

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – May 1, 2006 at 7:30 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Steve Melnyk
Members:	Marcia Watt Scott Latshaw Cristina Lanahan Ken Willard
Alternate:	Paul Zachman
Architectural Advisor:	Blake Held
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

**1. David Ferris, 27 Monroe Avenue ~ Addition
Present: Mr. & Mrs. Ferris**

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

Discussion: This is a continuation of an application for an addition for which the applicants have received conceptual approval, pending submittal of final plans showing the modification to the roof and including the design and details of the windows and doors. Board members questioned the applicants as to the specifications of the casement windows on the west elevation, and the applicants provided this information for the record on the final plans.

Finding of Fact: The addition was previously approved, in concept, subject to final approval of modification to the roof and submittal of the window specifications.

Motion: Based upon construction documents dated 4/21/06, Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the addition, as shown on the final plans, with Marvin, all-wood (non-clad) windows, as specified in the drawings, and provided that the two casement windows on the west elevation shall be simulated, double-hung windows and shall be constructed so that the sash and the exterior appearance of the glass is proportional to the other double-hung windows on the house.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw -yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 1, 2006.

**2. Nertila Selaj, Unique Tailors, 5 Monroe Avenue ~ Sign
Present: Nertila Selaj
Pierre Marou**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 4/3/06.

Discussion: The applicants are requesting approval for installation of two signs on the building at 5 Monroe Avenue, one on the front of the building and one on the west elevation. The applicant presented the proposed material for the sign, and Board members expressed concern with the sheen of the sign material, and asked the applicants if they would consider a matte finish. The Board further suggested that the applicant consider a wood sign or a solid material that has the appearance of a traditional wood sign. The Board also inquired whether the applicant would consider adding a frame or a border to the sign. Finally, the Board informed the applicants that they will need to submit a scaled representation of the sign for the record. The representation submitted shows the sign as being more square than rectangular and is not accurate. Mr. Turner, the Village Attorney, informed the applicants that they should contact the Building Inspector for information on obtaining a variance for the sign on the side of the building.

The application will remain *open*, pending submittal of alternative materials and scaled drawings of the sign.

3. Market Square Polish Pottery, 50 State Street ~ Sign **Present: James Bonsignore**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 4/19/06.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal for installation of a sign for his business, Market Square Polish Pottery, located at 50 State Street. The applicant stated that the sign is the same size, and will be placed in the same location, as the sign for the prior tenant's business. The material for the proposed sign is Coroplast, a corrugated plastic, with white, vinyl lettering and designs. Board members suggested that the applicant consider adding a border to the sign, in a dark color to give the sign a more finished look to disguise the corrugated construction, and also suggested that the applicant consider a matte finish for the sign. The Board expressed some concern about the appropriateness of the sign material, it being a fairly thin material that is typically used for yard signs. The applicant expressed a strong need to limit expenses and get a sign in place as soon as possible.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ Coroplast as a permanent sign material has had limited use, if any, in the Village.
- ✍ The sign is located on the second floor of the building and is the same dimensions as the existing sign for the prior business
- ✍ The applicant has agreed that the installed sign shall be subject to full review by the APRB in 6 months.

Motion: Based on the foregoing, Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the material and design for the proposed sign, as submitted, in a matte finish, with a slight reduction in the dimensions of the sign to allow for a wood frame for the sign in a dark color, the depth of the frame not to exceed 2 inches, and subject to further review in 6 months.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 1, 2006.

4. Todd Randall, 8 Wood Street ~ Fence **Present: Todd Randall**

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

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing a wood, picket fence on the property at 8 Wood Street. Board members informed the applicant that the height of the posts cannot exceed 42 inches and the height of the pickets cannot exceed 36 inches. Board members further informed the applicant that if he decides to install a gate, he will need to submit a sample of the gate for the record.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve, as submitted, a fence to be constructed of wood, painted or stained white, with the dimensions as set forth in the memorandum provided by the Building Inspector, dated 4/18/06, with the proviso that the posts, with cap, shall not exceed 42 inches in height, and the pickets shall not exceed 36 inches in height, and that the posts shall be spaced at a distance no greater than 6 feet. In addition, the applicant has the option of installing a gate in the section running along the front entry walk from the end post of the front perimeter fence to the bottom of the front stair railing. Such gate will be in a style to match the approved fence design, and provided that the applicant shall submit a representation of such gate for the record, and provided further that all setbacks shall conform to zoning requirements.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw - yes. *Motion carried.*
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 1, 2006.

The Board then informed the applicant that the front entrance renovations to the house do not conform to what the Board approved. Members pointed out that the railings and the balusters are significantly different from what the applicant submitted and what the Board approved. Mr. Turner, the Village Attorney, informed the applicant that he can either make the changes to conform to the approved plan, or re-submit the completed work for the Board's approval.

5. Chase Bank, 31 State Street ~ Signage

Present: Clinton Signs

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 3/9/06.

Discussion: The applicant submitted and reviewed a packet showing which signs Chase Bank is proposing to replace, and the material and dimensions of the new signs. A number of issues and concerns were raised by the Board, including whether the Village Code allows the bank's logo to be on a directional sign, and questions as to regulations regarding monument signs and internally-lit signs. Also, the applicant proposes adding 24-inch brass plate letters mounted to the building, and gooseneck lighting. The Board expressed concern regarding the size of the letters and noted that the letters on the Phoenix Building are only 12 inches in height and that the letters on the Library are of a similar size. Mr. Carpenter, Town Supervisor, who was present at the meeting, stated that the letters on the Town Library are between 9 and 12 inches in height. It was suggested by the Board that the proposed letters be reduced in size to approximately 12 inches to more closely conform to other similar buildings in the Village. He was advised that the design of the sign and new gooseneck lighting fixtures for such sign are subject to APRB review. Member Watt also suggested lowering the sign above the front door or to the side of the door, to create the appearance of a street-level sign. Board members also stated that a brush-painted finish for the signs is preferred, but depending on final placement, a finish consistent with existing signage lettering on the building might be dictated. The Board will consult with the Building Inspector as to the zoning issues.

The Board is leaving *open* the application. The applicant will submit a modified proposal to address these issues and will consult with the Building Inspector regarding zoning compliance.

6. Town of Pittsford: Veterans' Memorial
Present: William Carpenter, Town Supervisor

Discussion: Mr. Carpenter presented a conceptual design for a Veterans' Memorial to honor all Pittsford residents who have served in the Armed Forces, as well as recognizing the 20 Pittsford sons who have died in combat. Mr. Carpenter presented the proposed design to the APRB in order to obtain comments the Board may have regarding the plans.

Mr. Carpenter stated that the proposed site for the Memorial is the upper portion of the Port of Pittsford Park, due to its ambiance, as well as its central location in the community. The existing asphalt walkways will be replaced with concrete. The Memorial has been designed so that it can be seen from the street or sidewalk, as well as allowing for orientation toward the Village's Erie Canal Park. Mr. Carpenter presented drawings of the structure and stated that it will be constructed in brick, with granite insets and a copper roof, which will be similar to the roof on the Village Hall. The front of the monument is designed to honor all veterans, as well as specifically recognize the 20 Pittsford veterans who were casualties. The rear of the monument will honor all Pittsford veterans and bear a dedication entitled "We Remember." The monument setting will include wing walls on either side, measuring 2 feet in height and approximately 22 inches in length. The circumference of the memorial will include plantings and grass areas, concrete walkway, as well as room for dedication bricks, which families may buy to honor individual veterans. Lighting for this area will include lights for the two flags, mounted lights at the internal ends of the wing wall, and a subtle lighting on the monument intended to wash down from the top.

Mr. Carpenter presented samples of the brick for the monument, and Board Members expressed a preference for the darker brick. Member Zachman suggested adding a small pad at the rear of the monument for people to stand and read the plaque.

7. Pittsford Farms Dairy, 44 N Main Street ~ Repair of Fence
Present: Charles Corby

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 4/21/06.

Discussion: The application proposes restoring stone gateposts and repairing areas of the missing or damaged Gothic Revival cast-iron fence. There was some discussion about the light fixtures on the posts and the color of the mortar to be used. The applicant stated that the deep-red Medina stone will be replicated on the other side. He also stated that the nameplate will be black with gold lettering.

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

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw - yes. *Motion carried.*
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 1, 2006.

8. John Hoenig, 25 Rand Place ~ Addition
Present: John & Maura Hoenig
Jeff Lambert, Contractor

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 3/16/06, and building inspector reviewed on 4/10/06.

Discussion: The applicant presented plans for a rear addition to his house, located at 25 Rand Place. 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 applicant stated that he had obtained a variance from the Zoning Board. It was noted by board members that the rear of the residence has limited visibility from the public way. The applicants stated that the proposed plan will double the size of the existing upstairs porch. They further stated that they are proposing adding a Lincoln, all-wood side door on the north elevation, and replacing the flat roof with a pitched roof. The proposed windows are Lincoln, all-wood, non-clad windows. The windows in the rear are double-hung windows, with approximately 6 inches of wood trim between the windows. The upper portion of the house will be cedar shake and the lower portion will be clapboard.

Findings of Fact:

- ✍ The house was built circa 1918.
- ✍ The proposed addition is in the rear of the house with limited visibility from the public way.
- ✍ The existing, second-floor porch which will be reconstructed is not visible from the street and is not a significant architectural feature of the house.

Motion: Based on the documents submitted, dated 3/15/06, with the following clarifications and modifications:

- 1) All window and door trim shall match trim on the existing house, including the ribbon and molding;
- 2) The second floor of the addition shall be cedar shake and the first floor shall be wood clapboard to match existing;
- 3) The door on the north elevation shall be a Lincoln, all-wood door with half-glass to match existing door on the same elevation;
- 4) The paired double-hung windows on the second floor of the north elevation shall have approximately a 5-6" center mullion;
- 5) All windows will be Lincoln, all-wood (non-clad) windows;
- 6) The doors represented on the west elevation shall be all wood;

Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the alteration and addition, as submitted

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 1, 2006.

9. Robert Manzella (Naples Creek), 10 Schoen Place ~ Window
Present: Robert Manze lla

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

Discussion: This is an open application where 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 one or two double-hung windows or a single double-hung window, as currently exist on that side of the building. 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 a vinyl-clad window. Board Members viewed the window and reviewed the history of the other window portrayed as an existing picture window currently on the building. Member Zachman stated his opinion that it would be a mistake to reverse mount the window as an attempt to conceal the vinyl, because there would be a problem with weatherizing the front. He further stated that a vinyl-clad picture window would not be an appropriate style of window for the building. He pointed out that the windows in the other Schoen Place buildings are single or paired double-hung windows. Chairperson Melnyk recited the section of the Village Code regarding alterations for the applicant.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *approve* the removal of the small, single-pane window and the replacement of that window with a one-over-one, all-wood (non-clad) window, trim and dimensions to match the current one-over-one, all-wood window directly to the right of the single window being replaced in the center section of the building, contingent on the receipt of a cutsheet for the window.

Findings of Fact:

✍ The existing “picture window” on the building is rather an existing sliding shed door opening that was glazed, and by doing so, allowed contemporary usage while retaining original opening and door as architectural markers of the building’s history.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw -yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 1, 2006.

10. Paul Zachman, 20 Rand Place ~ Porch
Present: Paul Zachman

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 4/20/06, and building inspector reviewed on 4/21/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing adding a porch addition in the rear of the house. He presented plans for the addition and specifications for the door. He stated that the roof will be a hip roof, and that the railing and columns will match those on the side of the house.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for a porch addition, as submitted, and allowing the applicant the option of either matching the other sideboard or using rusticated block for the corner foundation.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw -yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 1, 2006.

11. First Presbyterian Church ~ Chiller Screen

Discussion: At the October 3, 2005 meeting, the Board approved the application of the First Presbyterian Church for the screened enclosure for the chiller unit, contingent upon receipt of engineering calculations and manufacturer specifications describing and supporting the proposed clearances for the proper functioning of the chiller. The Church submitted a letter from Trane

manufacturer stating that the described tolerances are the minimum distances necessary to assure adequate operating efficiency and cataloged unit capacity, as well as providing for unit servicing.

12. Arc House ~ 19 Church Street

Discussion: Board members discussed the letters submitted regarding the paint problem at the house at 19 Church Street, often referred to as the ARC house and owned by the First Presbyterian Church. It was stated that in order for the Church to be able to use hardi-plank as a replacement for the existing cedar clapboard, it would have to be established that the current peeling paint problem is caused by a deterioration in the composition of the cedar clapboard itself. Board members did not feel that this standard had been met and expressed the view that the applicant should attempt to completely strip the existing siding and repaint.

Minutes: April 3, 2006
April 12, 2006

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the April 3, 2006 and April 12, 2006 minutes, as amended.

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

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary