

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

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Maria Huot Cristina Lanahan (absent) William McBride Erin Daniele
Building Inspector:	Skip Bailey
Village Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

1. Michelle Madore, 20 Courtenay Circle ~ Fence

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/23/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of a 6-foot high, pressure-treated fence on the property located at 20 Courtenay Circle. He presented documentation indicating the location and the style of the proposed fence. He stated that the fence will have two gates, and that the posts will be on the inside of the 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 Huot, to approve the application for a fence, with matching gates, as submitted, the fence to be installed no further forward than the front corners of the house.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 4, 2008.

2. Mary Terziani, 45 Schoen Place ~ Sign

Present: Daniel Mason & Mary Terziani, Co-owners

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/24/08.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing installation of a 2' x 5' oval sign for their new business, "Water Lilies," located at 45 Schoen Place. They stated that the proposed sign will be made of cross-grain cedar, and will be installed in the same location as the existing sign. They submitted documentation indicating the dimensions and location for the sign. Member Huot suggested that the sign be installed below the header, and the applicants agreed to modify the application to reflect this change.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The proposed sign is the same size as the existing sign.
- 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 McBride, to approve the application for a sign, with the modification that the sign will hang from the header beam, below the header, noting that this location is not a walkway/traffic flow area.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 4, 2008.

3. Kirsten Fleckenstein, 61 Rand Place ~ Fence & garage door **Present: Kirsten Fleckenstein**

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/24/08.

(1) Fence: The applicant stated that she is proposing replacing an existing 3' picket fence with a board-on-board, pressure-treated wood fence, not to exceed 6 feet in height. She presented documentation indicating the specifications and location of the proposed fence. She stated that the posts will be the same size as the fence and will be installed on the inside of the fence.

(2) Garage Door: The applicant stated that she is also proposing installing a raised panel, solid steel garage door. Chairperson Zachman stated that even though the raised-panel style door exists in other locations in the Village, a recessed-panel style garage door would be more appropriate for this post-War style home.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The home is a post-War style home located in the Rand Place extension.
- The proposed fence will be installed in the same location as the existing picket fence.
- The proposed fence will not have the gothic posts at the top, as was depicted in the picture submitted by the applicant.
- The existing steel garage door is in disrepair, and is not original to the 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 Daniele, to approve the application for a fence and a steel garage door, as submitted.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 4, 2008.

4. Jonathan Murray, 29 South Street ~ Replacement windows

Present: Jonathan Murray

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/28/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is proposing replacing four windows on the second floor of his house with Marvin wood windows with aluminum-clad exterior. He further stated that the original wood windows are deteriorated beyond repair. He noted that the house is vinyl sided, and that most of the windows on the first floor, and some on the second floor, have been replaced with vinyl replacement windows.

Prior to this meeting, Chairperson Zachman had suggested to the applicant that he investigate an alternative window replacement, the Marvin “Tilt Pac Double Hung Window.” He stated that in almost all cases, the existing window frames are in functional condition, and replacement of the sash only is a preferred alternative, if the functionality of the existing window sash cannot be restored. He further noted that the process of putting a fully-framed replacement window “within” the existing window frame reduces the overall window opening, and is not typically appropriate as a replacement solution for historic homes. A sash-only replacement will look nearly identical in appearance to the existing window, and the new sash tilt in for easy cleaning, basically affording all of the benefits of conventional replacement windows.

Mr. Murray responded to Mr. Zachman stating that he had investigated the Marvin Tilt Pac windows, but that his research indicated that the specifications for the Tilt Pac do not recommend it for frames that are more than ¼" out of square. He further noted that one of the area's largest Marvin retailers (Rochester Colonial) has stopped carrying the Tilt Pac because of the generally unsatisfactory results they have found with the product. He stated that, based on these findings, as well as the condition of the existing frames, he selected a full-frame replacement window, noting that some of the issues with the existing window frames include: (1) The frames are not square; (2) There is rotted wood on the frames due to water penetration; (3) There is heavy paint accumulation on the sill (presumably lead-based); and (4) Some of the sashes are painted shut, and further damage to the frames may be expected in attempting to remove them. He concluded by saying that he had attempted to find a window that would have a minimal intrusion on the overall window opening, and the submitted window will not significantly alter the visual qualities of the house.

Board member Zachman stated that he had contacted Lee Patterson from Rochester Colonial regarding the Tilt Pac window. Mr. Patterson stated that they do still sell that line, and that he has personally sold Tilt Pac installations within the Village in the past and is familiar with the product. With Marvin’s new introduction of their full frame wood replacement window, Rochester Colonial has encouraged the use of the full-frame replacement (without regard to preservation sensitivities), because it is much easier to install, and if the installer is less than careful or inexperienced, problems can arise with the Tilt Pac due to inaccurate or sloppy measuring and poor installation. That can be said of many products. Mr. Patterson agreed that if you have a good mechanic and measurements are accurate, and you are within the recommended square variance, the Tilt Pac will perform well.

Mr. Zachman addressed the other issues outlined by the applicant:

- Another alternative is installation of jamb liners that incorporate the existing sash with some modifications. This works particularly well if your window is not square. There have been

several studies that have shown that a properly functioning/sealed single pane sash with effective storm windows can get nearly the same performance as double pane insulated glass windows alone. They open and close easily, tilt in, and seal very well.

- Removal of sash that has been painted in place for years can be done without further damage to the existing window frames.
- Lead paint is a problem with most all of the homes in the village (and countless other locations). It is a serious issue, and measures do need to be taken to minimize exposure. Proper maintenance to avoid chipping and peeling is needed, and lead paint can be covered over with newer paint with little risk of exposure, if the area is not chipping, cracking, or disturbed by sanding. The interior window stool, apron, and casement trim of all older windows that have not been stripped to bare wood would contain lead paint. Lead painted sills alone probably would not justify the installation of full frame replacement windows in an historic or architecturally significant setting.

The applicant presented photographs of the deteriorated state of the existing windows. He amended his application to propose the Marvin Ultimate Insert Double-Hung un-clad interior and exterior windows.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The house is a simple vernacular Victorian era home, built ca. 1910.
- The house is vinyl sided with aluminum-clad soffits, exterior sills, and casing trim.
- The front of the house is original, with a two-story addition in the rear.
- The front porch railing has been filled in and sided with aluminum.
- The other existing windows on the house are a mix of aluminum-clad and vinyl replacement windows.
- Only a few existing original features remain on the house.
- The applicant attested that the windows are beyond repair.
- All of the first-floor windows, and some of the second-floor windows, are replacement windows.
- Since the existing window openings on the house have been altered and reduced in size through a significant number of window replacements in the past, the architectural significance of the size of the window openings prior to replacement has been lost. Installing the window that the applicant proposes would create a better visual match than the existing windows.
- The applicant attested that he had measured the windows and determined that they are out of square beyond the tolerance allowed for a Marvin Tilt Pac replacement.
- The proposed window replacement will facilitate the removal of the existing exterior storm windows.
- The applicant is proposing a high-quality Marvin replacement window, with minimal window opening reduction.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of Marvin Ultimate Insert Double-Hung un-clad wood interior and exterior replacement windows.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 4, 2008.

5. Breathe Yoga, 19 South Main Street, Windows

**Present: Fran Overmoyer, Architect
Liz Palmer, Interior Designer**

Discussion: Chairperson Zachman stated that at the July meeting, the applicant received conceptual, conditional approval for the alteration of the main street storefront, as a function the expansion of her business into the front area of the building. The expansion will involve changing the style of the existing front windows from double-hung windows to store-front, display windows. One of the conditions of the approval stated that it was contingent on submittal of scaled drawings and details of the proposed materials.

Mr. Overmoyer presented final plans for the Board to review. Board members discussed the proposed details for the windows, the transom, the signage, and the cornice. He stated that he was considering two options for the windows: Option 1 is for a glazed storefront window, and Option 2 is a pre-made picture window. Chairperson Zachman stated that the simpler, glazed window will provide increased glass area and would be the more appropriate choice for the window. Mr. Overmoyer stated that the existing door will remain, and the transom height will be increased. He presented sign detail, stating that it will have raised, applied lettering, with a matte finish. The material for the cornice is painted MDO plywood. Mr. Overmoyer also indicated that the intention is to paint the cornice siding material and the existing minor cornice trim the same color, the intent being not to paint the new cornice an independent color from any other building feature, thus creating an independent “sign” larger than Code permits.

Unrelated to the current application, Mr. Overmoyer stated that he is also considering switching the existing window and the door on the entrance on the south side of the building, to accommodate the interior remodeling, and was seeking preliminary design input from the board. Board members stated concerns with making this type of change to the building purely for interior functional reasons, without regard to the exterior architectural feature arrangement. The new door location would be situated behind an existing porch column. It was suggested that the new window and door configuration be compatible with the existing porch column configuration. The applicant did not have properly scaled sketches required to work out a design alteration proposal. Various alternatives were discussed, and the applicants will return to the Board with the final proposal.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The cornice is a permanent architectural feature added to 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 Huot, to approve the detailed plans for the transom window, cornice installation, glazing for the window, raised applied Breathe lettering with a matte finish, as submitted. Also subject to the transom window being jammed-out and stopped to match the configuration of the store-front glass windows, and the new cornice paint color to match the color of the existing minor cornice remaining.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 4, 2008.

6. Anthony & Erin Daniele, 31 Monroe Avenue ~ Addition

Present: Anthony & Erin Daniele

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/23/08.

Discussion: The applicants submitted a proposal for expansion of the second floor of their residence, located at 31 Monroe Avenue. In addition, the proposal includes rebuilding of the front steps and enhancement of the foundation. They stated that the most significant change to the front of the structure is the removal of the dormer and the raising of the roof on the second floor of the first addition to the east of the original structure. In an effort to replace the headroom lost by the removal of the dormer, the roof of that section will be raised approximately 30". Brickwork, roofing, flashing, and woodwork will match the existing on the house. Mr. Daniele stated that, after consultation with Bero Architecture, they have modified their original plans and are no longer proposing cultured stone for the foundation. He stated that they are proposing to use traditional brick and limestone for the steps. He also stated that the double windows in the dormer are the only windows being replaced. There will be two new windows in the addition; however the applicant will be revising the size and location of the windows to be compatible with the Federal Style architecture of the original house.

Board members reviewed the plans, and Chairperson Zachman stated that regarding the replacement of the steps, although the front entry was added to the building after original construction, the entry in its own right has historical significance and it is important to maintain design characteristics such as the thickness of the caps. Board members also suggested that a simulated divided light window, with a thin muntin profile, would be more appropriate than the divided light window proposed.

The applicants will revise their plans and return to the Board at a future meeting. The application will remain **open**.

Information Only:

Pittsford Farms Dairy, 44 North Main Street ~ Addition

Present: Ron Morgan, Charles Corby

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/25/08.

The applicants were appearing for information only at this time and not seeking final approval at this meeting.

Discussion: The applicants stated that Pittsford Farms Dairy is requesting approval to replace the current dairy with a new facility that will contain a new store, an ice cream parlor, an on-site bakery, and a new processing facility. They propose relocating an existing tenant house to the northeast side of the property in order to accommodate the new dairy; altering the circular driveway; extending the rear driveway and adding parking at the side of the new facility and rear of the property; removing low-value trees and adding traditional landscaping; and demolishing the existing building that contains the store and processing facility.

Mr. Corby explained that the existing dairy's facilities and equipment are obsolete and require replacement. Due to its small size and construction, the existing dairy building does not conform to current New York State Department of Agriculture and Market regulations. He further noted that although demolition of the Creamery building was conditionally approved by the APRB in 2007, the revised plan proposes moving the building 120 feet east from its current location. They stated that they are proposing installing fencing between the main house and the barn. The front sign will remain the same, and directional signage will be upgraded. The Dairy will have an asphalt shingle roof and board-and-batten siding, and 8-foot black metal halide lights will provide the lighting.

After review of the applicants presentation of ideas, Chairperson Zachman stated that the final plan should include all of these details outlined with specific specifications, drawings, and other supporting documentation. Also, if demolition is proposed for the existing creamery and Dairy store, the applicants are required to provide justification for the demolition, as well as a visual rendering of how the site will appear after demolition.

The application will remain **open**, and the applicants will return to the Board with the revised plans.

Member Items:

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the July 7, 2008 minutes, as amended.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Daniele – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on August 4, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 9:45.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary