

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – January 8, 2007 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>Building Inspector:</b>	<b>Skip Bailey (absent)</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. David Elam, 17 Washington Road ~ Replacement windows  
Present: Matthew Elam**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 12/27/06.

**Discussion:** The applicant is requesting approval for replacement of wood windows with vinyl replacement windows that have already been installed on the house located at 17 Washington Road. He stated that the existing wood windows were in a deteriorated state, and he presented letters indicating that neither he nor his contractor was aware that approval from the APRB was required prior to replacing the windows.

Chairperson Zachman explained to the applicant that the Board will consider the application as if the windows had not yet been installed. He further stated that the Village Code and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, which have been adopted by the APRB, require that deteriorated architectural features be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible, and in the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture, and other visual qualities. Board members stated that windows are a significant architectural feature on a house, and that vinyl is not an appropriate replacement material for wood windows. Member Watt stated that although the letter from Accent Windows indicated that the replaced windows were the “same type” as the original windows, they were referring to style, not material.

There was some discussion to determine which windows are visible from the public way, and therefore subject to the Board’s jurisdiction. It was determined that the window on the rear of the house is not visible from the public way. Although some of the windows on the north façade were determined to be of limited visibility, Member Watt pointed out that from a preservation standpoint, it is desirable for a façade to present a uniform appearance.

Chairperson Zachman stated that vinyl replacement windows do not replicate the original windows, because both the material and the style of the windows are different from the original wood windows.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The original windows were wood.
- The replacement windows are vinyl.
- The replacement windows have a half-screen that covers one sash that is built into the window unit, which is a contemporary, non-historic feature.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *deny* the installation of vinyl replacement windows on the north, south and east facades of the house at 17 Washington Road, based on the stated findings of facts; the windows on the rear façade are not subject to the Board’s jurisdiction.

**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 January 8, 2007.

The applicant stated that he will work with the Building Inspector to establish a timeline for replacement of the vinyl windows. The Board gave the applicant examples of manufacturers that specialize in wood windows and doors.

**2. Michael Newcomb, 10 Lincoln Avenue: Update**

The Board reviewed the history of the information-only application for demolition and new construction of the house located at 10 Lincoln Avenue. Chairperson Zachman stated that the house is in a deteriorated state, but that it could be repaired. He stated that there is currently no formal application before the Board, but that Mr. Newcomb’s tentative plan is to demolish the house and build a new house at a different location on the property. The Board also reviewed the structural engineer’s report, which indicated that most of the structural elements of the house are in fair-to-good condition, with certain stated exceptions.

Member Watt stated that, unlike the demolition approved for the Flour Mill, this is an individual, residential structure that is located within the National Historic Register District. She further stated that according to Village Code standards for demolition, no structure may be demolished, other than for hardship, unless the APRB finds that preservation of the structure is not warranted. Member Latshaw pointed out that there have been public comments expressing opposition to demolition of the house, and that he is in agreement with these comments opposing the demolition.

Board members again emphasized that there is no formal application before the Board for demolition, and that currently, this is an enforcement issue.

**3. Pittsford Farms Dairy ~ *Information only***

**Discussion:** The Board reviewed the status of the Pittsford Farms Dairy project and noted that at the November APRB meeting, Mr. Corby presented preliminary plans, on an informational basis, for construction of a new, multi-use building and the demolition of two existing buildings: the creamery and the existing dairy. At that meeting, 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. The Board also informed the applicants that they are required to submit a formal application, with documentation justifying the proposed demolition, and that the Board should receive these materials in time to allow for a reasonable opportunity to review the plans. Board members indicated that when the applicants submit a

formal application, with plans and supporting documentation, the APRB can hold a special meeting at the site to view the area, in consultation with a preservation expert for further guidance.

The Chairman noted that no formal application, drawings, or additional materials regarding this project have yet been filed; however, the applicants have requested that a Special Meeting of the APRB be scheduled. The Board agreed that no Special Meeting should be scheduled until these documents are provided.

**Member Items:**

- Board members discussed various suggestions for improving the application process for better communication among the Boards, for example, through the use of checklists/cover documents being added to the applications.
- The Board stated that the Flour Mill's recently installed signage is in violation of their approved plan. The Board approved letters painted directly onto the clapboard, to scale, instead of smaller, plastic lettering.

**Minutes:**

**Motion:** Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the December 4, 2006 minutes, as amended.

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

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 9:30.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary