

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

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Steve Melnyk
Members:	Marcia Watt (absent) Scott Latshaw Cristina Lanahan Ken Willard
Alternate:	Paul Zachman
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

**1. Chris Williams, 26 S. Main Street ~ Sign
Present: Chris Williams**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 5/31/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the existing sign at 26 South Main Street with a 2' x 10' high-density urethane sign. Mr. Williams submitted photographs of two signs, showing the colors of the proposed sign, and he indicated that he was proposing using option B.

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

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

**2. St. Paul's Church, 28 Lincoln Ave ~ Windows (painting)
Kevin Marin, La Bella**

Discussion: At a Special Meeting held on November 15, 2005, the Board approved aluminum clad windows for St. Paul's Church, subject to the condition of leaving open the determination of whether the windows would be required to be hand-painted after complete installation of the windows and trim. Board members generally concluded that painting the windows would give the windows the textural appearance of painted wood and be consistent with the purposes of the Village Code.

Board members also stated that the clad windows should be painted on all facades installed for the purpose of consistency. Member Latshaw questioned the applicants as to whether they were intending to add the copper metal cap to the fencepost, as was approved in the original application, and they indicated that they were no longer proposing adding the cap.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, requiring that the installed aluminum clad windows at St. Paul's Church be painted, and also amending the original application to allow the fenceposts to remain without copper caps as previously approved.

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

3. Peter Cardona, 27 E. Jefferson Rd ~ Porch railings
Present: Peter Cardona

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 5/16/06, and building inspector reviewed on 5/25/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing a wood railing, consisting of capped posts, rails, and balusters, and possibly a lattice screen, on the west elevation of the house. He submitted a description of the material, style, and size of the railing, along with a diagram and photographs. Chairperson Melnyk stated that the diagonal style of the proposed lattice screen was a modern style, and questioned the applicant as to whether he had considered a vertical or horizontal style.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Melnyk, to approve the application for installation of a wood railing on the west elevation of the house, with all-wood posts, as drawn and described, and with the option of adding a lattice screen.

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

Findings of Fact:

- The west elevation of the house has limited visibility from the public way.
- The south elevation is not visible from a public way.
- The proposal is for replacement of a previously existing railing.

4. Joseph Brennan, 7 Line Street ~ Roof
Present: Joseph Brennan

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 6/16/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the flat roof at the rear of the structure following the line of the existing gable of the front structure. The eaves and siding will match existing. The color of the new shingles is gray. The applicants also propose installation of a 3-ft. stockade fence on the rear and the side of the property. The Board stated that the proposal for the fence would remain open pending the applicant's submittal of further detail regarding the fence.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the roof alteration, as submitted, the materials to match existing, the shingle to be an architectural shingle in a dark color (IKO Cambridge).

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

5. Chris Frank, 28 Church Street ~ Porch alterations
Present: Chris & Heather Frank

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 6/26/06, and building inspector reviewed on

6/27/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing (1) removal of a side porch, (2) installation of a fence in the rear of the property, and (3) installation of a railing that matches the existing front porch.

Porch: The applicants stated that the porch was removed because it was in a severely damaged condition. Since the removal of the porch, their neighbor has installed a fence on the property line within close proximity to the house. A restoration of the porch would restrict passage between the fence and the porch. The applicants are requesting approval to not replace the porch. Board Members attempted to determine the history of the porch and whether or not the porch is original to the house and historic.

Chairperson Melnyk referenced § 210-61 of the Village Code: “The APRB shall be guided by the following standards in issuing a certificate of approval for alterations and additions: Alterations and additions to existing buildings shall either be made consistent with the spirit of their architectural style or shall alter the structure to an appearance consistent with the architectural styles of historic value existing in the district.

Board Members acknowledged that the applicants are in a difficult situation because the neighbor’s fence was installed so close to the former porch. The Board suggested that the applicants contact Bero Architects, through Historic Pittsford, to learn the history of the house and the removed porch to aid in the determination of whether the porch is an historically significant architectural feature. The Board is leaving open this portion of the application pending further information about the history of the porch, which the applicants will provide in the form of a Bero report.

Fence: The applicants are also requesting approval to install a 6-foot, shadow-box fence in the rear of the property, to replicate the neighbor’s fence. The proposal calls for the fence to meet the neighbor’s fence with the addition of a gate. Mr. Turner, Village Attorney, informed the applicants that permission from the property owner will be required prior to installation of a gate at that portion of the fence.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the application for a fence in the rear of the property, as submitted, the gate to match the existing style of the proposed fence, contingent upon receipt of a notarized statement from the property owner on the north side of the property, allowing installation of the gate.

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

Railing: The applicants are also proposing installing railings to match the existing railings on the house. Board members questioned the applicant as to placement of the posts, and the applicants amended their application to affix the posts to the first step.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the amended application for a handrail, the posts to be affixed to the first step, the handrail to measure 2¼ inches in width, in the Southampton style, the height of the balusters to match existing porch railing height, to be painted or stained white, with the posts affixed to the molding, as shown in the diagram.

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

Findings of Fact:

- The windows added from the removal of the porch are not visible from the public way.

6. ESL Federal Credit Union, 11 State Street ~ Windows, doors, signage, canopy
Present: Al Bushnell
Karen Davis

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 6/21/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing (1) replacement of the recessed wood door/sidelite entrance on the north side (State Street) of the building with a new, recessed, painted wood door/sidelite entrance, (2) a new painted wood door/sidelite entrance with columned canopy on the south side (Church Street), (3) elimination of one window and enclosing of the opening with brick to match the existing on the south side (Church Street), and (4) new signage on both the north side (adjacent to the new entrance and above the existing “picture” window) and south side (in the gable end of the new canopy). The second part of the project consists of the construction of a new, single-lane canopy for the remote drive-up teller. The proposed open-sided structure will have an asphalt shingle and painted trim hip roof structure supported by four Doric columns on brick piers.

The applicant stated that the revised plan reflects concerns expressed by Board Members at a previous meeting. The State Street entrance proposal was modified to maintain the recessed entry, the doors will be all-wood, custom-made doors, and the ESL sign over the window will not have the curved top that was previously proposed. The proposal does call for a small sign adjacent to the door with the ESL logo. Mr. Turner, Village Attorney, stated that the signage will be reviewed by the Building Inspector. A new entrance is proposed for the rear of the building, with wood doors similar to the front doors, and a gabled roof canopy. The applicant stated that the material will be hardiplank, and Board Members expressed a preference for a smooth finish, as opposed to a faux-grain finish.

Member Lanahan suggested that a flat-roof would be a more appropriate architectural style for the surrounding neighborhood. Member Zachman concurred that a flat-roof style would be more appropriate for the building and neighborhood. Ms. Davis stated that the gabled style is not a standard style for ESL, but that they were attempting to create a traditional style. Board members expressed an interest in maintaining the sill from the window being removed as an historic marker. The applicants stated that the sill will remain, and bricks filling in the opening will be slightly recessed. The applicant presented cutsheets of the proposed light fixtures.

The Board is leaving open the rear entrance roof design, the signage, and the drive-thru canopy.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the front entrance on the north elevation of the building, as submitted, with custom-made, wood doors, single-pane glass door and sidelites, the doors to be moved forward 4 inches from the position of the existing door frame in the recessed enclosure.

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

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the light fixtures, in the location and styles as described in the submitted documentation, in an almond color to match the trim.

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

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the removal of the window on the south elevation, with the sill to remain, and with the brick recessed as an historic marker of the alteration.

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

Member Items:

Minutes: June 5, 2006

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the June 5, 2006 minutes, as amended.

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

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 10:00.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary