

**TOWN OF PITTSFORD
DESIGN REVIEW & HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES
DECEMBER 14, 2023**

Minutes of the Town of Pittsford Design Review and Historic Preservation Board meeting held on December 14, 2023, at 6:00PM local time. The meeting took place in the Lower-Level Meeting Room of Pittsford Town Hall, 11 S. Main Street.

PRESENT: Dirk Schneider, Chairman; Dave Wigg, Vice Chairman; Jim Vekasy; Bonnie Salem; Kathleen Cristman; John Mitchell

ABSENT: Paul Whitbeck

ALSO PRESENT: Anthony Caruso, Building Inspector; Robert Koegel, Town Attorney; Meghan Brooks, Building Department Assistant

ATTENDANCE: There were 17 members of the public present.

The Design Review and Historic Preservation Board (DRHPB) Chairman Dirk Schneider called the meeting to order at 6:01PM.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DISCUSSION

DRHPB Member Bonnie Salem thanked those who attended the 2023 Reception for Owners of Inventoried Homes. She stated that follow-up letters have been sent to the owners and that she feels it was a successful event. While it may not be a fast turnaround, many of the owners seemed interested in designating their homes.

RESIDENTIAL APPLICATIONS: NEW HOMES

14 Black Wood Circle

Applicant is requesting design review for a one-story, 2,241-square-foot, single-family home in the Wilshire Hills Subdivision.

Bill Arieno of Pride Mark Homes introduced the application. Mr. Arieno stated that this is the penultimate home in the Wilshire Hills Subdivision. The design is consistent with those in the neighborhood but unique along its cul-de-sac.

DRHPB Member Kathleen Cristman motioned to approve the one-story, 2,241-square-foot, single-family home in the Wilshire Hills Subdivision as submitted. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member John Mitchell. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

65 & 67 Skylight Trail

Applicant is requesting design review for a two-unit, one-story, single-family townhome in the Alpine Ridge Subdivision. The units are 2,023 and 2,760 square feet, respectively.

Bill Arieno of Morrell Builders introduced the application. Mr. Arieno stated that this is the third to last two-unit townhome to be built in the Alpine Ridge Subdivision. It has a side-load garage on the left unit and stone veneer on the right unit.

DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider asked if the gables are different in material than other townhomes. Mr. Arieno stated that each design is slightly different. Board Member Salem clarified the difference in square footage between the units stems from the finished basement.

DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider motioned to approve the two-unit, one-story, single-family townhome in the Alpine Ridge Subdivision, the units being 2,023 and 2,760 square feet respectively, as submitted. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member John Mitchell. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

RESIDENTIAL APPLICATIONS: ADDITIONS & RENOVATIONS

800 Allens Creek Road

Applicant is requesting design review for a 240-square-foot storage addition off the side of the home.

Dan Pieters, AIA, introduced the application with homeowner Brandon Di'Cesare. Mr. Pieters stated that he was brought in for the formal permit submission of the storage addition, whose construction had already begun. It is a side-load, double door shed addition adjoining the garage. The addition will be roofed with metal because of the shallow slope and the siding will match the color of the house, though it will have a vinyl shake rather than wooden.

Chairman Schneider asked about the current state of construction. Mr. Pieters stated that it currently utilizes a trench footing with a concrete pad and confirmed that it is attached to the garage wall. Upon questioning from Chairman Schneider, Building Inspector Anthony Caruso stated that full footings will have to be dug but that a more thorough analysis of the construction plans will be done during the code review process.

Board Member Salem expressed her concerns that this property is adjacent to a landmark home and that this addition is extending towards the property line that it shares with said landmark. She stated that the overall visual appeal is not present, especially when taking into consideration the roof style and the blank wall facing towards the road. DRHPB Member John Mitchell asked Mr. Pieters why they had not chosen a gabled roof. Mr. Pieters stated that there is a window in the second story bedroom there that is not shown in the plans which provides the only means of egress from that bedroom.

Mr. Di'Cesare stated for the Board's reference that he had received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals on November 20, 2023.

DRHPB Member Kathleen Cristman stated that while she understands the need for storage, the proposed addition does not do the home any favors.

The Design Review & Historic Preservation Board has asked the applicant to return to the Board with design changes to the roof shape and solid, road-facing wall.

800 Allens Creek Road

Applicant is requesting design review for an approximately 360-square-foot balcony addition off the rear of the home.

Dan Pieters, AIA, introduced the application with homeowner Brandon Di'Cesare. Mr. Pieters stated that they are proposing a balcony with a lower patio on the northwest corner of the house. The master bedroom leads onto the balcony from the second floor. A shed dormer will extend to create room for the door. The deck will be waterproof to avoid dripping on the patio below. The patio will be made of either pavers or poured concrete.

Board Member Salem asked if the view will be looking out over the neighbors. Mr. Pieters responded no; it should just be the golf course. Board Member Cristman asked what the railings will be. Mr. Pieters stated it will be a PVC picket rail with x-lacing, capped. DRHPB Vice Chairman Dave Wigg requested clarification on the watershed plan; Mr. Pieters stated that they would utilize a trough system that travels north with a gutter and downspout.

DRHPB Chairman Schneider motioned to approve the approximately 360-square-foot balcony addition off the rear of the home as submitted. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member Kathleen Cristman. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

9 Vincent Drive

Applicant is requesting design review for a 128-square-foot master bedroom addition and a 124-square-foot front porch addition, both extending off the front of the home.

Kip Finley, AIA, introduced the application with homeowner Donald Cornwell. Mr. Finley gave a brief overview of the additions and stated that the home's current design is nearly the same as it was when it was built. He also stated that the application has gone before the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance and was approved. There will be vinyl shake, vinyl clapboard, and faux stone used in the design. The faux stone will wrap the corner. The shakes will be in the Castlestone color demonstrated in the provided illustration. The clapboard will match the existing white siding. He added that there are two roofing options: either asphalt shingles or metal. Budget will determine which will be used.

Vice Chairman Wigg stated that the changes will be a nice improvement to the home and asked what color the windows will be. Mr. Finley stated that they will be white, as before.

There was some discussion on the materials being used in the project, and Board Member Salem cautioned against adding a fourth material with the metal roof. Board Member Cristman stated that the design feels very busy to her, and Chairman Schneider suggested that perhaps only the two gables have the shake. Mr. Finley stated that that is up to the customer. Board Member Salem noted that she felt that that suggestion would make the siding more cohesive.

Vice Chairman Wigg added that a white board band separating the two sidings would make it look very natural carrying over from the porch addition.

DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider motioned to approve the 128-square-foot master bedroom addition and a 124-square-foot front porch addition, both extending off the front of the home, as submitted, with the condition that the front elevation of the bedroom addition will have white clapboard siding up to the eave, and the gables on both additions will be the cedar shake style siding with a white transition board in between the clapboard and shake. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member Jim Vekasy. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

96 Coventry Ridge

Applicant is requesting design review for an approximately 512-square-foot covered patio with a bar area off the rear of the home.

Mike Loewke of Loewke Construction introduced the application. Mr. Loewke stated that this application had been before the Board over the summer but, after several design changes, they have come back to get approval for the new design. There will no longer be a fireplace wall and the finishings will match existing home. There will not be latticework on the television wall as shown in the plans, but rather a white PVC decorative panel.

Chairman Schneider confirmed with Mr. Loewke that the material will be vinyl siding. Mr. Loewke added that the roof would be metal due to the 2½/12 roof pitch. Chairman Schneider asked Mr. Loewke whether the CMU would be exposed as shown in the plans. Mr. Loewke stated that it would have a stone veneer. Board Member Salem confirmed that it would be the same stone veneer as that on the front of the house. Board Member Cristman asked what the flooring of the patio would be. Mr. Loewke stated that it would be stone pavers.

There was some further discussion wherein the Board confirmed other finishings for the addition, including the siding used and the style of posts.

DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider motioned to approve the approximately 512-square-foot covered patio with a bar area off the rear of the home as submitted, with the following conditions:

- 1) the end gables will have cedar shakes
- 2) the areas with CMU shown in the plans will be stone veneer
- 3) the areas showing lattice on the plans will receive solid PVC panels, painted to match the siding
- 4) the roof will be a standing seam metal roof with the color to be burnished slate.

This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member Bonnie Salem. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

65 Alpine Drive

Applicant is requesting design review for a 765-square-foot first floor addition and a 268-square-foot garage addition on the east side of the home, along with front facade changes.

Paul Morabito of Morabito Architects introduced the application. Mr. Morabito described the project and stated that the application received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals in November. He noted that several changes had been made to the plans published on the website (updated copies distributed to the Board), including the alteration of the porch roof angles and material, and the addition of board and batten to the gables. The front columns will be of smart trim in order to be maintenance-free.

Regarding the revised elevations, Chairman Schneider asked what the reason was for adding board and batten. Mr. Morabito stated that they are trying to bring it in as a design feature from the rear of the home. The addition is trying to balance interest with consistency. DRHPB Member Jim Vekasy confirmed with Mr. Morabito that the fascia will match up, and Board Member Cristman confirmed that the metal roofing will be black to match.

Vice Chairman Wigg asked if they had considered bringing the porch roof all the way around. Mr. Morabito stated that they had thought about it, but it would be essentially a floating roof with no purpose.

Board Member Mitchell asked if all of the siding would be white, including the brick. Mr. Morabito confirmed that it would be, and that the use of different materials creates different textures upon the white. The siding will be vinyl with a 5-inch exposure. Board Member Mitchell also confirmed that the columns would remain square.

There was discussion about the general design of the home, particularly the gables and shutters. The Board stated that they would prefer not to have the upper triangle in the gable, even though it pulls the design from the dormers, as it diminishes the overall look. Board Member Salem also suggested that the best course of action might be to remove the shutters from the lower window of the front door section in order to remain consistent with the upper windows.

Chairman Schneider asked if the new garage door will match the existing two; Mr. Morabito stated that it would either match, or they would replace all the doors to be the same.

DRHPB Member Bonnie Salem motioned to approve the 765-square-foot first floor addition and a 268-square-foot garage addition on the east side of the home, along with front façade changes, as submitted, with the following conditions:

1. that the board and batten in the gable run to the frieze
2. that the lower shutter be removed on the porch area
3. that the three garage doors match each other.

This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member Kathleen Cristman. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

45 Knollwood Drive

Applicant is requesting design review for exterior renovations and the enclosure of an existing second-story deck off the rear of the home.

Dan Pieters, AIA, introduced the application with Steve Grossi of Louis J. Grossi, Inc. Mr. Pieters stated that they are proposing to refinish the exterior of the home. Changes will include painting the existing brick in an opaque stain, replacing the roof with natural cedar that will gray over time, and bringing in copper elements in several areas (including the top ridge of the roofline and the entry). The current fiberglass columns will be replaced with wood and finished to match the weathered look. Wood shutters will be added, and the vented eaves will be of painted wood. The garage door will be a manufacturing composite wood with windows on top of it.

Mr. Pieters also stated that they are planning on enclosing the existing second-story deck to become a screened porch with douglas fir frames. Upon questioning from Board Member Cristman, he confirmed that the dividing window lites will be white.

There was further discussion about the design, and Board Member Salem stated that while this home is adjacent to a landmark home, the proposed changes seem unlikely to cause any negative impact and the design is appropriate for both the neighborhood and the home.

DRHPB Member John Mitchell motioned to approve the exterior renovations and the enclosure of an existing second-story deck off the rear of the home as submitted. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Vice Chairman David Wigg. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

RESIDENTIAL APPLICATIONS: ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

24 Whitestone Lane

Applicant is requesting design review for a 450-square-foot pavilion behind the home.

David Crowe, AIA, introduced the application. Mr. Crowe stated that the homeowners wish to create protective cover near the pool that is being built and the project received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for its size. He described the proposed design, stating that the pavilion will be open on all sides, with the exception of having a wall behind the bar area. The fireplace will be masonry with a stucco-white chimney. Other design details include a galvanized-finish roof with gutters to match, painted poly-ash composite-covered columns and beams and two downspouts on the south end of the structure. Additionally, the back wall will be sided with 6-inch, shiplap-style lpe wood to break up the white color with a natural material.

DRHPB Member Jim Vekasy motioned to approve the 450-square-foot pavilion behind the home as submitted. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member John Mitchell. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

25 Greylock Ridge

Applicant is requesting design review for an oversized, 224-square-foot pergola behind the home.

Frank Sudore, the project builder, introduced the application. Mr. Sudore stated that this application received a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for its size.

Chairman Schneider asked if the pergola will be built as depicted. Mr. Sudore confirmed that it would be.

DRHPB Member Bonnie Salem motioned to approve the oversized, 224-square-foot pergola behind the home as submitted. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

COMMERCIAL APPLICATIONS: ADDITIONS & RENOVATIONS

3690 East Avenue – St. John Fisher University

Applicant is requesting design review for the addition of two entry vestibules to the north and south elevations of the St. John Fisher Lavery Library as a part of a large-scale renovation project.

David Collins of Hamilton Stern Construction introduced the application with George Stooks of St. John Fisher University. Mr. Collins stated that the project is mostly interior work but will include the addition of two entry vestibules. The brick will match existing building. The entrance vestibules will have a cathedral arch with the classic St. John Fisher arch to match.

Chairman Schneider asked if the stone in the arch is precast. Mr. Collins stated that it is. The storefront windows on either side of the entrance and inside curtain wall will be bronze. Vice Chairman Wigg confirmed with Mr. Collins that the building was built in the 1970's and is thus over fifty years old. Board Member Salem confirmed with Mr. Collins that the materials that are used on the large vestibule will match the existing materials.

DRHPB Vice Chairman Dave Wigg motioned to approve the addition of windows and two entry vestibules to the St. John Fisher Lavery Library, as a part of a large-scale renovation project, as submitted. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Member Bonnie Salem. Following a unanimous voice vote, the application was approved, none opposed.

CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

810 Allens Creek Road

Applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness, pursuant to Town Code Section 185-196, for fence modifications. This property zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

Chairman Schneider opened the public hearing.

Kim Bailey of Stahl Property Associates introduced the application. Ms. Bailey stated that they are seeking amendments to their previous Certificate of Appropriateness. She summarized the changes she is applying for which are inconsistent with the previous application (2021), including the reduction, style, color, and placement of the fencing, the addition of the gate, the increase in the amount of asphalt to the side of the porte-cochere, and the removal of a small section of asphalt that connected the straight section of driveway with the loop. The Board held in extensive discussion on these modifications.

When Chairman Schneider asked Ms. Bailey why the fencing was changed, she responded that the original drawings submitted to the Board had just had a placeholder design and had not meant to represent the final style, as she had not realized it mattered. Chairman Schneider asked for the Board's opinion on whether they thought the fence style is compatible with age of building. The previously approved style was solid at bottom and pickets at the top, and he stated that the current look does not seem in keeping with the character of the home. Board Member Cristman noted that the fence is very important to the original approval of the additions, not just in its style but in its coverage and positioning of the new addition. Board Member Salem concurred.

Board Member Mitchell stated that he thinks that the change from white to black fencing makes the design very dark and would prefer to see it returned to the originally approved white paint. Board Member Vekasy said that he did not have a strong preference on color either way, but that the most bothersome part for him is the missing section of fencing next to the porte-cochere because it makes the back area look messy. Ms. Bailey stated that the fence was moved from the original position because a car parked in the porte-cochere could not fully extend its door, and the section was removed because she had wanted to place a gate for further access to the back but could not find one appropriate to their needs.

Chairman Schneider confirmed with Ms. Bailey that the curved section of pavement from the straight driveway to the looped driveway had been eliminated from the design and was now landscaped. Board Member Salem added that the removal of the fencing dramatically increased the amount of asphalt in the front of the property and expressed that the change is a detriment to the historic character of the property.

Chairman Schneider asked what the purpose was of adding the gate to the southwest corner of the property. Ms. Bailey stated that it privatized the side yard while allowing lawn equipment to pass through to the rear. Board Member Salem asked if she had considered adding a walkway to the gate to ground it to the landscape design rather than leaving it floating; Ms. Bailey stated that she intended to leave it up to the new homeowners. She had not realized that adding the gate to the property would require a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Chairman Schneider stated that the Board had approved a plan for additions and renovations to a historic home and that he takes issue with the fact that the plan was not followed. He stated that he would like to see the property returned to the approved design. Board Member Cristman added that she feels that disregarding of the original Certificate of Appropriateness sets a bad precedent and does not feel comfortable with allowing modifications post-construction. Ms. Bailey stated that she did not knowingly try to disregard the original Certificate of Appropriateness and that it was a mistake.

Board Member Mitchell suggested trying to find a middle ground by allowing the gate to remain rather than requiring it to be removed. Vice Chairman Wigg said that he too did not feel that the gate was of high importance, but that the fence and pavement issues needed to be resolved. There was some discussion wherein the Board considered allowing the gate to remain, but it was decided that, should the applicant or new homeowner wish to keep the gate, they could return with a separate Certificate of Appropriateness rather than trying to rework a resolution around allowing it.

DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider opened the podium to public comment. Hearing none, Chairman Schneider motioned to close the public hearing.

The Board, upon reading the resolution, denied the applicant a Certificate of Appropriateness. The resolution was moved by DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider, seconded by Board Member Kathleen Cristman, and voted upon by the Board, as follows:

Paul Whitbeck voted	Absent
Jim Vekasy voted	Aye
John Mitchell voted	Aye
Dave Wigg voted	Aye
Bonnie Salem voted	Aye
Kathleen Cristman voted	Aye
Dirk Schneider voted	Aye

The full adopted resolution is attached to the end of these minutes.

2024 MEETING SCHEDULE REVIEW

Building Department Assistant Meghan Brooks stated that there is a draft copy of the 2024 meeting schedule in front of each Board member that suggests moving the two meetings from the second and fourth Thursdays of December to the first and third Thursdays, in order to accommodate for the holidays. Following a brief perusal of the document, the Board approved the suggested date changes:

ORIGINAL:		NEW:
<i>Thursday, December 12, 2024</i>	→	<i>Thursday, December 5, 2024</i>
<i>Thursday, December 26, 2024</i>	→	<i>Thursday, December 19, 2024</i>

11/09/2023 MEETING MINUTES REVIEW

The minutes of November 9, 2023, were approved following a motion by DRHPB Member Bonnie Salem. This motion was seconded by DRHPB Chairman Dirk Schneider. Following a unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved, none opposed.

OTHER DISCUSSION

Design Review and Historic Preservation Board Chairman Dirk Schneider closed the meeting at 9:33PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Brooks
Building Department Assistant

OFFICIAL MINUTES ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT

**TOWN OF PITTSFORD
DESIGN REVIEW & HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
RESOLUTION**

RE: 810 Allens Creek Road

**Tax Parcel: 138.13-1-40
Applicant: Stahl Property Associates
Zoned: Residential Neighborhood (RN)
File: CA23-000006**

WHEREAS, the above property was previously designated as an Historic Landmark on January 18, 1996; and

WHEREAS, the applicant herein, Stahl Property Associates, as owner of the above described property, has heretofore submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to perform certain work on the property, including the construction of a 620 square foot, two-story addition to the rear of the building, an enlarged existing side porch, a porte-cochere with a wooden fence line to screen the proposed carriage house, and a free-standing, 1,200 square foot, two-story carriage house, in accordance with plans submitted on or about September 9, 2021, for which approval was granted by Board resolution adopted on September 9, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has completed certain work on the property, but has not secured a Certificate of Compliance from the Town because certain aspects of the work performed are not in compliance with the approved September 9, 2021 plans; namely, 1) the wooden gate and brick posts on the southwest side of the property are not authorized by the 2021 Board resolution, 2) the wooden fence on the northeast side of the property does not extend to the porte-cochere to screen the carriage house, is aligned at the end of the porte-cochere instead of in the middle of it, is painted black instead of white, and is of a different style, and 3) the asphalt driveway extends over an area of the northeast yard meant to remain grass and omits a curve in the front yard toward the porte-cochere meant to be paved; and

WHEREAS, the applicant, seeking to rectify this noncompliance, has submitted another application, dated November 3, 2023, for another Certificate of Appropriateness, asking the Board to approve the work already performed on the gate, the fence, and the driveway, to be in compliance with the provisions of Town Code Section 185-198(A); and

WHEREAS, a hearing was held on December 14, 2023, for the purpose of allowing the presentation of testimony and/or evidence by the owner or any other interested party, in accordance with Town Code Section 185-198(C); and

WHEREAS, this matter is a Type II Action, in accordance with the provisions of Section 6 NYCRR Section 617.5(c)(2), (11), (12), and (38), of the SEQRA Regulations, requiring no further review by this Commission;

NOW, THEREFORE, upon consideration by the Design Review and Historic Preservation Board of the aforesaid application, and upon the completion of the aforesaid hearing, and the Board having given this matter due deliberation and consideration; it is

RESOLVED, that the Design Review and Historic Preservation Board makes the following findings and decision:

FINDINGS OF FACT

The within application has been reviewed by the Board, taking into consideration the factors required by Town Code Section 185-197(C).

As to the appropriateness of the general design, scale, and character of the proposed work to the property, as well as with surrounding properties, the Board finds that:

The wooden gate and brick posts on the southwest side of the property were not part of the application for the original Certificate of Appropriateness. They are unnecessary alterations to the property that are not appropriate to the general design and character of the house.

The proposed changes to the length and color of the fence on the northeast side of the property will have a negative impact on the character of the historic property. The section of fencing was proposed in the original Certificate of Appropriateness application, approved September 9, 2021, to screen the new carriage house from the street. The relocation and reduction of the fence removes screening crucial to decreasing the visibility of the new carriage house addition and introduces additional asphalt to the property. These changes are a detriment to the character of the historic property and, as such, are not appropriate to the character of the home.

The omission of the driveway curve in the front yard toward the porte-cochere does not have a negative impact on the character of the historic property and is acceptable to the Board.

As to the texture, materials, and colors proposed to be used and the compatibility of such features to the property, as well as with surrounding properties, the Board finds that:

The black color used to paint the wooden fence is not appropriate to the historic character of the home and is incompatible with the white-painted trim and design features utilized in the rest of the design. The wood material of the fence remains consistent with the Certificate of Appropriateness granted September 9, 2021, but the current application does not meet the original fence style and the condition that the wood fence was to be painted white.

As to the visual compatibility of the proposed work with the property, as well as with surrounding properties, the Board finds that:

The gate, truncated fence, and widened driveway work by the applicant is not visually compatible with the historic nature of the property, with the exception of the omission of the extra asphalt curve in the front yard that would have connected the straight drive to the circular drive in the original Certificate of Appropriateness (2021). The original Certificate of Appropriateness was reviewed with consideration to the existing historic home with the proposed addition, the porte-cochere, the carriage house, the screening fence, and the driveway. Approval was granted based on the whole project and its compatibility with the historic home. The partial removal of the screening fence, which is an important piece of the

whole, is detrimental to the overall appearance and visual compatibility of the approved additions and changes.

As to the potential impact of the work on important historic, architectural, or other features of the property, the Board finds that:

The proposal to reduce the length of the screening fence and increase the amount of asphalt will have a negative impact on the historic property by increasing the visibility of the new carriage house and detracting from the original landscaping of the property. The original Certificate of Appropriateness (2021) was granted following careful review and consideration of the impact that the scope and scale of work would have on the historic property. The Board finds that the amendments made to the original plan and put forth in this application will have a negative impact on both the historic and architectural features of the property.

DECISION

Based upon the above Findings of Fact, the Board hereby concludes that the following work completed by the applicant is not compatible with the historic character of the structure and, as such, is not appropriate:

1. The reduction in length of the northeastern fence and its location to the porte-cochere.
2. The increase in asphalt to widen the driveway beside the porte-cochere.
3. The addition of a wood gate and brick posts on the southwestern side of the property.
4. The use of black paint on the fence.
5. The style of the fence.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact, the Board hereby concludes that the following work completed by the applicant is compatible with the historic character of the structure and, as such, is appropriate:

1. The omission of the extra asphalt connecting the straight drive to the circle drive, which was approved in the original Certificate of Appropriateness application (2021).

Accordingly, the Design Review and Historic Preservation Board hereby denies to the applicant a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The within Resolution was moved by Design Review & Historic Preservation Board Chairman Dirk Schneider, seconded by Board Member Kathleen Cristman, and voted upon by the Board, as follows:

Paul Whitbeck voted	Absent
Jim Vekasy voted	Aye
John Mitchell voted	Aye
Dave Wigg voted	Aye
Bonnie Salem voted	Aye
Kathleen Cristman voted	Aye
Dirk Schneider voted	Aye

The Design Review & Historic Preservation Board adopted the above resolution on December 14, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Brooks
Building Department Assistant
Secretary to the Design Review & Historic Preservation Board