

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK STATE OF NEW YORK

-----X

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION

-----X

Third Street Firehouse
Greenport, New York

February 6, 2017
5:08 p.m.

Before:
STEPHEN M. BULL - Chairman
DENNIS McMAHON - Member
SUSAN WETSELL - Member
CAROLINE WALOSKI - Member

Village Inspector
Eileen Wingate

Village Attorney
Joseph W. Prokop

Village Administrator
Paul J. Pallas

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

I N D E X

1
2
3 ITEM #1: Discussion and possible motion
4 on the application for sign permit
5 by the Special Effects Salon & Spa.
6 Page 4-7

7
8 ITEM #2: Discussion and possible motion
9 on the application of the Townsend
10 Manor Inn.
11 Page 7-17

12
13 ITEM #3: Discussion and possible motion
14 on the application of 114 Main
15 Greenport, LLC. Nora Flotteron,
16 Owner
17 Page 17-42

18
19 ITEM #4: Continued discussion and
20 possible motion on the written
21 decision on the Methodist Church
22 project that was introduced at the
23 January 2017 HPC meeting.
24 Page 42-76
25

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ITEM #5: Final discussion on CLG grant application for fiscal year 2016, determining a short list of projects for eligible funding.

Page 76-85

ITEM #6: 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.

Page 85-86

ITEM #7: Motion to accept the minutes of the December 5, 2016 and January 9, 2017 meetings.

Page 86-87

ITEM #8: Motion to schedule the next HPC meeting for March 6, 2017.

Page 87-88

ITEM #9: Motion to adjourn.

Page 88-88

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 CHAIRMAN BULL: It is now
3 5:08 p.m. This is the meeting of
4 The Historical Preservation
5 Committee on February 6, 2017. I
6 am Stephen M. Bull, Chairperson.
7 On my far right is --

8 MEMBER McMAHON: Dennis
9 McMahan.

10 MEMBER WETSELL: Susan
11 Wetsell.

12 MEMBER WALOSKI: Caroline
13 Waloski.

14 CHAIRMAN BULL: We have a
15 quorum.

16 The first item on our
17 agenda tonight is Item One. The
18 discussion and possible motion on
19 the application for sign permit by
20 the Special Effects Salon and Spa.
21 The applicant and owner Deborah
22 Schade desires to add a sign to the
23 existing sign at 455 Main Street.
24 Suffolk County Tax Map#
25 1001-4-7-19.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MEMBER WALOSKI: I am the
3 designer on this and Deborah is my
4 client. So I have recuse myself
5 from voting but I can give you some
6 information.

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

11 MS. SCHADE: Sure.

12 MEMBER WALOSKI: Okay.

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

16 MS. SCHADE: What I am
17 looking to do is there used to be a
18 sign where I wanted to put this
19 one. And I wanted mention the
20 services that we do at Special
21 Effects because I am finding that
22 some people don't know exactly what
23 we do there. So Caroline has
24 designed a sign that I think is
25 very well in keeping with the sign

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 something they want to add to it.

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

5 MS. SCHADE: No.

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

9 MEMBER McMAHON: I'll
10 second.

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

13 MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

14 MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

15 MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

16 MS. SCHADE: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN BULL: The next
18 item on the agenda is discussion
19 and possible motion on the
20 application of the Townsend Manor
21 Inn. The applicant Scott A.
22 Gonzalez desires to replace
23 fourteen windows on the northwest
24 side of the Gingerbread House, 726
25 Main Street with Anderson divided

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 light two over two windows.

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

10 Welcome.

11 MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you.
12 Scott Gonzales. Townsend Manor,
13 714 Main Street. Pretty much what
14 you just said.

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

18 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes. I think
19 now --

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

23 MR. GONZALEZ: Exactly.

24 MEMBER McMAHON: We are
25 kind of nailing it down now that it

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 is true divided two over twos.

3 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

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

7 CHAIRMAN BULL: I was.

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

11 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

12 Anderson --

13 MEMBER McMAHON: That's
14 fine. Very good. Very good.
15 Anybody?

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

18 MEMBER WALOSKI: That would
19 be two over two.

20 CHAIRMAN BULL: That would
21 be two over two? That looks like
22 --

23 MEMBER McMAHON: That is
24 four over four.

25 MR. GONZALEZ: There are

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 some four over fours there and
3 there are some two over twos and
4 there are some six over sixes,
5 within that building. What I am
6 looking to do is do two over two
7 that entire side and over the next
8 couple of years go around the whole
9 building so they will all be
10 uniform.

11 MEMBER McMAHON: Right.
12 Yes. Again, as I have mentioned
13 previously that I always compare my
14 house to anything we have ever
15 done, but circa 1840s is what
16 happens to houses like that -- or
17 any building in Greenport for that
18 matter -- is subject to many
19 different styles, changes with
20 regard to windows. And actually
21 the complete style of the house
22 could change.

23 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

24 MEMBER McMAHON: That is
25 the four -- is there a two over

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 two. Is there a --

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

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

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

23 MR. GONZALEZ: That is
24 correct.

25 MEMBER McMAHON: Any of

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 those are accepted by the Board.

3 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

4 MEMBER McMAHON: The only
5 thing is it -- the fact that it
6 doesn't match -- the picture
7 doesn't match what we are saying.
8 All of those are acceptable. The
9 three -- we like true dividing
10 light. Multiple panes is always
11 something that is very traditional
12 here in Greenport. If there is any
13 problem in regards to what has been
14 said or what is meant to be said
15 and it was then in actuality going
16 to be put in.

17 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

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

20 MR. GONZALEZ: I'm not.

21 MEMBER McMAHON: Oh, you're
22 not.

23 MR. GONZALEZ: No.

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

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 over two.

3 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

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

7 MR. GONZALEZ: Yes.

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

12 MEMBER McMAHON: That is
13 the important part. That is the
14 important part.

15 MS. WINGATE: That is the
16 most important.

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

19 MEMBER McMAHON: That is
20 correct. That is correct.

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

24 MEMBER McMAHON: The spacer
25 is in the glass.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MS. WINGATE: In the glass.

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

10 CHAIRMAN BULL: Divided.
11 Got it.

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

16 CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.
17 Understood.

18 MEMBER McMAHON: You should
19 know that.

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

23 So any further thoughts
24 other than what we have got in
25 front of us.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MS. WINGATE: Are you going
3 to go through the criteria?

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

9 So we're going to use a
10 guide, which is Chapter 76
11 Historic Area, preservation of, and
12 it is section 76.6, which is the
13 approval criteria that we often
14 like to reference when making this
15 kind of approval. In this decision
16 of -- or in this application, the
17 proxy will contribute to the
18 character of the Historic District.
19 This shall be retained by the use
20 of these windows and the use of all
21 of kind of window on all sides of
22 the building, seen and unseen. And
23 we're also -- in the notes I
24 believe this is also in this
25 application, we're talking about

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 the repairs to the trim and the
3 clapboard siding, which is the --
4 which is in -- within the new
5 construction or the reconstruction
6 that is related to the property
7 itself. That is also within
8 keeping with the way it was before
9 but also within the neighborhood.
10 That is in paragraph B, section
11 one.

12 Section two of paragraph B
13 talks about the scale of the
14 proposed alteration of the new
15 construction, which is the windows
16 itself. So in the two over two,
17 divided light, that is within the
18 general design and character
19 appropriate.

20 Do we all agree on that?

21 MEMBER McMAHON: We do.

22 MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN BULL: So the
24 textures and the materials and the
25 color, which is item number three,

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 relates to other and similar
3 properties. Not only that were
4 there itself but also other
5 properties in the neighborhood. So
6 it meets -- I don't know if I need
7 to go through every one of these.
8 Do I need to go through every one
9 of these? I think not.

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

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

16 MEMBER McMAHON: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN BULL: All in
18 favor?

19 MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

20 MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

21 MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

23 Item number three.

24 Discussion and possible motion on
25 the application of 114 Main

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 Greenport, LLC - Nora Flotteron
3 owner. The building is located at
4 114 Main Street. The Applicant
5 proposes to provide safe and proper
6 egress by adding two egress windows
7 facing the street to the upstairs
8 apartment. Further back and out of
9 sight from the street, a skylight
10 will be added to provide additional
11 light and ventilation. Suffolk
12 County Tax Map# 1001-5-3-13. The
13 Applicant is here.

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

25 I went up there just before

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 the meeting just to re-refresh
3 myself. To the south, Claudio's
4 has four windows and three windows.
5 In fact, they have the same roof
6 line and design. Across the street
7 whether it is -- I said Claudio's.
8 I meant Preston's to the south.
9 Excuse me. Across the street is
10 Claudio's. They have nine windows.
11 All the buildings except my
12 building actually have at least
13 three windows on the street. So we
14 are just trying really to become
15 uniform like the rest of the
16 buildings on the street. And have
17 egress, of course.

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

23 MEMBER WETSELL: And these
24 are casements?

25 THE APPLICANT: Those are

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 both casements. Correct. And we
3 add a sash across the middle. So
4 it looks like double hung even
5 though it isn't. They have the
6 space and the access they need.

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

13 THE APPLICANT: That is
14 correct. Thank you.

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

18 THE APPLICANT: Yes.

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

23 THE APPLICANT: I haven't
24 given any thought. But the builder
25 I would be using is Eugene Berger

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 (phonetic), who I have used for
3 years. He is a local builder out
4 here. Whatever is the best from
5 the standpoint of our needs and
6 aesthetics. I don't think there is
7 any difference.

8 MEMBER McMAHON: No. I
9 didn't mean to cut you short.
10 Generally there isn't. If they
11 swing -- if they pivot right to
12 right -- it is not an aesthetic.

13 CHAIRMAN BULL: It is not
14 an aesthetic.

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

24 My primary concern is, of
25 course, safety and the fact that

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 that divider is meant to replicate
3 the existing --

4 CHAIRMAN BULL: The feel.

5 MEMBER McMAHON: The sash.
6 Yes. The double hung. That is
7 where they are headed with it. I
8 get it. I understand that.

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

15 MEMBER McMAHON: No.

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

19 CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

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

24 MEMBER McMAHON: No. You
25 can't in a case with --

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 CHAIRMAN BULL: I wouldn't
3 think so. You could put one in the
4 middle. This would be ruinous of
5 the view, if that was a decision
6 that was made.

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

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

18 MS. WINGATE: Excuse me,
19 Stephen.

20 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

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

23 CHAIRMAN BULL: We could
24 talk a little bit about the
25 skylight. Let me finish first on

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 the windows themselves.

3 MS. WINGATE: Okay.

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

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

14 THE APPLICANT: Is it what?

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

22 THE APPLICANT: It normally
23 is the interior. It connects onto
24 the windows. For many years they
25 have been building solid windows.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 And you put a plastic insert in.
3 From the outside you would think
4 that's wood. You would never know.

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

11 THE APPLICANT: Right.

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

16 THE APPLICANT: No. They
17 aren't.

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

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

25 MEMBER McMAHON: If there

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 is a separation bar rather than
3 something that is applied inside
4 and out. Is that what you are
5 saying there is?

6 MS. WINGATE: That is what
7 I am saying.

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

16 CHAIRMAN BULL: The criteria
17 we are talking about is a fat bar
18 --

19 MEMBER McMAHON: True
20 divided.

21 CHAIRMAN BULL: Is it true
22 divided in its fatness?

23 MEMBER McMAHON: That is
24 correct. And that is good. That's
25 a good -- the fact that they are

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 making the effort to make it look
3 like the other one is great. That
4 is what we want. I just am not
5 familiar with the casement that it
6 has a true divided partition. If
7 you want to call it --

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

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

14 THE APPLICANT: Is it a bar
15 across.

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

18 MEMBER McMAHON: No. That
19 is correct.

20 MEMBER WALOSKI: If it is a
21 snap in --

22 MEMBER McMAHON: No. We
23 understand.

24 CHAIRMAN BULL: So snap ins
25 are no good.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

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.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 CHAIRMAN BULL: And that is
3 acceptable?

4 MEMBER McMAHON: That's
5 acceptable.

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

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

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

23 Am I'm correct in that?

24 MEMBER McMAHON: I think
25 so.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Now
3 let's talk about the skylight. So
4 I'm not familiar. Are there other
5 buildings with skylights in that
6 row?

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

15 Again, we are concerned
16 ourselves most of the time with
17 street scapes. This is a real
18 tight situation. You can't, you
19 know, unless you get a really fussy
20 angle, you might be able to see
21 something from the street.
22 Generally these places are one on
23 top of the other.

24 CHAIRMAN BULL: I
25 understand. It is a two story

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 structure. Because it is kind of
3 low to the street it could be
4 visible. People that have
5 skylights often like to raise them
6 to let in some ventilation. So its
7 appearance becomes more visible.

8 MS. WETSELL: Does it open?

9 MEMBER McMAHON: You know
10 what, the tendency --

11 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

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

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

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

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

23 THE APPLICANT: The
24 skylights that we would be using
25 would be facing south towards

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 Preston's.

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

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

16 MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.
17 Absolutely.

18 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah.

19 THE APPLICANT: We also --
20 initially we were looking for an
21 egress. We determined we don't
22 need that if we have the windows.
23 We have been looking at them for
24 the light. Not necessarily to
25 raise them or use them or some of

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 the other things you are
3 describing.

