

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – February 5, 2007 at 7:30 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Cristina Lanahan Scott Latshaw Marcia Watt (absent) Ken Willard (absent)
Building Inspector:	Skip Bailey
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Zachman called the meeting to order at 7:35.

1. Tom & Mary Dannhauser, 16 Locust Street ~ Fence & Porch
Present: Tom & Mary Dannhauser

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 1/18/07.

Discussion: The application is for installation of a backyard fence and renovation of a rear porch.

Fence: The applicants are requesting approval to install a wood picket fence in the rear of the property, located at 16 Locust Street. The proposed fence will measure 4 feet in height, with 2-inch cedar pickets with a round pointed top finish, spaced 1½ inches apart, with 2-by-4-inch pressure-treated cross rails, and 4-by-4-inch pressure-treated posts. The fence will have two gates, one single gate and one double gate, and will be painted green to match the house. The applicants presented a survey map indicating the proposed location for the fence, and Chairperson Zachman noted that it is well behind the front setback of the house.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the installation of a 4-foot, painted, wood picket fence, as indicated on the property map, with two gates, one single and one double. The applicant will submit design drawings for the gates.

Vote: Lanahan - yes; Zachman - yes; Latshaw - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 5, 2007.

Porch: The applicants are also proposing converting the existing enclosed rear porch into an entryway/mudroom. They stated that the existing addition was built on a stone and rubble foundation that does not extend to the basement, and that there is no electricity or plumbing. They presented plans and drawings for replacing the existing door and two windows. They propose replacing the door with an all-wood, one-over-two, panel-style door. They are also proposing removing the existing stairs on the north side of the open porch, extending the porch railing in the same location to match the existing railing, and installing an open porch floor and stairs on the east side of the enclosed porch. The applicants indicated that the railing would have a decorative ball on top, rather than having a flat top as shown in the plans. The applicants stated that the

existing vertical siding will remain as is, but they may request replacement of the siding at a later date.

Board members pointed out that the window on the west side is not visible from the public way, and the door on the east side has limited visibility from the public way. Chairperson Zachman asked the applicants if the proposal would include a skirting lattice on the porch, and the applicants stated that there would be a basket weave lattice on the part facing north. Board members questioned the applicants as to whether they were going to re-use the existing stairs, and the applicants stated that they probably would not, other than possibly the railing.

Findings of Fact:

- The proposed window change on the west side of the building is not visible from the public way.
- The proposed door on the east side has limited visibility from the public way.
- The porch floor is not visible from the public way.
- The railings and front steps are minimally visible from the public way.
- The proposed windows will be all-wood, exterior and interior, nonclad, one-over-one, double-hung windows.
- The proposed door is approximately 6” wider than the existing door.
- The existing, enclosed porch on the rear of the house currently has vertical, wood, painted siding.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for porch renovations, as submitted, with the following conditions: (1) the new railings and stairs will match the construction, materials, and features of the existing porch, and not the style as shown on the submitted drawings; and (2) If the cedar clapboard is installed on the rear porch exterior, it will have all the appropriate cornerboard trim on the exterior corners and match or preserve the existing casement trim around the windows and doors.

Vote: Lanahan - yes; Zachman - yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 5, 2007.

2. Richard Roach, 11 E. Jefferson Circle ~ Replacement windows & doors

Present: Richard Roach, Cornell Contracting & Anderson Windows

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 1/31/07, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/1/07.

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is requesting approval to replace the windows and doors on his house, located at 11 East Jefferson Circle. He stated that the house was built in 1954, and that the windows and doors are in a deteriorated state. He said that the existing windows are single-pane, double-hung windows, with wood sashes, a simulated divided lite appearance, and aluminum jamb liners. Also in attendance were two representatives from potential contractors for the applicant. Mr. Cornell, from Cornell Contracting, Inc., presented a proposal for window and door replacement that would involve the removal of the window grilles, and the installation of a “Thermatru” brand, smooth star, fiberglass entry door, which would be painted to match the original. The representative from Anderson Windows proposed a full-frame insert replacement window system to be installed inside the existing window frames using a new product, “Fibrex,” which is a composite of vinyl and wood, for the exterior finish on the windows and doors.

Chairperson Zachman stated that the house is over 50 years old, and, therefore, it has attained some historical significance. He further stated that the proposal for a full-frame insert inside the existing window frame on an historic home would result in a marked appearance change in the window. He explained to the applicant that windows are a key identifying feature on the exterior of historic homes, and that to propose changing this feature in a manner that compromises the historic integrity of the look of the window would be difficult for a preservation board to approve. Board members pointed out that the original windows on the house are wood windows, and 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.

Findings of Fact:

- The house is a ranch-style house that was built in the 1950's.
- The windows are in disrepair and in need of replacement.
- The existing windows are wood sash with aluminum jamb liners and spring balances that are not functioning properly.
- The existing front door has been modified with a mail slot that is not weather-resistant, and the door is of a lighter grade than is desirable for a front entry for energy efficiency and safety.
- The existing windows have a divided lite style appearance
- The proposal is for a non-divided lite appearance on the windows.
- The change to single lite sash style from a simulated divided lite sash style is not an architecturally significant alteration to this house and its style.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the replacement of the windows and doors, subject to the following conditions:

1. The new windows will be nonclad, wood, painted windows, with a replacement sash with a liner system;
2. The door will be a 6-panel, fiberglass, energy-efficient door, with either a solid panel or with 2 lites at the top, Thermatru brand, smooth star style (S296 or S210), with a smooth finish that will be painted
3. The applicant will provide manufacturer's cutsheets for the windows and doors.

Vote: Lanahan - yes; Zachman - yes; Latshaw - yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 5, 2007.

3. Pittsford Farms Dairy, 44 N. Main Street ~ Demolition

**Present: Charles T. Corby
Charles B. Corby**

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 1/19/07.

Discussion: The applicants presented documentation and plans for demolition of the creamery at Pittsford Farms Dairy. The application states that because of its small size, configuration, method of construction, and low ceilings, the current building is not readily adaptable to modern code requirements. New York State Department of Health regulations require replacing the current bottling plant with a new facility. The applicants submitted documents indicating that alternatives to demolition have been thoroughly investigated, and the option with the least impact was selected. The preferred alternative is to locate the new building on the site of the original

creamery and ice house. Demolition of the one minor building will permit the preservation of the greater whole. The demolition of the creamery will have the least impact on the view of the property from the public street. The building is set over 300 feet back from the Main Street. It is located behind the Pittsford Pub property and is only readily visible during the time of year when the leaves are off the trees. Due to the building's somewhat hidden and remote location, it is not suitable for the dairy store. The building's multiple floor levels, concrete slab, and small rooms make it ill-suited to accommodate a modern dairy operation or to make the building handicapped accessible.

Chairperson Zachman stated that the Pittsford Farms Dairy is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The property has the most complete extant assortment of outbuildings and landscape features of Pittsford's surviving early estates. He further stated that removal of one outbuilding, which would be replaced by another outbuilding, does not detract from the "collection of outbuildings concept" of the farm estate. He referenced the National Register application contents, which states "The Dairy is the only example where the context of agricultural land and active farm operations remains intact." The proposed changes aimed at maintaining a viable agricultural related business operation would preserve the historic purpose of the farm estate. The vast majority of the comments regarding architectural significance were focused on the main house and the characteristic landscape features of the surrounding property. The outbuildings were not noted individually for any outstanding architectural significance. It is the collection of outbuildings in the context of the entire property as a working farm estate that is significant.

Mr. Turner informed the applicants that full State Environmental Quality Assessment Review (SEQR) is required for this property.

Findings of Fact:

- The proposed demolition will not impact the main house.
- The Dairy must update the bottling plant equipment and layout to remain in business; some changes have to be made.
- Updating the facilities in the existing location is not possible.
- The proposed new location is adjacent to commercial parking activity on neighboring properties, and hides all facilities and employee parking requirements of the new building completely out of view from the street and other property viewscapes, thereby preserving the appearance of the historic landscaped grounds and circular driveway.
- Removal of one outbuilding that would be replaced by another outbuilding does not detract from the "collection of outbuildings concept" of the farm estate.
- The bottling plant location will be approximately in the same location as the original dairy creamery.
- The increase in size and bulk of the new bottling plant in the proposed location will not impact the main house and shifts the commercial and retail activities away from the main house.
- The building that is proposed for demolition is one of the least visible from the street; however, the proposed new structure is much larger and more visible than the building it will replace; therefore, sensitive replacement design and minimal impact on the estate grounds is very important.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the demolition of the creamery building, subject to the following conditions:

1. A negative impact SEQR declaration at the conclusion of the SEQR process;
2. APRB's approval of final design plans for the new building; and
3. All other Village Board approvals required by this project.

Vote: Lanahan - yes; Zachman - yes; Latshaw - yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 5, 2007.

Member Items:

- The Board discussed the letter sent from the Flour Mill owners in response to a letter sent to them from the Building Inspector indicating that the installed signage on the building does not conform to the approved plan. The Board resolved to ask the owners of the Flour Mill to appear before the board to seek approval for the unapproved changes.

Minutes

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the January 8, 2007 minutes, as amended.

Vote: Lanahan - yes; Zachman - yes; Latshaw - yes. *Motion carried.*

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary