

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – January 7, 2008 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

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

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

**1. Mark Gilbride, 4 North Main Street ~ Sign  
Present: Mark Gilbride**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 12/18/07.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installation of a building-mounted sign at his business, located at 4 North Main Street. He presented documentation and photographs indicating the dimensions, location, materials, and colors of the proposed sign. He stated that there will be no lighting for the sign.

**Findings of Fact:**

The Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board finds that:

1. The building is a ca.. 1895 “Gomph” Queen Anne style house.
2. The material for the sign is high-density urethane.
3. The sign is shaped and painted to closely imitate the appearance of a traditional incised wood signboard in terms of texture and form.

**Legal Criteria:**

The *Code of the Village of Pittsford, New York* mandates the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of buildings, structures, places and sights of historic, architectural, cultural or aesthetic value is a public necessity and purpose in the Village of Pittsford and to safeguard the heritage of the Village of Pittsford by preserving the Historic and Architectural Design District in the Village, which represents and reflects elements of its cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history (ARTICLE XIV, § 210-57).

The Code directs the Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board to review, approve or disapprove all plans and building permit applications for the construction, reconstruction, removal, restoration, alteration or demolition of any exterior architectural feature within the District to ensure alterations and additions to existing buildings shall either be made consistent with the spirit of their architectural style or shall alter the structure to an appearance consistent with the architectural styles of historic value existing in the district. Alternatively, contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties may be permitted when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, material and

character of the property, neighborhood or environment. In applying the principles of consistency and compatibility with the architectural styles existing in the District, the APRB shall consider composition, design, texture and other visual qualities (ARTICLE XIV, § 210-57).

**Decision:** The appearance of the sign is compatible with the architectural character of the building in terms of scale and design.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to *approve* the application for installation of a sign, as submitted.

**Vote:** Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 7, 2008.

## **2. Michael Newcomb, 18 Boughton Avenue ~ Windows & Siding**

**Present: Mike Newcomb**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 12/12/07.

### **Discussion:**

**Windows:** The applicant stated that the existing windows on the house are deteriorated beyond repair, and he is proposing replacing the original windows with all-wood windows. Chairperson Zachman stated that the mid-19<sup>th</sup> Century style of the original windows is a significant architectural feature of the house, and that to replace these windows with another type of window, with a different muntin configuration, will significantly impact the historic character of the house. He further stated that the Secretary of the Interior Standards state that deteriorated architectural features should be repaired rather than replaced, noting the importance of preserving original windows, whenever possible. Chairperson Zachman offered to meet with the applicant at the house to further evaluate the condition of the windows. The Board is holding *open* this portion of the application pending further information regarding the condition of the existing windows.

**Siding:** The applicant is also proposing installing hardi-plank siding on the north side of the house where the siding has been removed during renovations. Chairperson Zachman noted that there is catastrophic paint failure on that area of the house, and that it would be difficult for paint to adhere to siding.

### **Findings of Fact:**

The Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board finds that:

1. The house is an early nineteenth-century, hewn-frame, symmetrical, front-gable, Federal Style house altered with a mid nineteenth-century roof raising, and Italianate porch, and a ca. 1900 single-light door. It is believed the house was moved to its current site from another location.
2. Deterioration of the north sill and exterior wall framing has required repair of the wall of the house including the removal of the existing siding and sheathing.
3. Catastrophic paint failure had occurred on this wall prior to the repairs.

### **Legal Criteria:**

The *Code of the Village of Pittsford, New York* mandates the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of buildings, structures, places and sights of historic, architectural, cultural or aesthetic value is a public necessity and purpose in the Village of Pittsford and to safeguard the heritage of the Village of Pittsford by

preserving the Historic and Architectural Design District in the Village, which represents and reflects elements of its cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history (ARTICLE XIV, § 210-57).

The Code directs the Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board to review, approve or disapprove all plans and building permit applications for the construction, reconstruction, removal, restoration, alteration or demolition of any exterior architectural feature within the District to ensure alterations and additions to existing buildings shall either be made consistent with the spirit of their architectural style or shall alter the structure to an appearance consistent with the architectural styles of historic value existing in the district. Alternatively, contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties may be permitted when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment. In applying the principles of consistency and compatibility with the architectural styles existing in the District, the APRB shall consider composition, design, texture and other visual qualities (ARTICLE XIV, § 210-57).

**Decision:** Painted hardi-plank is a visually compatible alternative material because it will closely match the appearance of the original material in its reveal, profile, texture, and color.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to **approve** the application for the installation of hardi-plank siding on the north side of the house where the existing siding has been removed.

**Vote:** Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 7, 2008.

### **3. Kathleen Leonard, 42 Monroe Avenue ~ Dock**

**Present: Kathleen Leonard  
Brian Cook**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/18/07.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installation of a dock, deck and staircase on the canal bank. She stated that the material is pressure-treated lumber, and submitted documentation indicating the dimensions and location for the proposal. The applicant also stated that she has received approval for the dock from the Canal Corporation.

#### **Findings of Fact:**

1. The Erie Canal has been deemed National Register eligible and represents a significant historic resource within the Village of Pittsford.
2. Wood docks have been a common feature along the Village's canal waterfront through most of its history.

**Decision:** The proposed simple, functional design of the dock and stair design is visually compatible with the canal viewshed.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to **approve** the application for a dock, deck and stairway, as submitted.

**Vote:** Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 7, 2008.

**4. Rick & Jeanne Truini, 45 Lincoln Avenue ~ Replacement windows**  
**Present: Rick Truini**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/16/07.

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an open application for replacement of eight windows on the second floor of the applicant's house, located at 45 Lincoln Avenue. Board members noted that the house currently has three types of windows: wood, steel, and vinyl. At a previous meeting, the Board had stated that aluminum-clad windows would be more historically appropriate than the vinyl that was originally proposed by the applicants. The applicant presented a modified application proposing aluminum-clad windows from Jeld Wen. He presented a brochure, for the record, indicating the details of the proposed windows.

**Findings of Fact:**

The Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board finds that:

1. The building is an early twentieth-century Tudor Revival house.
2. The existing, original windows are steel casement-style windows, which the applicant stated no longer operate or seal properly due to corrosion and warping of the frames.
3. The windows to be installed are aluminum-clad, simulated divided light casement windows, with narrow profile muntins.
4. The muntin configuration of the proposed replacement windows will duplicate that of the existing windows.

**Legal Criteria:**

The *Code of the Village of Pittsford, New York* mandates the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of buildings, structures, places and sights of historic, architectural, cultural or aesthetic value is a public necessity and purpose in the Village of Pittsford and to safeguard the heritage of the Village of Pittsford by preserving the Historic and Architectural Design District in the Village, which represents and reflects elements of its cultural, social, economic, political and architectural history (ARTICLE XIV, § 210-57).

The Code directs the Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board to review, approve or disapprove all plans and building permit applications for the construction, reconstruction, removal, restoration, alteration or demolition of any exterior architectural feature within the District to ensure alterations and additions to existing buildings shall either be made consistent with the spirit of their architectural style or shall alter the structure to an appearance consistent with the architectural styles of historic value existing in the district. Alternatively, contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties may be permitted when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment. In applying the principles of consistency and compatibility with the architectural styles existing in the District, the APRB shall consider composition, design, texture and other visual qualities (ARTICLE XIV, § 210-57).

**Decision:** The proposed windows are visually compatible with appearance and style of the house because the finish, profiles, muntin pattern, shadow lines, and shape of the new windows closely matches the original windows.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to **approve** the application for replacement of the second-story windows, as submitted.

**Vote:** Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 7, 2008.

#### 4. Messner Carpeting, Monroe Ave ~ Addition/Alteration

Present: Peter & Greg Messner

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on

**Discussion:** The applicants presented several proposals to alter the front entrance of their building, in order to create greater visibility for the carpet business. Board members expressed varying opinions about the proposals. General comments from the board included the following:

1. The building is a ca. 1960, side-gable, brick-clad, symmetrical Colonial Revival style structure that housed Pittsford's post office from the time of its construction until the late 1980s. The building is part of group of mid twentieth-century buildings in the village designed to be architecturally compatible with the village's historic character. The period represented an early step in the evolution of Pittsford's historic preservation movement.
2. The board understands the need to achieve a reasonable level of commercial visibility, but expressed concern that the design proposing a gable-front glass enclosure was not compatible with the architectural character of the existing building because:
  - a. The treatment of the gable and trim detailing is inconsistent with that found on the existing building.
  - b. The alignment between columns and entablature does not follow the proportional rules of the Colonial Revival style.
  - c. The proposed treatment of glazing is incompatible with the building and the Colonial Revival Style.
  - d. The lower eave height of the proposed gable does not align with the existing cornice, thus creating an awkward proportion on the façade.
  - e. The use of only two columns to support the proposed new gable roof is inconsistent in proportion with the building and the Colonial revival style.

The applicants will consider the recommendations and return before the Board with a final plan. The application will remain *open*.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the December 3, 2007 minutes, as amended.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT:

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

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary