

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Special Meeting - August 16, 2005 at 4:30 PM**

**PRESENT:**

**Chairperson:** Steve Melnyk  
**Members:** John Limbeck  
Marcia Watt  
Scott Latshaw  
Ken Willard  
  
**Attorney:** Jeff Turner  
**Building Inspector:** Skip Bailey  
**Secretary:** Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 4:45.

**1. Pittsford Flour Mill, Schoen Place**

**Present:** Al Longwell  
Michael Newcomb  
Todd Longwell  
John Darcy - Attorney

**Discussion:** The meeting began with a viewing and discussion of the parging over of the stone foundation and concrete block. The Chairman noted that at previous APRB meetings, it was determined that the original stone foundation provided a differentiation of the 1800's Mill portion of the building from the newer portions of the Mill, and that it would be preserved during the project. The Board further pointed out that the cornerboard could have been maintained as a historic marker, but this was not required based on the representations of the applicant that the original foundation would be preserved.

The applicants stated that the reason for the removal of the foundation was that due to a drainage problem, the foundation was deteriorating. It was pointed out by Board members that the drainage issue does not affect the preservation of the stone foundation, and that if the applicants had encountered a problem with the preservation of the stone, they were required to come before the Board and present alternative options. The solution proposed by the applicants in response to the violation notice was to allow the parging to remain with additional parging scored to imitate a stone foundation. This proposal was voted on and denied by the Board at the August APRB meeting. The Board also pointed out that any grading/drainage problems are issues for the Planning Board.

The Board then examined a segment of the stone foundation on which the applicant had attempted to remove the new parging by chiseling it off. It appeared that the effort to remove the parging was successful, and it was agreed that the applicant would continue to remove the parging in this manner. Once the parging is removed and the original fieldstone is exposed, the applicant will examine the foundation and make a proposal for restoration. It was stressed by the Board that the method used to replace any stones or to fill gaps in masonry, and the use of any new fieldstone or other materials, would need to be reviewed and

approved by the Board prior to restoration work being commenced. It was agreed that another site visit would be necessary at that time.

With regard to the newer portion of the foundation which now has new parging over concrete block, it was determined that the applicant would attempt to remove the new parging and, based on the results, either remove the new parging or come back to the Board with a proposal for that portion of the foundation.

The next issue for discussion was the disposition of the rusticated block. The Board again stressed the importance of preserving these blocks for use at the site, as an historic marker of the warehouse that was demolished. The applicants stated that only 12 salvageable blocks remain. The Board discussed the possibility of retrieving the blocks, but the applicants indicated this was not now possible.

Next, the alteration of the basement openings was discussed, and the Board pointed out that there had been no application submitted for these changes. The site visit revealed that three openings had been filled with concrete block: two were windows that were to have been preserved according to the approved plan, and the third opening was possibly the site of a coal shoot and was not indicated on the previously filed plans. It was suggested that the applicants complete an inventory documenting all the changes regarding these openings/windows and present it to the Board.

The Board then addressed the office-door stairway. The Chairman noted that the application to turn the stairway to the side was denied at the last Board meeting. Also, the Board indicated to the applicants that the Board had approved concrete stairs with metal handrails. The applicant agreed that this stairway would be rebuilt according to the original approved plan.

The applicants stated that they had not anticipated the problems that they have encountered with this project, and that they have tried to maintain the integrity of the buildings. Board members stated that over a period of many months, and having made several concessions, they had worked with the applicants to create an acceptable plan for the project, but that the applicants had not acted in accordance with the agreed-upon plan.

Next, the Board and the applicants viewed and discussed the windows. The windows that were approved by the Board were all-wood, Kolbe & Kolbe replacement windows, but the applicants have installed windows that have wood sashes and aluminum-clad sills and trim. Board members presented specification sheets, minutes, and letters indicating that the approval granted was for all-wood windows. They stated that wooden sashes with clad trim was not approved by the Board. They went on to stress their concern with setting the precedent of allowing these windows to be installed in this historically significant building in the Village. Mr. Longwell stated that the window installed was the same as the sample window that was presented to the Board at the meeting at which the windows were approved. Bob Corby could not recall the composition of the sample window frame, and Board Members pointed out that, even if this were the case, the window had been represented to them to be all wood.

Mayor Corby suggested ways in which the windows could be altered visually in order to bring them closer to what the Board approved, for example, extending the sill casing to the edge of the window, caulking the seam, and painting the clad trim to eliminate the difference in sheen. He further suggested that the Board's preservation expert and the applicants' architect could work together to create a proposal to fix the problems that would be acceptable to both parties. Certain Board members expressed the view that any proposed changes would not address the fundamental issue, which is the use of clad windows. However, the Board determined that the matter should remain as a violation pending input from the architectural consultant and a specific proposal from the applicant. It was agreed that if such a proposal is made by the applicant, the applicant will trim out and paint one window for the Board to visually examine and consider.

Member Limbeck stated his opinion that any further involvement in the process by Mayor Corby would present a potential conflict of interest.

In closing, Chairperson Melnyk summarized the main issues discussed and action items resulting from the meeting:

- ✍ Restoration of the fieldstone and concrete block foundation: Applicants are to remove the parging from the fieldstone foundation and make a proposal for restoration. Applicants are to present test results for restoration of the concrete block portion of the foundation to the Board.
- ✍ Rusticated block: The warehouse rusticated block has been destroyed by demolition in violation of the approved plan. Applicants are to propose an alternate material to be used on the front entry stairway.
- ✍ Alteration of basement windows and openings: Applicant to submit an inventory of the windows and other openings and make a proposal for restoration or incorporation into the foundation.
- ✍ Windows: The presently installed windows have not been approved. Applicant should correct the window violation by installing the approved all-wood windows or make a proposal, based on consultation with its architect and the APRB consultant, for the installed replacement windows with modifications to address the use of cladding. Any such proposal is subject to Board review, and there is no assurance that it will meet the Board's preservation/rehabilitation standards.
- ✍ Signage: The building plan filed by applicants' new architect showed signage that has not been approved by the APRB. Signage will remain as previously approved unless applicant submits a proposal for a change.
- ✍ Approvals were granted by the Board conditioned on final construction plans with full details being submitted to the Board. The applicant must file a full, detailed set of construction documents as set forth in the two approval letters sent to applicant. Applicant is currently in violation of this condition to approval.

APRB 8/16/05  
Special Meeting

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 6:15 .

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary