

Proceedings held before the Historic Preservation Commission of of Brighton at 2300 Elmwood Avenue, Rochester, New York on June 22, 2017 commencing at approximately 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Jerry Ludwig  
John Page  
Wayne Goodman  
David Whitaker  
Arlene Vanderlinde  
Diana Robinson

NOT PRESENT : Justin DelVecchio  
Mary Jo Lanphear, Town Historian

PRESENT:  
Ramsey Boehner, Town Planner  
Kenneth W. Gordon Town Attorney

**FIRE ALARM PROCEDURES WERE ANNOUNCED**

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to call the June 22, 2017 meeting to order. May I have a motion to approve the agenda.

MR. WHITAKER: So moved.

MR. GOODMAN: Second.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED  
Jerry Ludwig Yes John Page Yes  
Diana Robinson Yes David Whitaker Yes  
Wayne Goodman Yes Arlene Vanderlinde

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have minutes from the May 25, 2017 meeting. I would like a motion to approve those with any corrections.

MR. GOODMAN: I move to approve the minutes from the May 25, 2017 meeting as corrected.

MR. PAGE: Second.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

Jerry Ludwig	Yes	John Page Yes
Diana Robinson	Yes	David Whitaker Yes
Wayne Goodman	Yes	Arlene Vanderlinde

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Secretary was  
this meeting properly advertised?

MR. BOEHNER: Yes, it was properly advertised in  
the Brighton Pittsford Post of June 8, 2017.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That meeting as duly  
advertised will now be held.

---

#### COMMUNICATIONS

NONE

---

#### DESIGNATION OF LANDMARKS

4H-01-17 Application of Mary Jo Lanphear, Town Historian, for property owned by Justin and Emily Lambert, at 3345 Elmwood Avenue, tax number 137.12-2-2-1.1 for landmark designation. All as described on application and documents on file. ADJOURNED TO THE JUNE 22, 2017 MEETING AT THE PROPERTY OWNER'S REQUEST.

MR. LAMBERT: Justin David Lambert and with me is my wife Emily Lambert and we are the owners of the property and we are passionate fans about modern and contemporary architecture and over the last four years we have been trying to figure out how to best take care of this house. So we felt we would not oppose dedication of the house if it is going to help protect it but as I understand it would be the youngest house that you guys protect.

---

So as a homeowner of this house over the past four  
and a half years I wanted to make a few comments about the way this  
might be different than some of the other properties. The first way is that  
in a lot of these houses they were contemporary and a lot of the  
construction materials were experimental unlike the 1850 farmhouses in  
Brighton. Some of these houses have not stood the test of time. The  
house is holding up pretty well right after we bought the house we were  
able to have Jim Johnson come over and walk through the house and talk  
about things that we wanted to do. And I met him out at the driveway and  
when he got out of the car he turned and looked up at the house and he  
said "Well it's still standing". That is an architecture joke but there is an  
element of truth in it. He hadn't seen it in twenty years and it is holding  
up pretty well but with parts of it there maybe better ways to achieve the  
same effect in moving forward.

One of the other points I wanted to make while we  
are here is that the tastes or desires of the original people may have been  
against the odds and style of Jim Johnson's intentions. Another thing we  
don't have any particular arguments or intentions of changing right now  
but there are things that are out of whack with the rest of his body of work  
but in the future may be up for discussion. The other thing is that I have  
pictures of things that Chris Brandt came in the summer of 16 and we  
were starting a renovation that was already planned so there were a few  
exterior changes that were made. And I think they are noted in the final  
version of his report but I just wanted you to have those on file. Do you  
guys have any questions for us?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess just a couple of  
comments number one as a group are understanding in that what was built  
A number of years ago is not necessarily perfect for today's lifestyle. As  
far as recent buildings well there is one not very far from you the Alcoa  
House which is his and also very unique with different materials than we  
are used to. And as far as changing things we are pretty flexible with that  
as long as they are compatible with what is already there.

MS. VANDERLINDE: It is not the interior that we  
have jurisdiction over bu the exterior. So are there exterior changes that  
you are interested in doing or is it mostly interior?

---

MR. LAMBERT: I am just thinking in general about and people were telling me you will have to get permission in order to change the house but I think the house is in great shape. So in general I wanted to raise these things up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We certainly have approved of a number of changes to houses over the years to traditional properties

MR. GORDON: If I may, a couple of specifics that the report mentions. The report talks about that there is a primary façade. Where there were broad front doors supported by comments that these front doors were recently replaced with wood and glass panels sideways keeping with the adjacent curved wall which was the condition of this property in 2016. The second comment is very similar the south rear façade has asymmetrical arrangement for the casement and sash and one of these things has been recently been modified to incorporate fixed frames similar to the north façade. And again there are pictures of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you have any other questions of us?

MR. LAMBERT: No I don't think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Commission have any questions?

MS. VANDERLINDE: I would like to see Mr. and Mrs. Lambert get a copy of the brochure if they are available?

MR. LAMBERT: We made a copy of that on line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone in the audience to speak to this designation? Okay then the public hearing is closed. Mr. Gordon if you would like to prepare a motion.

MR. GORDON: Yes, I would like to propose the following resolution for the Board with any conditions the Board may have.

---

Whereas, Application 4H-01-17 has been submitted for designation of 3345 Elmwood Avenue in the Town of Brighton, County of Monroe and State of New York, having a tax account number of 137.12-2-1.1 as a landmark under the Town's Historic Preservation Law.

And Whereas the Historic Preservation Commission duly called a public hearing to consider such designation which was duly held on June 22, 2017 and all persons having an interest in such matter having had an opportunity to be heard therein.

Whereas based upon materials submitted and the testimony from the public hearings including the February 17, 2017 application for designation submitted by the Town Historian Mary Jo Lanphear, the cultural resources survey prepared by Chris Brandt of Bero Architecture dated September 8, 2016 and the memorandum of the Town Historian Mary Jo Lanphear dated June 16, 2017 outlining the summaries reported for designation.

The Historic Preservation Commission hereby finds that the subject property possesses such Historic value based upon the fact that the property at 3345 Elmwood Avenue was built in 1968 and was one of a small number of land residences in the Rochester area designed by James H. Johnson during the height of his career. The property is a good example of the houses designed by Mr. Johnson and contains good geo tech and the exterior is a unique combination of a dramatic roof geometry that Mr. Johnson became known for the broad proportions and detail inspired by John Knees (phonetic) Architecture. This is one of Mr. Johnson's earliest residences in the Rochester area.

It Is Therefore Hereby Resolved, that the Town of Brighton's application 4H-01-17 is approved for designation as a landmark at 3345 Elmwood Avenue in the Town of Brighton, with the tax account number of 137.12-2-1.1 together with the properties cultural resources survey and memorandum by Mary Jo Lanphear together with any and all other materials received and presented as part of the application and the cultural resources survey being hereby received and filed

---

And We Further Resolve that the Historic Preservation Commission  
Hereby designates the above referenced subject property located at  
3345 Elmwood Avenue as a historic landmark subject to Chapter 224 of  
the Town code based upon the articulated findings regarding the Historic  
value of the subject property and its importance as an example of the work  
of a significant designer and his embodiment of distinguishing  
characteristics of a particular architectural style and its historic value as a  
part of the cultural, political, economic, architectural design and historic  
history of the Town of Brighton

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I have that motion.

MR. PAGE: I will make that motion.

MR. GOODMAN: Second.

---

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion?

MR. PAGE: It is a great house and thank you guys  
for wanting to be in it and taking care of it.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED  
Jerry Ludwig Yes John Page Yes  
Diana Robinson Yes David Whitaker Yes  
Wayne Goodman Yes Arlene Vanderlinde

---

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

6H -01-17 Application of Our Lady of Mercy School for Young Women  
At 1437 Blossom Road, tax number 122.12-2-90.1, for a certificate of  
appropriateness to renovate existing storage building to include a toilet  
room. All as described on application and documents on file.

MR. PHELPS: Good evening my name is Dave  
Phelps, I am an architect that Our Lady of Mercy approached us to solve a  
problem they had and that problem was there were no bathrooms both  
women and men's close to the track on the campus. The closest

bathroom was on the main galleria space and so for convenience and access they asked us to come up with a solution for bathrooms closer to the complex.

So I will give you a little background in 2002 the galleria and gymnasium were put on. At some point. I am not sure of the time table but the building was designated as historic and the storage area was part of that project and was tagged onto that historic designation building. It is not on the building but it is on the campus. The reason we are here although the renovation makes no additions on the building the interior changes makes some modifications to the façade of that building. And those renovations are pretty simple.

So this was to show how far away from the road the building is and that is in the packet we submitted. There are images standing pretty much where that façade is and looking this way the façade is barely visible. There is a whole line of trees as you are aware and also in the packet are imagery looking toward the apartment complex buildings and the town houses that are south of the field and again visibility of that façade is very limited. Nothing can be seen from the school. So very simply what we are proposing to do is using the same split face block and the same metal doors that is on the current building which is above here we are detailing this overhead door and placing here a man door in order to provide access to the men's side of the bathroom. This door will remain as an access point for the women's bathroom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we get the idea.

MR. PHELPS: The same hollow metal plush door that is on the building now will be painted white to match the rest of the building and the intent is to have the door here. It is a pretty simple façade change. So that is pretty much it. I don't think there is anything else. Are there any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or comments? Okay the public hearings are closed. Mr. Gordon do you have a motion?

MR. GORDON: Sure.

Whereas application 6H-01-17 has been submitted for a certificate of appropriateness under the Town's Historic Preservation Law for improving the property at 1437 Blossom Road owned by Our Lady of Mercy or Sisters of Mercy to perform work described as the renovation of the existing storage area to create an outdoor toilet facility for men and women.

And Whereas the Historic Preservation Commission duly called a public hearing to consider such matter on June 22, 2017.

And Whereas the necessary legal notice was published and required sign posted pursuant to Town Code.

And Whereas the public hearing was held and all persons having an interest in such matter had an opportunity to be heard therein.

And Whereas the Historic Preservation Commission hereby determined Pursuant to factors set forth in section 224-5 of the Town Code noting the above described work to the subject property is consistent with the Town's Historic Preservation Law and compatible with the properties historic character. Based upon review of the application and documents on file and received at the public hearing and the testimony at the public hearing.

It Is Hereby Resolved that the Historic Preservation Commission receives and files the above described application and all of it's attached comments.

And it is further resolved the Historic Preservation Commission hereby approves application 6H-01-17 for a certificate of appropriateness for the above described work to be performed at the property located at 1437 Blossom Road in the Town of Brighton is subject to the condition that the above work described is to be completed within a year from the date of approval.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

Jerry Ludwig	Yes	John Page Yes
Diana Robinson	Yes	David Whitaker Yes
Wayne Goodman	Yes	Arlene Vanderlinde

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

Jerry Ludwig	Yes	John Page Yes
Diana Robinson	Yes	David Whitaker Yes
Wayne Goodman	Yes	Arlene Vanderlinde

---

6H-02-17 Application of Brighton Volunteer Ambulance, owners and applicants, for property at 1551 Winton Road South, tax number 137.17-2-62.1, for a certificate of appropriateness to construct a 6, 500 sf addition and to renovate and additional 1,800 sf. All as described on application and documents on file.

MR. BOVA: My name is Scott Bova and I am the director of the architecture from the MRB Group and we were here a month ago informally to initially look at the project. We will be including a renovation to 1800 sf and a 6,500 square foot addition and also renovating the existing garage character with the existing building and the addition is already there. This right here is the existing building right here and this is the existing garage portion right here. The 1800 sf space will convert garage space into an office space and they will build a new structure in back which will contain garage space for vehicles. Right now there are plans for 8 vehicles and a drive through facility with an entrance on the back drive through to the front will be used for quick access for safety purposes and it will address Winton Road South. And again you all have copies of this rendition.

The last time we were in here we brought in the elevations and I will note two small revisions to that since we did those plans. Those floor plans added one extra exit door required by code and that will be on the back. I provided you with information on the addition's elevation and the window on the back for the offices. This is the west elevation. So if you look at the west elevation towards the back here there is a jog here with a side door over here. The idea is to maintain the character which is currently on the site.

We acknowledge the fact that it was originally built in brick and we are trying to accommodate that with the same style of brick that is complementary to the existing structure. We

have decided to design the garage in more of a carriage style structure to accommodate the building. We presented this with the materials and siding and right now it is wood and we are going to change it to fiber and cement board and trim very similar to what is up the street, I don't remember the name of it.

MS. VANDERLINDE: The Buckland house.

MR. BOVA: Yes, that is it. We thought that the grained wood would be a nice way to make it look like paneling.

MS. VANDERLINDE: You just lost me. Grained wood does not look natural nor is it an enhancement but you can turn it around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can turn it around and use the smooth side.

MR. BOVA: Okay so between the trim work and the siding we are using about 4-4 1/2 laps (phonetic) siding. We don't want this to look commercial we want to retain the residential character and detail of the building. It is very hard to scale down the carriage house character and again because of the doors, windows and shingle siding but we are trying to size that down because we don't want to take away or detract from the main house and I think we did pretty well. I think it is going to be very complimentary between the shingles and other materials that will be added to both the carriage house and the addition and the connectors.

We will provide the colors if you want to see them and the renderings. It was suggested that there be two or three roof elevations and we like the scale of that. We don't want anything long and monotone. I think it is very segmented and the scales do a lot and the windows and doors are very appropriate even though the doors will be a carriage style. I can show you those real quick. Those doors will be thermal and will allow us to add some additional space. These are actually sectional doors that go up in sections and they have a carriage

look to them. This is the hardware and the lights. These doors are 10 by 10 so they are a little taller but not too much larger between the trim and detail that keeps the style and we have given it the proper detail that is complimentary to the building. The windows these are wooden windows with very clean lines and standard clad board. They are 6 over one to match the house and we want to incorporate that with the hardy trim and again we are using hardy planks.

MS. ROBINSON: That is not good as the trim for wear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You might want to use Azak (phonetic)

MR. BOVA: We will have to use something that is good for durability.

MR. GORDON: Can I interrupt? Could you make sure you keep your voice up so our stenographer can hear what is being said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not having the windows picture framed in other words having a sill at the bottom I think that is appropriate.

MR. BOVA: We will have an apron board versus a continuous frame.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BOVA: The renderings haven't changed but before we go into any more detail we will bring in the materials we will be using.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions so far.

MR. PAGE: So you are going to come back again with another level of details is that what I understand? Is that what your intent is?

MR. BOVA: Yes, we do have elevations dimensions and materials on these documents and roof heights and we will have comments on that clearly before any construction.

MR. PAGE: Good so I am generally satisfied with the foot print and a lot of the things that you are planning to do; the brick is good, the roofs are good and the windows and doors but I have some material here that I would like to offer that has some suggestions in it. There is a book that we use that is on the back of this that has a lot of detail information and it is set up with avoid and use and so for each of the elements that I wanted to talk about I put the avoid and the use in there. And it is just an offering nothing beyond that. So I will just go through them and you have already answered one of my questions tonight. To approve the façade we need more detail and we need the coordination between them. Your plan is sort of like a site plan and we need a plan that is more coordinated with the elevations. Right now the plan doesn't have the entrance in the same place as the elevation and the renderings –

MR. BOVA: We are coming back in with updated things since last time -

MR. PAGE: Your coming back in and that is good and that stuff can be coordinated. So there is a number of details and I will start with a drip and a skirt and where the faux wood is located relative to the grade. It doesn't show – it shows on the elevations where the clap board is going into the ground and I am sure that is not what your intent is. One of the renderings shows a skirt and normally you would see a skirt which would be located above the ground and there would be an exposed masonry material that is going to take the brunt of the weather. And also would be a good detail for the bottom of that. The boxy returns are difficult in modern construction often and certainly in doing drawings especially at the schematic stage.

So I would request that you maybe think about those and do them a little bit more the way they used to be done rather than sometimes the way they are done now because they are an important element and on this building they have some important aspects to them. I think that the bay window – there is some stuff in there about the bay windows that I would just ask you to consider some of the detailing on it. The recess entrance that is particularly important – on the plan it looks like it is a recess next to the adjacent building which I understand is another office and I think the elevation separates it which is good. I think that the relationship between the door assembly with the sideline and the transom and what I am going to describe as a door surrounding even though it's this hybrid because it's recessed there. I still think that it would work better if the columns were located on the crown of the building. I am not sure that the width of the recess and the height of the pediment or the broken pediment and the slope that they could perhaps if they were modified I think it might look a little better and more in proportion to me. So these are just the things to consider. So I will pass this around if they are interested.

MS. VANDERLINDE: I noticed on the rendering there is no transit above the recess and there is not skirt.

MR. BOVA: The renderings we brought last month we certainly will look at the details and come back to you further down the road when we are closer to final elevations but we will certainly verify those details.

MR. BOEHNER: One thing I wanted to talk to the Board about is the timely process of where we are because of where they are with the design in the schematics and they will come back this month and they will come back again when they have adequate detail for you guys to approve. I want to see if you have any issues with the site plan layout. I believe they are scheduled to be at the July Planning Board meeting. They have done the Zoning Board and I think they are pretty much wrapped up with the Planning Board. My question is should I continue to table that matter with the Planning Board until they are done with you guys or do you think they are far enough along.

MR. PAGE: I'm okay.

MR. BOEHNER: If you thought there were going to be some changes I would tell the Planning Board to table the action. There is no demolition involved in this.

MS. VANDERLINDE: I don't see anything that is going to affect the site plan tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is just details.

MR. BOVA: I did bring the site plan tonight if you wanted to look at it.

MR. GORDON: What I am hearing is concerns over designing details and materials and it sounds like they are not quite at the point yet where the Board could articulate specific conditions and some additional work needs to be done before you know what it is there are proposing. I don't here anything that would affect the site plan.

MR. BOVA: No.

MR. PAGE: We actually talked about that last month and we looked at the site plan and weather the way they were proposing the addition was going to impose on the original building and it seemed like they had done a good job of stepping back and so on and that aspect of it was okay. That materials and entrances and details is what I went away interested in.

MS. VANDERLINDE: I have a question. It appears as though the height of the additions is no higher than the house?

MR. BOVA: That is correct.

MS. VANDERLINDE: Thank you I just wanted to make sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MR. GORDON: So the ridge line of the addition is 26 feet and the ridge line of the roof of the house is 28 feet five inches. I don't know with the cupola on the addition goes higher than the chimneys on the house.

MR. BOVA: We did not mention it but I can tell you it is lower.

MR. GORDON: I just don't want to drive by and wonder where that cupola came from if it is standing above the house.

MS. VANDERLINDE: I think the distance from the house would mitigate that visual and probably plantings on the property are going to give visual differences.

MR. BOEHNER: I would like to ask if they want a decision tonight or pass it along to the next meeting.

MR. GORDON: The applicant has requested that this application be held over knowing that it is past the 60 day requirement.

MR. BOVA: That is fine with us.

MR. BOEHNER: So the application will be continued until the July meeting.

MR. BOVA: Thank you.

---

HARDSHIP APPLICATIONS

---

NONE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The public hearings are now closed.

---

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

---

OLD BUSINESS

150 Old Mill Road, Demolition

This building was built in 1947.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We need a motion to send a letter to the Planning Board that this application is not scheduled for a public hearing to consider designation.

MR. WHITAKER: I will make that motion.

MR. GOODMAN: Second.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE	MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED
Jerry Ludwig Yes	John Page Yes
Diana Robinson Yes	David Whitaker Yes
Wayne Goodman Yes	Arlene Vanderlinde Yes

---

99 Pelham Road

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are in a position to send the first letter for designation. This is for both properties including the house on one and the green house on the other.

MR. PAGE: I will make that motion.

MS. ROBINSON: Second.

MR. BOEHNER: We would have to send the letter to the owner on record.

MR. GORDON: That is a Joyce Connolly.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

Jerry Ludwig	Yes	John Page Yes
Diana Robinson	Yes	David Whitaker Yes
Wayne Goodman	Yes	Arlene Vanderlinde Yes.

---

PRESENTATIONS

NONE

---

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NONE

---

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I have a motion to adjourn

MR. PAGE: So moved.

MR. WHITAKER: Second.

MR. LUDWIG: The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

\* \* \* \* \*

---

## CERTIFICATION

I, Judy Almekinder, 7633 Bauer Van Wickle Road, Lyons, New York 14489, do hereby state that the minutes of the June 22, 2017 meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission at 2300 Elmwood Avenue, Brighton, New York, is a true and accurate transcription of those notes to the best of my ability as recorded and transcribed by me.

Judy Almekinder

Judy Almekinder

State of New York  
County of Wayne

On this 30<sup>th</sup> day of June in the year 2017, before me personally came Judy Almekinder to me known, and known to me to be the person described herein and who executed the foregoing instrument, and she acknowledges to me that she executed the same.

Lisa D. Grimes

Notary Public

LISA D GRIMES  
Notary Public, State of New York  
Qualified in Ontario County  
No. 01GR6117761  
Commission Expires November 1, 2025

ADDENDUM TO THE MAY, 2017  
MEETING OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
COMMISSION

Roll CALL

MR. WHITAKER WAS PRESENT  
MS. VANDERLINDE WAS NOT PRESENT

Page 2  
4H-01-17  
Change name to Justin David Lambert

Page 3  
150 Old Mill Rd not 150 Old Mill Lane

Page 4  
Start  
MR. GORDON: The purpose of the code is to deal with properties  
that are to be demolished

MS. VANDERLINDE: Was not present she could not have  
moved the minutes – MR. CHAIRMAN will move the minutes.

Page 5  
At the end of Mr. Gordon's third sentence two carriage houses and  
so on, change house to houses  
Change spelling to Whitaker

Addendum protect greenhouses not glass houses  
Just add green houses and ancillary buildings  
Change spelling to Whitaker