

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Special Meeting – November 15, 2005 at 5:30 PM**

PRESENT:

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Chairperson: | Steve Melnyk |
| Members: | Marcia Watt Scott Latshaw Ken Willard (absent) |
| Attorney: | Jeff Turner |
| Building Inspector: | Skip Bailey (absent) |
| Recording Secretary: | Linda Habeeb |

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 6:30.

1. Pittsford Flour Mill, 15 Schoen Place

Present: Todd Longwell

Discussion: This is a project with several outstanding violations.

- ✍ The Board viewed the sample of stone for the base of the front stairs of the Flour Mill at the site. Board Members stated that it is an appropriate material.
- ✍ The applicant submitted the required specifications for the roof.
- ✍ The applicant also submitted a cutsheet for the door for the utility room. The door proposed is a flush, metal door, which will be hand-painted to match the trim. The frame will be pine, and it was clearly stated for the record that neither the door nor the frame will have cladding.
- ✍ The applicant further stated that they propose installing a custom-sized vent on the south elevation.
- ✍ The applicant also presented drawings of the proposed canopies. Chairperson Melnyk stated that the drawings are in line with the preservation expert's comments about the proposed canopies.
- ✍ The Board next discussed the proposed railings, stating that the expert's opinion is that the proposed railings are an appropriate addition to the building, retaining the simple, utilitarian look of the Flour Mill building. Board members reminded the applicant of the ADA requirements as to railing height and rail extensions.
- ✍ The applicant stated that the plans include a concrete slab measuring the same width and length of the canopy on the loading dock area on the north elevation of the building. Members pointed out that the grading in this area is different from what was originally proposed. The applicant stated that the area is now more level to facilitate handicap access.
- ✍ The applicant is proposing three oak-stained doors on the south elevation. The Board discussed the finish for the doors and informed the applicant that he will need to supply samples of the hardware for the doors.
- ✍ There was some discussion of the placement of the proposed downspouts, and the applicant requested the option of installing the downspouts either along the siding or along the cornerboards.

The applicant will add all these elements to a final plan to be presented to the Board for approval at the next meeting.

2. St. Paul's Church, 28 Lincoln Ave ~ Windows

Present: Mara Barendt

Members of congregation

Discussion: The proposal is for the installation of eight custom-made, aluminum-clad windows on a subservient nexus addition connecting three buildings with varying dates of construction, the windows to be treated by brush painting, caulking, and trimming to provide the appearance of wood windows. One of the windows is not visible from a public way, one window is marginally visible, and six are visible to varying degrees.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that the Board's previous denial of this proposal was based upon incomplete information, and therefore, he is of the opinion that the process was flawed. He reviewed the purpose of the APRB under the Village Code. He stated that St. Paul's campus is a significant historical structure in the Village. The design of the windows was approved, but the materials were not approved, and Chairperson Melnyk stated that composition is only one factor to be considered by the Board when reviewing an application. He referred to numbers 9 & 10 of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which specifically reference additions and new construction. From the Standards, "The Standards are to be applied to rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility."

Chairperson Melnyk also referenced Preservation Brief #14: "Entire districts or neighborhoods may be listed in the National Register of Historic Places for their significance to a certain period of American history. National Register listing does not mean that an entire building or district is frozen in time and that no change can be made without compromising the historical significance. It does not mean that each portion of a historic building is equally significant and must be retained intact and without change. Some change is thus anticipated within each rehabilitation of a building for a contemporary use."

Chairperson Melnyk next discussed the use of substitute materials, and listed some factors to be considered when deciding on the use of substitute materials, such as: whether the visual appearance is the same as the original, whether the original material is available, and whether the design and composition of the replacement material is consistent with the original.

Chairperson Melnyk also noted that the Depot has a brick nexus addition with metal clad windows, which was previously approved by the APRB.

Member Watt questioned the applicants as to when the Church discovered the clad windows, and the church representatives stated that the windows had been fully installed prior to their discovering that the incorrect windows had been shipped by the manufacturer and installed. She expressed concern with setting the precedent of allowing clad windows in the addition to this historic building in the Village. She noted that the Board has been consistent in requiring wood windows. She stated that clad windows do not hold up as well as wood over time, and she further stated that the applicants should compare the relatively short-term delay of 9-12 weeks for installation of the correct windows with the 30-40 years that the wood windows would be on the building.

Board members questioned the applicants and their contractor as to filling in the gap between the frame where the metal meets the wood, and suggested that it be caulked or painted.

Representatives for the Church expressed their view that this should be considered as a newly constructed addition, that links two historic structures, the parsonage and the Church, both of which have wood windows.

Counsel to the Board advised that the Depot decision set a precedent for clad windows on a newly constructed addition that links two historic structures.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The Church was built circa 1884, and the parsonage was built circa 1911.
- ✍ The Church is a significant historic structure in the Village.
- ✍ The application relates to the construction of a new addition linking these historic structures.
- ✍ The design of the addition as previously approved by this Board has some contemporary elements.
- ✍ The addition as proposed and the changes reviewed do not destroy any significant historic architectural materials
- ✍ The design is visually distinct from the historic structures, with particular note that window trim, as originally approved by the Board, called for flat casings, as distinguished from more elaborate casings on the historic structures.
- ✍ Cutsheets provided by the applicant indicate that the profiles of the wood and the aluminum-clad windows would be identical except with respect to the brick molding.
- ✍ The new structure is a subservient connecting addition on a commercial property.
- ✍ One of the eight windows is not visible.
- ✍ Preservation Brief # 14 references materials as one means for differentiating between historic and new construction.
- ✍ Originally, wood windows were approved and ordered by the applicant and were not delivered due to manufacturer error; thus, wood windows were not available without causing significant delay to the applicants' construction schedule.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve clad windows with flat wood casings subject to the condition that the question of whether the windows will be required to be hand-painted remains open to the Board's review after complete installation of the windows and trim.

Vote: Melnyk – yes; Watt – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried.*** **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on November 15, 2005.**

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 9:00.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary