

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – February 4, 2008 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

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

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

**1. Bill Livingstone, 28 Boughton Avenue ~ Modification of approval
Present: Bill Livingstone**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/12/07.

Discussion: The applicant presented revisions to the previously-approved application for repair and restoration of the front and rear porches at the house located at 28 Boughton Avenue. He presented photographs of the proposed modified column style, and stated that the material for the columns and the balusters will be either cedar or pine, which will be painted. He also stated that the railing height will be 30 inches, and the space between the balusters will measure 2½ inches. Chairperson Zachman noted that the proposed 6” turned style column and handrail details depicted in the sample photos submitted were appropriate, and represent a common style seen throughout the village on early 20th century vernacular homes.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The railing and column styles proposed are appropriate for this early 20th Century era of home, and are compatible with the scale of the porch.
2. All components of the railing system will be cedar or pine material that will be painted.

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 railing and column styles proposed are appropriate for this early 20th Century era of home, and are compatible with the scale of the porch.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to *approve* the modification to the application, as submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 4, 2008.

2. Phil Hart (Patio Enclosures), 5 Village Grove, Sunroom

Present: Phil Hart

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 1/23/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a sunroom and deck in the rear of the house located at 5 Village Grove. Board members noted that the proposed sunroom is of very limited visibility from the public way. Chairperson Zachman stated that there are plantings and trees that obstruct the view from the street. The proposed deck was not visible from the street and therefore did not require review.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The proposed sunroom is situated in a location that has very limited visibility from any public way, and the proposed deck would not be visible.
2. The proposed Sunroom and deck will be replacing an existing modern style deck.
3. The house was built in the 1980's and is not a historic home.
4. A sunroom enclosure with large floor to ceiling windows and doors is not inappropriate for this contemporary style home.
5. The proposed Sunroom is not an all glass enclosure and will have roof, gutter, and trim attributes that will match the existing house.

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).

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

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 4, 2008.

3. John Crawford (Aladdin's), 8 Schoen Place ~ Replace deck material

Present: John Crawford

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 1/23/08.

Discussion: Mr. Crawford presented plans and photographs showing improvements that are being made to the floor on the 2nd floor deck of his restaurant, located at 8 Schoen Place. He stated that the proposal is for removal of the existing pressure-treated lumber decking on the deck and replacement with Ipe wood decking.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The current deck is decked over with a pressure-treated material that will be removed and decked over with another wood product with a slightly different profile.
2. The existing pressure-treated decking is not historically significant.
3. From an appearance standpoint, the Ipe decking is an appropriate material and represents and improvement from the existing pressure treated decking.

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).

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to *approve* the decking replacement, 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 February 4, 2008.

4. Mike Newcomb, 57 N. Main Street ~ Replace gas canopies
Present: Rick Brown, Operations Manager

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 1/23/08.

Discussion: Mr. Brown stated that they are proposing transporting the two hip-style peaked canopies from the Schoen Place gas station to 57 N. Main Street to replace the existing canopies. The applicant indicated that the existing canopies had a minimum overhead clearance of 12', which is below the standard underpass clearance of 13'6", as confirmed by the Building Inspector, and this would leave them vulnerable to damage from taller commercial vehicles. The applicant is proposing to install the transported canopies from Schoen place 18" higher than the existing to meet desired clearance minimums. Chairperson Zachman noted that the canopies at the Schoen Place gas station have a hip style roof that would be minimize the apparent increase in height and profile when compared to the existing gable style canopies situated at the North Main Street Gas Station, and the corrugated/standing seam style roofing material is an appropriate style for this type of structure and use located near historical village railroad and canal settings. The lighting within the canopies will remain the same.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The two canopies from the Schoen Place gas station to be moved to the North Main Street gas station will measure 13'6" in clearance height when installed, which is a standard for underpasses and other similar structures, and they are replacing two existing gas pump island canopies.
2. The fact that they are slightly larger will be diminished by the fact that they are full hip roof style, whereas the existing canopies have a distinct ridge and gables on each end.
3. The roof material on the canopies at the Schoen Place gas station is corrugated steel, which is an appropriate material for the nonresidential setting of both gas stations.
4. Any changes to lighting locations and levels is subject to PZBA review.

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).

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to *approve* the application, as submitted, subject to final approval of the Planning Board.

Vote: Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on February 4, 2008.

5. Mike and Sue Conklin, 20 Green Hill Lane ~ Replacement windows

Present: Mike and Sue Conklin

Dan Culhane, Comfort Windows

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 1/24/08

Discussion: The applicants stated that they were in the process of installing 25 vinyl replacement windows on their house at 20 Green Hill Lane when the Building Inspector issued a stop work order because they had not applied for a permit or received approval from the APRB for the windows. They stated that they were not aware that they were required to apply for a permit prior to installing the windows. They further stated that it was an error on their part, but that it would be an extremely difficult hardship for them to replace the installed windows.

Chairperson Zachman stated that although he is sympathetic with the applicants' situation, the Board is required to consider the application as if the windows had not already been installed. He said that per Village Code, vinyl would not be an acceptable replacement material allowed on this neo-colonial revival, post WW II era house, because typical vinyl replacement windows reduce window openings and negatively impact the appearance of the house, as compared to the original double-hung wood windows. He further noted that when replacement is necessary, the same material as the original should be used, if available and functional. Member Huot noted that although the house was built in the 1960's, it is part of a neighborhood that is comprised of post WW II neo-colonial style homes that represent a specific period of development within the Village.

Chairperson Zachman further noted that the Village Code states that: "Deteriorated architectural features shall 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. Repair or replacement of missing architectural features should be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by historical, physical or pictorial evidence, rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other buildings or structures." (Section 210-61C.)

Mr. Culhane, from Comfort Windows, pointed out that the visual qualities of these particular vinyl windows do not significantly change the look of the windows when compared to other style vinyl replacement windows.

The Board decided to leave the application *open*, and to hold a special meeting at the site for further review.

Open Application:

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: This is a continuation of an open application for replacement of the existing roof on the building at 25 South Main Street with a metal roof. In a previous meeting, Chairperson Zachman had 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 the proposed type of metal roof would change the appearance and profile of the building roof eaves and ridge cap, and would not be consistent with the style of roof typically seen on this type of building. He explained that the metal roof style proposed would more typically be seen on a commercial/agricultural-use building. Although the current use of the building is commercial retail, it is important to maintain the original residential character of this important architectural example of early Pittsford residences.

The applicant presented examples of metal materials and designs, and Board members stated that they recommend an asphalt shingle roof, but if the applicant can show them an example of a metal roof with a narrower, more traditional rake edge and ridge cap, they would be willing to review and consider this proposal. The applicant then proposed a metal style roof that has the appearance of traditional asphalt shingles but has much greater durability, as well as application advantages that would allow for some roof sag corrections during installation. The board looked at a sample and concluded that the look and feel was very close to asphalt shingles and requested that the contractor provide an address where an actual installation of the roof can be looked at. It was also suggested by the applicant that a rear building that is also part of the roof replacement application may not be visible from the public view.

The Board decided to leave the application *open*, and to hold a special meeting at the site, and board members would view the example of the proposed metal, asphalt look-alike roof, in advance of the meeting.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the January 25, 2008 minutes, as drafted.

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

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary