

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – November 7, 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 (absent)
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

1. Amy Noto, 50 State Street ~ Sign

Present: Tony Noto

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 10/18/05 and building inspector approved on 10/21/05.

Discussion: The applicants' business has recently moved to a new building and they are proposing installing a 34"(l) x 72"(w) sign which was previously approved by the APRB. The only changes to the previously-approved sign are that the background color will be burgundy and the text color will be gold.

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

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 November 7, 2005.

2. Sutherland Auto Group, 9 Monroe Avenue ~ Signage

Present: Tony LoCurto
Paul Harris
Ken Bracker

Application: Submitted and date stamped 10/19/05.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing a sign of individual plastic letters mounted directly on a fascia board with seven gooseneck lights mounted three feet on center over the letters. The light fixtures were previously approved, but the number and color of the lights remained open subject to final approval of the signage.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for individual plastic letters in the size as shown on the submitted drawings, in a dark burgundy color with seven gooseneck light fixtures spaced three feet on center.

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 November 7, 2005.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to amend the previous motion to allow the applicant to select any color for the finish other than white (44), medium blue (45), or yellow (46), as set forth in the manufacturer’s catalog, provided that applicant shall notify the Village Office of the final color selection.

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 November 7, 2005.

3. Marianne Seehafer, 2 Courtenay Circle, Fence
Present: Sandy Seehafer

Application: Submitted and date stamped 10/26/05 and building inspector reviewed 10/27/05.

Discussion: The applicant is requesting approval to install 6foot, wooden, dog-eared style fencing on the rear left side of the house to the cement embankment and on the rear right side of the house to the neighbor’s fence/trees to screen a trailer that is stored on the property. The fence will have a gate in a style consistent with the other fence panel, and the applicant will submit a photographic representation of the gate for the record. Board members stated that any style of gate not consistent with the fence will be subject to further review by the Board.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The gate will be on the western side of the property.
- ✍ There gate will match in style the approved fence.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the 6-foot wooden fence, in a natural, dog-eared style of board, contingent upon receipt of a sample of any hardware for the gate.

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 November 7, 2005.

4. Carl Smith, 17 Eastview Terrace ~ Fence
Present: Carl Smith
Dan Varrente, owner

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector reviewed 10/25/05.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing fencing on the west side of the property to fill in a 45-foot gap in the fence. The proposed fence will continue the existing three-foot wooden fence and join the neighbor’s fence with a one-foot jog in the fencing.

There was some discussion as to whether the fence will be painted or stained and whether the previous owner had been required to paint or stain the fence. The current owner will pursue this issue with the previous owner and the Village Attorney.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the fence, in the same style, height, and specifications as the existing fence, and amending the application to include a right-angle section of fence to match the existing fence, approximately 12-18" wide, that abuts to the neighbor's existing fence of a different style.

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 November 7, 2005.

The applicant also proposes a 6-over-6 wood window over the kitchen sink, where there had previously been a casement window. There was some discussion about what size of window is appropriate based on the proportions of the other windows in the house.

The Board stated that the applicant would need to submit further information about the proposed window, including manufacturer's cutsheet, materials, and dimensions.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve a 6-over-6 all-wood replacement window with applied exterior muntins, to match the existing windows on that elevation of the house, all the casings and exterior trim to match existing, and contingent on receipt of the manufacturer's cutsheet.

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 November 7, 2005.

Board members also pointed out that the portico and the replacement steel door on the west elevation are open violations that need to be addressed by the owner. The Board will seek the opinion of the architectural consultant as to the appropriateness of the style of the portico.

5. Thomolaris, 24 Washington Ave ~ Addition

Present: Bill Thomolaris
Jim Brasley, Architect

Application: Submitted and date stamped on 10/19/05, and building inspector reviewed 10/21/05.

Discussion: The applicant presented plans for Phase I of a two-phase proposal for an addition to the house. The plan presented proposes enclosing the rear porch to create an eat-in kitchen. The plan would involve removing a window in the pantry and moving and reinstalling another window in Phase II of the plan. The vertical piece between the addition and the main house will remain, thereby showing some of the history of the house.

