

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD**  
**Historic Preservation Board**  
**Monday November 9, 2020 at 6:00 pm**

**PRESENT:**

**Members:**     **William McBride**  
                  **Lisa Cove**  
                  **Ken Morrow**  
                  **Mark Harrington**  
                  **Virginia Searl**

**Village Attorney:**     **Jeff Turner**  
**Village Clerk:**        **Dorothea Ciccarelli**  
**Recording Secretary:** **Linda Habeeb**

Member McBride called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

The Clerk read the following statement:

“Pursuant to Governor Cuomo’s recent Executive Orders 202.1, and due to the Coronavirus pandemic, the Village Hall is closed to the public during official meetings. The members of the HPB and the applicants for this meeting will participate in the HPB meeting from their homes for this meeting. This HPB meeting will be made available to the public for viewing through videoconferencing link if they so choose, which is identified on the Village website.”

**Conflict of Interest Disclosure:** Board members had no conflicts to declare.

**Antonio Daiuto, 7 Schoen Place ~ Sign**  
**Present:** Antonio Daiuto, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/28/20.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a sign on his business located at 7 Schoen Place. The proposed sign is the same sign that was approved by the APRB in 1996 for his business at a different location in the Village. He submitted documentation with photographs, dimensions, and material for the proposed sign.

Member McBride commented that there should be some space between the sign and the roof. Member Searl suggested that the sign be raised so that the reveal of one clapboard is exposed. Member Searl also suggested that the applicant consider adding some indication of where the door of his business is located, as it currently is difficult to locate.

**Motion:** Member Searl made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to approve the application for installation of a sign at 7 Schoen Place, as submitted, with the condition that the sign be raised from the illustrated position to expose the width of one clapboard at the bottom.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on November 9, 2020.**

**Alysa Plummer, 66 South Main Street ~ Stone wall**

**Present:** Alysa Plummer, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 09/25/20.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that the proposal is for approval of an existing free-standing dry-stacked stone wall located in the front yard of her house. She stated that the stone wall is 18 inches in height and 20 inches in width, and the setback from the sidewalk is 2 feet, which is within Village Code requirements. She commented that the stone wall is compatible with her house, which was built in 1872.

**Motion:** Member Searl made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to approve the application for a dry-stacked stone wall at 66 South Main Street, as submitted.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on November 9, 2020.**

**Finding of Fact:** This stone wall does not negatively impact the resource, and the stone material is compatible with, and in keeping with, the stone on the house foundation.

**Chris & Gail Booth, 6 Elmbrook Drive ~ Windows**

**Present:** Chris & Gail Booth, homeowners

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 09/24/20.**

**Discussion:** This is a continuation of an application from the October HPB meeting. The applicant is proposing replacing 10 lower windows on the house located at 6 Elmbrook Drive. The upper windows on the house were replaced a few years ago, and they are proposing replacing the lower windows with wood windows. The existing windows are single-pane windows that are in disrepair. He further stated that the replacement windows are easier to operate and are more energy efficient.

At the October meeting, the Board suggested that the applicants investigate the possibility of repairing the windows, as board members expressed that there is no need to replace existing windows that are in a repairable condition. The board gave the applicants a list of experts in the field of window repair and restoration.

The applicants explained that one of the specialists said that from his perspective, if the rest of the windows have already been replaced, it makes sense to replace the remaining 10, so that they will all look the same. And he also pointed out that on the outside of the windows, there are aluminum storm windows, which could be removed. In his opinion, it makes sense to replace the 10 windows. The other experts either did not respond to their calls or were not interested in participating.

Member Searl thanked the applicants for pursuing this, and stated that in her opinion, at this point, considering the number of windows that have already been replaced and the applicants' desire to have a cohesive appearance, having a unified appearance is preferable to retaining the windows.

Member McBride asked the applicants if the replacement windows are the same windows that were previously replaced throughout the house. The applicants stated that they are the same all-wood windows in the same dimensions as the existing windows.

**Motion:** Member Searl made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for window replacement at 6 Elmbrook Drive, as submitted.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on November 9, 2020.

***Findings of Fact:***

- At the first review of this application, the applicants were asked to pursue options for repairing the existing windows. They were given three names by the village board for repair carpenters to come and look at the windows. One person never replied, one person said it was too far away, one person gave an opinion regarding the windows, and that opinion will be included with this application. The applicant diligently pursued repair options as requested by the board, without success. In order to provide a cohesive appearance on their home, these windows are being replaced with the same manufacturer and material, same size and configuration of the windows to be replaced. While replacement of existing historic building materials, such as windows, is generally not recommended, the house has been significantly modified from its original condition by the previous replacement of the majority of the windows in the house, and therefore, the application does not present a negative impact on the resource because it has been highly altered.

**Elizabeth Mohd Sani, 9 Green Hill Lane ~ Windows**

**Present:** Elizabeth Mohd Sani, Homeowner

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/28/20.

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing three double-hung wood kitchen windows with vinyl windows in the same style as the existing windows. She explained that the house is a post-war home built in 1968, and that the existing windows are in disrepair and are not energy efficient.

Member Cove asked the applicant if she had looked into repairing the existing windows or replacing them with wood windows. The applicant stated that she had not looked into that because of her interest in cost-effective, energy efficient windows to improve the draftiness in the kitchen.

Member McBride stated that it is a post-war home, and the Village Code says that those wood windows that are in need of repair could be replaced by vinyl windows if those windows are not discernable to be vinyl from the public way. That's the decision the Board has to wrestle with before we send someone to look at repairing them.

The applicant expressed some concern about the cost and energy efficiency of repairing the wood windows. Member Searl stated that as a general rule, it will always be less expensive to repair the window than to replace it, and it can also be done in such a way as to be energy efficient. She further explained that those windows have probably been in the house for 70 years, and in the field of preservation, vinyl replacement windows are going to last somewhere between 15 and 20 years, and it's very unlikely that you recoup the cost of the windows required to cause energy savings over the period of time.

Board members agreed to table this application for the homeowner to investigate other options.

~~~~~

**Chris Kazacos, 15 Locust Street ~ Windows**

**Present:** Chris & Trish Kazacos, homeowners

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/1/20.

**Discussion:** The applicant explained that he is proposing replacing two casement windows on the rear addition of the house. He stated that the windows are in disrepair and do not function very well. They are proposing replacing the windows with wood double-hung windows, and also replacing the brick molding that's around the back of those windows to match the molding that's on the windows on the side of the house.

Member McBride stated that the proposal is to replace the existing windows with wood double-hung windows similar to the rest of the windows on the front of the house. Member Searl commented that the existing windows are not repairable.

**Motion:** Member Cove made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve, as submitted, the application for window replacement at 15 Locust Street.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. **The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on November 9, 2020.**

**Findings of Fact:** The existing windows that are being replaced are modern windows of a style that does not match the other, historic original windows on the rest of the house. The windows are clearly irreparable. Replacing these windows does not create a negative impact on the resource.

**Active Transportation Plan: SEQR**

**Motion:** Member McBride made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to approve the Village Trustees and the Town of Pittsford Board to have co-lead agency status for the purpose of SEQR compliance for the Active Transportation Plan and the 2020 supplement.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on November 9, 2020.**

#### **Member Items: Minutes**

**Motion:** Member McBride made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to approve minutes from the October 14, 2020 HPB meeting, as drafted.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes.**

**Motion:** Member McBride made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 pm.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes.**