The application will remain open, pending the applicants' returning to the Board for their approval of a proposal to more clearly replicate the original door.

#### **9. Colony House, 31 N. Main Street**

**Discussion:** The Board discussed whether legally existing vinyl siding can be replaced in-kind. Mayor Corby stated that the Code has been substantially revised since approval was granted. He indicated that he had had discussions with the owners of the property and recommended that the siding be removed and returned to the original clapboard and painted. The Board requested that the Building Inspector monitor the situation.

#### **Member Items:**

#### **Minutes:**

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the March 3, 2005 minutes, as amended.

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

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

APRB Meeting  
April 4, 2005

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

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary