

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Wednesday January 4, 2012 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Cristina Lanahan William McBride Maria Huot 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.

Esther Winter, 50 State Street ~ Sign

Present: Esther Winter

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 11/18/11.

Discussion: The applicant stated that she is proposing installing a sign on her business, which is located at 50 State Street in Northfield Common. She stated that the proposed sign will be made of wood with carved lettering. Chairperson Zachman noted that the application did not include the specifications for the proposed sign. The application will remain open, and the applicant will submit further details of the proposed sign.

Nadia Igumenshcheva, 20 S. Main Street ~ Sign

Present: Nadia Igumenshcheva

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 12/20/11.

Discussion: The applicant stated that she is proposing installing a sign on the building located at 20 South Main Street. She stated that the proposed sign will be made of high-density polyurethane foam, with painted background letters. She submitted documentation and photographs indicating the dimensions, material, and location for the proposed sign.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The proposed sign is similar to previous signs that were installed in this location.
- ◆ The sign will not cover or damage any significant architectural features of the building.
- ◆ The sign material is appropriate for the building and prevalent on other signs within the Village.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the installation of the proposed sign, as submitted.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot –yes; Daniele – yes. **Motion carried.**
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 4, 2012.

Michael & Kelly Puccia, 21 E. Jefferson Rd. ~ Replacement windows

Present: Michael & Kelly Puccia

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 12/14/11.

Discussion: The applicants stated that they are proposing replacing the existing windows on their house with vinyl replacement windows. The existing windows on the house are wood, double-hung windows. The applicants are proposing to replace the existing windows with vinyl windows. Chairperson Zachman stated that the installation of these windows will result in approximately ½-inch encroachment on the window glass. He noted that since this house was built in the 1960's, it is considered a post-war house, for which there is more flexibility in materials. He further stated that the material components of the window do not significantly alter the character of the house.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The house is a minimal traditional style home, which was built in the 1960's, and is surrounded by other similar style houses.
- ◆ There are existing, double-hung, multi-light, mass-produced, single-pane windows on the house.
- ◆ The windows are regular quality windows that do not possess special materials, or superior craftsmanship worthy of preserving.
- ◆ While the style and placement of the windows are significant contributing character-defining, architectural features of the house, the window units themselves are not.
- ◆ Replacement of the existing window sash with insert style replacement windows is considered an alteration based on the findings above. Substitute materials are allowed for alterations as long as the quality of the materials is equal to or better than the original component and the style is compatible with the original component or others in the neighborhood.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the installation of the windows, as submitted, with the condition that the grilles contain a narrow, contoured grid.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot –yes; Daniele – yes. **Motion carried.**
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 4, 2012.

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

Discussion: Chairperson Zachman reviewed the recent modifications to the current concept plan. He cited the specific code standards that the Board will act on per the requirements for a Special Use Permit:

§210-19.2B3c #2 – *The proposed development will be compatible, in terms of scale, massing, orientation, and architectural design, with the visual character of the Village and will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor be detrimental to the residents thereof.*

§210-19.2B3c #7 – *Proposed Buildings shall be unique and varied in design with a residential scale and architectural articulation that relates to the Village of Pittsford's building traditions. This means:*

(a) Varied roof heights, projecting bays, gables, recesses, and porches shall be used to visually divide larger buildings to produce a scale that is visually compatible with the Village's distinct aesthetic character

(b) Uniform building designs are to be avoided, and individual buildings with groups of buildings will be designed to create unique and distinct identities.

Board members then discussed which elements of the proposed project are compatible with the character of the Village, based on the code standards for granting a special use permit. Chairperson Zachman referenced the report of the Board's Preservation Consultant, Ted Bartlett, dated 4/27/11, as to whether the scale, massing, orientation, and architectural design of the project are compatible with the visual character of the Village. Mr. Bartlett determined that the scale, massing, and grouping concept of the buildings make strong reference to the existing historic character of the commercial buildings found along the canal, and appear to be of compatible design concept with the historic, canal-based commercial area within the Village.

Member Lanahan stated her opinion that although certain elements of the individual buildings appear to be compatible with the historic character of the Village, the mass of the project, as a whole, which is visible from certain areas of the village, is not compatible with the visual character of the Village. Member Huot questioned whether the reduction in height of some of the buildings affected the mass of the project, as it relates to the Village. Member McBride suggested reorienting some of the buildings on the site to create more greenspace. Chairperson Zachman stated that he is in agreement with the consultant that the canal commercial concept of the buildings is compatible with the historic character of the Village.

In discussions regarding the first motion, the majority of the board agreed that the architectural style of the buildings and their orientation to the lineal site were compatible with the Village; however, the mass and scale of the project in its entirety were not.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, stating that the proposed development is not compatible, in terms of scale, massing, orientation, and architectural design, with the visual character of the Village.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – no; Lanahan – yes; Huot –yes; Daniele – no. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 4, 2012.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, stating that the concept plan provides that varied roof heights, projecting bays, gables, recesses, and porches

shall be used to visually divide larger buildings to produce a scale that is visually compatible with the Village's distinct aesthetic character.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot –yes; Daniele – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 4, 2012.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, stating that the concept plan provides that uniform building designs are to be avoided, and individual buildings with groups of buildings will be designed to create unique and distinct identities.

Vote: McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot –yes; Daniele – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 4, 2012.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ **VISIBILITY** : There are about 20 thousand vehicles per day that will pass by this project on Monroe Ave. For much of the year, when there is no foliage, the public will have a clear view of most of the elevation and the horizontal breadth or mass of the property. This unobstructed view will be evident from the bottom of the hill going East to the bridge, and from the bridge as well as from the canal and across the canal. A top-down view of most of the site will be very visible from the grounds of Pittsford Sutherland High School, which is well attended by the public. The fact that the project is clearly visible to the public is very relevant to the issue because this is the gateway to the village and will become a defining element to the visual character of the village.