

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

PRESENT:

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

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

1. Scott Zakalik, 1 Elmbrook Drive ~ Window/Door Replacement

Present: John & Mary Crowe, Arkro Renovation LLC

Scott Zakalik, Homeowner

Steve Pfederson, Counsel for homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/21/07.

Discussion: The applicants stated that as part of the renovation of the 1950's house, the front door was replaced, the inoperable kitchen window was replaced, and shutters were added to the front door and window. Board members informed the applicants that they should have obtained a building permit from the Village office, at which time the Building Inspector would have informed them that they were required to come before the APRB for approval of their proposal, prior to beginning the renovations. The owner of the house explained that he was unaware of the existing violations when he purchased the house. Mr. Turner stated that the Village makes every effort to inform residents, real estate agents, contractors, and the public of what is required of homeowners living in the Historic Preservation District. Chairperson Zachman explained to the applicants that the Board would consider the application as if the work had not already been completed.

Front Door: Chairperson Zachman stated that the applicants had replaced the original door with a steel door, with a brush-painted, flat surface. Board members noted that the style of the replacement door is not architecturally incompatible with the style of the house. When questioned about the original door, the applicants stated that it had been removed and was either lost or destroyed. Board members also noted that a deteriorated wrought-iron railing had been removed, which was a decorative feature that did not add architectural significance to the house. Mr. Zachman further noted that small, incremental changes, over time, collectively can compromise the overall integrity of a house.

Findings of Fact

- The original front door has been removed.
- The door has been replaced with a smooth, metal, painted door.
- The replacement door is not incompatible with the style of the house.

Motion: Based on the findings of fact, Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *approve* the replacement of the front door with a smooth, metal, painted door, and the removal of the deteriorated, wrought-iron, railing, which was a decorative feature that did not add architectural significance to the house.

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 March 5, 2007.

Shutters: The Board noted that the new shutters do not match the other existing wood shutters on the house, in that they are vinyl shutters, with no cross-rails. Member Watt stated that the Board has consistently denied the use of vinyl as a replacement material for wood. It does not appear that shutters in those locations were original to the house.

Findings of Fact:

- The new installed shutters are composed of vinyl, with no center rail.
- Based on the 1976 Village house survey, there were no shutters on the house in those locations at that time.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *approve* either the installation of wood shutters, to match the existing wood shutters, or removal of the vinyl shutters.

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 March 5, 2007.

Window: Board members noted that the original casement window was replaced with a vinyl slide window. Chairperson Zachman stated that the replacement vinyl slide window is inconsistent with the other windows on the house in style and material, in that the other windows are wood casement windows, with horizontal divided lites. Board members noted that this style window is not appropriate for the house. Mr. Crowe stated that the original door and window were deteriorated beyond repair. Board members pointed out 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. Chairperson Zachman stated that the Board does not discourage improvements to homes, but that the improvements should be in accordance with the Village Code.

Findings of Fact:

- The original window was a double casement, wood window.
- The replacement window is a vinyl sliding window.
- The new window has no divided lites and does not match the existing windows.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *deny* the application for a vinyl replacement window.

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 March 5, 2007.

The applicants asked for guidance as to what type of replacement window the Board would approve, and the Board stated that an all-wood, non-clad window, with exterior-applied muntins, would be an appropriate replacement window for that location on the house. Board members gave the applicants the names of several wood window manufacturers.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *approve* an all-wood, non-clad, casement-style window, with 3 lites per sash or true divided lites, to match the existing opening, conditioned on the applicant's submittal of a specification sheet of the window to be installed.

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 March 5, 2007.

2. Flour Mill, 15 Schoen Place, Signage

Discussion: The application includes a letter stating the Flour Mill owners' assertion that the installed signage on the building is as was indicated on plans approved by the APRB. Member Watt researched past APRB meeting minutes and presented a letter, a portion of which states that "At a meeting on December 5, 2005, the APRB approved these plans by Overmoyer Design Architects, date-stamped 11/21/05, as the "final" plans for the Mill project (subject to certain exceptions not related to signage). The sign that was installed does not match the sign shown on these approved drawings and has not been approved as to size or materials." Mr. Bailey pointed out that the sign that was approved by the APRB requires a variance from the Zoning Board. The Board determined that the application is incomplete as is, in that it does not provide dimensions and other details of the proposed signage.

The application will remain *open*, and Chairperson Zachman will send a letter to the applicants from the Board indicating what is required for approval of signage for the Flour Mill.

Minutes

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the February 5, 2007 minutes, as amended.

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

Minutes

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the February 5, 2007 minutes, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 9:00.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary