

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – October 9, 2008 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

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

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

1. Michelle Pritchard (Evolution Pilates), 50 State Street ~ Sign

Present: Michelle Pritchard

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/10/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of a sign to hang over the door of her business, located at 50 State Street. She stated that the sign will be made of MDO board and will be painted. She submitted documentation indicating the dimensions, colors, 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 in the same location as the previous sign.
- The sign will not cover 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 October 9, 2008.

2. Joseph Wilt (Presto Video), 32½ South Main Street ~ Sign

Present: Joseph Wilt

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/30/08.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing installation of a sign for his new business, located at 32½ South Main Street. He stated that the sign will be made of high-density urethane, and will hang from the eave, out from the wall. He submitted documentation with the dimensions and proposed location for the sign.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The proposed sign will hang from the soffit over the door.
- The sign will not cover any significant architectural features of the building.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 9, 2008.

3. Jim & Allison Huffman, 5 Elmbrook Drive ~ Fence
Present: Jim Huffman

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/30/08.

Discussion: The applicants are proposing installation of a white picket fence on their property, located at 5 Elmbrook Drive. The fence will have two gates, and will match an existing fence on the property. They submitted documentation showing the location for installation of the fence and the dimensions of the fence and gate.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The house is a 1950's house.
- The yard has existing fencing on two sides.
- The pickets will be Gothic-style pickets measuring 4 inches in width.
- There will be 4 inches of space between the pickets.
- There will be 2 gates that will match the fence.
- The posts will be cut off at the top.
- The fence is minimally visible from the public way.

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 October 9, 2008.

4. Mike Newcomb, 32 South Main Street, Window
Present: Mike Newcomb, owner and Terry Cahill, Simply Décor

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/30/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is proposing replacing the existing storefront window at 32 South Main Street with a picture window of the same size. He stated that the existing window does not allow a view of the inside of the retail store and merchandise from the street. Chairperson Zachman stated that it is appropriate for a window of a retail establishment to have a transparent appearance in order for easier viewing of the inside of the store. He also noted that the exterior of the building has been radically altered from its original state.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The exterior of the building is clad in aluminum.
- The window being replaced is a bow bay window representing a storefront.
- A window with no divided lights is more suitable for retail storefront display.
- The proposed window is a wood-framed, aluminum-clad window in the same size as the existing window.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to approve the application for installation of the replacement window, with the casing and trim to match the existing window, and with the condition that if the bay head trim above the window is removed, the existing trim will be replaced.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 9, 2008.

5. Robert Brown, 69 North Main Street, Window

Present: Robert Brown

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/6/08.

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is proposing replacing the existing metal casement-style windows on his house with Eagle casement windows. He stated that the existing windows are original windows. He further stated that the existing windows are not functional, due to rust and hinge problems, and that repairing the windows would not be practical.

Findings of Fact:

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

- The house is a Tudor- style house, built in 1927.
- An important characteristic of a Tudor-style house is casement-style windows with divided lights and small panes.
- The homeowner stated that the windows are not functional, due to rust and hinge problems.
- Repair of the windows would not be practical, and would, in fact, be practically impossible.
- The applicant is proposing changing out the entire window unit.
- The proposed window is a wood-framed, black, aluminum-clad window, to match the existing metal windows on the house.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of replacement windows, all exterior casing and trim to match the existing windows on the house, and the muntins to match the existing windows in thickness and configuration.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 9, 2008.

6. George and Kathy Vanderzwaag, 31 Locust Street

Present: Kathy Vanderzwaag,

Discussion: At the September APRB meeting, the applicant received approval for construction of a covered porch. As a condition of the approval, the applicant was required to submit railing and door details for the record. Ms. Vanderzwaag submitted final plans and details for the Board's review.

Information Only:

- Caroline Trojian, 31 W. Jefferson Road ~ Renovation of barn

Discussion: The applicant submitted proposed plans for renovation of a barn at 31 West Jefferson Road. She stated that the barn was built in the 1930's and was not original to the house. She stated that the barn was in disrepair, and was inquiring on the prospect for demolishing the existing barn and rebuilding a new barn and creating a two-car garage with a loft over the garage.

Chairperson Zachman stated that the barn is an historic barn, and there is a very high standard for demolition of the structure. He explained that the applicants would be required to demonstrate that the barn is not salvageable or repairable. The Board cannot set the precedent of approving the demolition of an historic barn in the Village that is repairable. He informed the applicant that she would be required to submit a professional evaluation documenting that the barn cannot be repaired, in support of the case for demolition. It was also suggested that if the applicant explores that route, the Village may seek an independent outside analysis of the condition of the barn.

Another concern for the applicant was the existing orientation of the barn. In their view, a 90-degree rotation of the setting of a new barn constructed to replace the old barn would increase the functionality of the property. Chairperson Zachman suggested that there is most likely not any historical significance to the orientation of the existing barn, and that perhaps in the process of restoring the existing barn, it could be rotated to the desired orientation.

Board members informed the applicant that they have the opportunity, through Historic Pittsford, at no cost, to have the barn evaluated by Bero Architecture and study the possibilities for restoration and prepare a report regarding the historic significance of the barn. Member Huot suggested that the applicant investigate possible financial incentives in the form of government grants for rehabilitation of historic barns.

Member Items:

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the September 8, 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 October 9, 2008.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 9:00.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary