

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD**  
**Historic Preservation Board**  
**Monday October 14, 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. Member Searl commented that she no longer had an association with Bero Architecture.

**Rubiena Duarte, 15 South Main Street ~ Sign**

**Present:** Rubiena Duarte, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 09/28/20.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing installing a sign on her business located at 15 South Main Street. The proposed sign is an aluminum sign panel with laminated vinyl graphics. The sign will be installed centered below the window on the front of the building. It will be installed in the same location as the previous sign, and is approximately the same size but is a different shape, so will be slightly larger. The applicant submitted documentation with the photographs and dimensions of the proposed sign.

**Motion:** Member Cove made a motion, seconded by Member Searl, to approve the application for installation of a sign at 15 South Main Street, as submitted, with the condition that the sign be centered below the window above it.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on October 14, 2020.**

**Bonnie Miguel, 50 State Street ~ Sign**

**Present:** Bonnie Miguel, Business owner

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

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing installing a sign on her business located at 50 State Street. The proposed sign is a wood sign with silver metal letters. It will be installed in the same location as the previous sign. The applicant submitted documentation with photographs and dimensions of the proposed sign. Member Searl commented that the sign is too tall in relation to the sign next door and in relation to the proportions of the building.

**Motion:** Member Cove made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a sign at 50 State 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 October 14, 2020.**

~~~~~

**Ian McDonald, 28 South Main Street ~ Sign**

**Present:** Ian McDonald, Business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 09/22/20.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a sign on the business located at 28 South Main Street. The proposed sign is composed of 1-inch thick, high-density urethane black primed and painted letters to be mounted on the existing wall centered on the front of the building under existing lights. The letters are installed with 100% silicone adhesives that can be easily removed when the sign is taken down. The applicant submitted documentation with photographs and dimensions of the proposed sign.

**Motion:** Member Cove made a motion, seconded by Member Searl, to approve the application for installation of a sign at 28 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 October 14, 2020.**

~~~~~

**Bryan Meyer, 50 State Street ~ Sign**

**Present:** Bryan Meyer

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 09/12/20.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a sign on the business located at 50 State Street. The proposed sign is a decal of the logo for the business. The decal is made

of plastic and adhered to the inside of the front door window. The applicant submitted documentation with photographs and dimensions of the proposed sign.

**Motion:** Member Cove made a motion, seconded by Member Searl, to approve the application for installation of a sign at 50 State 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 October 14, 2020.**

~~~~~

**Robert Rowe, 6 Elmbrook Drive ~ Windows**

**Present:** Robert Rowe, Robell, Inc.

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

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing 10 lower windows on the house located at 6 Elmbrook Drive. He stated that the upper windows on the house were replaced a few years ago, and his customer is proposing replacing the lower windows with wood windows. Member Searl questioned the applicant as to the reason for replacing the windows. Mr. Rowe explained that 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.

Member Searl explained that this house was constructed in 1945. Windows were still being fabricated with high-quality old-growth lumber. Studies have clearly proven that historic windows, when well-maintained and which have well-fitting storm panels on them, perform equally as far as energy efficiency goes. She further noted that double-pane windows have a seal, and that seal fails in about 20 years, and then a person needs to replace the windows again, because the windows are not fabricated to allow simply replacing glass; the full windows need to be replaced. So once these windows are gone, you're setting up replacement about every 20 to 25 years of replacing all the windows again. She stated that in her opinion, there is no need to replace existing windows that are in a repairable condition.

Member Cove expressed that the Board should hear from the homeowners on their reasons for proposing to replace the windows. Member McBride suggested that this issue be tabled and the application be held open so that the homeowners can attend the next meeting to continue the discussion.

**Motion:** Member Cove made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to defer this application to the November 9, 2020 HPB meeting.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on October 14, 2020.**

~~~~~

**Chris Harrington, 37 Courtenay Circle ~ Windows**

**Present:** Chris Harrington, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 08/20/20.**

**Discussion:** The applicant replaced wood windows on the front elevation of the house with windows made of Fibrex, a composite material made of fiberglass and wood fiber. At the previous HPB meeting, Board members expressed concern that the previously existing wood windows were replaced with windows that are a different design and material. Member Searl stated that the replacement windows are not compatible with the Village's Design Guidelines.

Chairperson McBride explained that the Board's architectural consultant reviewed the application and gave the Board her opinion as to what the design code, specifically § 5(a) of the Village Design Standards, says about this kind of situation.

Her conclusion is as follows:

1. Under Section 5A– Rehabilitation Standard for Postwar Houses of the Village of Pittsford Building Design Standards, the type of windows installed are acceptable in terms of materials.
2. From far, the appearance matches the characteristics of the windows required of these period houses.
3. The muntin configuration is unperceivable from a distance to recognize if these are sandwiched between panes of glass.
4. The panes resemble what already existed, making the number of panes per sash appropriate to this period house.
5. The door is a full glass door with divided lites. Unless it is replacing what originally was there, no evidence that this type of door was common in this period era houses.

Member McBride stated that he visited the site, and viewing the windows from the street, he could not distinguish the replaced windows from classic wood windows.

Member Cove stated that the material is Fibrex, which is 40 percent wood fiber and 60 percent thermoplastic polymer. Member Searl stated that that is not a wood window, it is a fiberglass-type window.

Mr. Turner pointed out that the portion of the Design Guidelines that is relevant in this discussion is the part dealing with post-war houses. Generally, the Board would want to replace wood windows with wood, but post-war homes are treated somewhat differently than pre-war houses.

Member Searl commented that it is clear to her that those are replacement windows, and the difference is that the muntins on traditional wood windows are on the outside of the glass and there is a projection outside the glass; it's visible as a projection, and there are shadow lines that show on the glass and make the statement that this is a window with true divided lights. And the muntins on these windows, because they are between the two pieces of glass, is flat.

Member Harrington stated that based on the consultant's report and the Village Design Standards, he is in favor of approving the windows.

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

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – no; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on October 14, 2020.**

**Steve Sercu, 31 North Main Street ~ Door**

**Present:** Steve Sercu, Owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/20/20.**

**Discussion:** The applicant replaced the door on the house located at 31 North Main Street without HPB approval. In 2017, the Board denied the door, determining that the style of the installed door does not match the historic integrity of the house. The applicant is proposing a simple door surround with chamfered pilasters. Member Searl suggested revisions to the proposed door, which changes will be added as conditions for approval.

**Motion:** Member Cove made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the proposed door for 31 North Main Street with the following conditions: On sheet A20, the left front elevation that says 7.5 inches is changed to 9.5 inches; the eave overhang will be increased to 6¼ inches on the front and side; and there's a small simple trim on both pilasters on the front door. They will be using the existing 36-inch door.

**Vote: McBride – yes; Cove – yes; Morrow - yes; Searl – yes; Harrington - yes. The decision was filed in the office of the Village Clerk on October 14, 2020.**

**Member Items: Minutes**

**Motion:** Member McBride made a motion, seconded by Member Cove, to approve the 6/8/20, 7/13/20, and 9/14/20 Minutes, 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 8:30 pm.

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