

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – October 3, 2005 at 7:30 PM**

PRESENT:

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

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

1. Sarah McGeough, 39 S. Main St ~ Sign

Present: Sarah McGeough

Application: Submitted and date stamped September 21, 2005.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing a 20" (l) x 72" (w) rectangular sign with black applied vinyl lettering. The material for the sign will be MDO, a high-density foam. The proposed sign will be larger than the previous sign, but within Code limits. The applicant presented a drawing of the proposed sign showing the colors, and she indicated that the stitching on the sample will be omitted from the sign.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for a sign, made of MDO high-density foam, with the amendments to the application that the letters will be black and the stitching will be omitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – absent. *Motion carried.*
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

2. Susan Judson, 25 Washington Ave ~ Siding

Present: Susan Judson

Application: Submitted and date stamped September 21, 2005.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing removing the aluminum siding from the residence at 25 Washington Avenue and repairing the existing wood siding that is underneath or replacing it with wood siding to match existing. The applicant stated that the house was sided with aluminum in the 1960's.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The house was built in 1890.
- ✍ The house was moved to its current location in 1910.
- ✍ An addition was added to the house in the 1920's.

- ✍ The original clapboard siding was covered with aluminum siding in the 1960's.
- ✍ The rear addition has only aluminum siding.
- ✍ The applicant has determined that the original clapboard is present under the aluminum siding.
- ✍ The wood replacement siding will match the original clapboard siding.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application, as submitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – absent. *Motion carried.*
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

3. Erika Thomolaris, 24 Washington Ave ~ Fence and siding

Present: Mr. Thomolaris

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 8/19/05.

Discussion:

Fence: The applicant is amending the application to propose installation of a 3' wood picket fence across the front and the right side of the residence, with a short piece at the driveway. The proposed fence will be painted or stained white. The applicant stated that there will be no gates on the fence, and the end posts will be capped.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the wooden, picket fence, as submitted, the fence to be painted or stained white, the voids to be no wider than the pickets, the placement to be as indicated in the application, with the style of the caps to be left open, pending submittal of a picture rendition of the proposed caps, to be voted on separately.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes; Limbeck - absent. *Motion carried.*
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Shutters: The applicant is also requesting approval to install wood shutters. He stated that the proposed shutters would match the size of the windows and will give the appearance of being able to close. Chairperson Melnyk referenced #3 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which states "Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken."

It was advised that the applicant contact Historic Pittsford for an evaluation from Bero Architecture as to the history of the house, and the Board will consult the Board's architectural advisor as to the appropriateness of the shutters for this style of house.

The Board is leaving open this part of the application pending submittal of this additional information.

Siding: The applicant is also proposing removing the asphalt siding on the upper floor and installing wood clapboard siding.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The house was built in 1915.
- ✍ Asphalt shingle was not original to the structure, as it was not available at the date of construction.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve removing the nonoriginal asphalt shingle and replacing it with wood siding to match the existing wood clapboard on the house.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes; Limbeck – absent. *Motion carried.*
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Garage Doors: The applicant also is amending the application to request approval to replace a garage door with a steel door. The Board recommended that the door have a smooth texture and be painted, and gave the applicant examples of other acceptable steel garage doors in the Village. The applicant submitted examples of garage doors, and Member Watt stated that for a barn-style garage such as this one, the square or rectangular style of window on the door is preferable to the curved style. The Board is leaving this portion of the application open, pending the applicant's investigation as to the original material of the doors and other styles of replacement doors.

Shed:

The applicant is requesting approval for demolition of a shed on the property. The applicant stated that the shed is deteriorated and is a safety hazard. The Board noted that the shed has limited visibility from the public way. Chairperson Melnyk stated that since the APRB is a preservation board, the standards for demolition are very high. He further stated that the applicant has the option of moving the shed to another location on the property. The Board's attorney stated that the Building Inspector has the authority to order demolition of a structure if he determines that it is a safety hazard.

The Board is leaving open this portion of the application. The applicant will contact Bero Architecture for evaluation of the historic nature of the shed, and the Board will consult with its architectural advisor.

4. Scott Likly (Towpath Bike Shop), 3 Schoen Place ~ Sign, lights, fence

Present: Scott Likly

Discussion: The applicant stated that he had installed incorrect spindles on the porch railing, but will install the approved square spindles.

Sign: The applicant is requesting approval to install a previously-approved sign and gooseneck lights at 3 Schoen Place.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for the sign and lights, as submitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes; Limbeck - absent. *Motion carried.*
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Fence: The applicant is proposing installing a post-and-rail fence along the northeast edge of the site to match the existing fence at 3 Schoen Place. The height of the proposed fence will not exceed 44”.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the post-and-rail fence, in the location set forth in the site plan approved by the Planning Board, the posts to be 4-inch square posts, the height to be between 36-44 inches, the rails to be constructed in the proportions shown in the drawings submitted, with the intent that the fence will match the existing post-and-rail fence on the property directly across the street from the subject property.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.*** **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.**

5. Sutherland Service Station, 9 Monroe Ave ~ Sign, Awnings, Lights, Door, Windows

Present: Ken Bracker

Tony LoCurto

Discussion:

Site Lighting: The applicants are proposing replacing four lights, which do not comply with the current Zoning Code. The applicant presented documentation of the proposed lights, which are Citylitter, single-mount, 16 feet in height, in a dark brown/bronze color. The applicants are also proposing installing five wallpacks and seven gooseneck lights for the proposed sign. Board members questioned the applicants as to whether seven was an excessive number of lights for the sign.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the application for 4 pole lights, Citylitter S453, in a dark brown or black color, measuring 4” square and 16 feet in height, the placement to be as determined by the Planning Board.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.*** **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.**

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve five exterior WCS metal cutoff wallpacks, in a dark brown or black color, seven feet in height, as represented on cutsheet WP2, two to be mounted in the existing locations on the south side, one on the west elevation, and two on the front elevation, centered on the end columns, as shown on drawing WP2.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.*** **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.**

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the gooseneck light fixtures, as shown on the material submitted as GF-1 & GF-2 (M710/40, E1/40), provided that the number and color of the lights remain open subject to the final approval of the signage.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.*** **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.**

Louvre: The applicants are requesting approval to add a decorative round louvre, measuring two feet in diameter, to match the existing louvre on the front elevation of the building.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The style of the louvre currently exists on the building.
- ✍ The addition of a decorative element is consistent with the architectural style of the building.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the installation of a round louvre on the peak of the gable on the front elevation of the building, the dimensions and material to match the existing louvre on the West elevation of the building.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Awnings: The applicants are also requesting approval to install 18-inch, shed-style awnings over the garage doors and bay window. The proposed awnings are stationary awnings which will have the appearance of retractable awnings.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ Awnings are a temporary feature.
- ✍ Installation of awnings will not damage any architectural features of the building.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application for awnings, as described in the information provided, in a solid color coordinated with the signage and trim. The applicant will submit a color sample.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Planters: The applicants are also proposing adding three brick planters along the front elevation of the building. The planters will utilize the existing concrete bases, and the brick will match the existing brick.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the three brick planters, as described and drawn in the application, and in a color to match the existing brick on the building.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Windows: The applicants propose replacing the metal-framed window on the east elevation of the building with a metal-framed Conair window matching the existing bay window. Also proposed is the alteration of the metal window on the West elevation to be replaced with the Conair metal window, which is consistent with other windows on the building.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The building was constructed in the 1960's.

- ✍ The building is less than 50 years old.
- ✍ The doors and windows have been altered from the original.
- ✍ The architectural design of the building is not historic.
- ✍ The use of the building is changing from a traditional gas station to automobile sales.
- ✍ The existing window is metal.
- ✍ The West elevation window is the only double-hung window on the building.
- ✍ The proposed alteration to install Conair window is to make this window consistent with the other windows on the building.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the replacement of the metal-framed window on the east elevation of the building with a metal-framed Conair window to match the existing bay window (Elevation 8, A2) revised on 10/3/05.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the alteration of the metal window on the West elevation to be replaced with the Conair metal window, which is consistent with other windows, as described in Elevation 7, A2, revised 10/3/05.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Garage Door: The applicants are also requesting approval to replace the existing single-pane overhead garage doors with a Titan Model garage door, for which the applicant provided documentation.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the replacement of three overhead garage doors with the Titan Model garage doors, as described on sheet D1, which are of similar style as the currently existing doors, shall be in the number of lites represented in the drawings, all of which shall be glass.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Doors: The applicants are also requesting approval to fill in two door openings on the right side of the building.

Findings of Fact

- ✍ The doors are on the side elevation of the building and are no longer in use.
- ✍ The doors are not an architectural feature of the building that needs to be preserved.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the brick enclosure of the existing bathroom doors on the west elevation, using a tooth-in method.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

Roof: The application requests the replacement of the existing light gray roof shingles on the building with architectural-style shingles in either black or driftwood.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the replacement of the existing gray, nonarchitectural-style roof shingles with architectural-style shingles from the Certainleed Landmark Series in either black or driftwood.

Vote: Limbeck – abstain; Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. **Motion carried.**
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 3, 2005.

5. First Presbyterian Church, 21 Church St ~ Generator screen

Present: Virginia Searl

Discussion: This is an open application for proposed screening for the mechanical equipment for the First Presbyterian Church. Board members expressed concerns with the size of the proposed 7-foot, fence-like screen for the chiller unit. Various methods for minimizing the size of the chiller and screen were discussed, and Members suggested adding vegetation to screen the structure. It was also suggested that any screen be stained in a color that would assist it blending in with the background. The Board decided to leave this portion of the application open, pending the applicant's investigating ways to minimize the size of the screen and/or the area that the structure covers. The Board also advised the applicant to provide verifiable engineering schematics that describe functional spacing tolerances versus those suggested for maintenance.

The applicants stated that they had consulted with a mechanical engineer, who had stated that the proposed clearances are the required clearances for the operation of the unit. Chairperson Melnyk reminded the applicants that the Board had requested that the Church submit specific engineering calculations supporting their assertions that the proposed chiller measurements were required for operation of the unit, and not for maintenance purposes only.

The applicants further stated that they were proposing amending the application to increase the measurement of the unit from 19' 4½" to 19'6". The applicant also stated that the proposal now includes plantings for the purpose of screening the unit.

Findings of Fact

- ✍ The proposed chiller screen is the only type of screening that can accommodate the chiller
- ✍ The mechanical engineer stated that the size of the chiller screen is required for operation of the unit.
- ✍ The applicants have added plantings for screening of the unit.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the size of the fence, noting that the size of the bushes for screening of the unit will be 8' at maturity, and contingent on receipt of engineering calculations and data for the unit which support the fact that the size of the unit is required for operation, as opposed to being for maintenance purposes only.

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 October 3, 2005.

6. Pittsford Flour Mill, 15 Schoen Place

Present: Todd Longwell

Michael Newcomb, Jr.

Discussion: This is a project with several outstanding violations. Applicants submitted a list summarizing the proposed changes to the exterior of the Mill that differ from the previously-approved façade design.

1. Rear (north) façade
 - a. Door to the right of double door has been eliminated.
 - b. A bay of windows has been added to provide additional interior light.
 - c. One window has been eliminated at the rear façade of the office.
2. East façade
 - a. The two windows located on the third floor have been reduced in size to avoid severing a horizontal timber beam. The proposed windows match those occurring at the office and at east addition.
 - b. To provide more light, two new windows have been added at the first floor.
 - c. Gable vent to be eliminated.
3. Front facade
 - a. Main exterior stair will be faced with rubble stone veneer similar to texture of 1882 stone foundation.
 - b. Door at office has been raised from 6'2" to 7'0" to meet current Code requirements.
 - c. Cellar openings will be filled with cmu. The intent is to leave clear marker of openings so the historic building remains apparent. The grade adjacent to this side of the building is being raised to allow a street sidewalk and to eliminate the ponding of water adjacent to the building.
 - d. Instead of "Pittsford Milling Company" the owners would prefer the term "Pittsford Flour Mill," which is another historic name for the property and seems more descriptive.
4. West façade
 - a. Gable vents to be eliminated.

Board members discussed the proposed windows for the addition. Member Watt stated that the Board did not approve two-over-two windows for the addition, and questioned the applicants as to the size of the original windows. The Board also discussed the alteration of the basement windows and openings, stating 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 chute and was not indicated on the previously filed plans. It was determined that the openings would be filled in with block, with the exterior finish to be determined in the future. The Board will consult the preservation expert to determine if the coal chute is historically significant.

Also discussed was the proposed stone facing around the front stairs, and Board Members noted that the staircase and railing were not approved. The applicants stated that the stone foundation should not have been parged, and indicated that they had attempted to correct this by removing the parging and adding new scored parging which has the appearance of block. The applicants stated that it is not possible to remove the parging from the cinderblock. They also stated that they are proposing removing the parging from the fieldstone and then repointing the stone.

They went on to discuss the rusticated block, which was supposed to be saved as a remnant of the warehouse. The applicants are proposing a rubble-stone veneer as an alternative material, an example of which can be viewed on the building. Member Watt questioned whether, from a preservation standard, it was appropriate to match stone. The applicants stated that the mason will retrieve a sample and make it available for the Board to view.

The Board next discussed the proposal to change the wording of the signage for the Flour Mill from "Pittsford Milling Company" to "Pittsford Flour Mill," which the applicants stated is another historic name for the property and seems more descriptive. Board Members stated that historically, both names were used, and conceptually, this change would be acceptable.

As for the attempt to correct the installation of the windows with the aluminum-clad sills and trim on the Mill, Chairperson Melnyk pointed out that a layer of cladding introduces a new material and design change to the windows. He further stated that alterations can be made to change the appearance of the windows to be more like wood, but that the issue is the setting of the precedent of allowing these windows to be installed in this historically significant building in the Village. The applicant explained that they had installed the style of window that they had understood the Board to have approved.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that there may have been a miscommunication between the applicants and the architect, but that the Board's intention was very clear. Starting in September 2004, the Board indicated that it would not approve clad windows, and the minutes from a number of APRB meetings reflect the clear intent of the Board to install all-wood windows in this building of significant architectural standing in the Village.

Chairperson Melnyk questioned the applicants as to the possible use of the windows in the Grain Elevator instead of the Mill, but the applicants stated that that was not possible, since it would not be permitted by the Village Code.

The Village attorney stated that it might be possible for the parties to agree to a time period for the replacement of the windows.

The Board took no formal action on the Mill project.

Member Items:

The Board discussed possible topics to present at the upcoming Joint Board Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 12:30.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary