

Proceedings held before the Historic Preservation Commission of of Brighton at 2300 Elmwood Avenue, Rochester, New York on July 28, 2016 commencing at approximately 7:30 p.m.

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

NOT PRESENT: Wayne Goodman
Justin DelVecchio

Kenneth W Gordon, Town Attorney
Ramsey Boehner, Town Planner
Mary Jo Lanphear, Town Historian

FIRE ALARM PROCEDURES WERE ANNOUNCED

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to have a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. WHITAKER: So moved.

MS. VANDERLINDE: Second.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to call the July 28, 2016 , meeting to order. We have minutes from the June 23, 2016 meeting. I would like a motion to approve those with corrections.

MR. PAGE: So moved to approve the minutes for the June 2016 meeting with corrections.

MR. WHITAKER: Second.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Page Yes	Mr. Ludwig Yes.
Ms. Vanderlinde Yes	Ms. Robinson Yes
Mr. Whitaker Yes	

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was this meeting properly advertised?

MR. BOEHNER: Yes, it was properly advertised in the Brighton Pittsford Post of July 14, 2016.

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

COMMUNICATIONS

NONE

DESIGNATION OF LANDMARKS

NONE

CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

7H-01-16 Application of Diana Robinson, owner of property at 407 Edgewood Avenue, tax number 150.06-5-16 for a certificate of appropriateness to remove four large lawn trees in the rear yard. All as described on application and documents on file.

MS. ROBINSON: My name is Diana Robinson of 407 Edgewood Avenue. We started with one acre of land that reverted back to wilderness and little by little it whittled away and before the addition went on we threw in a couple of pine trees here and there without much thought about what we were doing. So I guess the landscape people are helping me and decided that these four trees need to go. The maple trees are basically weeds and the pine tree always looks nice but it is in the middle of the yard. So we are taking them down three maples and one pine tree.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Boy, I would miss the shade.

MS. ROBINSON: Well, Doug Rap (phonetic) from EDR is helping me but the answer is not to let the weeds continue. They should have been gone a long time ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay any questions?
Comments?

MR. WHITAKER: I never heard Maples called weeds before.

MS. ROBINSON: Well the Silver Maple - we should have gotten rid of it 20 years ago we spent money trimming it up and it is smack in the middle of the yard.

MS. VANDERLINDE: What are your plans now?

MS. ROBINSON: We are looking at plants and just before we started the addition we talked of white pines, five or six of them here or there. We might have to dig up some of the pines and move them but they are not that big yet. It needs some order.

MS. VANDERLINDE: Would you be replacing the shade trees?

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, just not right away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Hearing none we will close the public hearing. Is there anyone in the audience who cares to speak? Now the hearing is closed. Mr. Gordon we need a motion to remove these four trees?

MR. GORDON: I assume there was some discussion about why this property was designated and whether it included these four trees.

MR. BOEHNER: The application does state the trees have no historical character or connection to the house.

MR. GORDON: I would also like to mention Ms. Robinson is a client of my firm but my work with her has nothing to do with this project. So I do not believe I have a conflict and I will make a motion.

WHEREAS Application 7H-01-16 has been submitted for a certificate of appropriateness under the Town's Historic Preservation Law for the removal of four trees at property located at 407 Edgewood Avenue owned by Diana Robinson and Johnathan Berkner (phonetic)

AND WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission duly called a public hearing to consider the matter on July 28, 2016

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 having an opportunity to be heard therein.

AND WHEREAS, the Historic Preservation Commission hereby determines pursuant to the factors set forth under section 224-5 of the Town Code that the above proposed removal of the trees at the subject property will not affect the historic character of the property and is consistent with the purposes of the Town's Historic Preservation Law based upon the review of the application and documents on file received at the public hearing and the testimony presented in the public hearing.

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the Historic Preservation Commission hereby receives and files the above described application and supporting materials

AND IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that the Historic Preservation Commission hereby approves the application of 7H-01-16 for a certificate of appropriateness for the above described work to be performed at the property located at 407 Edgewood Avenue subject to the condition that the above described work be completed within one year for the date of this approval.

MR. WHITAKER: So moved.

MS. VANDERLINDE: Second.

UPON ROLL CALL VOTE MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Page	Yes	Mr. Ludwig	Yes.
Ms. Vanderlinde	Yes	Mr. Whitaker	Yes

* MS ROBINSON ABSTAINS

7H-02-16 Application of Bell Atlantic Mobile of Rochester L.P (d/b/a Verizon Wireless) for property owned by Morgan Titus, LLC at 1420 Monroe Avenue, tax number 137.95-3-76, for a certificate of appropriateness to construct and operate a micro cell wireless facility which includes a roof mounted antenna. All as described on application and documents on file.

MR. VANDERWALD: My name is Nate Vanderwald with the law firm Nixon Peabody and I am here tonight on behalf of the applicant Verizon Wireless on the location that is before you. Just briefly Verizon Wireless is looking to install this micro cell antenna on the existing building at 1420 Monroe Avenue. An analysis of the companies network determined a need for this antenna in this area, specifically for hot spots or coverage, traffic hot spot coverage given the nature of the area and the density of the usage in this area. Extensive studies were done to determine where this facility could be located within a confined search ring, which is an area in which the installation of the facility would meet the coverage objectives of this project. And after analyzing the search ring and the available structures within the search ring it was determined the structure at 1420 Monroe Avenue for a number of reasons which we can discuss later was the appropriate site.

You have been provided with extensive materials including photo simulations of what this facility would look like setback on the existing structure. The equipment cabinet is on the inside out of the Commission's purview as per the code. And I would respectfully submit that this minimal facility an example I have this evening if you would like to see will in no way affect the building's designation as a historic

landmark. Again any aspect of this application I would be happy to discuss in further detail.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have all the details I will open it up to the Commission for questions.

MS. VANDERLINDE: It says Chop House but it really is not.

MR. VANDERWALD: The names are given by Verizon Wireless for the project to be honest I could not tell you how these names are determined but that is just the name of this site and that's the site name.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MR. BOEHNER: I have a question about the proposed wall mounted or roof mounted co-axil. So there is going to be some wire along the side of the building.

MR. VANDERWALD: That is correct it will run from the equipment cabinet in the basement up through the antenna.

MR. BOEHNER: That can't run interior because it seems on some of the drawings it talks about –

MR. CHAIRMAN: You would probably have to go through several apartments if it were inside.

MR. VANDERWALD: Also here this evening is Chris Boyce who is the consultant hired by Verizon Wireless in connection with this project who has been involved sine the outset and is aware of the project details.

MR. BOEHNER: Because on the drawings it talks about interior electrical routing and then on some of your detail sheets it looks like it is on the outside.

MR. BOYCE: Chris Boyce I am the acquisition specialist. We have done a handful of these in the City of Rochester and the same question came up. A lot of times we like to run on the outside

because we are dealing with a lot of – if you have to run it through the roof and there is a leaky roof we are adding more damage to the building and a lot of times it is easier to run it on the outside of the building up through a co-axe cable tray.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How big will the cable be?
Will it be one inch?

MR. VANDERWALD: One and 5/8's but we can tell you exactly, again this cable will be run through a cable tray which can be painted also to match the exterior of the building.

MS. VANDERLINDE: That would be on the building where the Chop house is, or the structure is?

MR. VANDERWALD: It would actually be on the courtyard side setback a little more than half way from the front of the building.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you couldn't see it from the street?

MS. VANDERLINDE: Will it be visible to the tenants?

MR. VANDERWALD: It would run down the exterior certainly not through a window. It would be in a tray of the size we discussed painted to match the exterior. So I would presume it would not be visible to someone observing out their window.

MS. ROBINSON: C 500 it says cable running down the side.

MR. BOYCE: Yes it is.

MS. VANDERLINDE: So it is in a uniform box all the way down.

MR. BOYCE: I think that is right because you would cause a little bit more damage if you ran it on the inside and you

have to deal with the businesses and then dealing with the roof top and entering the roof top and there would be issues with that.

MR. BOEHNER: What is the dimensions of that box? I am just trying to get it on the record.

MR. BOYCE: It is 22 inches by 8 inches and several feet long and that will cover the co-axil that runs down to the basement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the dimensions are?

MR. BOYCE: 22 inches and 7 and 5/16 off the Building to the basement. There are details on the sheet do you see C 500. It says a roof mounted cable tray.

MR. PAGE: I am just wondering if the cable tray that is going to be on the side of the building is approximately the same size as that which is 11 and 3/4 inches around the pipe and again projects off. It has three cables and one ground wire.

MR. VANDERWALD: The plan view obviously from overhead of that metal cover is 11 and 2132 of an inch wide and it looks like that portion that will be on the roof is 8 feet long but then that would also run down the length of the building.

MS. ROBINSON: You don't need a pvc sleeve coming down the side of the building?

MR. PAGE: Let me ask there is another drawing that says a conduit support detail that is suggesting a wall mounting situation so in keeping with what Ramsey is asking I don't see something that identifies what is going on the side of the building other than what you are suggesting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It sounds like the boxes are larger than it needs to be with an inch and 5/8 cable.

MR. VANDERWALD: The CC500 sheet 2 detail 202 shows the bracket on the side of the structure for the conduit.

MR. BOEHNER: This is on CC500?

MR. VANDERWALD: Yes detail sheet 202.

MR. WHITAKER: You can see the bracket that fits into the wall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The bracket goes on the wall and then channel pipe goes down the wall.

MR. PAGE: This indicates that those items that are described in the drawing – it doesn't describe a cover.

MR. GORDON: Let's clarify for the applicant and the Board what specific issues you want to see imposed on the side of the building relative to the conduit. Can you give the Board a specific description of what the cable and the box the cable goes in is once it is installed? Do you have that information available tonight or would you like an opportunity to present that at a later time?

MR. VANDERWALD: Neither of us feels comfortable tonight definitively exactly what we will be running down the side or know the dimensions other than to say it will be painted to match the exterior of the building. So I would not want to make a representation to the Commission..

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think unless you can do that I think we have some significant questions here. It is not our place to tell you how big the conduit is that is your department and we do have a side view but we don't have a face on view and an elevation to show this top to bottom as to what it is going to look like.

MR. GORDON: What I was going to say is that the standard that the Commission needs to meet in order to grant the certificate of appropriateness is that the work you are intending to perform is consistent with the Historic character of the building. Aesthetics and visual impact is significant when it comes to a building like this which makes it difficult to designate. So it is important to the Commission to know what it is going to look like so the Board can make that decision as to whether what you are proposing to install will in fact be consistent with

the historic character. Understanding it will match we are still unsure of the dimensions and the character of the building.

MR. PAGE: I have a problem with this strip that run along the side of the building if it were inside then it would be done.

MR. BOEHNER: On one of your drawings it talks about it being internal, proposed internal electrical grounding –

MR. VANDERWALD: I know it is internal once you get to the basement.

MR. BOEHNER: When you look at this one drawing it gives you the impression that it is all interior. It isn't until you look at all the details that it is not.

MR. VANDERWALD: We will certainly obtain that clarification and those details as to what the project entails as far as running those lines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We want elevation from roof to basement showing how it is going to be mounted and so forth.

MR. GORDON: If it would be possible to bring in examples of what the cable will be contained in that may be helpful too to the Commission. While the Commission is particularly talented in historic buildings I dare say I can speak for the Commission in saying their cable technology or wireless technology as experts they are not. So we don't want to suggest that the Commission would ask of you that would jeopardize in any way the function of the telecommunication systems. We are just interested in how it will look.

MR. VANDERWALD: Certainly and we can obtain that information and provide that ahead of the next scheduled meeting.

MS. VANDERLINDE: Are there other buildings around town like this?

MR. VANDERWALD: Not that I can speak to here this evening I can certainly inquire of that and if there is I can present that. Certainly each installation is unique in its nature and specifics but if I become aware of a similar one that I can alert the Commission to I will advise that along with the updated materials.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MS. ROBINSON: Yes on the detail sheet one of two the elevation calls it 6 foot 5 to the center of the building and what is the 24 point 2 inches?

MR. VANDERWALD: The 24 point two inches is the actual height of the antenna itself. The 6 point 5 is the antenna center line height above the base roof line to the top of that antenna.

MS. ROBINSON: You still can't see it from the street?

MR. VANDERWALD: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from the Commission? Any other questions from the audience?

MS. SACCO: My name is Kathleen Sacco and I live in that collection of buildings and my concern is the integrity of the building. That is why I am here. I saw the notice and I wasn't quite sure what it was about but I am glad to hear you are not going to make a decision right now. I am very surprised that the detail is lacking and my concern is what will happen to that building and I just don't trust Verizon to maintain the integrity of the building. It is shocking to me what you presented. You can't even understand it much less I can. So I want to see something much more detailed and I leave it to you but –

MR. GORDON: Ms. Sacco, if I may, what changes are you referring to that were made on the back of the building?

MS. SACCO: They put signs up on the back of the building and they changed the windows on the back they put some boards on the windows, I don't even know what they are really.

MR. GORDON: How long ago were those changes made?

MS. SACCO: I would say within the past year.

MR. GORDON: Maybe you can ask somebody to take a look over there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right we will continue this next month after we find out more.

MS. SACCO: Okay I thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what we are here for.

MR. GORDON: Ms. Sacco, just so it is clear the Commission will not be making a decision tonight and we will continue this matter presumably at our August meeting which is August 25 and this matter will be on again at 7:30 pm.

MS. SACCO: I will be here. Thank you so much again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen we will wait to hear from you and keep this hearing open.

HARDSHIP

NONE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The public hearings are closed.

New Business

None

Old Business

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just want to let you know I went by Mr. King's property at the corner of Penfield and East Avenue and it looks like the windows were vinyl so a letter was sent to Mr. King by the building department and Mr. King was ordered to correct those Andersen Windows and they are not in yet but I assume they will be. Any other old business?

1981 South Clinton Avenue

MS. LANPHEAR: It is really looking awful. The roof over the front door is pretty much all gone.

A discussion was had regarding the state of the home.

PRESENTATIONS

NONE

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NONE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I have a motion to adjourn?

MS. VANDERLINDE: So moved.

MR. PAGE: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The meeting is adjourned.

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Judy Almekinder, 7633 Bauer Van Wickle Road,
Lyons, New York 14489, do hereby state that the minutes of the July 28 2016
Meeting of the Town of Brighton's 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

On this 15 day of August in the year 2016, 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.



Notary Public

TAMMI M. MACKERCHAR
Notary Public, State of New York
Qualified in Yates County
No. 01MA6058207
Commission Expires May 7, 2019

Addendum to the July 2016 meeting of the
Historic Preservation Commission

PAGE 4 It should be made clear that Mr. Gordon did not make the motion
for 7H-01-16 but rather Mr. Whitaker did.