The Board addressed an open item for shutters from the applicant's previous application. Chairperson Melnyk stated that the Board's architectural advisor's opinion is that shutters are not appropriate for this style of house. The applicant stated that they were no longer requesting the installation of shutters on the house.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The house was built circa 1915-1920.
- ✍ The proposed alteration is in the rear of the property.
- ✍ The design and materials are consistent with the spirit of the architectural style of the house.
- ✍ Although adding some character to the property, the rear porch and railing are not significant architectural features of the house.
- ✍ The existing cornerboard will remain, thus providing an historical marker of the existence of the original porch once the addition is completed.
- ✍ There is not a full foundation under the rear porch; the opening is currently covered with wooden lattice work.
- ✍ The applicant intends to complete foundation work in 6 months as part of Phase II of the plan, to be subsequently submitted.
- ✍ The rear east elevation is not visible from the public way and not subject to Board review.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the application to enclose the rear porch, as submitted, with the condition that the applicant will return to the Board within 6 months to address the foundation or fill in to match.

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 November 7, 2005.

6. Lanahan, 26 Locust St ~ Addition

Present: Cristina Lanahan

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 4/20/05.

Discussion This is an open application for an addition. The applicant presented drawings with details of the proposed addition, and the Board considered the style of the overhang canopy above the front door. Board members also questioned the applicant about material for the foundation, and she stated that she does not have a sample of the foundation yet.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the overhang canopy above the door, as submitted 11/7/05.

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 November 7, 2005.

7. Dick Dennison, 11 Golf Ave ~ Discussion of windows

Present: Dick Dennison

Mr. Dennison stated that as a Village resident and life member of Historic Pittsford, he has always been interested in preservation issues and has supported the APRB and its mission. He further stated his opinion that the newer clad windows are superior to the older ones, and suggested that the Board study the issue and consider allowing clad windows in the Village. He also suggested that the Board make available for residents accurate data as to wood versus clad windows.

Member Watt stated that the Village Boards are in the process of reviewing, and investigating ways of improving, the manner of educating residents about these issues. She also pointed out

that there is some question as to the longevity of clad windows, and that the State Historic Preservation Office will no longer support the funding of projects with clad windows.

The Board thanked Mr. Dennison for his comments.

8. Michael Newcomb, 85 South Street ~ Garage Doors
Present: Michael Newcomb

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 10/27/05.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing two wood garage doors with two steel doors. He stated that the wood is deteriorated. Member Watt questioned the applicant as to whether he would consider replacing the doors with wood doors. The applicant stated that the cost of wood doors is substantially higher than the cost of steel doors. The proposed steel doors will have lites and a slight grain finish. Board members stated that a painted, solid door would be a better replication of a wood door.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The garage was constructed in the 1950's.
- ✍ The garage is not historically significant.
- ✍ The wood panel doors are being replaced with hand-painted, steel replacement doors with a smooth finish to better replicate the appearance of wood and fit within the architectural styles of historic value existing in the Village.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve two painted, steel replacement garage doors, with 16 panels and a smooth finish, and contingent on submittal of a cutsheet prior to the issuance of a building permit.

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 November 7, 2005.

9. Michael Newcomb, 51 S. Main Street ~ Garage Doors
Present: Michael Newcomb

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 10/27/05.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing two garage doors with two steel garage doors. One door was damaged by a snow plow, and the applicant would like to replace both doors for a consistent appearance. The Board questioned the applicant as to whether the door is repairable, and the applicant stated that it is not possible to repair only the two bottom panels. The Board suggested that the applicant investigate other steel door styles that have been used in the Village and select a more appropriate style for this garage, which is visible from Main Street. The Board will consult their architectural advisor as to the appropriate style of door for the garage.

10. St. Paul's Church, 28 Lincoln Ave ~ Windows
Present: Mara Barendt
Members of congregation

Discussion: Representatives for the Church stated that clad windows had been mistakenly installed in the addition portion of the Church instead of the wood windows that had been approved by the Board. The applicants stated that there will be an excessive delay in their project if they are required to wait for the new windows to be installed. The applicants presented proposals for ways that the windows could be altered to create the appearance of wood windows. There was some discussion of the differences between the installed windows and the approved windows, for example, the sill is thinner than a wood window sill, and there is a gap where the trim meets the metal. Board members asked if the applicants would consider painting the windows to create an appearance closer to that of wood.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that there is a distinction in the Village Code between replacement windows and windows in new construction, and that there may be more latitude in allowing clad windows in new construction. He also stated that the Board's architectural consultant has said that on clad windows, the seams separate and water can get in and rot the wood.

Member Limbeck stated that although the Board is sympathetic with the Church's situation, his opinion is that the applicants did not pursue relief from the manufacturer aggressively enough.

Board members expressed their reluctance to set the precedent of approving clad windows in this building, and stated that they must consider both past and future applications when considering setting a precedent.

A member of the Church's congregation, Mr. Stevens, stated that a delay in the completion of the renovations may cause members of the congregation to lose support for the project.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to deny approval for clad windows in St. Paul's Lutheran Church.

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 November 7, 2005.

11. Pittsford Flour Mill, 15 Schoen Place **Present: Todd Longwell**

Discussion: This is a project with several outstanding violations.

Counsel to the Board stated that the trustees and the applicant had reached a settlement agreement in connection with threatened litigation involving the project and, more specifically, the installation of unapproved clad windows. Member Limbeck then left the meeting. The issues related to the project, other than the windows, were then discussed. The applicant stated that they had removed the parging on the foundation and had discovered various types of materials underneath, such as brick, concrete, and stone. He offered to meet with the Board at the site to demonstrate samples of some possible materials for the foundation.

Board members pointed out items that had changed from the original approved plans:

- ✍ The shingle roofing that was installed has not been approved. The applicant stated that the installed shingle is an architectural-style, asphalt, 30-year shingle. The Board stated that the applicants would need to provide documentation of the materials and style of the shingle for the record.

- ✍ One vent that had been part of the previous plan was not on the current revised plans. The Board stated that the vent was historic and in keeping with the industrial “feel” of the building.
- ✍ New gutters were installed in three locations on the building. The applicant explained that the gutters are 6” half-round, aluminum gutters, in a color to match the trim, and 3-inch corrugated downspouts, in a color to match the siding.
- ✍ The applicant described the proposed handrails, noting that they will be round and welded. The Board stated that the applicant will need to provide the details of the stairs and railing, and the Board’s preservation expert will also be consulted as to the appropriate railing style.
- ✍ The Board pointed out that the orientation of the overhang at the side door had been changed from previous plans. The applicant explained that the previous orientation of the overhang was a safety hazard because it would have caused water and snow to fall onto the steps. He stated that the same roofing materials would be used. There was also some discussion about the stabilizer beams, and concerns were expressed by the Board that the beams were too bulky.
- ✍ On the west elevation, in the loading dock area, railings that were shown on previous plans had been omitted from the current plan. The applicant stated that the grading had been changed.
- ✍ There was also some discussion about the grading and lack of railings of the entrance on the north elevation.
- ✍ There were some questions about the placement of the windows on the current plans, and the Board informed the applicant that they would need final plans indicating the proposed placement of the proposed windows on the building.
- ✍ The applicant stated that on the east elevation, the plans call for a strip of aluminum flashing. Board members questioned whether it would be visible, and the applicant stated that they would paint the trim and the flashing.
- ✍ The Board also noted that these plans show a new steel door on the rear of the building. The applicant stated that this door would be a utility room door. Board members stated a preference that the metal door be flat, painted, and solid.
- ✍ The Board questioned the applicant as to whether the cinderblock on the office extension infilled window will remain.

The Board and applicants will schedule a site visit to address these issues.

12. Robert Manzella (Naples Creek), 10 Schoen Place ~ Awnings

Present: Robert Manzella

Application: Submitted, date stamped, and building inspector approved on July 20, 2005.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing four roll-up awnings on the north elevation of his business at Schoen Place. The Board decided to leave the application open, pending the applicant’s submittal of a cutsheet and fabric sample for the proposed awnings. The applicant submitted to the Village office two samples of awnings in different shades of yellow for the Board’s consideration.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application, as submitted, and the Buttercup yellow awning material (Style # 4635).

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

APRB Mtg.
11/7/05

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary