

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – May 5, 2008 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Maria Huot
	John Limbeck
	Cristina Lanahan
	William McBride

Building Inspector:	Skip Bailey
Village Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

**1. Trevor Harrison, (HBT Architects) 16 South Main Street ~ Sign
Present: Trevor Harrison**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 3/31/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the existing sign on the building at 16 South Main Street with a new sign of the same height, but slightly narrower in width. He stated that the proposed sign will be installed in the same location as the existing sign. He submitted documentation indicating the proposed dimensions, design, and colors of the sign.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The proposed sign is nearly identical to the existing sign, but is three inches narrower in width.
2. The proposed sign is made of aluminite, a layered aluminum product.
3. The sign will be fastened to the building in the same manner, and in the same location, as the existing sign.

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 a replacement sign, as submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

2. Justin Hahs, 10 State Street (Hungry’s) ~ Sign

Present: Jessica Hahs & Susan Hahs

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/25/08.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing installation of a sign on the business located at 10 State Street. They stated that the proposed sign will be installed in the same location as the previous sign for Jonny’s Hots. They submitted documentation and drawings indicating the dimensions, materials, location, and colors of the proposed sign.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The proposed sign is the same size, and will be installed in the same location, as the previous sign.
2. The sign will utilize the existing lighting from the previous sign.
3. The sign is made of 3/4” plywood, with applied vinyl lettering.
4. The sign will not cover any significant architectural features on the building.

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 Lanahan, to approve the application for installation of a sign, as submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

**3. James Bonsignore, 50 State Street (Market Square Polish Pottery) ~ Sign
Present: James Bonsignore**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/28/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that the business is in the process of moving to another location in Northfield Common. He explained that he is seeking approval of the proposed sign, and approval for use of the sign at either location. He stated that he is modifying the application to propose a sign smaller than was originally proposed, because of the location on the building of the sign previously approved to be mounted above it. He submitted documentation of the dimensions and material of the proposed sign.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The applicant submitted simulation drawings of the proposed sign.
2. The sign size is different from that which was originally submitted.
3. The sign will hang 12” below the header line to provide clearance from the sign previously approved to be mounted above it.
4. The material for the sign is Alupalite, a double-sided, aluminum-clad plastic material with a matte finish.
5. The sign has a wood frame, which will conceal the edge profile of the material.

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 Huot, to approve the application, as modified.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

4. Gayle & Nick Mourgides, 50 State Street (Mustards) ~ Door

Present: Gayle & Nick Mourgides

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/10/08.

Discussion: The applicants stated that they are applying for approval to replace three steel doors on the building located at 50 State Street. They indicated that the doors were deteriorated beyond repair. Mr. Mourgides stated that one door has been replaced with an all-wood, divided lite door with exterior muntins. Chairperson Zachman stated that wood is a more compatible replacement material for the existing doors than steel.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The applicant indicated that the existing doors were not repairable.
2. One door has been replaced with an all-wood, divided lite door with exterior muntins.
3. Wood is an appropriate replacement material for the existing, non-original steel doors.

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, as submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

The applicants also questioned the Board regarding replacing a damaged entry door on the lower level of the building with an overhead garage door. They stated that the area had most likely been serviced by an overhead garage door at one time, because the hardware for a garage door is still there. Chairperson Zachman stated that this would be considered an alteration, not a replacement. Board members indicated that a wood door, or a smooth, non-textured steel door would be an appropriate replacement for this non-original door.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The door is in disrepair.
- The door is not original to the building.
- There was previously an overhead door in that location.

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 installation of the overhead door, subject to the following conditions: (1) The door will be replaced with a recessed-panel, simple-style, wood or steel garage door, with no faux-grain finish and no windows, the exterior frame of the door opening to be finished and trimmed out in cedar to match the existing trim on the building; or (2) replace the existing, non-original deteriorated pedestrian exit door with a smooth, six panel steel door with no windows.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

5. Katja Kalwak, 28 Eastview Terrace ~ Door

Present: Katja Kalwak

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/25/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that she is proposing replacing the damaged, unsafe side door on her house with a fiberglass door. Board members stated that the existing door is an original, wood door, which, according to the Secretary of the Interior Standards, should be repaired, and, if beyond repair, be replaced in-kind. Chairperson Zachman also pointed out that the other doors on the house are natural wood doors, and stated that a faux-grain, faux-finished fiberglass door would not be an appropriate replacement for a wood door. The applicant stated that she was unable to find a wood door in the appropriate style. Chairperson Zachman provided a brochure with an example of a solid wood door in the appropriate style

for the house. The applicant stated that she was amenable to modifying her application to propose replacement of the door with the wood door discussed.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The applicant indicated that the original wood door is damaged and unsafe.
2. The home was constructed in 1925 and is a Side Gabled vernacular folk house with some Craftsman style design features. Most exterior features appear to be original.
3. The faux-grain, fiberglass door originally proposed is not an appropriate replacement for a wood door.
4. The applicant modified the application to propose a solid wood, un-clad door manufactured by Simpson, Model 7118 I.G. that matches the existing door.
5. The new door will be a full door and frame replacement.

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, as modified.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

6. Judy Peace, 70 North Main Street, Garage Door

Present: Judy Peace

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/16/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that she is proposing replacing deteriorated wood garage doors with steel garage doors. Chairperson Zachman stated that the existing garage doors are original to the house, and that the proposed modern, raised-panel steel door, in a decorative style, is not appropriate for this house. The applicant stated that she would be willing to amend her application to propose an in-kind replacement with flat-panel wood doors.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The existing garage doors are original to the house.
2. The house was constructed in 1914 and is a front gabled local vernacular folk Victorian style home with original wood clapboard siding & trim intact.
3. The existing doors have some water damage.
4. The applicant amended the application to propose flat-panel, wood doors for an in-kind replacement.

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 Lanahan, to approve the amended application for wood replacement garage doors.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

7. Melinda Martin, 39 Courtenay Circle ~ Fence & Shed

Present: Terry & Melinda Martin

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/18/08.

Discussion: The applicants stated that they are proposing installing a pre-built, wood-frame shed and a stockade fence in the rear corner of the yard. The proposed stockade fence is a natural wood fence, measuring 6’ in height. A correction to the application was noted: The fence will be 100 feet long, not 104 feet, as was indicated in the application. The shed will be minimally visible from the public way as will be the fence.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. This is a post-war neighborhood in which storage sheds are common.
2. The proposed shed is a T111 wood-sided shed, with an asphalt roof, painted or stained to match the house.
3. The proposed fence is a stockade natural wood fence.

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 McBride, to approve the application for installation of a fence and shed, as amended.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

8. Pittsford Flour Mill, 15 Schoen Place

Present: Jeff Davis, Omnipoint Communications

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/18/08.

Discussion: The applicant represents Omnipoint Communications, Inc., a public utility in New York responsible for providing wireless telephone service in the geographic area that includes Monroe County and the Village of Pittsford. He stated that since the comments of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation (SHPO) had indicated that the roof-mounted antennas previously proposed “will have an adverse impact upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the State and National Registers of Historic Places,” they are revising the application to propose side-mounting of the antennas on the Grain Silo.

Chairperson Zachman pointed out that the SHPO review was based on the Grain Silo prior to the changes that are currently being made to the building, and therefore, some of their concerns are no longer accurate. He also questioned the applicant as to the possibility of either lowering the location on the building where the antennas will be mounted, or redirecting the antennas. Mr. Davis replied that because of safety concerns, it was not possible to mount the antennas lower on the structure.

Member Limbeck and Member Lanahan stated their opinion that the side-mounted antennas will be less intrusive than the roof-mounted antennas previously proposed.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. SHPO did not approve mounting antennas on top of the structure.
2. The applicants have re-submitted a proposal with the antennas mounted on the side of the structure.
3. The grain silo is an industrial/agricultural structure, which is being significantly altered and adapted for re-use as an office building.
4. Mounting of antennas on the building would appear similar to industrial/agricultural equipment that may be present on a working concrete grain silo and would not be incompatible with the industrial style of the building.
5. Side mounting of the antennae would least impact the profile of the penthouse tower above the converted grain silos.
6. Some of the SHPO concerns are no longer accurate.

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 proposal for side-mounting the antennas on the Grain Silo, with the following conditions:

- (1) The southwest double antenna bracket will be shifted to the southeast to even the offset between the left and right antennas and reduce the offset of the far west antenna;
- (2) The color of the antennas and steel stand-off equipment will match the color of the concrete structure;
- (3) The approval is subject to verification by the consultant that health and safety issues prevent the lowering of the antennas on the building; and
- (4) The approval is subject to site plan approval from the Planning Board.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – no; Lanahan –yes; Huot – no. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

9. Samuel Arena, 19 Maple Street ~Fence

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/25/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is proposing replacing the existing picket fence off the southeast rear corner off the house in the rear of the yard with a wood lattice fence and gate. The applicant submitted a photograph of the proposed fence from Locust Street, and the Board requested that he submit a scaled drawing of the fence. He stated that the fence will not exceed six feet in height. The applicant is also proposing installing a spa/hot tub, which will not be visible from the public way when the fence is installed.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The fence and gate will be installed off the southeast corner of the house in the rear yard.
2. The height of the fence will not exceed 6 feet.
3. The fence will be made of wood and will be painted.
4. The fence will replicate the custom fence in the photograph submitted.
5. The proposed spa/hot tub will not be visible from the public way when the fence is installed.

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 Lanahan, to approve the application for installation of a fence, as submitted.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – no; Lanahan –yes; Huot – no. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

10. James Weick (Bank of America), 9 North Main Street~ Window replacement

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/25/08.

Discussion: At the October 1, 2007 APRB meeting, the Board voted to approve this application for unclad, wood windows, conditioned on the applicant's submittal of a manufacturer's cut sheet of the windows, defining the size of the muntins and true divided lights. The applicant submitted the requested information for the record. Applicant also pointed out that the two large curved bay windows on the 1st floor east elevation of the Bank will be repaired instead of replaced.

11. Eric Geoca, Rand Place (Private Drive) ~ New construction

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/25/08.

Discussion: The applicant submitted plans for construction of a new, single-family residence on the private drive off of Rand Place. He indicated that the house will be a 2427 sq. ft. center-entrance colonial, with a bonus room of 205 sq. ft. and a walk-out basement. The house will have a stone front on the first-floor level and Mountain Blue Timber Select traditional 4" vinyl siding on all other exterior surfaces, except for the front peak, which will have shake-style vinyl siding. The trim will be white, and the roof will be GAF Charcoal.

Board members noted that only the rear elevation of the house will be visible from the public way. Chairperson Zachman stated that hardi-plank or wood clapboard would be more appropriate for the siding material in the context of an historic village setting. Board members also discussed re-aligning the windows and adding windows on the rear elevation.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The only elevation of the house that is visible from the public way is the rear elevation facing Jefferson Road.

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 proposed design for the rear elevation of the new construction of a single-dwelling house on Rand Drive, with the following modifications:

1. The second floor window on the left side will be relocated to the right so as to align it with the window below;
2. Two garage windows will be added to the rear elevation, the left window to align with the left edge of the bedroom windows above, and the right window to be offset from the corner of the house the same distance as the left window is from the dining bump-out on the first floor;
3. The siding will be a cementitious clapboard, such as hardi-board or wood clapboard siding; and
4. All windows and doors will have casing trim.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

12. Boardwalk Design Inc., Paul Zachman, 85 West Jefferson Rd ~ Deck

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/24/08.

Discussion: The applicant submitted plans for construction of a flat porch roof over the existing patio area on the rear of the house, a balcony deck constructed over the flat roof structure below, and installation of a vinyl-clad, double-hung window on the east side, second story of the house, to match the other windows. It was noted that only the east side of the proposed structure will be visible 290' from Jefferson Road. Mr. Zachman presented a sample of a composite PVC clad material for the railing, which has a matte finish that looks similar to wood.

Findings of Fact:

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

1. The house was constructed in 1996, and the style is an American Vernacular Revival prevalent in the 1980's and 90's from American House Styles: A Concise Guide, by John Milnes Baker.
2. ½" x 6" beveled cedar clapboard siding with rough sawn cedar corner board and trim finished with solid color oil-based stain.
3. The existing windows and doors are wood-white vinyl clad.
4. Only the east side of the proposed structure will be visible at 290' from Jefferson Road.
5. The proposed railing style is very similar to other porch railings on the house; the proposed top rail is larger and has more detail than the existing 2 x 4 top rail component.
6. The proposed railing is part of an addition to 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: Member Limbeck made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the application for enclosing the porch, adding a deck with a wood railing, painted or stained, and installation of a double-hung window on the east side second story, to match the other windows on the house.

Vote: Limbeck – yes; McBride – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

Member Items:

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

Vote: Limbeck – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan –yes; Huot – yes. *Motion carried.* This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on May 5, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT:

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary