

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – April 3, 2006 at 7:30 PM**

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	<b>Steve Melnyk</b>
<b>Members:</b>	<b>Marcia Watt</b>
	<b>Scott Latshaw (absent)</b>
	<b>Cristina Lanahan</b>
	<b>Ken Willard</b>
<b>Alternate:</b>	<b>Paul Zachman</b>
<b>Architectural Advisor:</b>	<b>Blake Held</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. Julie Judge, 7 Schoen Place ~ Sign**  
**Present: Julie Judge**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 3/17/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installing a 42”(1) x 60” slate-gray sign on the left side of the building of her business at 7 Schoen Place. She stated that the material for the proposed sign is high-density urethane. She submitted photographs showing the placement, dimensions, and colors for the sign. The Board discussed with the applicant the texture of the material for the sign and the unique design. The applicant stated that she intended the sign to appear “slate-like” and that the rough appearance is the result of shading. Member Watt questioned the applicant as to the proposed placement of the sign over a seam separating two different types of material on the building. The applicant stated that she was limited in areas on the building to place the sign, due to the long frontage of the building and the window placement. It was also noted by the Board that the submitted drawings were not drawn to scale, and that the sign is larger than the previous sign. Member Watt expressed concern about the size of the sign. The Building Inspector stated that the dimension of the sign is below the maximum allowed by the Village Code.

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

**Vote:** Willard – yes; Watt – abstain; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes. *Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.*

**2. Majed El Rayess, 30 Church Street ~ Fence**  
**Present: Majed and Suzanne El Rayess**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 3/17/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installing a 2’11” wood picket fence, beginning 3’ north of the street line and extending for approximately 56’, and continuing with a 5’10” pressure-treated, board-on-board fence for approximately 72’ to the existing board-on-board fence along the rear (north) property line. He submitted documentation indicating the placement, dimensions, and design for the proposed fence. Member Zachman pointed out that the common style for Village fences is for the rails to run between the posts, instead of attached to the posts, and the applicant agreed to amend his application to reflect this change. The applicant also stated that the top of the pickets will be pyramidal shape.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the application for a fence, as submitted, with the amendment that the cross-rails will run between the posts instead of attached to the face.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.

**3. Frances Noeth, 4 Courtenay Circle ~ Fence**  
**Present: Frances Noeth**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 3/21/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing the existing split-rail fence with a round-rail fence, measuring 4 feet in height in the front corner of the house and rear yard, and measuring 3 feet in height from the front corner of the house to within 15 feet of the street. She submitted a recent survey map and photographs indicating the proposed location and dimensions of the fence. Member Watt questioned the applicant about the existing wire mesh fence on the property, and the applicant stated that it would be removed, and that the new fence will not have wire.

**Findings of Fact:**

- ✍ The material for the fence is cedar.
- ✍ The fence is a round-rail fence.
- ✍ The rails are 10 feet in height.
- ✍ The posts are 3 feet in height in the front yard portion of the fence.
- ✍ There is currently a fence of similar style in the rear yard.

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

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.

**4. Mark Bergin, 84 South Street ~ Fence**  
**Present: Mark Bergin**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 8/24/06.

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an open application for a fence, for which the Board requested that the applicant submit further details about the proposed fence. The applicant presented a proposal for the installation of a 3'6" colonial-style, picket fence on his property. He stated that the proposed fence will have three gates, and he submitted documentation showing the style of the gates. When questioned about the style for the top of the pickets, the applicant indicated that they will be a pyramidal style. The applicant also stated that he was considering not painting the fence, and the Board's Architectural Consultant, Blake Held, stated that a natural fence would not be inappropriate for this application.

**Findings of Fact:**

- ✍ The house was built in the 1890's.
- ✍ The fence is in the rear of the property.
- ✍ The proposed fence will abut an existing, natural-finish fence.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application for a fence, as submitted, noting that the tops of the pickets will be in a pyramidal shape, and that the fence may be painted or stained white, or left natural.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.**

**5. 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:** This is a continuation of an open application for an addition to provide light to an existing area located on the top portion of the building of his business, which is located at 66 Monroe Avenue. Board Members had expressed concern that the style for the proposed soffits did not match historic construction and may appear out of proportion. Board members had also suggested that the applicant 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 drawings. The applicant revised the application and presented plans proposing an eave at an angle, instead of straight, and also proposing installation of four wood windows, with siding and trim to match, and he eliminated the panels. Member Watt questioned the applicant as to the lighting, and the applicant stated that there would be no interior lights at night after business hours.

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

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.**

**6. Robert Manzella (Naples Creek), 10 Schoen Place ~ Window**  
**Present: Robert Manzella**

**Application:** Submitted and date-stamped on 3/23/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing a small existing window on the building of his business with a vinyl-clad picture window. Board members stated that the installation of a picture window interrupts the rhythm of the building, and asked the applicant if he would consider revising his plan to propose two double-hung windows, as currently exist on that side of the building. The applicant pointed out that there is another picture window at another business in the building. The Architectural Consultant stated that a picture window, properly proportioned and trimmed, can be appropriate.

The Board stated that there are two issues for consideration: the fact that the window is a picture window, and the fact that it is not an all-wood window. The application will remain *open*, and Board Members will view the window and review the history of the other picture window currently on the building.

**7. ESL Federal Credit Union, 11 State St ~ Doors, Windows, Signage**  
**Present: Allen Bushnell, Barkstrom & LaCroix, Architects**  
**Karen Davis, Tim Pryor, Attorneys for ESL**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 3/23/06.

**Discussion:** The project consists of remodeling the first floor of the building located at 11 State Street to operate a Federal Credit Union. Included in the proposed exterior modifications are the replacement of the recessed wood door/sidelite entrance on the north side (State Street) with a non-recessed, prefinished, aluminum door/sidelite entrance having separate street entrances for first and second-floor tenants; a prefinished aluminum door/sidelite entrance with columned canopy on the south (Church Street) side; removal of one window and enclosing the opening with brick to match the existing on the south side, and new signage on both the north side (above entrance and window) and the south side (in the gable end of the new canopy.). The applicants presented a sample of the asphalt shingle for the roof.

Board Members questioned the applicant regarding the replacement of wood windows and doors with aluminum. The applicants expressed a willingness to investigate replacing the windows and doors with wood. The Board also expressed concern that the new doors not appear flush with the front of the building, and the applicant agreed to consider recessing the doors more than the 4" currently proposed.

There was also discussion as to whether the proposal for two separate street entrances for different businesses will affect the allowable signage and will require a variance from the Zoning Board in order to permit the signage currently proposed. The applicants were informed that they may not be able to use the entire area over the entrance for their sign unless a variance is obtained. Board members further expressed concerns about the curved nature of the design for the sign and its size relative to the architectural style of the building. The applicants stated that this design is the ESL logo, and expressed their desire to use it in the signage. Alternatives were discussed, such as possibly incorporating it into an entry canopy, or placing the white letters of the logo directly onto the brickface. The application for signage was left open, pending resolution of the zoning and entry design questions. The Building Inspector will research the zoning issues and report to the applicant and the Board.

The applicants also submitted details about the proposed lighting. They are proposing that the gooseneck lights over the window remain, that a new rectangular fixture be mounted over the door to "uplight" the proposed new signage, and that decorative, Victorian-style fixtures be used on the front and sides of the building. For the parking lot, the applicant proposes box-style pole lights. Board members stated that the proposed decorative fixtures are not compatible with the style of the building and are inconsistent with the gooseneck fixtures on the front. They suggest using a less ornate, nondescript fixture for lighting the sides of the building. It was stated that some small decorative fixtures may be appropriate for the front of the building, but that the placement and style will depend on signage and the revised design of the entry. The lighting was left open pending resolution of signage and other design issues and to allow applicant to re-submit a revised overall lighting plan.

#### **8. David Ferris, 27 Monroe Avenue ~ Addition**

**Present: Mr. & Mrs. Ferris**

**Steve Takatch, Architect**

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

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an open application for an addition. The applicants are 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. The applicants had revised the plans to address the Board's comments and concerns with the massing for the addition and the front elevation rooflines, but were not satisfied with the revisions, and decided to return to their original proposal.

The Board then heard from Blake Held, who had reviewed the roof design issues with the applicants' architect. Mr. Held concurred that the proposal to turn the addition and add a gable on the east elevation improved the Monroe Avenue elevation, but created an awkward and inappropriate roof design on the west elevation. It was his conclusion that for the currently proposed addition, the design set forth on the drawings that were initially submitted presents the best roof alternative.

The Board still expressed concerns with the appropriateness of the way in which the massing for the addition relates to the house and the issue of compatibility. After further discussion, Member Zachman suggested adding a wall-dormer feature to break up the long pitch of the roof. Mr. Zachman suggested that such a dormer would bring a horizontal roofline element to the Monroe Avenue elevation, bringing it closer to the alternative that had been previously proposed by the Board. Also, from the east elevation, the wall dormer would be reflective of the wall dormer on the original house on the Monroe Avenue elevation. Mr. Held concurred that such a dormer would be appropriate and would be beneficial in softening the severity of the new roofline of the addition.

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

✍ Village Code requires egress from the second-floor windows for the new addition.

- ✍ The tiered nature of the rear portion is due to limitations concerning the driveway access and turnaround room required by virtue of Monroe Avenue being a State road.
- ✍ The main portion of the house was built in the 1870's.
- ✍ The addition will replace a previous addition.
- ✍ The existing foundation is unsuitable for building a two-story addition.
- ✍ The addition that is to be removed will be replicated in the first floor of the new addition and on the east elevation, the original windows will be reused.
- ✍ The applicant has consulted the contractor and been advised that the garage can be moved in total without structural damage.
- ✍ The location of the garage on the site is not significant to the historic character of the property.
- ✍ The proposed new location of the garage will not adversely affect any adjacent historic structures.
- ✍ The materials proposed to be used in the new addition for windows and doors will be wood and compatible with the existing original house.
- ✍ The rear elevation first floor is not visible from the public way.
- ✍ The rear elevation second floor is of limited visibility from Washington Avenue.
- ✍ The Code allows additions to have contemporary elements, and provides that additions should be distinguishable from the original house.
- ✍ The rear door and sidelight are not visible from the public way.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Melnyk, to approve, in concept, the proposal for an addition, as shown on drawings submitted on 4/3/06, as represented on pages A4 and A5, with the following changes:

1. The rear porch construction shall include a beam and be of construction to match the front porch of the original house, as shown on SK-2.
2. The second-floor windows of the original house are one-over-one.
3. The roof on the front east and rear elevations shall be modified to include a wall dormer to be of such proportion and pitch as is compatible with the existing wall dormer on the front of the house, as drawn on A4, and subject to Board approval of final drawings.
4. The exterior elements are as identified on A5, and the applicant shall provide additional detail regarding door and window specifications, which shall be subject to Board approval.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.***

**Motion:** Based on the findings of fact noted above, and on the conceptual approval of the addition, Member Watt made a motion to approve the relocation of the garage to the location identified on the site plan submitted at the 3/6/06 APRB Meeting.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Willard – abstain; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.***

- ✍ ***Finding of Fact:*** Based on the Board's site visit to the property, and consultation with its architectural advisor, it was determined that the existing kitchen door is not an original exterior door.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion to approve, in concept, the replacement of the existing exterior kitchen door with an all-wood door, the design and details of which remain subject to Board approval.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.***

No action was taken with respect to that portion of the application relating to replacement windows for the second floor of the original house, and this item remains open.

**Member Willard** left the meeting at this time.

**Information only:**

✍ **Linda Pulhamus, 7 E. Jefferson Road ~ Garage, modifications to house**  
**Present: Mr. & Mrs. Pulhamus**

**Discussion:** The applicants requested feedback from the Board on their proposal to remove the current garage on the property and replace and relocate it with a two-stall, two-story garage, moved back four feet from the current location. The proposal also includes modifications to the house: replacing an aluminum kitchen window with two, double-hung wood windows; replacing the front porch handrail; replacing light fixtures at entrances; and removal of a bathroom exhaust fan.

The Board's architectural consultant, Mr. Held, stated that the existing garage is not a significant historic structure, and that the general style of the proposed garage appeared to be an appropriate replacement. The applicants were cautioned that a two-story garage may raise issues of massing, and that the Board would need to consider any potential impact on nearby structures. The applicants will need to submit a formal application for demolition, a proposed new garage, and the other proposed modifications to the house.

✍ **John Hoenig, 25 Rand Street ~ Addition**

**Discussion:** The applicant presented plans for a rear addition for his house, located at 25 Rand Street. The proposal is for replacement of the first floor bath with a family room, and replacement of the second-floor sunroom with a closet and larger sunroom.

The Board informed the applicant that this project will require a variance from the Zoning Board. The applicant was advised to contact the Building Inspector for instructions on how to proceed with the Zoning Board. Once these issues are resolved, the addition should be formally submitted to the APRB for review. It was noted by members that the rear of the residence has limited visibility from the public way. It was suggested that when the applicant submits final drawings for approval, those drawings should show the manner in which the existing house relates to the proposed addition.

✍ **Flour Mill, Schoen Place~ Modification of canopy**

**Discussion:** The applicants submitted drawings showing a design change to the entry canopy at the Flour Mill. The changes consist of a different attachment point for the support rods and the addition of horizontal beams at each support rod location. The change is intended to improve the strength of the structure and the feasibility of construction.

The Board's Preservation Consultant, Ted Bartlett, sent the Board his statements indicating that the modification was a reasonable, utilitarian design, which is consistent with the style of the canopy.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the design change to the entry canopy, as submitted.

**Vote:** Lanahan – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2006.**

**Member Items:**

At the Board of Trustees Meeting of February 8, 2006, Cristina Lanahan was appointed to fulfill the unexpired term of John Limbeck. Her term expires in April 2008. Paul Zachman was appointed as an alternate, per § 9-3 of the Village Code, for a 5-year term that expires in April 2011.

**Minutes:**

APRB 4/3/06  
Regular Meeting

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the March 6, 2006 and March 15, 2006 minutes, as amended.

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

**ADJOURNMENT:**

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

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary