

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – September 8, 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. Peter LePore, 25 State Street ~ Sign

Present: Peter LePore

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 5/19/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of a building-mounted sign for his business, which has recently moved to 25 State Street. He stated that the proposed sign is a hand-painted, wood sign. He submitted photographs of the sign and documentation indicating the dimensions and location for the sign.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The proposed sign will be installed on the front of the building.
- The sign will be constructed of wood and hand-painted.
- The sign will not affect any significant architectural features of the building.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the sign, 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 September 8, 2008.

2. Marcos Vera, 20 S. Main Street ~ Sign

Present: Marcos Vera

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/27/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of a wood sign for his new business, located at 20 South Main Street. He stated that the sign will be centered above the window in the current location of the frame shop sign, which will be moved to another location on the building.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The proposed sign will be mounted over the front window.
- The frame shop will move their sign to another complimentary location on the building.
- The proposed sign will not damage or obstruct any architectural features of the building.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to approve the application for installation of a sign, 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 September 8, 2008.

3. Craig Iannazzi, 1 North Main Street ~ Sign
Present: Craig & Christie Iannazzi

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/28/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of two building-mounted signs at 1 North Main Street. He stated that the proposed signs will be installed in the same locations as the previous signs. Chairperson Zachman noted that the signs have slightly smaller dimensions than the previous signs, and will therefore be a better fit in those locations.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The proposed signs will be made of plywood and will be painted, with stenciled lettering.
- The signs will be slightly smaller than the previous signs.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application, 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 September 8, 2008.

4. Breathe Yoga, 19 South Main Street, Door
Present: Fran Overmoyer
Cyndi Weis, Owner of Breathe Yoga

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 6/24/08.

Discussion: This is a continuation of an open application for switching the existing window and the door on the entrance of the south side of the building, to accommodate interior remodeling. At a previous meeting, Board members had stated concerns with making this type of change to the building purely for interior functional reasons, without regard to the exterior architectural feature arrangement. Mr. Overmoyer presented detailed plans, indicating that the center window will be eliminated, and the door will be on center of the bay. The door entryway will be nearly centered

between two columns. He stated that the window will be a square-framed aluminum fixed window, and the door will be a glass door with a center opening.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The applicant is proposing rearrangement of the window and door locations to eliminate having a window located behind a post.
- The door entryway will be nearly centered between two columns.
- The building is not an original storefront façade.
- The proposed changes will not alter any historically significant building attributes
- The proposed design is architecturally balanced and functional.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Daniele, to approve the design, as submitted, subject to the following:

1. The window and door casing trim will be clad in aluminum to match the existing windows and doors and maintain the pattern of material repetition on the building, and match the divided light configuration and muntin dimensions.
2. The siding will be repaired as much as possible to match the existing white vinyl.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 8, 2008.

5. William Creary, 18 North Main Street ~ Stairs and landing

Present: William Creary

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 6/18/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that the existing stairs are in a deteriorated condition, and he is proposing replacing the steps and landing on the south side of the building, and changing the entrance to face the rear of the property. The applicant presented a drawing indicating the dimensions of the proposed stairs and landing, including the posts, railing, and spindles. It was determined that the decking will not be visible from the public way.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The applicant revised the application to propose eliminating one stair tread.
- The railings, skirting, stair treads, and material on the landing will match the existing material.
- The decking is a composite material, but is not visible from the public way.
- The proposed stairs, railing, and landing will be painted to match the house.
- The existing stairs are not original to the house

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application, as amended.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 8, 2008.

6. John Salisbury, 56 North Main Street ~ Door

Present: Chuck Smith, Design Works Architecture

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/27/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the door and sidelights on the building with a painted wood and glass door with sidelights and a new transom. He stated that the awning will be removed. The proposed material for the door is Douglas Fir wood.

Findings of Fact:

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

- This building was built in the 1970's and is not an historic building.
- The door is not an architecturally significant feature of the building.
- The proposed door is a high-quality wood door with transom lights above to match the height of the other door on the building.
- The existing door to be replaced does not currently match the other entry door on the opposite side of the building, nor will the new door; however, the proposed new door is an appropriate style for the building and will improve the appearance of the entryway.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to approve the application for a replacement 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 September 8, 2008.

7. Steve Newcomb & Heather Erwin, 18 Green Hill Lane ~ Fence

Present: Steve Newcomb & Heather Erwin

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/26/08.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing installing a pressure-treated board-on-board fence on the south side of the property. They stated that the proposed fence will match the existing fence on the property and will join with the neighbor's fence on the north side. They submitted documentation indicating the material, dimensions, and location of the proposed fence.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The applicants are proposing installation of a fence on the south side of the property to fill in a space left from removal of plant material.
- The proposed fence is a 6' pressure-treated, board-on-board fence.
- The fence will have a 4' extension joining with the neighbor's fence on the north side.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Daniele, to approve the application for a fence, 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 September 8, 2008.

8. Michael & Brett Byrne, 6 Courtenay Circle ~ Fence

Present: Michael Byrne

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/26/08.

Discussion: The applicants stated that they have installed a pressure-treated wood fence in the front of their property, and a black chain-link fence in the rear. Chairperson Zachman pointed out that the Board will consider this application as if the fence had not already been installed.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The fence has already been installed.
- The fence conforms to all Village Code requirements.
- The black chain –link fence is not visible from the street

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application, 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 September 8, 2008.

9. Tom Cummings, 99 South Main Street ~ Fence

Present: Tom Cummings

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/25/08.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing replacing the existing stockade fence in the rear of their property with a board-on-board, 6-foot high fence. They submitted documentation indicating the dimensions, material, and location of the fence.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application, 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 September 8, 2008.

10. Kelby Ash, 58 Rand Place ~ Fence

Present: Kelby Ash

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/27/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installing a wood picket fence in the front and sides of the property. He stated that the fence will measure 3 feet in height, and will have one gate across the sidewalk. He submitted documentation showing the proposed location and dimensions of the fence.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Daniele, to approve the application for installation of a fence, 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 September 8, 2008.

11. Michele Dinan, 11 Elm Street ~ Fence

Present: Michele Dinan

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/26/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of a wood picket fence for the purpose of pet containment. The fence will have a double gate constructed of the same material, which will be located across the driveway. She submitted documentation and drawings indicating the location of the fence and the proposed style of gate.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a fence, 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 September 8, 2008.

12. Warren Olson, 12 Locust Street ~ Porch

Present: Richard Osgood, Bero Architecture

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/28/08.

Discussion: The applicants presented a proposal for removal of the existing front patio/stoop and replacement with new stairs and landing. They stated that the stairs and landing will be made of wood, and the railing will be a traditional wrought-iron railing. There will be a framed lattice on the side skirting. They are also proposing to repair and re-point the stone foundation where necessary.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The existing stone patio is not original to the house, and is not a significant architectural feature of the house.
- The decking and stair treads will be made of cedar.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application, 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 September 8, 2008.

13. Pittsford Farms Dairy, 44 North Main Street

Present: Ron Morgan, Charles Corby, Charlie Corby

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/26/08.

Discussion: The applicants presented a proposal for replacement of the existing dairy at 44 North Main Street with a new facility that will contain a new store and processing plant. Also proposed is the demolition of the existing building that contains the store and processing facility, and addition of low-intensity shielded lighting.

The applicants submitted documentation with a summary of the materials for the windows, doors, roof, siding, trim, and other details of the proposed new facility. The applicants noted modifications to the previously submitted plans: the cross gable will project out towards the driveway, the rooflines will be lowered two feet, and windows were added to the north elevation. The applicants are proposing a 4 ft. board fence, with decorative posts. Board members stated that the proposed style of post was too decorative for a simple, rustic fence.

Also discussed was the demolition of the existing Dairy building. The applicants submitted documentation explaining the justification for demolition of the dairy. They stated that the existing dairy's facilities and equipment are obsolete and require replacement, and that due to the Dairy's small size and construction, the dairy building does not conform to current New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets regulations.

Board members discussed the fact that the dairy building has been changed extensively over the years, and that as a result, no significant historical architectural features remain. Therefore, preservation of the structure is not warranted under general standards, as set forth in Village Code § 210-61.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The existing Dairy plant has been changed extensively with first floor block building additions around three sides of the building that have removed historically significant features.
- The entire farm property has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places as a prime example of a working farm and its collection of outbuildings. The existing dairy building was modified and expanded over the years, and this brought commercial activity in close proximity to the architecturally important residential farmhouse. Relocating the Dairy production and retail activity to a different location further away from the house on the property will protect the residential character of the home. Creating a new stylistically compatible building for the Dairy operations to replace the existing structure to be removed will maintain the collection of outbuildings associated with the working farm portion of the property.
- The new Dairy will be built in a different location, since there is no commercial need to have a functional structure close to the house.
- The demolition of the existing building will open the viewshed to the barn area beyond the circular driveway, and will create a natural buffer between the house and the working part of the farm, preserving the residential character of the house.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Daniele, to approve the application for construction of a new dairy facility, 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 September 8, 2008.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for demolition of the dairy building, in the context of the development of the property.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 8, 2008.

14. George and Kathy Vanderzwaag, 31 Locust Street ~ Porch

Present: Dan Pope, Architect

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/27/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing construction of a covered porch along the west side of the existing 2½-story stucco house and an entry deck and stair along the south side of the house, as shown on the submitted drawings. The proposed covered porch will have a hip style framed roof structure with tapered square columns with natural finish fir flooring. He stated that the columns will be made of fiberglass and painted, the railings will be cedar, and the shingles will match the existing shingles on the house. The skirt material on the deck will be solid board framed with lattice. Board members reviewed the drawings, and suggested the modification that the right edge of the porch column, floor, and eave overhang be pulled in so that the overhang does not exceed the corner of the house. The applicant stated that he will submit railing and door details. It was noted that approval given by the APRB will be subject to the Zoning Board's approval of the setbacks.

Findings of fact:

- The house was built in 1830.
- The house is a stone house that was covered in stucco in the 1950's.
- The house is a hybrid of styles; no original architectural details remain.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to approve the application, as submitted, subject to the following conditions:

1. The right edge of the porch column, floor, and eave overhang on the west elevation will be pulled in so that the overhang does not exceed the corner of the house.
2. The floor of the porch will be 1 x 4 fir tongue-and-groove; the side stoop will be 5/4 x 6 wood.
3. The ceiling will be fir ceiling bead; the porch header and soffit trim will be pre-primed painted cedar.
4. The skirt material on the porch and deck will be a solid vertical 5/4 board framed with 1x4 & 1x6 to create a recessed panel appearance.
5. The applicant will submit railing and door details for approval at a later meeting date.
6. This approval is subject to the approval of the Zoning Board for the setbacks.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 8, 2008.

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

Present: Anthony & Erin Daniele

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

Discussion: This is an open application for a proposal for expansion of the second floor of the residence, located at 31 Monroe Avenue. In addition, the proposal includes rebuilding of the front steps, removal of the dormer, and raising of the roof on the second floor of the first addition to the east of the original structure.

Mr. Daniele presented revised plans, which incorporate recommendations made by the Board at the previous meeting. He stated that on the front elevation, they are proposing double-hung wood windows with narrow metal external muntins. The two front windows on the second floor will be located over the original windows on the first floor, as is appropriate with the Federal style of architecture. Chairperson Zachman requested that the applicants submit a manufacturer's cut sheet for the windows. Mr. Daniele also stated that they are proposing using limestone caps for the steps, and that they are not changing the foundation. He noted that they will rebuild the side knee walls in brick. The brickwork, roofing, flashing, and woodwork will match the existing on the house. He also noted that on the west elevation, they are proposing installation of a casement window resembling a double-hung window, because of Fire Code regulations for the bedroom egress window.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the modifications to the application, as presented and submitted.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 8, 2008.

Member Items:

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the August 4, 2008 minutes, as amended.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on September 8, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 10:15.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary