

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/24/16.**

**Discussion:** The applicants are proposing modifying an application that was previously approved by the APRB. They are proposing a different style of garage door than was approved. The material for the door is wood overlay, with plain glass windows. They are also proposing a different cultured limestone that has more texture than the originally approved stone. Board members stated that they had no concerns with these modifications.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The applicants are proposing modifying the application to change the style of garage door and the type of cultured limestone.
- The proposed door is a wood garage door in a similar style as the approved door.
- The applicants submitted documentation with the specifications for the proposed garage door and exterior stone.

Motion: Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the modifications to the application, as submitted.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Latshaw – yes. Motion carried. *This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2017.***

~~~~~

**Jon Schick, 44 Sutherland Street ~ New construction**

**Present: Jon Schick, Architect; David Mattia, Homeowner**

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 2/19/16.**

**Discussion:** This is an application for construction of a two-story house with a three-car attached garage. Chairperson Huot explained to the applicants that before their presentation, the Board will discuss the decision-making process relating to this application. She explained that the board has reviewed the documents submitted by the applicant regarding other Districts' regulations and his experiences with other municipal boards and explained that the APRB's decisions are based on the Village of Pittsford Guidelines for Historic Preservation and the Village's preservation code.

Ms. Huot explained that the Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board is a very traditional board in terms of preservation. The house at 44 Sutherland Street was built in 1949 and is considered a contributing building of the Village of Pittsford because it is part of the historic district. The original house was designed by a noted Rochester architectural firm and embodies the distinctive characteristics of a mid-century Tudor Revival style, which is representative of the construction and style of mid-century architecture in Rochester. She stated that in reviewing the Preservation Standards from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), new construction should follow the character of the neighborhood and the neighboring district. Sutherland Street is a very unique street in the Village of Pittsford. There is a great deal of stone, brick, and wood. The new construction should draw elements from the neighboring structures to respect the character of the neighborhood. The decision-making process will involve reference to the mid-century Tudor revival style of architecture. She stated that the current plan for the house includes an eclectic mixture of styles.

Mr. Schick questioned Chairperson Huot as to her characterization of the house as a Tudor, and expressed his opinion that the house is a Cape. Member Lanahan pointed out that a house can be both a Cape and a

Neo-Tudor. Chairperson Huot explained that generally, the first floor of a mid-century Tudor revival house is a very heavy floor in terms of the use of the materials. The existing house is not a literal Neo-Tudor house, but it has some of the elements of that style. She further explained that the board is not suggesting that the applicants need to make significant changes to their plans, but only that they have concerns with two details of the plans: the railings and the style of the dormers. Mr. Schick stated that at the last meeting, the Board reviewed the Village's Design Guidelines, and the Board agreed that the house was appropriate for the neighborhood. Member Lanahan stated that the Board did agree that the proportion, scale, and massing of the new house are appropriate, but stylistically, there was very little discussion. Chairperson Huot pointed out that Board members had expressed concern with the porch railings and the style of the dormers. Mr. Mattia stated that the Board had indicated that the new structure should not be a replica of the existing house. Ms. Huot explained that the Board is not proposing any significant changes to the proposed plans. Mr. Schick pointed out that there are other houses in the Village with these features.

Chairperson Huot explained that a designer or preservationist contemplating new construction in a historic setting may adopt one of four strategies based on four possible attitudes toward the existing setting or resource:

1. Literal replication
2. Invention within a style. This strategy, while not replicating the original design, adds new elements in either the same or a closely related style, sustaining a sense of continuity in architectural language. The intention is to achieve a balance between differentiation and compatibility, but weighted in favor of the latter. This strategy also has a long history: In fact, it is what most architects have always done.
3. Abstract reference
4. Intentional opposition

*Excerpt taken from "Sense of Place: Design Guidelines for New Construction in Historic Districts"*

Chairperson Huot stated that this Board has stated from the beginning that it is important to take elements and proportions from the existing house and incorporate these elements into the new structure. Mr. Mattia stated that the applicants have no intention of modifying these features. He stated that the submission is complete, and he requested that the board vote on the plans as submitted, with no changes.

- Although scale, building height, setback, site coverage, orientation, spacing between buildings was considered compatible, the massing of the new house is a hybrid of different styles, not specific to the original house or the mid-century Tudor Revival style. Massing in the neighboring structures is complex and has a mix of different periods. The character of the houses in the neighborhood is defined mostly by the introduction of stylistic and decorative elements, and the materials used for the composition of the facades. Porch, dormers, and materials in this case determine the compatibility of the new construction with the neighborhood.
- The characteristic elements of both the general neighborhood and the immediate environments are not strongly represented in the new building. Two design changes were

suggested by the Board: to discuss the design of porch style and railings and the changes in massing and style of the front dormers of the house.

- Not having homogeneous architecture, the styles of the houses in the neighborhood are designed with heavy materials like stone, brick, typical of the mid-century Tudor Revival architecture, which has a wide array of representations in Sutherland Street. The materials proposed for the new structure are minimally compatible with the surrounding structures/ the neighborhood.
- Under the design considerations for new buildings, new construction should reflect strong neighborhood design characteristics. The elements of the new house do not reflect strongly the design characteristics of the neighborhood, due to the introduction of a mix of borrowed elements from different periods in the new style proposed by the applicant.
- Sutherland Street derives its character from being one of the few neighborhoods with large residences in the village, which have been constructed of brick, stucco, or, more rarely, stone. Materials under discussion are still under consideration questioning its compatibility with the character of the neighborhood.

Based on the findings of fact and the record in this matter, Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for new construction at 44 Sutherland Street, as submitted.

**Vote: McBride – no; Huot – no; Lanahan – no; Latshaw – no. Motion carried. *This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on April 3, 2017.***

**Minutes:**

**Motion:** Chairperson Huot made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the 02/06/17, as revised.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan - Latshaw – yes. Motion carried.**

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Chairperson Huot adjourned the meeting at 8:00 pm.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary

