

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

PRESENT:

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

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

1. Ellen Gans 39 S. Main Street ~ Sign

Present: Ellen Gans

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 8/18/06, and building inspector reviewed on 8/22/06.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal for a sign, made of high-density urethane, with raised pink and green letters on a brown background for the business located at 39 S. Main Street. She submitted documentation indicating the dimensions and proposed location for the proposed sign.

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

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 7, 2006.*

2. Bill Wahl's Microcreamery, 45 Schoen Place ~ Sign

Present: Thomas Frisina

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 8/25/06, and building inspector reviewed on 8/24/06.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal for a sign, made of high-density urethane, in red, white, and blue colors with a tan border. The submitted documentation indicates the dimensions and location of the proposed sign.

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

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. *Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 7, 2006.*

**3. Martin Duffy, 7 Stonegate Lane ~ Door Replacement
Present: Martin Duffy**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 8/22/06.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal to replace the existing wooden door with a fiberglass door at the residence located at 7 Stonegate Lane. The applicant stated that the door is deteriorated. The Board asked the applicant if he had considered replacing the door with a wooden door. The Board noted that the door is not a street-facing door and is of limited visibility from a public way. Board Members also noted that the door is not unique, in that it is a fairly typical wood panel door. The Board stated that a smooth grain fiberglass door, when painted, more closely replicates a wooden door.

Chairperson Melnyk referenced the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, stating that "Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible; in the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities." He also stated that the board has generally determined doors to be a less-permanent architectural feature of a structure. This policy, combined with the very limited visibility of this non-street facing door, may allow board members to review this particular application under the guidelines for alterations, which state "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."

Findings of Fact:

- Stonegate Lane is a private street.
- The house was built circa 1941.
- The wooden door is deteriorated and in need of replacement.
- The door is for a non-street-facing entry and is of very limited visibility from the private street.
- The Board has considered doors generally to be a heavily used, and thus less permanent, architectural feature of a structure.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the change of material from a wood to a fiberglass door, with wood sidelights, conditioned on the material for the sill plate being wood, and on the door having a smooth finish, hand-painted to match the trim color of the house.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes. ***Motion carried. This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 7, 2006.***

4. Anderson Power Systems, 67 Monroe Ave ~ Generator

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

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of a stand-by generator in the rear of the building at 67 Monroe Avenue. The Board pointed out that the proposed location for the generator is in a remote location of the property and not visible from a public street. The applicant stated that the owner will screen the generator with vegetation, possibly arborvitae plants.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the installation of the exterior mechanical equipment, as described in the submitted application, and conditioned on the generator's being screened with vegetation.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Melnyk – yes; Zachman – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 7, 2006.**

5. Paul Schenkel, 18 Rand Place ~ Siding
Present: Paul Schenkel

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

Discussion: The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing original 6-inch reveal cedar clapboard siding on his house with hardiplank siding. The applicant stated that the wood siding does not hold paint, and it has been necessary for him to repaint the house every 2-3 years. He stated that he has investigated other options, and he has concluded that replacement of all original cedar clapboard with new hardiplank clapboard is the best solution for his problem. Member Zachman stated that he has done extensive research on the problem of paint not adhering to wooden features, and he stated that part of the problem is that over the years, there is an accumulation of paint build-up, and the chemical composition of today's paint does not have the rejuvenative properties of earlier paints, provides less seal, therefore, allows moisture to penetrate, and the resulting expansion and contraction of the wood causes the paint to peel, typically much quicker than in the past. He further stated that cement fiber, or cementitious, clapboard, while still somewhat porous, expands and contracts to a very negligible degree, and therefore, will hold paint better than wood. Member Zachman stated that it is his opinion that cement fiber, or cementitious, clapboard has a higher probability of successful paint adhesion, and is a better long-term replacement solution than new wood to severe moisture-caused paint adhesion problems on existing wood.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that the APRB is a preservation board, and the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards state that deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible, and that in the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities. Chairperson Melnyk reiterated that Member Zachman also indicated methods for treating wooden clapboard, such as back-priming, that have had success increasing the length of paint adhesion. He also pointed out, as Member Zachman did, that regardless of the clapboard material, the underlying sources of moisture must be determined and addressed before applying the new siding. Chairperson Melnyk stated his concern with setting the precedent of allowing the wholesale replacement of all the structure's original wooden clapboard with a substitute material such as hardiplank due to peeling paint. Chairperson Melnyk put forth the question that if the Board extends the latitude it has allowed for replacement doors and, to a lesser extent, replacement windows, to the typically very permanent architectural feature of a structure, such as its sheathing (siding), then what is this preservation board actually preserving. Member Zachman clarified his comments regarding paint adhesion on wooden clapboard versus cement fiber clapboard as not necessarily advocating for the substitute material over wood in a preservation district. He said in his extensive research he found other preservation boards struggling with the same issue, and some allowed the substitute material and some chose not to. Member Melnyk provided the example of Smithfield, VA, which will only allow cement fiber clapboard on new construction in their district. Member Zachman stated that his point is that as a long-term

solution to a paint adhesion problem, cement fiber appears to be a better material to use given its negligible expansion/contraction properties and that it is always back-primed. He further stated that it may be that owning a home in a preservation district conveys upon the owner additional maintenance responsibilities, somewhat a “burden of preservation.” Member Zachman stated that he would not choose to use cement fiber clapboard on his own home, as he appreciates the patina of original clapboard with its historical indications of numerous paint applications, and also qualified that his comments were meant to be taken into account for consideration of allowing cement fiber clapboard only to structures that present a severe paint adhesion problem.

There were questions as to whether or not the Board had already allowed hardiplank as a replacement material for original wood siding in the Village, though it was discussed that it has been allowed for new construction, to achieve a better historically appropriate appearance than existing material, and on structures where it may already have been present.

Chairperson Melnyk indicated that in his opinion, considering the allowance of a substitute material for the original wooden clapboard does not satisfy the guidelines for review under “Alterations and additions” and some of the “Additional General Standards.” He stated that if the replacement is considered under “Repairs,” that requires original material to be deteriorated beyond repair, prior to replacement. The Board discussed the method of determining whether the existing siding is deteriorated, and whether or not non-adherence of paint constitutes deterioration of the original clapboard siding. Member Zachman expressed an opinion that the paint failure is more akin to a system failure. He said that the original wooden clapboard itself could be made to hold paint, was probably not deteriorated in the familiar sense, but that in the context of a specific home, with particular moisture problem, that maybe it could be considered deteriorated if traditional methods of correction fail, and the clapboard continues to require an unreasonable repainting cycle. Mr. Zachman again qualified that allowance of cement fiber board might be approved only in the narrow context of structure with a severe paint adhesion problem, and would not be extended to structures that do not have severe paint adhesion problems. Member Latshaw expressed that he does accept that the paint adhesion problem severity in this specific instance constitutes deterioration of the original wooden clapboard. Chairperson Melnyk expressed his opinion that allowing complete replacement of a structure’s original wooden clapboard with hardiplank due to paint adhesion problems is a proposition he would prefer the entire five voting member board consider and advocated that an expert be consulted regarding this matter. Member Zachman accepted the role of board liaison with the expert on this issue.

Findings of Fact:

- The date of original construction is circa 1920.
- The wooden clapboard is original.
- The applicant has attested he has tried to mitigate the paint problem through ventilation modifications and continues to have a 2-3 year cycle of replacing paint.

Member Latshaw made a *motion* to approve the replacement of original cedar clapboard and the material change from cedar to hardiplank, the trim detail to match the existing exactly, the finish to be smooth, hand-painted, and caulked after application.

The motion was not seconded.

The applicant expressed his displeasure and frustration with the Board’s not granting approval for him to move forward with his proposal. He indicated that the Board has a history of members being absent, and delaying applications. He indicated that irrespective of what an expert

determines, the board would eventually allow the hardiplank on his home. Attorney Turner said that the board does not, in fact, have a history of delays due to absent members. The Board is holding *open* the application and will consult an expert regarding the paint problem. The Board offered to hold a special meeting prior to the next regular meeting if an expert's opinion is obtained and schedules allow the full Board to attend.

6. Michael Newcomb, 15 S. Main Street ~ Door Replacement
Present: Michael Newcomb

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 8/17/06, and building inspector reviewed on 8/23/06.

Discussion: The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing steel door with a steel door on the property at 15 South Main Street. He stated that the door is a commercial door, is the same door as another door already allowed on another street facing entrance to the structure, and that he proposes using the same hardware.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the replacement of the steel door, with painted muntins, as submitted.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Melnyk – yes; Zachman – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 7, 2006.**

7. Christopher Williams, 26 S. Main Street, Garage Demolition
Present: Christopher Williams

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

Discussion: The applicant is requesting approval to remove a non-original shed attached to an original barn. The shed was subsequently altered to be an automobile garage with a contemporary garage door. The attested applicant stated that the garage is not part of the original barn structure, and the original barn wall exists and has a former window opening that will be exposed if the shed is removed. Chairperson Melnyk noted that the removal of the attached, altered shed might be considered a component of rehabilitation of the original barn by restoring the original footprint and exposing the original exterior wall. The applicant indicated he would cover the window hole with wood remaining from the removed shed.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, declaring that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment, and therefore, a negative declaration is made.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Melnyk – yes; Zachman – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 7, 2006.**

Findings of Fact:

- The structure to be removed is not part of the original barn.
- The attachment is in the vernacular style.
- There is no indication in the survey of the attachment having historical significance.
- The original wall and window remain intact.
- The original barn structure will have its original footprint restored.

- The contemporary garage door is a modern adaptation.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to allow removal of the garage, as submitted, the former window opening in the original wall to be boarded up with boards salvaged from the removed shed.

Vote: Latshaw – yes; Melnyk – yes; Zachman – yes. *Motion carried.* **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 7, 2006.**

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 10:30.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary