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CHAIRMAN BULL: It is now 5:08 p.m. This is the meeting of The Historical Preservation Committee on February 6, 2017. I am Stephen M. Bull, Chairperson. On my far right is --

MEMBER McMAHON: Dennis McMahon.

MEMBER WETSELL: Susan Wetsell.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Caroline Waloski.

CHAIRMAN BULL: We have a quorum.

The first item on our agenda tonight is Item One. The discussion and possible motion on the application for sign permit by the Special Effects Salon and Spa. The applicant and owner Deborah Schade desires to add a sign to the existing sign at 455 Main Street. Suffolk County Tax Map# 1001-4-7-19.
MEMBER WALOSKI: I am the designer on this and Deborah is my client. So I have recuse myself from voting but I can give you some information.

Deborah, do you want to present it? I have the information. Do you want to come up here and present it?

MS. SCHADE: Sure.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: If you wouldn't mind coming up and presenting it at the podium there.

MS. SCHADE: What I am looking to do is there used to be a sign where I wanted to put this one. And I wanted mention the services that we do at Special Effects because I am finding that some people don't know exactly what we do there. So Caroline has designed a sign that I think is very well in keeping with the sign
right below it.

MEMBER WETSELL: This is replacing a sign that was previously there that was previously approved by the Committee before some of the Board members --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes, I remember that.

MEMBER WETSELL: Yeah. It looked like this. It is really the same size as --

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.

MEMBER WETSELL: -- what we plan on putting there now. It fills the same space. Right now there is a hole here. And they took the other one down and put this one.

MEMBER McMAHON: I think that is kind of self-explanatory. I think you nailed it. I don't think we need to beat it up too much unless anybody else has
something they want to add to it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Do you want to say any more about it?

MS. SCHADE: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we have three members that we make a motion that we approve the sign.

MEMBER McMAHON: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: We have a second. All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

MS. SCHADE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The next item on the agenda is discussion and possible motion on the application of the Townsend Manor Inn. The applicant Scott A. Gonzalez desires to replace fourteen windows on the northwest side of the Gingerbread House, 726 Main Street with Anderson divided
light two over two windows.

Further, the Applicant proposes to make necessary repairs to the trim and clapboard siding, and in the spring plans to paint the Main Street side of the building and replace the shutters. Suffolk County Tax Map: 2-3-10.

Welcome.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you. Scott Gonzales. Townsend Manor, 714 Main Street. Pretty much what you just said.

MEMBER McMAHON: You have been here before. We have gone through this before?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. I think now --

MEMBER McMAHON: This is formalizing what we previously talked about.

MR. GONZALEZ: Exactly.

MEMBER McMAHON: We are kind of nailing it down now that it
is true divided two over twos.

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: We also --
I don't know if you were here at
the time.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I was.

MEMBER McMAHON: The two
over twos are in keeping with the
-- and they are true divided light?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

Anderson --

MEMBER McMAHON: That's
fine. Very good. Very good.

Anybody?

CHAIRMAN BULL: So this top
I see here, is this a two over two?

MEMBER WALOSKI: That would
be two over two.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That would
be two over two? That looks like
--

MEMBER McMAHON: That is
four over four.

MR. GONZALEZ: There are
some four over fours there and
there are some two over twos and
there are some six over sixes,
within that building. What I am
looking to do is do two over two
that entire side and over the next
couple of years go around the whole
building so they will all be
uniform.

MEMBER McMAHON: Right.

Yes. Again, as I have mentioned
previously that I always compare my
house to anything we have ever
done, but circa 1840s is what
happens to houses like that -- or
any building in Greenport for that
matter -- is subject to many
different styles, changes with
regard to windows. And actually
the complete style of the house
could change.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: That is
the four -- is there a two over
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two. Is there a --

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. None of
them are two over two, oddly
enough.

MEMBER WETSELL: No. Six
over six. Four over four. There
are no two over twos.

CHAIRMAN BULL: We
understand it will be Anderson. We
understand that it will be the same
style as the ones that are part of
the application in the same series.
That it will -- it will have --
well it will fit -- so it will be
two over two. It will be light
pre-finished white. I'll be equal
sash. There is a lot of detail
here we don't need. But the
divided light will be with a
spacer. That is the important
thing.

MR. GONZALEZ: That is
correct.

MEMBER McMAHON: Any of
PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

those are accepted by the Board.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: The only thing is it -- the fact that it doesn't match -- the picture doesn't match what we are saying.

All of those are acceptable. The three -- we like true dividing light. Multiple panes is always something that is very traditional here in Greenport. If there is any problem in regards to what has been said or what is meant to be said and it was then in actuality going to be put in.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: You understand. You're a builder.

MR. GONZALEZ: I'm not.

MEMBER McMAHON: Oh, you're not.

MR. GONZALEZ: No.

MEMBER McMAHON: But it is two and two below. So that is two
over two.

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: What we have pictured here is not. But it is going to be two over two?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It is going to be two over two and it is going to be achieved by using a divided light with a spacer.

MEMBER McMAHON: That is the important part. That is the important part.

MS. WINGATE: That is the most important.

MR. GONZALEZ: No. There is nothing. It is the true space.

MEMBER McMAHON: That is correct. That is correct.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The divided light, there is always a spacer actually in the glass?

MEMBER McMAHON: The spacer is in the glass.
MS. WINGATE: In the glass.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. Even though -- even thought it is applied on the inside and outside there is a true divider inside that. Those are not, in some cases, individual pieces of glass. but they are truly divided.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Divided.

Got it.

MEMBER McMAHON: If you break that glass you are replacing the entire sash. Not just a piece of glass.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

Understood.

MEMBER McMAHON: You should know that.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. Okay. That is a detail on this Anderson that I was unaware of.

So any further thoughts other than what we have got in front of us.
MS. WINGATE: Are you going to go through the criteria?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, I think I am going to go through the criteria. Thank you for that suggestion. I have it right here somewhere. Got it. Oh, yes.

So we're going to use a guide, which is Chapter 76 Historic Area, preservation of, and it is section 76.6, which is the approval criteria that we often like to reference when making this kind of approval. In this decision of -- or in this application, the proxy will contribute to the character of the Historic District. This shall be retained by the use of these windows and the use of all of kind of window on all sides of the building, seen and unseen. And we're also -- in the notes I believe this is also in this application, we're talking about
the repairs to the trim and the clapboard siding, which is the -- which is in -- within the new construction or the reconstruction that is related to the property itself. That is also within keeping with the way it was before but also within the neighborhood. That is in paragraph B, section one.

Section two of paragraph B talks about the scale of the proposed alteration of the new construction, which is the windows itself. So in the two over two, divided light, that is within the general design and character appropriate.

Do we all agree on that?

MEMBER McMAHON: We do.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So the textures and the materials and the color, which is item number three,
relates to other and similar properties. Not only that were there itself but also other properties in the neighborhood. So it meets -- I don't know if I need to go through every one of these. Do I need to go through every one of these? I think not.

MR. PALLAS: To the extent they are applicable to the project.

CHAIRMAN BULL: But they are applicable to the project. As I'm surveying this list, I make a motion that we approve.

MEMBER McMAHON: Second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

Item number three.

Discussion and possible motion on the application of 114 Main
Greenport, LLC - Nora Flotteron owner. The building is located at 114 Main Street. The Applicant proposes to provide safe and proper egress by adding two egress windows facing the street to the upstairs apartment. Further back and out of sight from the street, a skylight will be added to provide additional light and ventilation. Suffolk County Tax Map# 1001-5-3-13. The Applicant is here.

THE APPLICANT: I brought a picture which I think will be helpful. I don't think you have this. Very simply it is currently a one bedroom studio and we are looking to make it a three bedroom studio and have the proper ability to be able to get out. We want the windows to match. So we would use a sash across the casements. So it matches the double hung.

I went up there just before
the meeting just to re-refresh
myself. To the south, Claudio's
has four windows and three windows.
In fact, they have the same roof
line and design. Across the street
whether it is -- I said Claudio's.
I meant Preston's to the south.
Excuse me. Across the street is
Claudio's. They have nine windows.
All the buildings except my
building actually have at least
three windows on the street. So we
are just trying really to become
uniform like the rest of the
buildings on the street. And have
egress, of course.

MEMBER McMAHON: The amount
of the windows on the top there, it
looks fine. It is balanced. It
looks -- it is appropriate. It
looks appropriate.

MEMBER WETSELL: And these
are casements?

THE APPLICANT: Those are
both casements. Correct. And we add a sash across the middle. So it looks like double hung even though it isn't. They have the space and the access they need.

MS. WINGATE: I think the terminology, sash. Sash defines the amount of glass. What he is talking about is the Check Rail. So it will have a fat Check Rail. So it looks like a double hung.

THE APPLICANT: That is correct. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So the windows, I presume, will be operational.

THE APPLICANT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Will they swing from the left corner outwards or from the right or have you given any thought to --

THE APPLICANT: I haven't given any thought. But the builder I would be using is Eugene Berger
(phonetic), who I have used for years. He is a local builder out here. Whatever is the best from the standpoint of our needs and aesthetics. I don't think there is any difference.

MEMBER McMAHON: No. I didn't mean to cut you short.

Generally there isn't. If they swing -- if they pivot right to right -- it is not an aesthetic.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It is not an aesthetic.

MEMBER McMAHON: It is not an aesthetic. So in practicality, if I was the builder, one would swing left and the other would be swinging right. It would be like a natural situation. That doesn't necessarily have to be the case, nor is it necessarily anything that we need to discuss in that regard.

My primary concern is, of course, safety and the fact that
that divider is meant to replicate the existing --

CHAIRMAN BULL: The feel.

MEMBER McMAHON: The sash.

Yes. The double hung. That is where they are headed with it. I get it. I understand that.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I have a question about air conditioner, window air conditioners. There is no mention of it here. Do people actually put window air conditioners in these windows?

MEMBER McMAHON: No.

THE APPLICANT: We have central air and heat on the property already.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

THE APPLICANT: There used to be, but no longer, window units. We have removed them. It looks a heck of a lot nicer.

MEMBER McMAHON: No. You can't in a case with --
CHAIRMAN BULL: I wouldn't think so. You could put one in the middle. This would be ruinous of the view, if that was a decision that was made.

So you told us that you have got central air conditioning and central heating. So that is not an issue.

So going back again to our approval criteria, the -- to my mind the character or the block is being preserved with the examples you have provided us. You know, with Preston's and Claudio's across the way.

MS. WINGATE: Excuse me, Stephen.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MS. WINGATE: Can you talk about the skylight a little bit.

CHAIRMAN BULL: We could talk a little bit about the skylight. Let me finish first on
the windows themselves.

MS. WINGATE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: On the windows themselves, facing the street, I think we are in agreement that those type of windows meet the criteria that we have.

MEMBER McMAHON: I, being a builder, I do not know if that bar -- how that bar is -- goes if that is a true divided light situation. Do we know that?

THE APPLICANT: Is it what?

MEMBER McMAHON: True divided light. Is there a bar -- as we had a previous discussion with our other applicant. If that bar actually shoots through the center. That -- I don't know. Being a builder I don't know --

THE APPLICANT: It normally is the interior. It connects onto the windows. For many years they have been building solid windows.
And you put a plastic insert in. From the outside you would think that's wood. You would never know.

MS. WINGATE: I do believe you can order them as a full divided situation. The Check Rail is so fat though that -- you know the shadow that you get with the cheap one?

THE APPLICANT: Right.

MS. WINGATE: You don't get that. I don't believe they are snap in grills. They shouldn't be snap in.

THE APPLICANT: No. They aren't.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Should we see a sample of this. Is there a sample.

MS. WINGATE: Actually there is a house on Main Street that you could stand on the sidewalk and look at it.

MEMBER McMAHON: If there
is a separation bar rather than something that is applied inside and out. Is that what you are saying there is?

MS. WINGATE: That is what I am saying.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. If that is the case, we have no problem. That is our only criteria. The fact that that is a fat separate bar, it is truly divided. That is our -- our -- we can only push it so far. You meet the criteria.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The criteria we are talking about is a fat bar --

MEMBER McMAHON: True divided.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Is it true divided in its fatness?

MEMBER McMAHON: That is correct. And that is good. That's a good -- the fact that they are
making the effort to make it look like the other one is great. That is what we want. I just am not familiar with the casement that it has a true divided partition. If you want to call it --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Would you be more comfortable if you actually --

MEMBER McMAHON: No. I'm fine with fact that is what -- if that is in fact what we can say we are going to get.

THE APPLICANT: Is it a bar across.

MEMBER WALOSKI: As long as it is not a snap in.

MEMBER McMAHON: No. That is correct.

MEMBER WALOSKI: If it is a snap in --

MEMBER McMAHON: No. We understand.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So snap ins are no good.
MEMBER WALOSKI: No good.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And true divided is good.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And this meets paragraph A.

MS. WINGATE: It is called full divided. True divided means there are separate panes of glass.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

MS. WINGATE: Full divided is that -- right?

MEMBER McMAHON: That is what I was getting at before. The solid pane.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That is important.

MS. WINGATE: Let's get our terminology right. It is full divided.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Full divided.

MEMBER McMAHON: Meaning one piece of glass with a divider.
CHAIRMAN BULL: And that is acceptable?

MEMBER McMAHON: That's acceptable.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we're talking about a full divided window.

MS. WINGATE: A casement window with a fat Check Rail.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Fat Check Rail, full divided. That is what we agreed to. And it talks about that in paragraph A, sentence or item number three, which is new construction shall be compatible with the Historic District in which it is located. And this seems to be compatible in its character and its solution to -- that it is new construction of a window that has never been there before.

Am I'm correct in that?

MEMBER McMAHON: I think so.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Now let's talk about the skylight. So I'm not familiar. Are there other buildings with skylights in that row?

MEMBER McMAHON: If I might add, if it is hardly -- and I am not saying that it is not important. But if it is not visible from the street, you know, it is practical for light in that building. Just speaking from a contractor's point of view.

Again, we are concerned ourselves most of the time with street scapes. This is a real tight situation. You can't, you know, unless you get a really fussy angle, you might be able to see something from the street.

Generally these places are one on top of the other.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I understand. It is a two story
structure. Because it is kind of low to the street it could be visible. People that have skylights often like to raise them to let in some ventilation. So its appearance becomes more visible.

MS. WETSELL: Does it open?

MEMBER McMAHON: You know what, the tendency --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: The tendency for one of those windows is probably maximum six inches.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I agree because you don't want water to get in.

MEMBER McMAHON: They just don't go any further.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Do we know whether or not the skylight faces north or south?

THE APPLICANT: The skylights that we would be using would be facing south towards
Preston's.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Towards Preston's. And how many skylights?

THE APPLICANT: We may need one or two. It has to do with the lighting requirements because as he was saying these building are close. To be able to have sufficient light we might be able to accomplish it through some of the newer lighting products that are out there. We are still dealing with that. I would rather have the approval and not need it.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah.

THE APPLICANT: We also -- initially we were looking for an egress. We determined we don't need that if we have the windows. We have been looking at them for the light. Not necessarily to raise them or use them or some of
the other things you are describing.

We have owned the building almost a year. My son has lived there. The central air is perfect for him. The last thing he wants is more fresh air from outside.

MEMBER McMAHON: Either way, just so that we don't have to run it by, operable or unoperable (sic), I don't think -- I don't think it is a point.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, I think --

MEMBER McMAHON: Unless it really swung out.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Or for a boat that was entering the harbor, would it be visible from that angle? But it sounds like if it is already hidden by Preston's roof then I think you are pretty well protected. Because there is a sea view as well as a street view.
THE APPLICANT: There is no

--

MEMBER McMAHON: Look at
the size of the building.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Exactly.

Exactly.

MEMBER McMAHON: You are
not seeing it from anywhere.

MEMBER McMAHON: It is
strictly a light situation.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Anything
else on this application we wanted
to look at? No. That's it.

MR. PALLAS: Chairman, if I
may.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Sure.

MR. PALLAS: The skylights,
if I may ask a question. It is one
skylight, two?

THE APPLICANT: We would
like the approval for two. We were
hoping to need none. But if that
comes back to the discussion with
proper lighting requirements.
MS. WINGATE: The New York State code requires lighting calculations, the windows need egress but they don't necessarily put the rooms over the top for light. So the architect is presently working on the calculations for the lighting. Personally, I think we are in for two, if not three skylights.

MEMBER McMAHON: I think it is a moot point. If you can't see, what is the point.

MS. WINGATE: Because you need light in there.

MR. McMAHON: Right. And it says ventilation on the application. So if there is three vented skylights on that side of the house --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Then they have to be operable.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: They would
be the kind of skylight with the full opening.

MR. McMAHON: It would be silly not to have them because there is a certain time of the year you don't need the A/C and it is nice to be able to crank open a skylight for a little fresh air.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: If you can't see it -- and again, seeing that that building is clearly overshadowing that building on that side, I don't think anybody is going to see if. And if you do, just keep walking. That was a joke. That was a joke.

MR. PALLAS: If I may suggest that the criteria be -- you may want to set the distance -- a minimum distance back from the front so that you are sure it is not visible. If you are basing -- if you are basing -- If you are to
ultimately approve this basing it on its not being seen from the street I think you need to define how far back from the front you want for it to start.

MEMBER McMAHON: Do we have an idea of --

MR. PALLAS: The issue is that it is not shown and --

MEMBER McMAHON: From the first room off the street. The rest would not be so important.

MS. WINGATE: The first room is fourteen feet.

MEMBER McMAHON: The first room is fourteen feet back off the street?

MS. WINGATE: Long, off the street.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So, would the skylight be in the first room?

MEMBER McMAHON: And if it would --

MS. WINGATE: Not beyond
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fourteen feet.

MEMBER McMAHON:  Safely
back I think would be in the four
to six feet area would be safe
distance back. I would say -- you
know, that is tough for anybody to
say. It can't be within two feet
of the edge of the roof because you
could see it. And generally they
sit about six to seven inches off
the edge of the roof in height.
And so if you're four feet back, if
that room is that long, the further
you can push that back,
practicality wise.

THE APPLICANT: Those
numbers are all fine. If you want
six feet that's easy.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. We
would prefer. If it is of no
consequence to you, if we can say
that it is six feet from the edge
of the roof back from the front of
the street and it is no consequence
to you.

THE APPLICANT: No.

MEMBER McMAHON: That would be lovely. And we're out of it. We don't have to think about it anymore, safely. Do we feel confident with that?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Does everyone feel confident?

MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: That is a very good point. Very good point.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you for bringing that to our attention.

MEMBER McMAHON: Some of those are bubble type.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: Which would -- is not a flat glass ventilated thing, but generally when it is vented it is a flat glass.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we are talking about a flat glass
MEMBER McMAHON: Flat glass.

THE APPLICANT: We haven't chosen -- and I will be happy to come back to the building inspector or whoever if necessary and say is this acceptable or this many feet back. I will work completely -- I am just looking more after approval. I do not want to be an eyesore in town.

MEMBER McMAHON: No. No. We understand that. We appreciate it. We really appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we are talking six foot back, flat roof --

MEMBER McMAHON: In a flat glass.

CHAIRMAN BULL: In a flat glass.

MEMBER McMAHON: Not a bubble is what we are saying.

THE APPLICANT: That is not
a problem. The squared off ones.

MEMBER McMAHON: No. There is generally two -- and I am not a salesman for the company but, Insula Dome and/or a Velux makes the flat glass. Primarily nobody wants a bubble anymore. They are out of style.

MS. WINGATE: There are very few -- except for those two companies, there are very few skylights that meet the hurricane code. You are totally limited to the two products that he just mentioned.

THE APPLICANT: That is not a problem either. I will say the building made it for 150 years through Hurricane Sandy and everything else.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a motion that we approve that we just discussed.

MS. WALOSKI: I second the
motion.

CHAIRMAN BULL: We have a second. All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, we passed that one.

THE APPLICANT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Here we go, item number four.

Continued discussion and possible motion on the written decision on the Methodist Church project that was introduced at the January 2017 HPC meeting.

Applicant James Olinkiewicz is proposing to keep and restore the original 1881's church sanctuary and remove the later addition as shown on the survey. The old church sanctuary is located at 625 1st Street with the church
sanctuary fronting on Main Street.
Suffolk County Tax Map#
1001-2-6-49.1

Now, there is a draft of a Findings and Determination in front of us. And I propose to read it. And by reading it, if people have an issue with any part of it at that point I will check paragraph to paragraph to see if people have a problem with it.

So, here is the application: The application is made by James Olinkiewicz, the applicant, as the contract vendee of property at 625 1st Street, for a Certificate of Appropriateness for an alteration at the property 525 1st Street, which is the site of the former Methodist Church.

That is a pause, if anybody has an issue with it.
The Applicant seeks to remove the rear portion of the
former Methodist Church building.
The portion that is proposed to be removed as added to the Church building in the 1960s.
That is a fact.
We didn't get to that. Go ahead.
MEMBER WETSELL: The whole thing isn't from the '60s.
CHAIRMAN BULL: There was a question that came before our committed as to whether the facade said of the portion that is being proposed to be removed, whether that facade is from the 1960s or is it just behind it that is from the 1960s.
MS. WINGATE: From what I understand, the single door with the two windows is from the '20s. And the community room was done in the '60s.
CHAIRMAN BULL: So there are -- there are two parts to this.
They are seen in this photograph here. I will hold it up for the camera. Here we are. Not that the camera can necessarily see them, but in behind this tree is a portion of this -- an entrance way to the community room from Front Street that was originally built in the '20s.

MS. WINGATE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BULL: In that there are some stained glass windows, I believe.

MS. WINGATE: I haven't been in there.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I was in there and I think I saw stained glass windows. But then around to the back of it, behind it is a larger, much larger space that was created as a community center in the 1960s. Yes. Thank you.

MR. PROKOP: So can I propose that the -- so the portion
that is proposed to be removed was added to the building in the 1960s except that the entranceway to the community room from Front Street was built in the 1920s. The entranceway to the community room from Front Street also to be removed.

MS. WINGATE: Main Street.

MR. PROKOP: Main Street.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

MR. PROKOP: That is also to be removed is from the 1920s.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Correct. I believe that is an accurate description of the construction of the part that is to be removed.

MS. WINGATE: That piece is also the part that is close to the property line. That is the non-conforming piece.

MEMBER WETSELL: But that is grandfathered. It is not required to --
MS. WINGATE: Oh, absolutely. It doesn't need any kind of zoning variances. It just makes for a --

MEMBER WETSELL: A narrow driveway.

MS. WINGATE: Right. A narrow driveway.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So that is a portion of the property that is of concern to a member of this committee.

MEMBER WALOSKI: That would be a concern to me too.

CHAIRMAN BULL: To two members of our committee.

MEMBER WALOSKI: That 1920s portion. Especially if there is --

MEMBER WETSELL: Well, there is ordinances --

MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.

There is architectural --

MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Further on
in this application, I admit it is just a draft written to give us something to talk about, to work off, to work from, that the windows in that portion be moved to another portion. To a part that was to be reconstructed. That would be the part that would be facing --

MEMBER McMAHON: I think the same direction. There is -- there is an entryway that is within that add-on but it is hidden.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And he was going to reapply some of these windows to retro fit it back into the building, is what I understand it to be.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. That is what I think we find in the report as to his plan.

So shall I continue to read this to make sure we go over all the points or --

The application for
subdivision was submitted by the Applicant to the Greenport Village Planning Board pursuant to Chapter 118 Subdivisions of the Greenport Village Code. The subdivision application provided for the removal of a portion of the former Methodist Church in order to reduce the building size on the lot.

The applicant also filed an application with the Greenport Historical Preservation Commission for the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness as provided in Greenport Village Code Section 76-5.

MR. PROKOP: Can I just make a suggestion?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Please.

MR. PROKOP: On the paragraph before that. I am sorry I didn't catch it. To reduce the building size. It shouldn't say to that of a single family residence.
I believe that is the purpose of this. That is what I think. So it is reduce it from 7000 square feet to 3000 square feet to make it more suitable to a single family residence.

MEMBER McMAHON: That was somewhere in these notes that I rarely read.

CHAIRMAN BULL: We did talk about it.

MEMBER McMAHON: You did. You did address it because I remember that.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So now onward.

The application was heard and considered by the Historic Preservation Commission at a public meeting on January 9, 2017 and then discussed at a public meeting of the Historic Preservation
Commission for decision on February 6, 2017.

And that is this meeting we are having now.

The Historic Preservation Commission conducted a site visit at the site 625 1st Street on January 9, 2017, prior to the January 9, 2017 public meeting. In attendance at the site visit were the applicant, James Olinkiewicz, and the members of the Historic Preservation Commission.

The matter of the application then came before our commission at the January 9th meeting. The Applicant made a presentation at the meeting and we accepted the comments.

After visiting the location of the 1880's Church Sanctuary and interviewing the applicant, James Olinkiewicz at the site and based on the discussion with the
Applicant at the Historic Preservation Commission's regularly scheduled meeting on January 9, 2017, and after review and consideration of the Village of Greenport file and records on this matter and the responsibilities of the Historic Preservation Commission pursuant to Chapter 76 of the Greenport Village Code, the Village of Greenport Historic Preservation Committee members; Stephen Bull, Roselle Borrelli, Dennis McMahon, Caroline Waloski and Susan Wetsell make the following findings and determinations regarding the allocation to remove a portion of the structures of the former Church Sanctuary and its manse at 625 1st Street with the church front Main Street. Suffolk County Tax Map#1001-02-06-49.1.

So here are the findings
and this is what we are going to talk about today.

So the findings are: 1)

The removal of the portion of the Church building that is in the rear of the structure and which was added in the 1960s is not a major alteration as intended by the definition of Major Alteration provided in Section 76-2 of the Greenport Village Code:

"Major Alteration, any alteration, construction, removal or demolition of a landmark or structure which may significantly impair the historic or architectural appearance or features of the landmark or historic district."

Now we have a bit of a question here because would the 1920s, which is the part --

MS. WETSELL: That is visible.
CHAIRMAN BULL: -- visible from the street, whether that impairs the historic or architectural appearance.

Let me finish the paragraph.

Because the approximately 4,400 square foot portion of the building to be removed is located to the rear of the structure and does not have a historic significance or value for preservation because the portion to be removed was added to the historic portion of the building in the 1960s and the partial demolition there does not significantly impair the historic or architectural appearance or features of the landmark or historic district and that therefore no public hearing is required for this application.

Well, that is actually on
the point of what we are talking about. Let's dig in on that.

MEMBER WETSELL: Well, it does impact because it is visible from the street. It is part of the structure. It has old elements, the core windows, doors and door trim. And I -- I think -- I mean that photo was taken so you can barely see it, unfortunately.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah.

MEMBER WETSELL: I think it isn't at all not a major alteration. I think it is a huge alteration from that standpoint.

MEMBER WALOSKI: So that is a picture --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Let's take a look at some of these --

MEMBER WETSELL: They didn't include that in any of the pictures. You can't see anything.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. It is very poorly taken. So, on the
backside though, this portion of this --

MEMBER WETSELL: Oh, no.

CHAIRMAN BULL: -- we don't have an issue with the addition?

MEMBER WETSELL: No.

MEMBER WALOSKI: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So that is not the problem.

MEMBER WALOSKI: It is the facade that is the problem.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And this part here, this is not a problem?

MEMBER WETSELL: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: This is the back of a building from the '60s, the 1960s.

MEMBER WETSELL: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we don't have a problem with that. So now we are narrowing our issue down to --

MEMBER WALOSKI: The 1920s
MEMBER WETSELL: It is this part here. It is this part right here.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That would be -- it actually shows up in this picture as well.

MEMBER WETSELL: This is the street.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It shows up in this picture as well. This part right here.

MEMBER WETSELL: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: This part right there. This is the part we are really concerned about is this --

MEMBER WETSELL: Right. I don't really care about anything except what is visible from the street which --

MEMBER WALOSKI: The facade itself?

MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.
MS. WINGATE: It is not just a facade. It is a space. It is a space.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Right. It is a space. It is defined as a space. You can't call it a facade.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I don't want to say whether they put this in the 1960s because I didn't receive that information. So I didn't go down to see it. I am trying to --

MEMBER WETSELL: Well, this just lumps together. Both of those sections. You can't tell.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Is he planning on building something there behind that?

MS. WINGATE: He has to repair --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, I see.

MS. WINGATE: -- and replace walls to make everything --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Right.
MS. WINGATE: -- which is 

MEMBER WALOSKI: The only 

part to me that is historic is that 

part it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: This is the 

street. And this is the piece that 

we see. This is the part -- 

MEMBER WALOSKI: So it is 

this.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It is this. 

And there is kind of a stage here. 

I don't know exactly how they did 

it. There is a kind of stage here. 

You see an element of it here.

MEMBER WETSELL: So it is 

kind like this portion?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, the 

interior I believe is open all the 

way across.

MEMBER WALOSKI: So this is 

sort of original at least around 

here?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. So
they may have done -- judging by
the roof and the -- it is hard to
know -- it is hard for me to
understand what they did.

MR. PROKOP: Get as much as
you can.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I have no
problem with this but I do have a
problem with this, losing that
architecture.

MS. WINGATE: Visible
architecture.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Visible
architecture. And it was something
that was built in the 1920s.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Could you
take a look at this as the person
who knows this building better than
we do?

MS. WINGATE: I don't know
that I do.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I
understand. To me it looks like
from this picture here because
this is --

MR. PALLAS: Excuse me. Only one person can speak at a time so the stenographer can --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. PALLAS: -- find out who is speaking and record it appropriately, please. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So what we are doing at the moment is we are drawing the configuration of the hip roof, which to give us an idea of what the space is that we are talking about.

MS. WINGATE: I think that is what the addition -- what the addition might have done --

MS. WETSELL: Then they just opened this up.

MS. WINGATE: Right. The problem is this is set back so far from this it makes for a very difficult construction project.

MEMBER McMAHON: I am going
to run something by you. And with 
all respect to the 1920s addition 
and how well they mirrored the 
architectural points and how well 
they did that. And it makes you 
sensitive in many regarding as to 
its demolition, but again when you 
start thinking about getting things 
back to bare bones and the way 
everything -- many, many houses in 
Greenport have been added onto and 
added onto. Some were done 
according to the period. That one 
was done better than most because 
you feel those elements have been 
dragged into it.

In the same context I want 
to say that I'm looking at the 
project on a practicality 
standpoint as well. I don't mind 
sometimes when you get back to the 
bare bones of what was there is a 
true renovation. Even though you 
might be losing elements that you
feel are important that you see from the street. You might be used to seeing from the street. So you have grown accustom to the look and feel of the property. Sometimes when you eliminate all these add-ons you get a simpler feeling to the way that church looked at the time it was built. It was a smaller scale. When you start adding on all of these things, as nicely done as it might have been, well as you think it fits according to that, when you see that disappear that sometimes -- and you see what that building looked like back in the day. That also can add a great deal to how you feel about that piece of the property. Even though you might be losing an element or two, I would like to see if there are any -- there was a stipulation in regards to reusing any stained glass that might
disappear and be reincorporated into that. I think that is where we should lay -- you know, put our priorities. There are some -- there are some old trims that have been boarded over. And that I thought was a part of the conversation that those windows would be reinstalled, if any were removed.

So even though you might not be looking dead onto the face. You will see that church meander back a little bit like it did when it was built. So that is my feelings on that. Not meaning to sway -- practicality in regards to making that fit.

MEMBER WETSELL: Well, our job isn't to make it easy for him. Our job is to --

MEMBER McMAHON: No. Absolutely not. That is why I started where I did.
MR. PROKOP: May I make a suggestion?

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: So I put this here, this point of major alteration because you need to get passed this. I think you need to explain your decision why you don't think it is a major alteration, if you agree with that. Then the things you are talking about later in your decision with conditions and, you know, it does require the applicant later on to maintain those windows and replace them. You do have that language. Just with respect to this, if I could say -- if I could just suggest if it is not a major alteration, removal of a 4,400 square foot portion of the building constructed in the 1920s and the 1960s does not significantly impair the historical or architectural appearance or
features of the landmark or Historic District. And that therefore, no public hearing is required for this application.

So what I'm suggesting that removal does not significantly impair the historic or architectural appearance. If you disagree with me then just let me know.

MEMBER WETSELL: That is what is sort of --

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So we're split on that.

MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: The removal of the larger portion of that, I think we all agree.

MS. WALOSKI: We all agree about the larger portion.

MEMBER McMAHON: And what portion of that -- and if you want to put a square footage number on that, then that is the point. It
is a part of that 4,000. But I am
telling you right now, if it is a
thousand, they are removing three.
I cannot be quoted on that but I'm
giving you a general idea. Just
from a contractor's standpoint we
are seeing a major portion of that
1960s building go. But to
reconnect -- and it is a good
point. We are not here to make it
easy on the contractor or the --
excuse me, the new owner. But to
reconnect points A to B is a visual
-- it could be a disaster to save
front view and to make it somehow
incorporated somehow back into that
building could be worse than --
than better, is what I'm saying to
you. Sometimes getting back to
bare bones is better than trying to
incorporate a feature that was put
on -- even though 1920 was a long
time ago. And we certainly would
appreciate -- hey, this is 2017 --
MEMBER WALOSKI: But it is important to what that building was in the Village at that time.

MEMBER McMAHON: Understood. Understood. And we have been voting it for the last twenty-five, thirty years as well.

MR. PALLAS: I just want to revisit the point that the Village Attorney was trying to bring up. The concept of a major alteration is defined specifically. It is not subjective. It is in the Historical Code to what qualifies as a major alteration. That criteria is what determines whether or not a hearing is required. I think the Village Attorney was seeking to find out if you believe by definition that it is a major alteration. Then you need to have a public hearing.

MR. PROKOP: That's right.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I think it
is a major alteration.

MEMBER WETSELL: I would certainly see it as a major alteration.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I don't think we can just say take that down because I think it --

MR. PALLAS: Again, there is a clear definition. It is not as to what qualifies. It has nothing to do with the square footage or size.

MS. WALOSKI: I'm not talking about square footage or size. I am talking about aesthetics.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And we are talking about something that is two -- two units combined. An alteration made in the '60s on an alteration that was made in the '20s.

Do we have any evidence in photograph or of other forms of
what it looked like in the 1920s?

MS. WINGATE: I was going
to ask that perhaps you would like
to make another site visit.

MS. WALOSKI: That is a
good idea.

MS. WINGATE: Now that you
are honing in on everything you can
walk through it with a little more
background.

MS. WETSELL: I think that
is a good idea.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I want to
say that I am with Dennis on the
point that I don't see how, if we
were to constrain the new owners to
have to include that side and then
another side, how it would be -- I
wouldn't be a hardship on them to
try to integrate that into the main
building, I think, unless -- and
give it the appearance of what it
was like in the 1920s if we are
going to respect that time frame.
It is hard to imagine. I mean as a builder myself how that would be, the archeology --

MEMBER WETSELL: We can go and look at it again.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. I do think it would be good idea for us to go and look at it again.

MEMBER McMAHON: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a motion that we postpone our written decision and we need another location visit, a site visit. And we would also like to see, if possible, the plans from 1920 with elevations.

MEMBER WETSELL: That might be a hardship.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well then take a photograph then, snapshot.

MS. WINGATE: I'm going to ask for permission to schedule another site visit. And do you
want to schedule a public hearing?

MEMBER McMAHON: No. I don't think at this point. I think we should look at it.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Lets visit it.

MEMBER WETSELL: Why don't we wait and see.

MS. WINGATE: Okay. Joe, do you have a definition of an alteration?

MR. PROKOP: It is in the decision that you all have.

MS. WINGATE: Maybe we just need to have that read out loud.

MR. PROKOP: It should be on page 2. It says, number 1, major alteration. Any alteration, construction, removal or demolition of a landmark or structure which may significantly impair the historic or architectural appearance or features of the landmark or historic district. So
this building is not a landmark.
It is in the Historic District.

MS. WINGATE: It is in the district.

MR. PROKOP: But it is not a landmark. So what we are talking about is if this construction, removal or demolition may significantly impair the historic or architectural appearance or features of the History District.
Not the building because the building itself is not a landmark.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Right. So what we talked about as far as district, Greenport has this blessing of having add-ons to the buildings.

MS. WETSELL: That's right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And that is what gives Greenport some of its character and charm.

MS. WALOSKI: I recall using this definition narrative. I
CHAIRMAN BULL: I think that -- we have a split decision here, even on our own committee. So I think it would be a matter -- we should take and have a public hearing on it. What do you think? Dennis?

MEMBER McMAHON: I would like to avoid it if we could -- if -- I mean, that -- what does that entail?

MR. PROKOP: It is just taking public comment on it. That is all it usually means. And it is not going to delay. We can have a public hearing at the next meeting. It just means you are going to take comment from the public.

MEMBER McMAHON: That's good. Okay.

MR. PROKOP: You still make the decision.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I think we
should hear what other people have to say.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a motion that we have a public hearing because it would be important to have the community beyond just us talking about it.

MEMBER McMAHON: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I also think it is important to have the fifth member with us when we make a decision so that we are not split.

So motion, public hearing and site visit.

MS. WINGATE: Site visit. I need permission.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So there are two motions. So first the motion is for a site visit.

MEMBER WALOSKI: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?
MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.
MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.
MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Another motion is for a public hearing at the next meeting for comment.

MS. WINGATE: We are looking at March, folks.
MEMBER McMAHON: Somebody has to second that motion.

MS. WINGATE: March 6th.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Public hearing March 6th. Do I have a second?

MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.
MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.
MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So we will revisit the discussion and possible motion at that time.

Item number five. Final
discussion on CLG grant application for fiscal year 2016, determining a short list of projects for eligible funding. Application must be received by March 1st, 2017.

So I was contacted by the New York Parks Department. And I proposed a couple of projects for possible funding. That grant application is due on March 1st. So I wanted to get a consensus from the committee on my ideas that I put forward to them because we will have to finish the grant application at that time.

The application doesn't really come from us, per se, but it is us. It has to be stamped by the -- it comes from the mayor from the Village. The Village has a status of -- of being this landmark, you know, Historic Preservation. There are two items that I was talking in correspondence to Linda Mackey, who
is with the Parks Department of New York and she oversees our grant application.

One of the ideas was to ask her about having them help us in doing this twenty-eight year, you know, cataloging inventory of all the Greenport structures. And another was a project idea that we would go out and we would shoot details of the importance of some of these buildings in Greenport like the bell and the bell tower or the old town hall. Architectural elements that might not be here, might not survive twenty years.

That was the second project I pitched to her.

And the third project I pitched to her that was an outreach, an educational outreach where we would bring in experts in the renovation of the old houses to provide the public owner of the
houses here in Greenport and
builders, contractor and the
carpenter over at Hanff's Boat Yard
who have these woodworking skills
but may not be familiar with
working on old houses. And to see
if they would be interested in
funding that.

So she got back to me and
so her -- let me just read from her
e-mail.

She said, "My
recommendation for a survey would
go beyond camera photos." That is
what I was suggesting. That we get
their help with camera photos to
add to the collection that we have
already got where we would
ultimately have an annotation.

She said, "I would
recommend a reconnaissance level
survey of the Village because an
update seems long overdue, and it
sound like there is interest in
areas outside the Historic District." We have talked about this before. There are some single buildings that we like that are within the Historic District -- but are outside the Historic District that we may not be able to bring into the Historic District because we can not enlarge the Historic District. But according to the new direction you can cherry pick individual structures and in that way we add them to our own -- what we as a group think is important. Then we promote them to the State level. And then perhaps then as far as the Federal level.

So, talking about this, "-- reconnaissance level survey of the Village because an update seems long overdue, and it sounds like there is interest in areas outside the Historic District, so it would be great to identify eligible
properties for local designation and Nation Register. The survey report would also act as a great planning tool for future preservation activities. I've attached a sample scope of work for a reconnaissance level survey to give you a sense of what it entails."

What I will do is, after this meeting, I will e-mail this to you. But basically she wrote the application for us.

MEMBER WALOSKI: That's nice.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So you just enlarge on what is written. And this is kind of important because you can imagine in writing any kind of an application like this you don't want to get it too stuck in committee with a short deadline.

MEMBER WALOSKI: And we have their approval.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, we have their pre-approval, which was the nature of my call to them.

MEMBER WALOSKI: That's great.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So then she says -- it goes on, "Depending on your priorities, the Village could also apply for a PreserveNY grant through the Preservation League of NYS for the proposed survey."

So that goes back to the survey we were trying to do before, the twenty year survey that we might get funding from another source that she has given us. So that was the first idea of getting support for the twenty year survey. And these are small amounts of money, by the way.

Anyway, I also spoke to David McEneny. And he is the administer of all of these grants. And he -- about this workshop. He
thinks it is a great idea. Beyond the types of training, who would it be marketed to? This is something we would address. Say the homeowners, the carpenters, the contractors, the tourists.

**MEMBER WALOSKI:** Real estate people.

**CHAIRMAN BULL:** Yes. And the real estate people. Very good. Yes.

Then who would provide the training? We would then go to outside resources? People who have done this sort of activity before. We need a consultant. All of these generally require a consultant. Somebody who has done these kind of workshops, who is a professional, who is outside of our general group. And what are their fees? These are the kinds of question they need on the application. Are we funding the rental space? Which
means now I am going to make a phone call to Hanff's Boat Yard and say, are you going to give us your space there? Because they have a nice meeting room on the weekends.

And then they recommend some people to contact is Sarah Kautz with the Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities. Who have worked with communities on Long Island and are a great resource.

With that, do I have the general consensus or the consensus I need to make these applications?

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.
MEMBER WALOSKI: Absolutely.
MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor of -- I make a motion that we write the applications.
MEMBER WALOSKI: I second the motion.
CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

The next item on the agenda is item number six. Discussion and possible motion on the final items to be included in the 2016 Annual Report required by the Village to maintain its Certified Local Government (CLG) status. This report is to be submitted no later than February 28, 2017.

This report is generally prepared by Eileen because it is basically a form where you fill out -- there are specific numbers about kinds of things that were done. Some were done before my time last year. Some were done last year where we kind of discussed -- we discussed signage. We discussed,
you know, the Main Street project. Different kinds of projects that came before and she fills out the numbers.

So do I have the approval? May I make a motion that we accept those items that we previously discussed and have Eileen put in this report on our behalf?

MEMBER McMAHON: I second item number six.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.
MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.
MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Item number seven. Motion to accept the minutes of the December 5, 2016 meeting and the January 9, 2017 meeting. I make a motion to accept. Has everyone had a chance to read them?

MEMBER WALOSKI: I haven't
read them. I haven't been getting
my e-mail. I haven't had a chance
to read them.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in
favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.
MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Aye.
MEMBER WALOSKI: I haven't
gotten them.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Its okay.
So that is three in favor.
Motion to schedule the next
HPC meeting for March 6, 2017. Any
issues?
MEMBER WETSELL: That's
good.
CHAIRMAN BULL: All good?
Motion to accept that. All in
favor?
MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.
MEMBER WALOSKI: March 17th
you said?
CHAIRMAN BULL: March 6th.
MEMBER WALOSKI: That's fine.

MS. WINGATE: You need to go to Village Hall and get set up. It is not something that -- are you taking care of it?

MR. PALLAS: I'm taking care of that.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I make a motion to adjourn. Are we all in favor?

CHAIRMAN BULL: We have a second. All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you so much.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:13 p.m)
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