

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting – March 3, 2008 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	<b>Paul Zachman</b>
<b>Members:</b>	<b>Maria Huot John Limbeck Ken Willard Cristina Lanahan</b>
<b>Building Inspector:</b>	<b>Skip Bailey (absent)</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. Liberty Home Funding, 4 South Main Street ~ Sign  
Present: Pat Lavell**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/15/08.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing installing a sign on the right side of the front door on the building located at 4 South Main Street. He submitted documentation indicating the proposed dimensions, design, and colors for the sign, but stated that he did not yet know the material for the sign. Chairperson Zachman stated that a wood or a solid composite material would be appropriate types of material for the sign.

**Findings of Fact:**

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

1. The sign will be mounted on the building to the right of the existing sign.
2. There will be two signs on both sides of the door.
3. The sign will be the same dimensions as the existing signs.

**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 Limbeck, to *approve* the application for installation of a sign, as submitted, with the stipulation that the material be either solid wood or high-density urethane.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 3, 2008.

## **2. Mustards Restaurant, 50 State Street ~ Sign**

**Present: Gayle and Nick Mourgides  
Terry Wood**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/29/08.

**Discussion:** The applicants are proposing installation of two signs on the building located at 50 State Street. They presented documentation indicating the dimensions and proposed locations for the signs. They stated that the signs will be constructed of a high-density urethane material. They are also proposing installation of two gooseneck lights that will match the existing gooseneck lights on the building.

### **Findings of Fact:**

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

- The signs as proposed are compatible with other signage in Northfield Commons, and the locations as proposed do not obstruct any important features on the building exterior.

### **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 Limbeck, to *approve* the application for the installation of two signs, as submitted, subject to the Building Inspector's confirmation that the signs conform to Village zoning regulations, and subject to the following conditions: (1) The sign to be installed

on the canal-side entrance will be installed in a location high enough on the building that it will not encroach on the window below it; (2) The gooseneck lights proposed for the south side of the building will match, as closely as possible, the existing gooseneck lights.

**Vote:** Limbeck – yes; Willard – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 3, 2008.

**3. Greg Lull, 44 Rand Street ~ Replacement windows**  
**Present: Greg Lull**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/22/08.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing the existing casement windows on the house with vinyl-clad Anderson wood windows. When questioned by Board members as to the reason for the replacement of the windows, he stated that the existing windows on the home are deteriorated. He also indicated that the proposed replacement windows will be a complete window unit replacement, which will match the existing windows.

Chairperson Zachman noted some facts regarding this house:

- a. The house was constructed in 1968, and is a Neo-French Eclectic Style Ranch profile from the front, and a two-story, walk-out basement/living space profile at the rear. By preservation standards, the house is not considered historic.
- b. The house is on a private drive and is set back at least 120 feet from Rand Place. The rear of the property is visible from East Jefferson, but is at least 200 feet from the road, with houses and lots in between.
- c. The private drive is located along a section of Rand Place that is a post-WWII neighborhood consisting of Ranch and Cape Cod style homes.
- d. The windows are wood casement style and picture window style with standard brick mold exterior casement trim.
- e. The existing casement windows are single-pane glass with heavy paint accumulation on the sash; some windows are painted shut.
- f. The predominant architectural characteristics are the steeply pitched hip roof with attached garage, vertical board-and-batten siding, and single light, vertically proportioned casement-style windows.
- g. The proposed windows are full-frame replacements that will match the size and proportion of the existing windows and will not reduce the visible glass openings.
- h. The proposed aluminum-clad windows have virtually identical sash and brick mold profiles as non-clad wood windows and would be indistinguishable from non-clad windows from any public view.
- i. The proposed aluminum-clad windows will not negatively or significantly impact or change the important architectural characteristics of the house or surrounding neighborhood.

Chairperson Zachman explained that the entire Village has been designated as a Local Historic Preservation District, and that Village Code requires 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. He said that traditionally, vinyl would not be an acceptable replacement material that would be approved for this post-WWII era house, because typical vinyl replacement windows reduce window openings and negatively

impact the appearance of the house. Board members stated that wood windows are available to replace the existing windows.

The Board will hold *open* this application, pending consultation with a historic preservation expert.

**Minutes:** January 7, 2008  
February 4, 2008

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the January 7, 2008 minutes, as drafted.

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

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Limbeck, to approve the February 4, 2008 minutes, as revised.

**Vote:** Willard - yes; Zachman - yes; Limbeck - 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