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

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

14 CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, I
15 think --

16 MEMBER McMAHON: Unless it
17 really swung out.

18 CHAIRMAN BULL: Or for a
19 boat that was entering the harbor,
20 would it be visible from that
21 angle? But it sounds like if it is
22 already hidden by Preston's roof
23 then I think you are pretty well
24 protected. Because there is a sea
25 view as well as a street view.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 THE APPLICANT: There is no

3 --

4 MEMBER McMAHON: Look at
5 the size of the building.

6 CHAIRMAN BULL: Exactly.
7 Exactly.

8 MEMBER McMAHON: You are
9 not seeing it from anywhere.

10 MEMBER McMAHON: It is
11 strictly a light situation.

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

15 MR. PALLAS: Chairman, if I
16 may.

17 CHAIRMAN BULL: Sure.

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

21 THE APPLICANT: We would
22 like the approval for two. We were
23 hoping to need none. But if that
24 comes back to the discussion with
25 proper lighting requirements.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MS. WINGATE: The New York
3 State code requires lighting
4 calculations, the windows need
5 egress but they don't necessarily
6 put the rooms over the top for
7 light. So the architect is
8 presently working on the
9 calculations for the lighting.
10 Personally, I think we are in for
11 two, if not three skylights.

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

15 MS. WINGATE: Because you
16 need light in there.

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

22 CHAIRMAN BULL: Then they
23 have to be operable.

24 MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN BULL: They would

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 be the kind of skylight with the
3 full opening.

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

10 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

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

19 MR. PALLAS: If I may
20 suggest that the criteria be -- you
21 may want to set the distance -- a
22 minimum distance back from the
23 front so that you are sure it is
24 not visible. If you are basing --
25 if you are basing -- If you are to

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 ultimately approve this basing it
3 on its not being seen from the
4 street I think you need to define
5 how far back from the front you
6 want for it to start.

7 MEMBER McMAHON: Do we have
8 an idea of --

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

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

14 MS. WINGATE: The first
15 room is fourteen feet.

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

19 MS. WINGATE: Long, off the
20 street.

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

23 MEMBER McMAHON: And if it
24 would --

25 MS. WINGATE: Not beyond

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 to you.

3 THE APPLICANT: No.

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

9 CHAIRMAN BULL: Does
10 everyone feel confident?

11 MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

12 MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.

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

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

17 MEMBER McMAHON: Some of
18 those are bubble type.

19 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

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

24 CHAIRMAN BULL: So we are
25 talking about a flat glass

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

skylight.

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

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 a problem. The squared off ones.

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

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

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

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

25 MS. WALOSKI: I second the

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 sanctuary fronting on Main Street.

3 Suffolk County Tax Map#

4 1001-2-6-49.1

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

13 So, here is the
14 application: The application is
15 made by James Olinkiewicz, the
16 applicant, as the contract vendee
17 of property at 625 1st Street, for
18 a Certificate of Appropriateness
19 for an alteration at the property
20 525 1st Street, which is the site
21 of the former Methodist Church.

22 That is a pause, if anybody
23 has an issue with it.

24 The Applicant seeks to
25 remove the rear portion of the

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 former Methodist Church building.

3 The portion that is proposed to be

4 removed as added to the Church

5 building in the 1960s.

6 That is a fact.

7 We didn't get to that. Go
8 ahead.

9 MEMBER WETSELL: The whole
10 thing isn't from the '60s.

11 CHAIRMAN BULL: There was a
12 question that came before our
13 committee as to whether the facade
14 said of the portion that is being
15 proposed to be removed, whether
16 that facade is from the 1960s or is
17 it just behind it that is from the
18 1960s.

19 MS. WINGATE: From what I
20 understand, the single door with
21 the two windows is from the '20s.
22 And the community room was done in
23 the '60s.

24 CHAIRMAN BULL: So there
25 are -- there are two parts to this.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 They are seen in this photograph
3 here. I will hold it up for the
4 camera. Here we are. Not that the
5 camera can necessarily see them,
6 but in behind this tree is a
7 portion of this -- an entrance way
8 to the community room from Front
9 Street that was originally built in
10 the '20s.

11 MS. WINGATE: Correct.

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

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

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

24 MR. PROKOP: So can I
25 propose that the -- so the portion

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 that is proposed to be removed was
3 added to the building in the 1960s
4 except that the entranceway to the
5 community room from Front Street
6 was build in the 1920s. The
7 entranceway to the community room
8 from Front Street also to be
9 removed.

10 MS. WINGATE: Main Street.

11 MR. PROKOP: Main Street.

12 CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

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

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

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

23 MEMBER WETSELL: But that
24 is grandfathered. It is not
25 required to --

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MS. WINGATE: Oh,
3 absolutely. It doesn't need any
4 kind of zoning variances. It just
5 makes for a --

6 MEMBER WETSELL: A narrow
7 driveway.

8 MS. WINGATE: Right. A
9 narrow driveway.

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

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

16 CHAIRMAN BULL: To two
17 members of our committee.

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

20 MEMBER WETSELL: Well,
21 there is ordinances --

22 MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.
23 There is architectural --

24 MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN BULL: Further on

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 in this application, I admit it is
3 just a draft written to give us
4 something to talk about, to work
5 off, to work from, that the windows
6 in that portion be moved to another
7 portion. To a part that was to be
8 reconstructed. That would be the
9 part that would be facing --

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

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

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

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

25 The application for

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1 subdivision was submitted by the
2 Applicant to the Greenport Village
3 Planning Board pursuant to Chapter
4 118 Subdivisions of the Greenport
5 Village Code. The subdivision
6 application provided for the
7 removal of a portion of the former
8 Methodist Church in order to reduce
9 the building size on the lot.
10

11 The applicant also filed an
12 application with the Greenport
13 Historical Preservation Commission
14 for the issuance of a Certificate
15 of Appropriateness as provided in
16 Greenport Village Code Section
17 76-5.

18 MR. PROKOP: Can I just
19 make a suggestion?

20 CHAIRMAN BULL: Please.

21 MR. PROKOP: On the
22 paragraph before that. I am sorry
23 I didn't catch it. To reduce the
24 building size. It shouldn't say to
25 that of a single family residence.

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 I believe that is the purpose of
3 this. That is what I think. So it
4 is reduce it from 7000 square feet
5 to 3000 square feet to make it more
6 suitable to a single family
7 residence.

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

11 CHAIRMAN BULL: We did talk
12 about it.

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

16 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

17 MEMBER McMAHON: Exactly.

18 CHAIRMAN BULL: So now
19 onward.

20 The application was heard
21 and considered by the Historic
22 Preservation Commission at a public
23 meeting on January 9, 2017 and then
24 discussed at a public meeting of
25 the Historic Preservation

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 Commission for decision on February
3 6, 2017.

4 And that is this meeting we
5 are having now.

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

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

21 After visiting the location
22 of the 1880's Church Sanctuary and
23 interviewing the applicant, James
24 Olinkiewicz at the site and based
25 on the discussion with the

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 Applicant at the Historic
3 Preservation Commission's regularly
4 scheduled meeting on January 9,
5 2017, and after review and
6 consideration of the Village of
7 Greenport file and records on this
8 matter and the responsibilities of
9 the Historic Preservation
10 Commission pursuant to Chapter 76
11 of the Greenport Village Code, the
12 Village of Greenport Historic
13 Preservation Committee members;
14 Stephen Bull, Roselle Borrelli,
15 Dennis McMahon, Caroline Waloski
16 and Susan Wetsell make the
17 following findings and
18 determinations regarding the
19 allocation to remove a portion of
20 the structures of the former Church
21 Sanctuary and its manse at 625 1st
22 Street with the church front Main
23 Street. Suffolk County Tax
24 Map#1001-02-06-49.1.

25 So here are the findings

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 and this is what we are going to
3 talk about today.

4 So the findings are: 1)
5 The removal of the portion of the
6 Church building that is in the rear
7 of the structure and which was
8 added in the 1960s is not a major
9 alteration as intended by the
10 definition of Major Alteration
11 provided in Section 76-2 of the
12 Greenport Village Code:

13 "Major Alteration, any
14 alteration, construction, removal
15 or demolition of a landmark or
16 structure which may significantly
17 impair the historic or
18 architectural appearance or
19 features of the landmark or
20 historic district."

21 Now we have a bit of a
22 question here because would the
23 1920s, which is the part --

24 MS. WETSELL: That is
25 visible.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 CHAIRMAN BULL: -- visible
3 from the street, whether that
4 impairs the historic or
5 architectural appearance.

6 Let me finish the
7 paragraph.

8 Because the approximately
9 4,400 square foot portion of the
10 building to be removed is located
11 to the rear of the structure and
12 does not have a historic
13 significance or value for
14 preservation because the portion to
15 be removed was added to the
16 historic portion of the building in
17 the 1960s and the partial
18 demolition there does not
19 significantly impair the historic
20 or architectural appearance or
21 features of the landmark or
22 historic district and that
23 therefore no public hearing is
24 required for this application.

25 Well, that is actually on

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 the point of what we are talking
3 about. Let's dig in on that.

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

12 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah.

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

17 MEMBER WALOSKI: So that is
18 a picture --

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

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

24 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. It is
25 very poorly taken. So, on the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

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

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 --

3 MEMBER WETSELL: It is this
4 part here. It is this part right
5 here.

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

9 MEMBER WETSELL: This is
10 the street.

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

14 MEMBER WETSELL: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN BULL: This part
16 right there. This is the part we
17 are really concerned about is this
18 --

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

23 MEMBER WALOSKI: The facade
24 itself?

25 MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MS. WINGATE: It is not
3 just a facade. It is a space. It
4 is a space.

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

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

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

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

20 MS. WINGATE: He has to
21 repair --

22 CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, I see.

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

25 CHAIRMAN BULL: Right.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MS. WINGATE: -- which is

3 --

4 MEMBER WALOSKI: The only
5 part to me that is historic is that
6 part it.

7 CHAIRMAN BULL: This is the
8 street. And this is the piece that
9 we see. This is the part --

10 MEMBER WALOSKI: So it is
11 this.

12 CHAIRMAN BULL: It is this.
13 And there is kind of a stage here.
14 I don't know exactly how they did
15 it. There is a kind of stage here.
16 You see an element of it here.

17 MEMBER WETSELL: So it is
18 kind like this portion?

19 CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, the
20 interior I believe is open all the
21 way across.

22 MEMBER WALOSKI: So this is
23 sort of original at least around
24 here?

25 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. So

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 they may have done -- judging by
3 the roof and the -- it is hard to
4 know -- it is hard for me to
5 understand what they did.

6 MR. PROKOP: Get as much as
7 you can.

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

12 MS. WINGATE: Visible
13 architecture.

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

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

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

23 CHAIRMAN BULL: I
24 understand. To me it looks like
25 from this picture here because

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 this is --

3 MR. PALLAS: Excuse me.

4 Only one person can speak at a time

5 so the stenographer can --

6 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

7 MR. PALLAS: -- find out

8 who is speaking and record it

9 appropriately, please. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN BULL: So what we

11 are doing at the moment is we are

12 drawing the configuration of the

13 hip roof, which to give us an idea

14 of what the space is that we are

15 talking about.

16 MS. WINGATE: I think that

17 is what the addition -- what the

18 addition might have done --

19 MS. WETSELL: Then they

20 just opened this up.

21 MS. WINGATE: Right. The

22 problem is this is set back so far

23 from this it makes for a very

24 difficult construction project.

25 MEMBER McMAHON: I am going

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 to run something by you. And with
3 all respect to the 1920s addition
4 and how well they mirrored the
5 architectural points and how well
6 they did that. And it makes you
7 sensitive in many regarding as to
8 its demolition, but again when you
9 start thinking about getting things
10 back to bare bones and the way
11 everything -- many, many houses in
12 Greenport have been added onto and
13 added onto. Some were done
14 according to the period. That one
15 was done better than most because
16 you feel those elements have been
17 dragged into it.

18 In the same context I want
19 to say that I'm looking at the
20 project on a practicality
21 standpoint as well. I don't mind
22 sometimes when you get back to the
23 bare bones of what was there is a
24 true renovation. Even though you
25 might be losing elements that you

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 feel are important that you see
3 from the street. You might be used
4 to seeing from the street. So you
5 have grown accustomed to the look and
6 feel of the property. Sometimes
7 when you eliminate all these
8 add-ons you get a simpler feeling
9 to the way that church looked at
10 the time it was built. It was a
11 smaller scale. When you start
12 adding on all of these things, as
13 nicely done as it might have been,
14 well as you think it fits according
15 to that, when you see that
16 disappear that sometimes -- and you
17 see what that building looked like
18 back in the day. That also can add
19 a great deal to how you feel about
20 that piece of the property. Even
21 though you might be losing an
22 element or two, I would like to see
23 if there are any -- there was a
24 stipulation in regards to reusing
25 any stained glass that might

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 disappear and be reincorporated
3 into that. I think that is where
4 we should lay -- you know, put our
5 priorities. There are some --
6 there are some old trims that have
7 been boarded over. And that I
8 thought was a part of the
9 conversation that those windows
10 would be reinstalled, if any were
11 removed.

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

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

23 MEMBER McMAHON: No.
24 Absolutely not. That is why I
25 started where I did.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MR. PROKOP: May I make a
3 suggestion?

4 MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.

5 MR. PROKOP: So I put this
6 here, this point of major
7 alteration because you need to get
8 passed this. I think you need to
9 explain your decision why you don't
10 think it is a major alteration, if
11 you agree with that. Then the
12 things you are talking about later
13 in your decision with conditions
14 and, you know, it does require the
15 applicant later on to maintain
16 those windows and replace them.
17 You do have that language. Just
18 with respect to this, if I could
19 say -- if I could just suggest if
20 it is not a major alteration,
21 removal of a 4,400 square foot
22 portion of the building constructed
23 in the 1920s and the 1960s does not
24 significantly impair the historical
25 or architectural appearance or

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 features of the landmark or
3 Historic District. And that
4 therefore, no public hearing is
5 required for this application.

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

12 MEMBER WETSELL: That is
13 what is sort of --

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

16 MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

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

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

22 MEMBER McMAHON: And what
23 portion of that -- and if you want
24 to put a square footage number on
25 that, then that is the point. It

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 is a part of that 4,000. But I am
3 telling you right now, if it is a
4 thousand, they are removing three.
5 I cannot be quoted on that but I'm
6 giving you a general idea. Just
7 from a contractor's standpoint we
8 are seeing a major portion of that
9 1960s building go. But to
10 reconnect -- and it is a good
11 point. We are not here to make it
12 easy on the contractor or the --
13 excuse me, the new owner. But to
14 reconnect points A to B is a visual
15 -- it could be a disaster to save
16 front view and to make it somehow
17 incorporated somehow back into that
18 building could be worse than --
19 than better, is what I'm saying to
20 you. Sometimes getting back to
21 bare bones is better than trying to
22 incorporate a feature that was put
23 on -- even though 1920 was a long
24 time ago. And we certainly would
25 appreciate -- hey, this is 2017 --

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MEMBER WALOSKI: But it is
3 important to what that building was
4 in the Village at that time.

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

9 MR. PALLAS: I just want to
10 revisit the point that the Village
11 Attorney was trying to bring up.
12 The concept of a major alteration
13 is defined specifically. It is not
14 subjective. It is in the
15 Historical Code to what qualifies
16 as a major alteration. That
17 criteria is what determines whether
18 or not a hearing is required. I
19 think the Village Attorney was
20 seeking to find out if you believe
21 by definition that it is a major
22 alteration. Then you need to have
23 a public hearing.

24 MR. PROKOP: That's right.

25 MEMBER WALOSKI: I think it

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 is a major alteration.

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

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

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

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

18 CHAIRMAN BULL: And we are
19 talking about something that is two
20 -- two units combined. An
21 alteration made in the '60s on an
22 alteration that was made in the
23 '20s.

24 Do we have any evidence in
25 photograph or of other forms of

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 It is hard to imagine. I mean as a
3 builder myself how that would be,
4 the archeology --

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

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

10 MEMBER McMAHON: That's
11 fine.

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

19 MEMBER WETSELL: That might
20 be a hardship.

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

23 MS. WINGATE: I'm going to
24 ask for permission to schedule
25 another site visit. And do you

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 want to schedule a public hearing?

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

6 MEMBER WALOSKI: Lets visit
7 it.

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

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

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

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

17 MR. PROKOP: It should be on
18 page 2. It says, number 1, major
19 alteration. Any alteration,
20 construction, removal or demolition
21 of a landmark or structure which
22 may significantly impair the
23 historic or architectural
24 appearance or features of the
25 landmark or historic district. So

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 this building is not a landmark.

3 It is in the Historic District.

4 MS. WINGATE: It is in the
5 district.

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

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

20 MS. WETSELL: That's right.

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

24 MS. WALOSKI: I recall
25 using this definition narrative. I

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 know you don't want to hear that.

3 CHAIRMAN BULL: I think
4 that -- we have a split decision
5 here, even on our own committee.
6 So I think it would be a matter --
7 we should take and have a public
8 hearing on it. What do you think?
9 Dennis?

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

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

21 MEMBER McMAHON: That's
22 good. Okay.

23 MR. PROKOP: You still make
24 the decision.

25 MEMBER WALOSKI: I think we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

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?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

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

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 discussion on CLG grant application
3 for fiscal year 2016, determining a
4 short list of projects for eligible
5 funding. Application must be
6 received by March 1st, 2017.

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

17 The application doesn't
18 really come from us, per se, but it
19 is us. It has to be stamped by the
20 -- it comes from the mayor from the
21 Village. The Village has a status
22 of -- of being this landmark, you
23 know, Historic Preservation. There
24 are two items that I was talking in
25 correspondence to Linda Mackey, who

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 is with the Parks Department of New
3 York and she oversees our grant
4 application.

5 One of the ideas was to ask
6 her about having them help us in
7 doing this twenty-eight year, you
8 know, cataloging inventory of all
9 the Greenport structures. And
10 another was a project idea that we
11 would go out and we would shoot
12 details of the importance of some
13 of these buildings in Greenport
14 like the bell and the bell tower or
15 the old town hall. Architectural
16 elements that might not be here,
17 might not survive twenty years.
18 That was the second project I
19 pitched to her.

20 And the third project I
21 pitched to her that was an
22 outreach, an educational outreach
23 where we would bring in experts in
24 the renovation of the old houses to
25 provide the public owner of the

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 houses here in Greenport and
3 builders, contractor and the
4 carpenter over at Hanff's Boat Yard
5 who have these woodworking skills
6 but may not be familiar with
7 working on old houses. And to see
8 if they would be interested in
9 funding that.

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

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

21 She said, "I would
22 recommend a reconnaissance level
23 survey of the Village because an
24 update seems long overdue, and it
25 sound like there is interest in

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 areas outside the Historic
3 District." We have talked about
4 this before. There are some single
5 buildings that we like that are
6 within the Historic District -- but
7 are outside the Historic District
8 that we may not be able to bring
9 into the Historic District because
10 we can not enlarge the Historic
11 District. But according to the new
12 direction you can cherry pick
13 individual structures and in that
14 way we add them to our own -- what
15 we as a group think is important.
16 Then we promote them to the State
17 level. And then perhaps then as
18 far as the Federal level.

19 So, talking about this, "--
20 reconnaissance level survey of the
21 Village because an update seems
22 long overdue, and it sounds like
23 there is interest in areas outside
24 the Historic District, so it would
25 be great to identify eligible

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 properties for local designation
3 and Nation Register. The survey
4 report would also act as a great
5 planning tool for future
6 preservation activities. I've
7 attached a sample scope of work for
8 a reconnaissance level survey to
9 give you a sense of what it
10 entails."

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

15 MEMBER WALOSKI: That's
16 nice.

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

24 MEMBER WALOSKI: And we
25 have their approval.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, we
3 have their pre-approval, which was
4 the nature of my call to them.

5 MEMBER WALOSKI: That's
6 great.

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

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

22 Anyway, I also spoke to
23 David McEneny. And he is the
24 administer of all of these grants.
25 And he -- about this workshop. He

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1
2 thinks it is a great idea. Beyond
3 the types of training, who would it
4 be marketed to? This is something
5 we would address. Say the
6 homeowners, the carpenters, the
7 contractors, the tourists.

8 MEMBER WALOSKI: Real
9 estate people.

10 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. And
11 the real estate people. Very good.
12 Yes.

13 Then who would provide the
14 training? We would then go to
15 outside resources? People who have
16 done this sort of activity before.
17 We need a consultant. All of these
18 generally require a consultant.
19 Somebody who has done these kind of
20 workshops, who is a professional,
21 who is outside of our general
22 group. And what are their fees?
23 These are the kinds of question
24 they need on the application. Are
25 we funding the rental space? Which

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

1 means now I am going to make a
2 phone call to Hanff's Boat Yard and
3 say, are you going to give us your
4 space there? Because they have a
5 nice meeting room on the weekends.
6

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

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

17 MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.

18 MEMBER WALOSKI:

19 Absolutely.

20 MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN BULL: All in
22 favor of -- I make a motion that
23 we write the applications.

24 MEMBER WALOSKI: I second
25 the motion.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 CHAIRMAN BULL: All in
3 favor?

4 MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

5 MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

6 MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

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

17 This report is generally
18 prepared by Eileen because it is
19 basically a form where you fill out
20 -- there are specific numbers about
21 kinds of things that were done.
22 Some were done before my time last
23 year. Some were done last year
24 where we kind of discussed -- we
25 discussed signage. We discussed,

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 you know, the Main Street project.
3 Different kinds of projects that
4 came before and she fills out the
5 numbers.

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

11 MEMBER McMAHON: I second
12 item number six.

13 CHAIRMAN BULL: All in
14 favor?

15 MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

16 MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

17 MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

18 CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Item
19 number seven. Motion to accept the
20 minutes of the December 5, 2016
21 meeting and the January 9, 2017
22 meeting. I make a motion to
23 accept. Has everyone had a chance
24 to read them?

25 MEMBER WALOSKI: I haven't

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

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.

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

2 MEMBER WALOSKI: That's
3 fine.

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

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

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

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

15 MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

16 MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

17 MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

18 CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you
19 so much.

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

22
23
24
25

1 PROCEEDING 2-6-2017

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

3

4

STATE OF NEW YORK

5

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK

6

I, Barbara D. Schultz, a Notary

7

Public within and for the State of New

8

York, do hereby certify:

9

That the within proceedings is a

10

true and accurate record of the

11

stenographic notes taken by me.

12

I further certify that I am not

13

related to any of the parties to this

14

action by blood or marriage; and that I

15

am not in any way interested in the

16

outcome of this matter.

17

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have here

18

unto set my hand.

20

21

19
22



Barbara D. Schultz

23

24

25