

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – December 3, 2007 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Cristina Lanahan (absent) Maria Huot John Limbeck Ken Willard
Building Inspector:	Skip Bailey (absent)
Village Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Zachman called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**1. Christopher Lawrence, 21 Lincoln Avenue ~ Sign
Present: Christopher Lawrence**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 11/20/07.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of two signs on the front entrance of the building located at 21 Lincoln Avenue. The applicant stated that the proposed signs will replace the existing signs in the same locations, and will be lighted with concealed LED lighting. The signs will be painted, wood signs with aluminum lettering.

Findings of Fact:

- The signs will be located in the same locations as the existing signs.
- The signs will be 12” taller than the existing signs.
- The signs will be lighted with LED lighting.
- The signs will be made of wood and painted.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to ***approve*** the application for installation of signs, as submitted, contingent on verification that the signs conform to zoning regulations.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Huot – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on December 3, 2007.

**2. Gerald Rosen, 25 S. Main Street ~ Roof
Present: Gerald Rosen
Ryan Morse, Pro-Nailer Residential Roofing**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/8/07.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the existing roof on the building at 25 South Main Street with a corrugated metal roof. Chairperson Zachman stated that the metal roof proposed by the applicant would not be an appropriate style of roof for a residential Federal-style building of that era, which is located in a very visible location in the Village. He further stated that a metal roof would change the appearance and profile of the building, and would not be consistent with the style of roof typically seen on this type of

building. He explained that a metal roof would more typically be seen on a pole-barn agricultural or commercial-use building. Although the current use of the building is commercial, it is important to maintain the original residential character of this important architectural example of early Pittsford. Board members noted that if a metal roof were to be put on the building, a true standing seam roof would be much more appropriate, as opposed to a corrugated metal roof. An asphalt shingle roof would be the most historically appropriate style of roof for this architecturally-sensitive building.

The applicant gave examples of homes on which he had installed metal roofs with a mineral surface finish. Chairperson Zachman stated that he and other Board members will visit and review the examples suggested by the applicants, and that the application will remain open.

3. Pittsford Flour Mill, 15 Schoen Place
Present: Al Longwell, Michael Newcomb
Jeff Davis, Omnipoint Communications

Discussion: The applicants presented revised plans for the Grain Tower renovation project. They are proposing a change in the windows from double-hung windows to casement-style, aluminum-clad windows, with exterior muntins. Also proposed is the change of the lower of two steel doors existing in the south wall of the penthouse tower to a fixed glass window. The fixed glass window will be the same size as the steel door it is replacing, and will be tinted to more closely resemble the second steel door above it.

The Board also discussed the proposal to install cell antennas on the roof of the Grain Tower structure. Board members suggested that the equipment be located as low on the structure and close to the building wall as is functionally possible. Chairperson Zachman explained that since the Grain Silo is the tallest structure in the Village and visible from many important vantage points in and around the canal, mounting the antennas on top of the penthouse structure would visually disrupt the building roof profile as seen from these vantage points.

Mr. Davis submitted a memorandum from Jeremiah Jordan, RF Engineer, stating the necessity of installing the antennas on the roof of the structure, as opposed to side mounting the equipment. He stated that if the antennas are mounted on the side of the penthouse, one of the sectors will have skewed, or turned, antennas and another sector will have an obstruction between the two antennas, the penthouse itself. In conclusion, the report indicates that while it is possible for the antennas to be mounted on the side of the silo penthouse, it will not be possible to follow OCI antenna design criteria with standard mounting hardware, due to the specific azimuths that need to be achieved and the inherent shape and orientation of the silo penthouse.

Findings of Fact:

- The proposed 9th floor addition is an expansion of the existing penthouse structure on top of the grain silos. The existing window locations, rooflines, and wall characteristics will be carried forward in the design of the proposed addition. Increasing the size of the penthouse structure above the silos would not significantly alter the historic character of the structure. It was not uncommon to see varying sized penthouse structures atop concrete grain silos, such as the one situated in Schoen Place, and the proposed size of the addition appears to fall reasonably within the range of size for such structures.
- The proposed design change substituting metal, clad, casement-style windows with no muntin divisions for the paired double hung window style is an appropriate change. The paired double hung windows affect a more residential style that is not as compatible with the commercial adaptive re-use of the structure. The proposed windows are new additions to a structure that did not have windows situated in the grain tower portion. Introduction of windows is essential for the proposed adaptive re-use of the structure, as it will be converted into office space.

- The new windows located on the 9th floor penthouse addition should match the appearance, location, and size of the existing windows, including divided light configuration with external muntins.
- The replacement of the lower steel door is a functional improvement, as the new elevator will need to be extended up to the 9th floor level with proposed revision to convert that floor to usable office space. Each floor below has a previously approved fixed window associated with the new elevator.
- The approval of the proposal does not include the installation of the cell antennas, which will be held *open*, pending Planning Board approval, SEQR review, and the consultant's report regarding side mounting of the antennas.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to *approve* the revised plans, dated 11/5/07, with the following stipulations: (1) the window locations on the ninth floor addition will be projected out to match the existing window sizes and locations and will have externally-applied muntins configured to match the existing windows, and (2) the approval does not include the cell antenna portion of the application.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on December 3, 2007.

Next, the Board discussed the sign/historic marker installed on the Flour Mill. The Board had indicated to the applicants that while the use of applied letters for signage is common in and around the Village, it is important to note that the large size and scale of the Mill signage is unique, and the intent of the original approved “painted on” signage was to reflect the original sign depicted in historic photographs of the Mill. Members again pointed out to the applicants that the installed applied lettering is not as was approved by the APRB.

Mr. Newcomb stated that throughout the history of the Flour Mill, there was rarely any type of signage on the building. It was pointed out by Board Members that in the case of an historic building such as the Flour Mill, the signage is considered an “historic marker” referencing the historic building, and not a private business.

Findings of Fact:

- The style of the applied lettering mounted on the building is not out of character with other examples of signage throughout the Village.
- The size of the 36” lettering is larger than would typically be permitted; however, the size of the lettering is designed to depict an historical marker naming the building to reflect its past use and function, as opposed to commercial signage advertising business tenants. An historic photo of the building during its use as a mill did show large-scale signage in approximately the same location as the new proposed signage.

Motion: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to *approve* the applied lettering signage on the Flour Mill.

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on December 3, 2007.

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

Vote: Limbeck - yes; Zachman - abstain; Willard – yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.*

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary