

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

**PRESENT:**

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

**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 McBride 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 Member Huot stated that she would recuse herself from the deliberations for 21 Church Street. The other Board members stated that they had no conflicts to disclose.

**Leslie Samarra, 6 South Main ~ Sign**

**Present:** Leslie Samarra, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/18/18.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing installing a new sign in the front of the business located at 6 South Main Street. The proposed sign is made of aluminum, with vinyl lettering and raised flat cut acrylic tree logo. The existing lighting will remain. She provided a photograph of the proposed sign and documentation with the dimensions of the sign.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The proposal is for installation of a new sign over the doorway of the business located at 6 South Main Street.
- The sign will completely fill in the existing space.
- The existing lighting will remain.
- The proposed sign is made of aluminum, with vinyl lettering and raised flat cut acrylic tree logo.
- The applicant submitted documentation with the dimensions and material for the sign.

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

**Vote:** Huot – yes; McBride – yes; Morrow – yes; Cove – yes; Latshaw – yes. **Motion carried. *The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on May 7, 2018.***

~~~~~

**Jason Crane, 7 Stonegate Lane ~ Roof overhang**

**Present:** Jason Crane, Contractor; Deborah Tedrick, Homeowner

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

**Discussion:** The proposal is for installation of a roof overhang to protect the steps to the main entrance of the house. The material will be pine or fir for the framing and standing seam steel for the roof.

Board members expressed concern with the style of the proposed overhang, stating that the shed roof style doesn't match the architectural style of the house. The style of the house is Colonial Revival for which a gable or pitched roof would be a more appropriate style. The applicants explained that a shed roof would not adequately cover the stairs and protect them from the elements. Mr. Crane stated that a pitched roof would detract from the view of the house from the street. It was also pointed out that installation of a gabled roof would result in a loss of some of the original molding, which would change the character of the front door. This is an important architectural feature of the house.

The application will remain open, and the applicants will research other options.

~~~~~

**Jason Crane, 27 Lincoln Avenue ~ Siding**

**Present:** Jason Crane, Contractor

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

**Discussion:** The proposal is for removal of aluminum siding from a rear addition and installation of wood clapboards to match the reveal of the existing house. The applicant stated that the wood clapboards will be primed and painted to match the existing house, and the corner boards and all trim will also match the existing house.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The proposal is to replace the existing aluminum siding on an addition in the rear of the house with wood clapboard siding.
- The new wood siding will match the reveal of the existing house.
- The siding will match the style, trim and details of the house.

**Motion:** Member McBride made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to approve the application for installation of replacement wood clapboard siding at 27 Lincoln Avenue, as submitted.

**Vote:** Huot – yes; McBride – yes; Morrow – yes; Cove – yes; Latshaw – yes. **Motion carried. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on May 7, 2018.**

~~~~~

**Tom Dakin, 38 Rand Place ~ Light Fixtures**

**Present:** Tom Dakin, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 4/18/18.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that the proposal is for (1) Replacement of an existing light fixture at the front entrance door facing west; (2) Installation of two new light fixtures, one on each side of the garage overhead door facing west; (3) Installation of two new light fixtures, one on each side of the French door

facing north. He submitted documentation with the specifications for the light fixtures and the locations for the installations.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The proposal is for installation of five lights.
- The light fixtures are Kichler Linford Olde Bronze Medium Base Outdoor Wall lights.
- All the lights are the same style, with the light on the front door being slightly larger.

**Motion:** Member McBride made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to approve the application for installation of five light fixtures.

**Vote:** Huot – yes; McBride – yes; Morrow – yes; Cove – yes; Latshaw – yes. **Motion carried. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on May 7, 2018.**

~~~~~

**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 proposal is for replacement of 12 windows on the second floor on the eastern elevation of the First Presbyterian Church, located at 21 Church Street. At the previous meeting, Mr. Huot explained that most of the windows are deteriorated with broken counter balance systems on some. Board members suggested that the applicants consider repairing the deteriorated windows or replacing the windows with wood windows.

The applicants contacted Jim Liebel to review the windows to determine if they can be restored. Mr. Liebel confirmed that it would not be cost effective to restore the existing windows. He presented a proposal to completely remove the existing windows and the existing aluminum storm windows and replace them with custom mahogany wood windows that replicate the existing windows. The frame and sash dimensions are the same as the existing windows. The glass is double pane and the mullions will match the existing mullions on the inside and will be removable for cleaning and painting. There are removable mullions on multiple windows in the church. The glass area will be the same as the originals. Replacement interior and exterior wood trim will be the same as the originals. The lower sash will be removable by removing the inside window stops to also facilitate cleaning and painting. Overall curb appearance is improved by the permanent removal of the aluminum storms, while preserving the original configuration and attributes of the windows.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The existing windows will be replaced with mahogany wood windows that closely match the existing windows.
- The frame and sash are the same dimensions as the existing windows.
- The windows do not have true divided lites.
- The storm windows will be removed.

**Motion:** Member McBride made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to approve the application for replacement windows, as submitted.

**Vote: Huot – yes; McBride – yes; Morrow – yes; Cove – yes; Latshaw – yes. Motion carried. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on May 7, 2018.**

~~~~~

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

**Present:** Andrew Van Roo, PLAN Architectural Studio; Mark Pandolf

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

**Discussion:** The applicants presented a revised proposal based on comments from the Board at the previous meeting. While board members generally agreed that the revised version was an improvement over the previous proposal, they expressed concern that in the current version, the new construction does not reflect the architectural style of the existing building. The applicants stated that their understanding from the last meeting was that the Board suggested that they revise the style of the new construction to be more in line with the architectural style of the Depot building. They also stated that they changed the fieldstone columns from full height to four-foot-high knee walls. They also changed the earlier proposed unshielded lights to shielded sconces. The existing structure is attached to the building, but the new porte cochere is detached from the building.

Member Latshaw stated his opinion that based on the information provided by the Board to the applicants at the previous meeting, they have revised the plan as was requested. He also pointed out that the existing structure is a post-World War II era building, and tying in the porte cochere structure with the existing overall plan of the Del Monte property is appropriate. Member Cove stated her concern about the fact that there is no other stone on the existing building. Member Huot pointed out that the reference in the current plans is to the Depot building, but there is no connection to the existing 1995 building.

The applicants explained that the plans were revised based on the Board's comments at the previous meeting, suggesting that the new construction reflect elements of the Depot building. They were of the opinion that the previous design submitted to the Board reflected elements of the existing building. Member Huot stated that it was not the intention for the design to completely ignore the existing building. The geometry, proportion, mass, and scale reflect the existing building. The applicants expressed that it is difficult to integrate the thin Victorian architecture of the Depot building with the heavy architecture of the existing building.

Board members questioned whether the proposal would be considered a demolition of the existing carport. Mr. Turner explained that if it is a proposal for demolition, the first question is whether or not preservation of the structure is warranted under the Village Code. If the existing structure is visible from the public way and is not deteriorated, then removal of it would be considered demolition. The applicants pointed out that the carport structure was not original to the building, but was added as a later addition, and therefore, was not worthy of preservation.

Board members will further review the history of the renovations to the existing building and add this application to the June 4<sup>th</sup> agenda.

~~~~~

**Minutes:**

**Motion:** Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to approve the April 4, 2018 minutes, as drafted.

**Vote:** Huot – yes; McBride – abstain; Morrow – yes; Cove – yes; Latshaw – yes. **Motion carried.**

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

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary