

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – August 1, 2005 at 7:30 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Steve Melnyk
Members:	John Limbeck
	Marcia Watt
	Scott Latshaw
Absent:	Ken Willard
Attorney:	Jeff Turner

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

**1. Bryan & Cristina Lanahan, 26 Locust Street ~ Addition
Present: Cristina Lanahan**

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 5/31/05.

Discussion: This is a continuation of an open application for an addition, in which the Board held open the replacement of certain windows, pending architectural evaluation. The applicants stated that the windows had been evaluated by Bero Architecture, and it was determined that the windows date from the early 1900's. They further stated that in light of this information, they are no longer requesting approval to alter the windows. They also propose replacing the aluminum storm windows with wood storm windows. The application will remain open pending submittal of new drawings for the double-hung, one-over-one windows proposed for the addition. The applicant will return to present the revised drawings and address other open issues.

**2. Flour City Bagels, 24 State Street (Library) ~ Awnings
Present: Craig Bright, Director of Real Estate for Flour City Bagels, LLC**

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 5/26/05.

Discussion: The applicant, Flour City Bagels, LLC, as lessee for the retail space in the southwest corner of the new Pittsford Library, is requesting approval for signage and awnings on the front and sides of the retail space, as detailed in the submitted materials. It was determined that the Board can approve fixed awnings which have the appearance of roll-up awnings. The applicant is proposing awnings on the front and side of the building, but lettering for only the side awnings. Also, the request for the building-mounted sign has been modified to reduce the height of the lettering to 14 inches. Board members questioned whether the applicant had considered adding lettering to the front awning and omitting the building-mounted sign. The applicant stated that he had not considered that option. The Board further questioned the applicant as to whether the awnings facing State Street are of sufficient length to cover the upper section of the windows, which have interior muntins only (thus being inconsistent with the other windows on the building which have interior and exterior muntins).

Findings of Fact:

- ⌘ There is existing precedent for permitting fixed awnings that appear to be roll-up type awnings in the Village.
- ⌘ Materials for lettering on the building will be consistent with materials being used by the Town of Pittsford elsewhere on the State Street façade to identify the Library.
- ⌘ The submitted drawings indicate that the upper portions of the State Street windows with interior muntins will be covered by the awnings.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application, as submitted, for fixed awnings which appear to be roll-up awnings, for the reduced size of the sign on the front façade, and for signage on the west side awnings.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. **Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 1, 2005.**

3. Pittsford Flour Mill, 15 Schoen Place

Present: Fran Obermeyer – Architect

Discussion: The Flour Mill developers sent a representative, Mr. Fran Overmoyer, to address the APRB regarding the violations noted in the Building Inspector’s letter to the applicants. The Board referenced the letter, dated 7/14/05, in which the developers were instructed to submit an application to resolve the failure to maintain the original stone foundation of the Mill and the disposal of the rusticated block from the demolished warehouse. The Board addressed these issues and reviewed the various other proposed changes presented by the applicants’ representative.

The Board stated that at previous meetings, it was always the understanding, based on building plans submitted by the applicant, that the original stone foundation was to be preserved and that there were several discussions about the foundation providing a differentiation of the 1800’s portion of the mill building from the newer portions of the mill. The retention of the stone foundation was a significant factor in other decisions made by the Board with respect to the project, including those related to siding, fenestration, and signage.

The applicants’ proposed solution to the parging of the original foundation is to allow the parging to remain and to add additional parging scored to imitate a stone foundation. The Board stated that the applicants should have investigated various techniques for removal of the stone parging, and then presented expert analysis of the foundation and the possibilities for restoration to its original appearance for the Board’s review.

The Chairman informed the applicant that the Board has obtained an expert opinion from its consultant architect, Ted Bartlett of Crawford & Stearns, stating that sandblasting should not be ruled out without actually testing its effect on the sub-straight. He has witnessed examples where it has met with varying measures of success. Based on that expert opinion, the Board stated that before the Board will be able to render a decision on the foundation, the owners will need to make testing results available to the APRB, as well as provide samples of any alternative repair methods or materials they are proposing.

With respect to the present proposal, the Board noted that there was insufficient evidence to determine that the foundation could not be restored, and that the applicant has provided no sample of scored parging for the Board to evaluate.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to deny the application to allow the parking to remain and to add additional parking with a scoring feature.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 1, 2005.***

Next, the Board noted that the application submitted did not address Item #2 of the Building Inspector's letter, which stated that the applicants were required to address the disposal of the rusticated block. The architect was unable to provide the Board with any information on this subject.

In addition, the developers are requesting additional changes to the approved project design. Board members felt that these changes would further move the rehabilitated building away from its original design. The Board considered each proposal, which included removing a single egress door on the north façade, reorienting a stairway on the canal side façade, changing the approved design of the historically reminiscent signage, and adding stone facing to several design features.

Egress door:

Regarding the proposal to remove the single egress door on the north facade, the Board stated that they approve of the removal, in concept, but that they would require the applicant to provide additional information. No approval can be granted until the applicant submits detailed drawings for review.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the removal of the door, in concept, but to hold the application open pending the applicant providing detailed drawings and resolution of the violations noted in the July 14, 2005 letter.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 1, 2005.***

Reorientation of office-wing entry:

The applicant is requesting that the stairway be turned based on concern that, as approved, the bottom of the stairway is too close to the road. Also, the interior plan has changed so that the applicant anticipates greater usage of this entrance.

Board members stated that the re-orienting of the office-wing entry would be another change from that which is historically representative of the original. Members reviewed the site plan and noted that there is a sidewalk between the base of the stair and the street and that this has not changed since the original approval was granted.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to deny the proposal to reorient the office-wing entry porch, as proposed on the current application.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 1, 2005.***

Commemorative plaque:

The applicant requested approval for a commemorative plaque. No specific details regarding size or placement were provided.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to hold open the issue of the commemorative plaque, pending submission of further details from the applicant and direction from the Village attorney as to what the Village Code allows.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 1, 2005.***

Stone facing for front entry and portions of foundation:

The applicant is seeking approval to use stone facing in place of the rusticated block on the canalside entry stairway.

Members noted that, until it is known whether the foundation can be restored to its original appearance and, if not, what any proposed alternative foundation will look like, and whether or not the rusticated block from the demolished warehouse is available for use at the project, the Board is unable to evaluate additional changes to the building that further take away from its historic design and/or which propose to use alternative materials.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to leave open the issue of the stone facing for the front entry and portions of the foundation, pending the applicant providing further details and resolution of the violations noted in the July 14, 2005 letter.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 1, 2005.***

The Board also noted that several differences existed between the building plan submitted by Mr. Overmoyer as part of this application and the building plans approved by this Board as the basis for the granting of the building permit. Based on advice from counsel, the Board recommended that the building inspector be directed to review the plans for inconsistencies and report the differences to the Board and the applicants.

The Board then summarized the issues that remain unresolved:

- ⌘ Building inspector's list of violations in the letter dated July 14, 2005: (1) parging of original foundation in violation of approved plan; (2) destruction of rusticated block from warehouse.
- ⌘ Need for additional information concerning egress door, commemorative plaque, and stone facing
- ⌘ Differences between the approved plan and the current plan.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary