

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Special Meeting – May 15, 2006 at 7:30 PM**

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	<b>Steve Melnyk</b>
<b>Members:</b>	<b>Marcia Watt Scott Latshaw Paul Zachman</b>

<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	<b>Linda Habeeb</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------

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

**1. Todd Randall, 8 Wood Street ~ Fence, front entrance, basement windows  
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. The fence design was previously approved by the APRB at its meeting on May 1, 2006. However, the applicant is now proposing changes to that design and the applicant has submitted revised drawings, dated May 15, 2006. Board members again informed the applicant that the height of the posts and cap cannot exceed 42 inches, and the height of the pickets cannot exceed 36 inches. The applicant presented dimensioned drawings of the proposed fence and gates. The applicant showed a sample of the post caps. Board members informed the applicant that the common style for Village fences is for the rails to run between the posts, instead of attached to the posts, and applicant agreed that this method of construction would be used. The fence shall have one gate in the location approved at the May 1, 2006 meeting.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *approve* the modification to the fence, as depicted in the drawings, submitted and dated May 15, 2006, with such fence to be constructed of wood, painted or stained white, the posts, with cap, not to exceed 42 inches in height, the pickets not to exceed 36 inches in height, and the rails to run between the posts.

**Vote:** Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw - yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 15, 2006.**

The Board next addressed the fact that the front entrance renovations on the house do not conform to what the Board previously approved. Members pointed out that the railings and the balusters are significantly different from what the applicant submitted and what the Board approved. The spindles on the approved design were plain, without detail, and the installed spindles are turned. Also, the height of the railings is greater than 30 inches. There was some question by the applicant's contractor as to the minimum height of the railing as required by Code. Member Zachman stated that the approved plan was an appropriate style for the house, but that the entrance, as built, is not historically accurate. The Board is leaving *open* this portion of the application, pending consultation with the Board's architectural advisor as to whether the

entrance design is appropriate for the house, and pending further information as to the allowable height for railings and spindles under the Building Code.

Next, the Board discussed the portion of this application relating to the replacement of three basement windows with glass-block windows, which application was considered at a prior meeting and left open. Steve Melnyk had received an opinion from Ted Bartlett regarding the use of glass block in basement windows, and that opinion had been circulated to Board Members. Member Watt reported on information that she had received from Skip Bailey, the Building Inspector. Mr Bailey had informed Member Watt that his research showed that some historic preservation districts had allowed the use of block in circumstances where the thickness of the foundation allowed the blocks to be recessed from the outer wall and an historically appropriate screen or storm window is placed over the blocks to further hide their visibility. Member Watt noted the limited visibility of the basement windows on the 8 Wood Street property. Further, the applicant stated that the windows that are being replaced are not the original windows. Member Watt expressed the view that such an approach seemed reasonable for this application. Member Watt and other Board Members agreed that the use of glass blocks would need to be a case-by-case determination based on visibility, whether original historic windows are in place and could be preserved, and other factors. It was noted that the windows can be recessed and screened, and that the windows are of limited visibility.

***Findings of fact:***

- ✍ The existing basement windows are not original to the house.
- ✍ The windows are below grade and of limited visibility from the public way.
- ✍ Architectural consultant comments to the Board, dated 3/31/06, relative to glass block usage indicate latitude in usage relative to replacement of original windows and visibility.
- ✍ A wood-framed screen can be placed over each window to further screen the glass block from view.

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to ***approve*** the removal of three existing, nonoriginal basement windows and the replacement of the windows with glass block windows, including a vent, provided that the glass block will be recessed a minimum of ¾-inch from the exterior foundation wall, and provided that a permanent, wood-framed screen will remain in place on each such window year-round.

**Vote:** Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.*** **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 15, 2006.**

**2. Unique Tailors, 5 Monroe Avenue ~ Sign**

**Present: Pierre Marou**

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

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval for installation of a sign on the building at 5 Monroe Avenue. At the APRB meeting held on May 1, 2006, the applicant presented a proposed material for the sign, and Board members had expressed concern with the material and the sheen of the sign finish, and asked the applicant if he would consider a thicker material with a matte finish instead. The Board also inquired whether the applicant would consider adding a frame or a border to the sign. The applicant presented a sample of an alternate sign material with a matte finish and vinyl lettering. The dimensions are as stated in the original application. The Board

APRB 5/15/06  
Special Mtg.

suggested that the applicant use a thicker size of the material for the sign, to create more depth, and add a border in a dark color to the edge.

**Motion:** Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the sign, in 13 millimeter thickness, with a matte finish, in the color “cintra white” with vinyl black and burgundy lettering, and a black border as demonstrated in the application and sample displayed. Additionally, the edge of the sign will be colored black.

**Vote:** Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw - yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 15, 2006.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 8:35 PM.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary