

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 5:30 PM

**PRESENT:**

<b>Chairperson:</b>	Lisa Cove
<b>Members:</b>	Virginia Searl Jeffrey Pollock Ken Morrow
<b>Absent:</b>	Kendra Evans
<b>Attorney:</b>	Jeff Turner
<b>Building Inspector:</b>	Steve Lauth
<b>Recording Secretary:</b>	Kristen Kreiser

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Motion by Chairperson Cove, and seconded by Member Searl**, to call the meeting to order.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – yes; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes. *Motion Carries.*

**CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE**

Board Members indicated that they had no conflicts of interest to disclose.

**25 Monroe Avenue – Removal of non-functioning exterior storm door**

**Present:** James Walter

**Application was submitted, date-stamped, and reviewed by the Building Inspector on 05.02.22.**

Applicant is doing some interior renovations and found a door on the side of the addition that he did not realize was there. The door is drywalled and paneled over. There is no other door other than that storm door. There is an interior door, but not a regular exterior door, it is just a frame. The applicant is proposing to remove the door and fill it in with clapboards that will match the rest of the house.

The board brought up concerns about a cut line & the applicant explained the boards will be staggered, sanded, and painted so there will be no cut line.

Member Searl, brought up concerns with character-defining features of the home and that the presence of the door speaks to the past use of the wing of the home. She prefers the door to be insulated and covered with the drywall as is.

The attorney advised the applicant since there were only four board members present, he had the right to adjourn to another meeting in order to have a five-member panel.

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 5:30 PM

**A motion by Member Pollock, and second by Chairperson Cove** to approve the application as submitted with conditions. The condition being there will not be a single cut line.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – no; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes. *Motion Carries.*

**18 Eastview Terrace – Door replacement**

**Present:** David Dodell-Feder

**Application was submitted, date-stamped, and reviewed by the Building Inspector on 05.02.22.**

Applicant is proposing to replace the current wood door with a similar style, but different material. The current door has sustained a lot of damage, the wood is rotting and the door frame is deteriorating which is causing water to get inside and cause more damage. The door is also not flush with the rest of the house which is causing a draft.

The applicant is looking to get a fiberglass door. Chairperson Cove asked the applicant if he had considered the possibility of another wood door. The applicant stated that he had, but the door he was looking at matched the new door that was recently installed in the garage. He thought that the matching doors would be a better option.

Member Searl, brought up replacing the door with a window and that it would address the water damage issue. The applicant stated he did not want to replace it with a window because the roof is flat and it was just replaced with a rubber material membrane. The applicant also mentioned he wanted to keep the option of potentially installing a deck in that area open. Member Searl, wanted to make sure the applicant could provide adequate protection for the roofing without compromising the water-tight connection at the door.

Member Pollock confirmed with the applicant if the door goes in the framing and molding will also be re-done.

After a brief discussion about the door that was previously installed in the garage, it was confirmed that the new door replaced a window and did not replace an existing door. Chairperson Cove, asked the applicant if there was a door option that looked more closely related to the door he was replacing. The applicant explained he had been looking at doors for some time and he thought the door he chose looked close to the door that is currently there. He also stated that there were no doors available within a reasonable time period and within the price point he was looking at.

Member Searl described the differences between the existing door and the proposed door. After the discussion, the applicant agreed to take some more time to look to find a

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 5:30 PM

door similar to the existing one with exterior casings to match with other openings on the house. It was confirmed the door opens inward and the applicant is keeping the screen.

The item was tabled to the next meeting.

**71 State Street – Addition**

**Present:** Bob Michaels

**Application was submitted, date-stamped, and reviewed by the Building Inspector on 05.02.22.**

The proposal is for a rear one-story addition that will include a bedroom and a bathroom. It was confirmed that the applicant was in front of the PZBA on May 4<sup>th</sup> and approved for a rear addition. There was a brief discussion on what is actually visible from public view or not. The determination is that one side of the addition will be visible from State Street.

The applicant's proposal was designed specifically to be subordinate to the primary structure complying with the historic preservation code. The applicant carefully reviewed the mass and scale as well as the rules and recommendations provided with the application and the code. The applicant explained the roofline was dropped and the setback on one side was 3ft and 2ft on the other side to meet the HPB standards. After a brief discussion about windows, it was confirmed that the applicant would be using a simpler style of double-hung window that has no head casing.

**A motion by Chairperson Cove, and second by Member Pollock** to approve the application for rear addition as submitted.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – yes; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes. *Motion Carries.*

**3 Village Grove – Roof replacement**

**Present:** Clark Turner

**Application was submitted, date-stamped, and reviewed by the Building Inspector on 05.02.22.**

Applicant is proposing to remove the original material shingle roof and replace it with a metal roof. The roof is shallow and forms ice dams which have caused leakage, the skylights leak, and the applicant is not interested in another asphalt roof for fear of the same issues. There was a quote done by Kangaroo for the metal roof. It would be a standing seam metal roof about 16 inches wide with about a 1 ½ inch seam.

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 5:30 PM

Chairperson Cove brought up two significant concerns about the proposal. The first concern is the change in material and the second concern is the look of the house changing significantly. Being a ranch-style house, and changing the historic look of a shingle roof will dramatically change the look.

Member Searl stated the house was built in 1989 and is ineligible to be listed in the national registry district in the village. There was a discussion regarding the standards of rehabilitation and preservation of newer-built houses. The slope of the roof is 3 on 12 which is considered the lowest. Member Searl recommended if the applicant tries asphalt shingles again there be some sort of durable waterproof membrane put down under the shingles to prevent leakage. A properly installed roof with architectural shingles with flashings and waterproof underlayment as required by NYS building code should fix the issues and they should not continue.

**A motion by Member Morrow, and second by Member Pollock** to approve the application for standing seam metal roof as submitted.

**Vote:** Cove – no; Searl – no; Pollock – no; Morrow – yes. *Motion Denied.*

**9 Austin Park – Replacement windows**

**Present:** Emily Nunn

Applicant is proposing to replace 22 existing windows with Infinity by Marvin Ultrex fiberglass. All windows will be replaced with the same dimensions, color, style, casement replacement, and double-hung for double-hung as those they replace with one exception being a rear-facing picture window. This window will be replaced with a full glass door and two full glass sidelights called fiberglass. The applicant is also looking to replace two existing exterior doors to the garage with fiberglass doors.

Applicant quoted from section five of the building design standards entitled rehabilitation standards for postwar homes and also quoted the recommendation of architect Blake Held. The applicant explained the windows on the house are more than 65 feet back from the public right of way, so a passerby would not be able to distinguish the material of the window. The applicant is also requesting that the muntin pattern be altered on all windows visible from the public right of way to an eight-over one dividing light pattern. The applicant would like all windows to be consistent in appearance and materials.

The third request from the applicant is to include dividers from muntins between the glass only. The applicant referred back to and quoted a set of HPB minutes with the same request, where the application was approved.

Chairperson Cove mentioned the muntins were a concern for her. She also explained that the board tries not to compare what other people in the village have done

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 5:30 PM

previously and this is primarily because the boards differ depending on who is serving on the board at any given time. The board tries to follow the regulations and codes and handles each application differently.

There was a brief discussion regarding the proposed glass door in the rear of the house and if there was some sort of deck or something being constructed. There is a large drop from the edge to the ground. The applicant stated there would be a threshold and a proper stairway installed.

Board members are in agreeance with a change in material, but changing the configuration of the existing muntin pattern will change the elegance of the house. The appearance of the house will significantly change. The applicant continued to ask the board why properties in the village were previously approved for changing the existing muntin patterns.

**A motion by Chairperson Cove, and second by Member Searl** to approve the materials part of the application for window replacement as submitted.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – yes; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes. *Motion Carries.*

**Findings of Fact:** The property at 9 Austin Park was constructed in 1958 it is within the national register district of the village and it is also included in the village-wide historic district. The materials proposed are fiberglass. The village of Pittsford's historic and architectural design district building design standards page 94 addresses design standards for post-war mass-produced builder homes regarding materials. Page 95 states the use of newer materials such as vinyl-clad or aluminum-clad windows may be an appropriate substitution for wood windows if the appearance is indistinguishable from wood from the public right of way. Substitute material should be similar in form configuration, color, texture, and profile to the windows they replace. These design standards were generated before fiberglass became a commonly used substitute material for wood windows and should be included as newer material, although not specifically listed on page 95.

**A motion by Chairperson Cove, and second by Member Pollock** to deny the part of the application for the change of eight over eight to the eight over one for the front windows only.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – yes; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes. *Motion Carries.*

**Findings of Fact:** The property at 9 Austin Park was constructed in 1958 it is within the national register district of the village and it is also included in the village-wide historic district. The village of Pittsford's historic and architectural design district building design standards page 95 addresses if replacement is necessary the configuration type and overall appearance of windows should match the original for example a double-hung

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 5:30 PM

window should not be replaced by a casement window. The original muntin configuration and dimensions should be replicated as closely as possible interior muntins or muntins sandwiched between panes of glass do not sufficiently resemble the appearance of a true divided light window. Windows with exterior and interior applied dividers plus spacers within the panes of glass for double placed windows are preferable.

**A motion by Member Searl, and second by Chairperson Cove** to deny the part of the application for the false muntins installed between the double pane glazing only.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – yes; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes. *Motion Carries.*

**Findings of Fact:** The property at 9 Austin Park was constructed in 1958 it is within the national register district of the village and it is also included in the village-wide historic district. The village of Pittsford's historic and architectural design district building design standards page 95 addresses if replacement is necessary the configuration type and overall appearance of windows should match the original for example a double-hung window should not be replaced by a casement window. The original muntin configuration and dimensions should be replicated as closely as possible interior muntins or muntins sandwiched between panes of glass do not sufficiently resemble the appearance of a true divided light window. Windows with exterior and interior applied dividers plus spacers within the panes of glass for double placed windows are preferable.

**MEMBER ITEMS:**

**Minutes –**

March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Minutes were discussed again and Chairperson Cove wanted it noted in the minutes that the location of the air handling unit for St. Louis Church was already approved by the PZBA and the HPB had no ability to deny it. During the discussion, the attorney informed the board that the screening was already approved by the planning board during the site plan review, however, the HPB still had the option to deny it. – March 14<sup>th</sup> minutes tabled until the next meeting for findings of fact.

April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022

**A motion by Member Searl, and second by Chairperson Cove** to approve the April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022 meeting minutes, as amended.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – yes; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes. *Motion Carries.*

Member Searl passed out educational material to the board members and the building inspector regarding National Park Service.

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Monday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022, at 5:30 PM

Member Searl put together a memo for the HPB board members, the board of trustee members, Jeff Turner the attorney, and Mayor Plummer regarding 19 North Main Street. After the memo was read aloud there was a discussion among board members, the attorney, and the building inspector.

**Motion by Chairperson Cove, and second by Member Searl** to close HPB meeting for May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

**Vote:** Cove – yes; Searl – yes; Pollock – yes; Morrow – yes; *Motion Carries.*

---

Kristen Kreiser, Recording Secretary

***Further detailed information about this specific meeting is available on the website.***