

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Tuesday May 24, 2011 at 5:00 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Cristina Lanahan William McBride Erin Daniele Maria Huot
Preservation Consultant:	Ted Bartlett
Village Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Zachman called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

Westport Crossing Development, 75 Monroe Avenue, Application for Special Permits for Multiple Dwelling Buildings and Restaurant

Present: Mark IV: Anthony and Chris DiMarzo, Donald Riley, Vice President Marketing & Development; Roger Brown, Architect; Richard LaCroix, Barkstrom & LaCroix; Bryan Powers, Engineer

Discussion: Chairperson Zachman stated that the purpose of the meeting is for Board members to review the revised conceptual plans for the development at 75 Monroe Avenue to determine whether it is compatible with the Village.

Mr. DiMarzo began the presentation by reviewing the modifications that have been made to the original plan and the current status of the project. Mr. Brown stated that the current version of the plan is a change in the approach to the design and architecture of the proposed buildings for Westport Crossing, based on the fact that the Village of Pittsford is built on the Erie Canal and part of its character is embodied in that reality. He stated that the visual character of the Village is embodied in 3 character types:

1. Traditional "Main Street" commercial;
2. Traditional single-family residential neighborhoods; and
3. Erie Canal industrial/warehouse.

He further stated that for this site, they have designed a building type to be compatible with its environment and meet the requirements of the R-5 zoning as follows:

1. The historic Erie Canal industrial/warehouse building type is the model;
2. Canal edge neighborhood reflecting diversity, adjacent to and paralleling the canal;
3. Reflecting historic buildings along the Erie Canal as built in other canal Villages;
4. A building type of traditional and interesting forms, regular window patterns, details, materials, variety, etc.

The proposed revisions to the plan have made the “Canal Side/Soft Industrial type of styling appropriate for this site because:

1. The industrial/warehouse building type is native to the Erie Canal edge in general.
2. These buildings were often large, 3, 4, 5 stories.
3. They often were found adjacent to the traditional village “Main Street” neighborhoods.
4. Buildings were varied in form, scale, and materials.
5. This building type has often been rehabbed to residential and mixed use.
6. Schoen Place contains 3-story buildings and buildings with interesting variety.
7. This particular building type offers these advantages: a variety of building materials that look historically natural; variety, flexibility, and interesting forms; easy to adapt to plan and site condition variety; variety of window sizes, configurations, spacing, etc.; simple in layout with more straight walls; opportunity for bays, cantilevers, porches, roof configurations, towers, dormers, color, and painted graphic lettering.

He stated that in addition to the architectural modifications, the site plan has also been significantly modified to further improve the overall flow of the streets and the connection to pedestrian accesses. Some of the site plan modifications are:

1. Elimination of the large residential building closest to the canal and bridge.
2. Coordination of different footprints for each building to correspond with the new architectural building styles.
3. Creation of a two-way village-style street along the canal. This road would have a residential scale streetscape similar to many residential streets in the village, with two lanes, parallel parking, tree lawn, sidewalks, front lawn, and residences.
4. Easing of the curvature of the new two-way street along the canal to make it more linear. This street would have many pedestrian walking connections and tie into the public realm and dockage.
5. The residential buildings have been completely separated, creating small open spaces between buildings with no bridges or connections above ground.
6. The restaurant building has been reshaped, and the pool has been moved to allow space for the road and to make it fit better with the canal shape.
7. The heights of the residential buildings are a mix of 2, 3, and 4-story, with varying roof layouts. Many of the building elevations have been turned from parallel to perpendicular to the canal, adding even more variation. The tallest building has been located at the far end of the site.
8. The width of the residential buildings has been reduced, thereby creating more green space and room for the roadways.

Mr. Bartlett, the Preservation Consultant, presented a letter with comments and observations regarding compatibility of the revised project proposal as it pertains to the Village’s R-5 Residential District Zoning. The letter states that the applicant has made significant character-changing revisions to the previous proposal submissions. Most importantly, the change in overall project character through the use of Canal Commercial designs that draw from existing and historic canal-side commercial examples has brought a new re-invigorated character to the project. He stated that after review of the schematic site plans, building footprints, building elevations, and details provided by the applicant, it is his opinion that the Canal Commercial design concept as a design approach for this site,

and the schematic site plans and building drawings, as shown, are compatible with the historic character of the Village of Pittsford, as stated in the R-5 Residential District legislation. However, the site plans and building drawings proposed and observed for this review are of schematic nature, and while they set the tone for the project design, the particulars and specifics of the details are yet to be worked out. When the details are developed, they will need scrutiny to see that they have followed the compatible design conceptual intent and R-5 guidelines.

Member McBride stated that while the architectural style of the proposed buildings has been improved, the massing of the buildings has not been addressed. He stated that the cluster of large buildings creates massing issues, and suggested that the applicants investigate ways to minimize the bulk. Member Lanahan questioned whether some of the large, four-story buildings could be reduced in size. Chairperson Zachman stated his opinion that the historic canal commercial appearance of the buildings is compatible with the Village and similar to other buildings in and around the canal throughout western New York. He further stated that the size of the buildings creates drama and is consistent with the canal commercial architectural style. Member Daniele stated that she concurs with the consultant that the current proposal is compatible with the Village character.

Mr. DiMarzo stated that with these changes, he believes that they have met the intent of the criteria that the APRB was asked to review, and he asked that the Board positively recommend the current design to the Planning Board to continue the approval process.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 7:15 pm.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary

APRB 5/24/11
Special Meeting