STATE OF NEW YORK  
VILLAGE OF GREENPORT  
------------------------------------------ X

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
------------------------------------------ X

February 10, 2014  
5:00 P.M.

BEFORE:

FRANK UELLENDahl - CHAIRMAN
ROSELLE BORRELLI - MEMBER (Excused)
LUCY CLARK - MEMBER
DENNIS MCMahON - MEMBER
CAROLINE WALOSKI - MEMBER
CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: I am going to get started with the Historic Preservation Meeting. It is now February 10, 2014. We had a one week postponement because of a snow storm. It is 5:12. There are two items on the agenda, and we are waiting for Matt Ritter who is the contractor on 449 Main Street, which is Item No. 1. So we will see if he comes. So I guess we should discuss Item No. 2. Discussion and possible motion on an application submitted by Carlos and Patricia DeJesus, owners of the residence located in the Historic District at 754 Main Street. The applicants would like to replace all windows at the rear of the facade of their
home with vinyl replacement units (4
double-hung's, 1 awning, 2 casements).
SCTM# 1001-2-3-6. The Building Inspector,
Eileen Wingate told me the homeowners could
not be here tonight. They could have been
there last week. She submitted some photos
of the rear of the facade of the house, and
I visited the site this afternoon, and took
a lot of photos. They do have -- there are
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many different types of windows. There are
double-hung's. I couldn't really tell if
the first and second double-hung windows
are casements. They may be casements, but
I really cannot tell exactly are to be
replaced. There is also in the front some
kind of porch. There are four windows that
were boarded up, and I cannot really tell
from the application whether those windows
will be replaced as well. They are
planning to replace the rear windows with
vinyl windows. I do not know this company.
It's called Power Remodeling Group. I was online this afternoon to see if I could get some details about measurements, frames, but there was nothing on the website that would give me any more information. But I would like to open up the discussion on this project. We have been approving windows in the Historic District that are not wood windows, but some of the windows that were approved where made out of composite material. The Reese building was one. I do not know about this company, so that is why I would like to open up the discussion on this project.
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MEMBER WALOSKI: It's kind of important for us to know the extent of the replacement. If they're planning on restoring those porch windows also. This is not a complete application.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: It's
unfortunately not a complete application. They did not submit any photos. They did not submit a floor plan that would tell us exactly which windows are affected here. I also have a question, is it only rear facing windows because there is also windows on the sides, that are visible from the street, and I do not know based on the count of the windows that they submitted here, if some of those windows were to be included in this case.

MEMBER MCMAHON: My opinion is, they are on the back of the house and not facing the street. Since we have approved vinyl windows before, I have no problem. I do agree, that if they do extend this program to the side of the house they should give us more information. So based on that decision, to do only the back of the house, then I would approve. If they go to the side of the house, then they should
probably give us a sample of the window.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: Another question is, as you can see from the photos from the Building Inspector, those existing windows have six over six double-hung's. The applicant's propose no grills at all facing the back of the house. This is something that we feel should be concerned about or do we maybe mention or ask them to have grills on them? Again, this is also facing the back, which has a long facade facing the rear yard. So we may have to actually take a walk and take a look.

MEMBER MCMAHON: These grills look like they are faked in anyway.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: No, not as far as I could tell. There was a lot of snow and ice.

MEMBER MCMAHON: If they are going to stick to the back of the house then I really don't have a problem with it. You can see that they were a hodge-podge
windows. There is nothing here that is
preserved or preservable.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: You know, if you
walk into the rear yard, you feel, like,
"God, you have to clean this up." It's not
a beautiful site. There are a lot of
changes. Some of those windows are
preexisting. Some of them have been
replaced. I would just like to know if they
are going to include the porch windows or
not, or maybe can you?

MEMBER MCMAHON: No.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I have a question.

Who's facing the back? What property is
going to look at this?

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: This property is
facing east. There is nothing really back
there.

MEMBER WALOSKI: So it's not going to
impact anyone's view?

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Correct.
MEMBER WALOSKI: It will have an impact, if you have a house that is really cared for and following all the codes and restrictions and then you get somebody that just puts in whatever.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: I did not see that. As a matter of fact, I think if they are willing to spend the money on replacement windows and the windows on the back would be an improvement on the property.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Maybe we should table it until we take a look at it and inspect it and find out what is happening?

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Well, yes, this is one way of going forward. There is also the possibility that we can approve it based upon what we are going to put in our motion.

MEMBER MCMAHON: These would be an improvement as well.
MEMBER WALOSKI: I don't even know if that is even in their plan though. We need someone to come in and explain it. So I would table it.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: I have some questions too. Based on the agenda, there are seven windows. Dennis has a point, there are quite a few more windows. We don't if they are going to be replaced.

MEMBER CLARK: Your point being, you want them all replaced?

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: No. No. I would like to know which windows are where.

MEMBER MCMAHON: It's not terribly clear. To me, I am with them pulling out their windows and putting in new ones. I think what is going on back here is not affecting anybody. It's obviously going to be an improvement. I cannot imagine that these are not going to be replaced here.
CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Well, it's a porch. I just don't know why they're boarded up. I can see that we can see that we can make a motion of what they're asking for. We may want to ask them to be more specific on which ones are to be replaced and which ones are not. And also exclude any windows on this side, north and south and the front.

MEMBER MCMAHON: That's fine.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Does that work for everybody?

MEMBER CLARK: Yes.
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MEMBER WALOSKI: Okay. I would agree of passing this as long -- because you said --

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Make a motion then.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I make a motion that we pass replacing the windows proposed on the back of the property at 754 Main
Street, but only the back. Not the sides or the front.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: And continuing the motion, we would like more clarifications on which windows will be replaced or are there any windows that --

MEMBER CLARK: Will remain as is.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: Will remain as is.

MEMBER MCMAHON: I will second that.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: All in favor?

MEMBER CLARK: Aye.

MEMBER MCMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: Aye.

All in favor.

Okay. Matt Ritter is here. So we are moving onto Item No. 1, continued discussion and possible motion on an application submitted by Mathew Ritter on
behalf of Bennett Brokow (449 Main Holding, LLC), the owner of the commercial property located in the Historic District at 449 Main Street. The owner will present samples for the front porch railings. SCTM# 1001-4-7-18.

Okay, Matt, how are you doing?

MR. RITTER: I'm doing good. How are you? Good to see you.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: So before you get started, this is a project that we reviewed last month, and some details had been approved. The owner was there.

MR. RITTER: Yes, he was.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: This is a beautiful historic structure on Main Street. Everybody has seen the paint job on the front elevation. And I have printed out a photo of the historic map that the owner has seen probably or not.

MEMBER MCMAHON: Have you seen that map?
MR. RITTER: I have not seen that map. I have seen some details but unfortunately have been lost. I have seen some details of the trim on the south side, but only one side. After this application, I was going to actually ask for the Board’s recommendation if there is any grants or any funding, to restore the gable trim. Mr. Brokow is highly interested in restoring this. He's a very generous man. This will be a copious amount of work and money, and I would like to know if the Village could assist?

MEMBER MCMAHON: There used to be a program. Mr. Abatelli knew more about that. We don’t handle that.

CHAIRMAN ULDENDAHL: We don’t have the funds. You can go to the Village and ask Mr. Abatelli about it. But tonight, Matt Ritter, we are here to discuss those items, the gable or --

MR. RITTER: It was something that I
wanted to ask about.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Okay. So we're only talking about the railing?
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1
MR. RITTER: Yes.

2
CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: So what is the owner planning to do as far as the porch railings?

5
MR. RITTER: This is my design here. Going to paint it white obviously. This design replicates the window trim. Comes down just like this in the middle.

9
CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: So we have a pre-base in front and this central element will be one --

12
MR. RITTER: Yes, per bay.

13
CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: And on both sides?

15
MR. RITTER: Correct. And the stairs.

16
CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Stairs going down. Okay. Now, what is the height of
MR. RITTER: 36.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: I don't think you actually have to make it 36" in height because the historic building had very low railing. I was talking to the Building Inspector and she would grandfather this in. I would like to know from you what the distance is from the top of the porch to the -- not really our concern, but the Building Department's concern. Is it more than 30" from the top of the porch to the grade? As per building code, you don't need a 36" rail if you are closer to the grade. We would like to get as closely to the original, as far as the height is concerned. This may be 20-21" high.

MR. RITTER: I see the original. Very nice. I had not seen this before.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: Matt, so what it was before, this is a little bit out of
proportion. This is not the historical look of a porch. These homes, like mine and Dennis' home, our railings are a little bit lower to the ground. We would like you to keep that in mind. I personally think that it should be lowered.

MR. RITTER: So do I. Obviously there is a cap that comes on the columns for detail. That is where this railing stops, at that cap.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: This is an indication that the railing would be a couple of inches lower. Question is, can you shorten this?

MR. RITTER: Sure.

MEMBER WALOSKI: How would this look if shortened?

MEMBER MCPAHON: You can take the centers our. The square ones are easier. The decorative ones become shorter.
MR. RITTER: It's a great idea. I would love to do it.

MEMBER MCMAHON: If you can get it down to that height and squeeze it --

MR. RITTER: Okay. Done deal.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: We are talking about historical railings. So I feel, as we discuss it now, we have to bring it down so that it works with the columns.

MR. RITTER: It would look very nice.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: So this design will be a departure of the historical design but let's discuss this?

MEMBER MCMAHON: They have the same sort of details on my windows. The fact that you drag that same sort of elements to the windows, that is what you want to do.

I think too many of those, it's too busy. The fact that he made it lighter, it's --

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Could we have basically the distance of the two styles,
of the spindles, could we move the frame
closer?

MEMBER MCMAHON: You are looking at
the space in the center?

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: Yes. I don't
care so much about the bottom. We are now
looking at the entire place. So we have
like six or seven spindles on the right
hand side.

MEMBER WALOSKI: To me it doesn't
matter.

MEMBER MCMAHON: Those are all equal
spaces. I agree.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: I feel that this
should be the same in space. I don't care
so much about this -- I mean, that is my
opinion. You may want to widen this
another half an inch, I don't know. As
long as the voids are basically the same,
then it would flow together.

MR. RITTER: Okay. Interesting. I
will just re-proportion these setbacks.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: This gets a little bit closer. You can widen this a little more.

MEMBER MCMAHON: The cadence always changes. Matt's giving us a simple here.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: That is my opinion.

MR. RITTER: Okay. You have a valid point.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: I would have approved the spindles continuously but I kind of like it.

All right.

MR. RITTER: I wish I had seen these pictures prior.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: These pictures are available at Village Hall to the public.

Okay. So may I have a motion.

MEMBER MCMAHON: I will make a motion to approve the sample railing. Matt's
going to shorten it and make it a little
more appropriate of what is there, and
adjust the spacing and try and shorten it.
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1               MR. RITTER:  Do you need me to bring
another sample?

2               MEMBER MCMAHON:  No, we are approving
it.

3               MEMBER CLARK:  I second it.

4               CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL:  All in favor?

5               MEMBER CLARK:  Aye.

6               MEMBER MCMAHON:  Aye.

7               MEMBER WALOSKI:  Aye.

8               CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL:  Aye.

9               Are you planning to come back next
month to discuss other details?

10              MR. RITTER:  I didn't plan to.

11              CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL:  I don't need to
see another sample. I would rather take a
look at it in the field.

12              MEMBER WALOSKI:  Yeah, we can stop by,
an not hold you up.
CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Matt, thank you very much for your presentation. So moving right on. Item No. 3, motion to approve the minutes of December 2, 2013.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I make a motion to approve the minutes of December 2, 2013.
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MEMBER CLARK: I second.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: All in favor.

MEMBER CLARK: Aye.

MEMBER MCMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Aye.

Motion to accept the minutes of last month, January 6, 2014.

MEMBER CLARK: I will make a motion to accept them. I actually have corrections. Do you want to do it next month?

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: No, I think we
can do it now and we can approve it. You have some comments?

MEMBER CLARK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Please. Go ahead.

MEMBER CLARK: Page 31, Line 12. It states that it's Mr. Brokow but it's actually Mr. Van Eiff from the Baptist Church. And also Line 17, the same thing. Also Page 32, Line 3 and Line 9. For some reason, Mr. Brokow's name got into where Van Eiff should have been.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: That's important. So basically replacing the name Brokow with Van Eiff. Thank you for that, Lucy.

MEMBER CLARK: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN ULLENDAHL: Item No. 5, motion to schedule the next HPC Meeting for March 3, 2014.

MEMBER CLARK: I will be here. I make a motion to schedule the next HPC Meeting
for March 3, 2014. Is everyone available?

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: I am not. I am in Germany. Would you like to Chair the meeting?

MEMBER CLARK: I would love to Chair the meeting.

CHAIRMAN ULENDAHL: So then I will appoint Lucy to Chair the meeting next month. Thank you very much.

Motion to adjourn. It is now 5:46.

(Whereupon, the meeting concluded.)
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