

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

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	<b>Paul Zachman</b>
<b>Members:</b>	<b>Cristina Lanahan Scott Latshaw Marcia Watt Ken Willard</b>
<b>Attorney:</b>	<b>Jeff Turner</b>
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	<b>Linda Habeeb</b>

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

**1. Market Square Polish Pottery, 50 State Street ~ Review of sign  
Present: James Bonsignore**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/19/06.

**Discussion:** At the May 1, 2006 APRB meeting, the Board approved the material and design for the Market Square Polish Pottery sign, as submitted, subject to a further review and subsequent approval in six months. The approved material for the sign is coroplast, a corrugated plastic, in a matte finish, with a slight reduction in the dimensions of the sign to allow for a wood frame for the sign. The Board had expressed some concern about the appropriateness of the sign material, and the applicant expressed a strong need to limit expenses and get a sign in place as soon as possible.

Chairperson Zachman stated that the coroplast material shows striations and allows the sign to bend. He suggested that the applicants use a sub-straight behind the sign to give it support. Member Watt pointed out that the sign is on the second floor of the building, and the frame helps to conceal the texture of the sign. The applicant stated that the matte finish on the sign further helps to conceal the striations. Member Watt questioned the applicant as to whether he had considered a wood sign, and the applicant again stated that due to financial concerns related to a new business, he has not considered a wood sign at this point.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the use of the coroplast material for the sign, in this situation, with the condition that the sign be back-framed to provide support.

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

**2. St. Paul's Lutheran Church, 28 Lincoln Ave ~ Sign  
Present: Mara Berndt**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/16/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant submitted a proposal for an all-wood sign and frame, with the church's name, logo, and a removable wood plaque, which indicates the times of church services. The proposed sign is the same size, and will be installed in the same location, as the existing sign. Member Latshaw asked the applicants if the proposed sign will be lighted, and the applicant stated that the sign will have exterior lights on the ground.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application for a wood, painted sign, with vinyl letters, as submitted.

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

**3. Michael Kieffer, 74 S. Main Street ~ Fence**  
**Present: Michael Kieffer, attorney for Daniel Subtelny**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/2/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing relocating the existing chain-link fence from its current location to another location on the property, as the result of a subdivision of the properties of 72 & 74 South Main Street. Board members determined that the fence is minimally visible from the public way.

**Findings of Fact:**

- The application relates to the relocation of an existing chain-link fence.
- The applicant has subdivided his property, creating a new property line.
- The fence will be moved to a location along the new property line.
- The property line is 176 feet from the front property line at its closest point.
- The chain-link fence matches the other existing fence on the property.
- The fence is minimally visible from the public way.

**Motion:** Based on the previously stated findings of fact, Chairperson Zachman made a *motion*, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the relocation of the fence from its current location to the proposed location on the rear property.

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

**4. Matthew Lennarz, 27 Lincoln Ave ~ Fence**  
**Present: Matthew Lennarz**

**Application:** Submitted and date-stamped on October 9, 2006, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/16/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that the property currently has a white picket fence around three of the four sides of the house, and he is proposing replacing the snow fence on the west side with a matching white, picket fence. The chain-link portion of the fence will be removed.

**Findings of Fact:**

- The new fence, as proposed, will identically match the existing picket fence.

- The existing snow fence has no architectural value.
- The existing chain-link fence that is currently installed on the diagonal will be removed.
- The new fence will run along the property line.
- The new picket fence will be painted white.

**Motion:** Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Chairperson Zachman, to approve, as submitted, the application for a fence, based upon the findings of fact previously stated.

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

Information Only:

- **Pittsford Farms Dairy, 44 N. Main Street ~ Demolition**  
**Present: Charles and Charlie Corby**  
**Dan Skorzy, Contractor**

**Discussion:** Mr. Corby presented plans for construction of a new, multi-use building and the demolition of two existing buildings: the creamery and the existing dairy. Mr. Corby stated that the plan proposes preserving the existing home, barn, smokehouse, and park-like area on the property. Mr. Corby stated that they have outgrown the area and need more space to operate. He further stated that the current building is obsolete, and that the Health Department standards are not being met by the current plant configuration. The location of the boiler in the bottling plant is outdated, and several pieces of machinery need replacement; however, it is not feasible to replace them within the old bottling plant.

Chairperson Zachman pointed out that the Dairy is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. He referenced the report, stating that Pittsford Farms is important as the earliest farm estate developed within Pittsford. The property has the most complete extant assortment of outbuildings and landscape features of Pittsford's surviving early estates. It is the only example where the context of agricultural land and active farm operations remains intact.

The Board discussed with the applicants the possibility of moving buildings, rather than demolishing them.

Member Watt explained to the applicants that as a Preservation Board, the APRB has very high standards to be met prior to demolition of historic buildings. She referenced the Village Demolition Code, which states that demolition may be permitted only after the developer of the site has submitted and obtained approval for his plans for new development. In addition, the Code requires that "No structure may be demolished unless the APRB finds that: (a) Preservation of the structure is not warranted under general standards set forth in this section; or (b) The structure is deteriorating and that the owner has demonstrated that he cannot economically afford to preserve the structure ..."

The Board suggested that the applicants research the history of the dairy buildings and look at the Pittsford Flour Mill file to see examples of the type of documentation required prior to demolition. Board members indicated that when the applicants submit a formal application, with plans and supporting documentation, the APRB will hold a special meeting at the site to view the area. The Board will also consult a preservation expert for further guidance.

**Member Items:**

The Board discussed ways to improve the application process for more complete and timely applications, and modifications to the approval/denial letter that is sent to the applicant.

**Minutes:**

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the September 7, 2006 minutes, as amended.

**Vote:** Willard – yes; Watt – abstain; Zachman – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – abstain. ***Motion carried.***

**ADJOURNMENT:**

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

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary