

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – March 6, 2006 at 7:30 PM**

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	<b>Steve Melnyk</b>
<b>Members:</b>	<b>Marcia Watt</b>
	<b>Scott Latshaw</b>
	<b>Cristina Lanahan</b>
	<b>Ken Willard (absent)</b>
<b>Attorney:</b>	<b>Jeff Turner</b>
<b>Building Inspector:</b>	<b>Skip Bailey</b>
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	<b>Linda Habeeb</b>

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

**1. SJ's, 25 South Main Street ~ Sign**

**Present:** Shirley Joseph  
Swanda Reddington

**Application:** Submitted and date stamped on 11/ 28/05, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/21/06.

**Discussion:** The applicants are proposing installation of a new sign on the front elevation of the building located at 25 South Main Street. They submitted a drawing showing various designs for the sign and indicated that they are proposing using the first design shown, which is individual gold letters pin-mounted to the building. The submitted documentation also indicated the dimensions, location, materials, and colors for the proposed sign. Board members raised the question of whether the pin-mounting of the letters to the building would damage the brick. The applicants and the Building Inspector stated that it would not significantly harm the brick, and pointed out that this is the same method of mounting that was used for the letters on the Phoenix Building.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for a sign for the street façade of the building at 25 S. Main Street, the material, colors, and location for the sign to be as indicated in the submitted materials, and the design as indicated by the first example on the photograph submitted.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 6, 2006.**

**2. Todd Randall, 8 Wood Street ~ Windows/Remodeling**

**Present:** Todd Randall

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 2/14/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing three projects for the residence at 8 Wood Street:

- (1) Front entrance. The applicant submitted documentation showing the details of the proposal to remodel the front entrance of the residence. The plans were previously approved by the Board on 10/26/01, but the approved project was never undertaken.
- (2) Fence. The applicant stated that he was not prepared at this time to present the fence proposal, and requested that this portion of the application remain open until the next Board meeting. Board members informed the applicant that a proposal for a fence requires submittal of a survey map and a description of fence and gate detail for the record.
- (3) Windows. The applicant is proposing replacement of three basement windows with Pittsburgh-Corning Guardwise block windows. He submitted specifications and photographs of the proposed windows, and indicated that the window on the west side of the house would be completely concealed with decorative shrubbery. He stated that there would be a vent to prevent the accumulation of moisture. He indicated that security is the primary reason that he is proposing this material for the windows.

Chairperson Melnyk pointed out that grates over the windows would be one alternative method of satisfying the security issue. He further stated that if the windows are not original to the house, then the materials used have some latitude, but the style of the windows becomes the dominant characteristic reviewed, and this style is not appropriate to the 1880's house. Board members also informed the applicant that screening the windows with shrubbery is considered only a temporary solution, because the shrubbery can be removed or die. Another board member noted that the windows are only minimally visible from the public way, that they are not a significant architectural feature, and that this alteration would not harm the structural integrity of the house.

The Board is leaving open this portion of the application, pending the applicant's contacting Bero Architects through Historic Pittsford for a detailed architectural analysis of the house. The Chairman also agreed to seek input from the Board's preservation consultants.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for the front entrance alterations, as submitted.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 6, 2006.**

### **3. Matthew Wahl, First Presbyterian Church, 21 Church Street ~ Fence** **Present: Matthew Wahl**

**Application:** Submitted and date-stamped on 2/14/06 and building inspector reviewed on 2/21/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installation of a fence in the playground area on the northeast corner of the church lot. He submitted documentation that indicates the location, dimensions, and materials for the fence. The applicant stated that a portion of the proposed fence will be 36" in height and made of aluminum, reminiscent of a wrought-iron style, and the remainder will be a 4-foot, black vinyl-coated, chain-link fence. It was pointed out that due to the fact that the fence is for a playground area for small children, a flat rail along the top of the fence is proposed, instead of the more traditional style with open points.

#### **Findings of Fact:**

- ☞ There was previously a fence in the location where this fence is proposed to be installed.

- ✍ The location for the proposed fence contains a playground, so child safety is an issue.
- ✍ The proposed chain-link fence is masked by shrubbery and is minimally visible.
- ✍ The proposed aluminum rail fence is a style similar to the style of stair railing currently on the property.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for a fence, as submitted.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Watt – abstain; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 6, 2006.**

**4. Matthew Wahl, Forsythe Jewelers, 66 Monroe Ave ~ Addition**  
**Present: Matthew Wahl**

**Application:** Submitted and date-stamped on 2/14/06 and building inspector reviewed on 2/21/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant submitted plans for a proposed addition to provide light to an existing area located on the top portion of the building for his business, which is located at 66 Monroe Avenue. A number of issues were discussed regarding this proposal: Member Watt expressed concern that the style for the proposed soffits does not match historic construction, and that although it would match the existing style on the building, it may appear out of proportion in this application. The applicant concurred and is revising the application to propose the plum-cut eave soffit style instead. Board members also questioned the applicant as to whether he would consider revising the application to propose all-wood (non-clad) windows and use wood clapboard between the windows rather than the panels shown on the current submission. The Board also advised the applicant that he will be required to submit details of the proposed windows for the record.

The Board is holding the application open, pending the applicant's revision of the application and submittal of revised drawings and additional information.

**5. William Creary, 18 North Main Street ~ Addition**  
**Present: William Creary**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 2/21/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant presented elevation drawings and a survey map for a proposed one-story conference-room addition for his business at 18 North Main Street. The proposed addition encompasses an area of 168 square feet and will replace a deck on the canal-side of the building that is currently in poor condition. The applicant stated that the siding will match the existing wood clapboard siding, and the proposed windows will be all-wood, non-clad windows.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application for an addition, with wood siding and all-wood (no cladding) windows, as submitted.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 6, 2006.**

**6. Mr. & Mrs. David Ferris, 27 Monroe Avenue ~ Addition**  
**Present: Mr. & Mrs. Ferris**  
**Stephen Takatch, Architectura PC Architects**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 2/21/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing removal of portions of the existing house, construction of a new foundation and addition, and moving the garage to a different location on the property.

Board members referenced comments from the Board's architectural consultant, Blake Held, stating that the massing for the addition should respond more sympathetically to the original structure. Also, the front elevation reveals a roofline jutting out in a manner that is disruptive to the form of the original. The house has an assortment of existing window dimensions and styles from varying periods in history. The majority of the proposed new windows are shown as eight-over-eight divided lites, a style that is foreign to the house. Mr. Held indicated that it would be more appropriate to maintain the one-over-one window style of the original house. He further points out that the new windows are proportionately wider than the existing house windows and appear awkward in relation to the original. Shutters should be mounted and be of such size as to appear able to be closed over the opening. The proposed window placement is problematic in some cases, where the window is too close to the corner. Chairperson Melnyk voiced concerns over the extent of proposed alteration to the existing structure of the home to accommodate the proposed addition, and questioned if demolition criteria must be met. Member Watt expressed that the alteration might be considered a rehabilitation instead of a demolition. Member Lanahan expressed a view that for any addition, the existing structure will typically lose one or two walls, but as this proposed alteration impacts more than that, it might be considered a demolition.

The applicants stated that they are also proposing moving the garage to another location on the property, contingent on their receiving the Board's approval for construction of the addition.

The Board reviewed the submitted plans and noted certain inaccuracies regarding the existing windows and rooflines and asked that these be corrected. The rear entry door and porch were discussed and the Board expressed the view that these should be more consistent with the original house. The applicants will need to revise the drawings to reflect these comments and supply roof angles, shingle and siding material, and dimensions and details about the windows.

Given the substantial nature of this application and the number of issues presented, the Board decided to leave the application open, and will schedule a site visit with the applicants and the Board's architectural consultant to further review the structural issues related to the proposed demolition, the massing of the new addition, and other proposed design elements.

**6. Scott & Jennifer Latshaw, 49 Monroe Avenue ~ Stairs, Railings, lights**  
**Present: Scott Latshaw**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 2/15/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant presented plans for repairing steps on the rear of the house and resurfacing them with bluestone to match the walkway and patio. The proposal also calls for removal of the pipe railings and replacement with wood spindles, measuring 1" square and 4" on center, in a newel post design, identical to those on the front porch. The light fixture at the back door will be removed and lowered; the applicant submitted a cutsheet for the new light fixture. A light fixture will be installed on the front of the garage, as indicated on photographs and a cutsheet submitted by the applicant.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ✍ The rear entry cement stairs date from the 1940's.
- ✍ The Board previously approved construction of the porch and railing.
- ✍ The proposed railing will match the front railings on the house.
- ✍ The bluestone was salvaged from the front sidewalk of the property for the stair treads and landing.
- ✍ The risers are made of cement.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application for stairs and railings, as submitted.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – abstain. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 6, 2006**

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the application for lights, as submitted.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – abstain. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 6, 2006**

✍ Robert Huot, 19 Church Street ~ Painting

**Discussion:** Mr. Huot submitted documents stating that the house at 19 Church Street, often referred to as the ARC house and owned by the First Presbyterian Church, has a paint problem. Inquiries about the age of the house indicate that it was built in the early 1800's. Previous attempts to correct the paint problem have failed, and the appearance of the building continues to deteriorate. A study of the paint problem was done by Bero Architects, and a report, dated April 9, 1999, was provided by them with recommendations. The report suggests some possible reasons for the paint problems, such as moisture problems, inadequate ventilation, and paint build-up.

The church has followed many recommendations in the Bero report, but the paint continues to peel off, and painting is becoming an increasing expense. A group of church members who have studied the problem are looking at two possible solutions:

1. Heat strip the entire house of paint and try using stain instead of paint.
2. Replace the siding with Hardy Plank.

The Board noted that repair of existing siding is preferable to replacement. The Board would need more information from an expert regarding the condition of the siding and its ability to hold paint before it could approve replacement with Hardi Plank. The Board suggested that the Mr. Huot investigate further to discover the reason that the paint is not adhering to the clapboard.

#### Minutes:

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the February 6, 2006 minutes, as amended.

**Vote:** Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried.*

#### **ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 11:30.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary