

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD**  
**Architectural and Preservation Review Board**  
**Monday April 2, 2018 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

**Members:**           **Maria Huot**  
                          **Lisa Cove**  
                          **Scott Latshaw**  
                          **Ken Morrow**  
                          **William McBride (absent)**

**Alternate:**       **Ron Johnson**

**Village Attorney:** **Jeff Turner**

**Building Insp.:**   **Kelly Cline**

**Recording Sec.:**   **Linda Habeeb**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm.

**Conflict of Interest Disclosure**

Member Latshaw stated that he will be Acting Chairperson for this meeting. He asked if any of the Board members had a conflict of interest with any of the applications before the Board, and board members stated that they had no conflicts to disclose.

**Catlin Miller, 7 Schoen Place ~ Sign**

**Present:** Catlin Miller, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/26/18.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing adding a sign to an existing sign on the business located at 7 Schoen Place. She stated that the sign will remain in the same location and will be the same size as the existing sign. She provided a photograph of the proposed sign and documentation with the dimensions and material for the sign.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The proposal is for attaching a sign to an existing sign on the business.
- The sign will be in the same location and will be the same size as the existing sign.
- The applicant submitted documentation with the dimensions and material for the sign.

**Motion:** Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to approve the application for installation of a sign, as submitted.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Huot – yes; Latshaw – yes; Morrow – yes; Johnson - yes. **Motion carried. *The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on April 2, 2018.***

~~~~~

**Casey Dunlavey, 10 Schoen Place ~ Window**

**Present:** Casey Dunlavey, Business owner; Paul Zachman, Boardwalk Design

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 3/14/18.**

**Discussion:** The proposal is for installation of a sliding window on the south elevation of the business located at 10 Schoen Place. Board members explained to the applicants that since there has been a change to their Special Use Permit, they will need to present their proposal to the Board of Trustees prior to seeking APRB approval. It was also pointed out that there are outstanding violations on the property that will need to be addressed.

Member Latshaw explained that since there are some unresolved issues with this application, the Board will hear their presentation, but will not offer feedback on the application at this time. The applicants questioned why they were not required to go before the Board of Trustees when they were granted APRB approval for another sliding window in 2013. The applicants pointed out that a large porch was approved at Aladdin's, and they were not required to go before the Board of Trustees for approval first. They asked why this situation was being treated differently.

Ms. Cline explained that she recommended that the applicants come before the APRB because the proposal is for an architectural change to the building. Mr. Turner explained to the applicants that since there has been a change to their Special Use Permit, they will need to present their proposal to the Board of Trustees prior to seeking APRB approval. He also said that this Board cannot act until all the requirements of the Zoning Code have been met. The applicants will work with the Building Inspector to remedy the outstanding violations.

Mayor Corby explained that this is a unique situation, in that the land immediately outside the building is New York Thruway Authority land which is leased by the Village. He also stated that since 1994, the Village has had a specific lease for that land, with certain conditions that the Village is legally bound to New York State to abide by. Technically, the previously approved window should have also come before the Trustees prior to the APRB's approval, because special permits for a "use" require the trustees in approving that use to evaluate what the environmental effects are. In the previous special permit approval, there was an understanding that there would be no external changes to the outside of the building.

Mr. Dunlavey asked if the Board would consider granting conditional approval, contingent on the applicants going before the Board of Trustees for the Special Permit. Mr. Turner stated that it would not be appropriate for one Board to conditionally approve prior to the decision of another Board. Board members stated that they would be willing to schedule a special meeting to expedite the process after the applicants meet with the Board of Trustees.

~~~~~

### **Robert Huot, 21 Church Street ~ Windows**

**Present:** Robert Huot, Church member

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 3/13/18.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that they are proposing replacing 12 windows on the second floor of the church on the eastern elevation of the First Presbyterian Church, located at 21 Church Street. Mr. Huot explained that most of the windows are difficult to open, with broken counter balance on some of the windows. The sashes have wood deterioration in parts of the windows that are difficult to paint. They are proposing replacing the wood windows with aluminum-clad windows. The applicants pointed out that the location of the windows is on a wing of the church that was built in 1953.

Member Huot questioned whether the applicants have considered repairing the windows. The applicants cited difficulty in maintaining wood windows. Board members also suggested that the applicants consider

replacing the windows with wood windows. Member Latshaw stated that windows are a character-defining feature of the building which should be replaced in kind, and this application proposes a change in material. Member Morrow stated that repair of the windows can be done economically.

The application will remain open, and the applicants will research repairing the existing windows.

~~~~~

**Del Monte Lodge, 41 North Main Street ~ Porte Cochere; Lights**

**Present:** Andrew Van Roo, PLAN Architectural Studio

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 3/20/18.**

**Discussion:** The applicants stated that the proposal is to replace the existing carport with a gabled Porte Cochere. New construction will consist of stone piers to match existing piers along the canal with simple pre-cast concrete pier caps. The rear entrance canopy will be replaced with new dimensional wood-framed gabled canopy. The design of the new construction was based on utilitarian, traditional canal architecture. There will be new decorative lighting to replace existing lights.

Member Huot questioned the reference to “canal architecture” and pointed out that the architectural style of the proposed construction is completely different from the style of the existing building. Member Cove stated that the proposed structure is similar to an “Adirondack” style of architecture. She further stated that the new construction does not flow or blend with the architecture of the existing building; the proposed structure introduces a new architectural style to the building. The new construction should reflect the architectural style of the existing building. Board members questioned the use of the round stones. The applicants pointed out that the Board had previously approved that type of stone, but Member Huot stated that the previously approved stones were not attached to the building in this manner. She further stated that the Del Monte building has a very unique architectural style, and the proposed construction is not appropriate for this style of building.

Ms. Cline stated that the applicants are amending the application to include light fixtures. The applicants will not need Planning Board approval because the lights they are proposing are of less intensity than the lighting that was previously approved by the Planning Board. She further stated that the applicants have revised their plans for the decorative light fixtures to propose dark-sky compliant light fixtures that provide shielding around the bulb. Member Latshaw stated that board members will need to review the proposed light fixtures prior to approving them.

Board members reviewed the details of the dark-sky compliant lights proposed for the rear parking lot.

**Motion:** Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to amend the application to include five parking lot pole light fixtures, and to approve these lights, as submitted.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Huot – yes; Latshaw – yes; Morrow – abstain; Johnson - yes. **Motion carried. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on April 2, 2018.**

The application will remain open, and the applicants will revise the proposal based on members’ comments and be placed on the next APRB meeting.

~~~~~

**Jacqueline Olivencia, 85 South Main Street**

**Present:** Jacqueline Olivencia, Mark Tichenor, Homeowners

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 1/29/18.**

**Discussion:** The Building Inspector issued a violation notice for this property because windows were replaced and a skylight was installed without APRB approval. The applicants stated that the previous owner replaced three wood windows with vinyl windows. The other windows in the house are wood windows. Mr. Turner explained that architectural features run with the house, so that it is the current owners' responsibility to remedy the situation.

The skylight that was installed is visible from the public way. The applicants pointed out that there are a number of residences in the Village with skylights, and provided addresses and photographs of some of these skylights. Ms. Cline stated that she also found many skylights in the Village. She explained that the previous Building Inspector allowed the installation of skylights that were not visible from the public way. Member Huot stated that the skylights that are in the Village houses have not been approved by the APRB.

Board members discussed whether the skylight is architecturally appropriate for this period of home. Mr. Turner stated that the question that Board members should ask is whether, if the skylight had not been installed, they would approve the proposal to install it.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The house is an 1800's house located on South Main Street
- The application is revised to include only the installed skylight.

**Motion:** Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to deny the application for installation of a skylight at 85 South Main Street.

**Vote:** Cove - yes; Huot - yes; Latshaw - yes; Morrow - yes; Johnson - no. **Motion carried. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on April 2, 2018.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary