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CHAIRMAN BULL: Historic Preservation Commission for March 6, 2017. I'm Stephen Bull. And I am the Chairperson and starting from my left to my right the committee will introduce themselves.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Roselle Borrelli.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Caroline Waloski.

MEMBER WETSELL: Susan Wetsell.

MEMBER McMAHON: Dennis McMahon.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So there is going to be a slight change in the agenda tonight. We are going to start with Item 1 and then we will go to the public hearing after that and then we will go to Item 2.

Item #1: Discussion and possible motion on the
application of Dawn Polewac, for the property located at 602 First Street. The applicant proposes to build a two-hole split rail fence 135 feet along the north side of the property.

So, Joel.

MR. DAILY: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN BULL: If you would like to take a look at -- and according to this -- Joel?

MR. DAILY: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Introduce yourself, please.

MR. DAILY: I am Joel Daily. I am a general contractor out of Southold. And I am standing here for Polewac.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

So Joel, it looks like indicated on here that the fence is going to be 24 inches tall.

MR. DAILY: No. It is
It is going to be 36. So 36 inches tall. It is two holes. Much like what is shown here.

MR. DAILY: Possibly about eleven feet.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So let's discuss this.

MEMBER McMAHON: I think it is as about as simple as you can get.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. This kind of fence is in keeping with the History District and so according to our mission, this type of fence on the border has passed all other muster and so therefore I make a Motion to approve the fence.

MEMBER McMAHON: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?
MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.
MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.
MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Motion passes. Thank you, Joel.

MR. PALLAS: Why don't you go to Item 3.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

Rather than open up the public hearing, you are saying?

MR. PALLAS: I would prefer to wait for Joe.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So we are going to move onto Item 3, which is: Discussion on obtaining a possible grant from the Preservation League of New York State with an application deadline of March 27, 2017.

So to bring you up-to-date on this, we made two proposals, that we had discussed, to the New York State Department of Parks.

And this was about -- it was two
applications. One was for the survey that we were going to be doing, the 20th Anniversary survey that was approved by the Trustees. And the second project was a one day workshop.

So in talking to our contact at the New York State -- The CLG representative, she mentioned that there was a possibility of getting a grant from the Preservation League of New York State. So I gave them a call and I haven't had a follow-up call with them, but we would take the application that we already made to the Parks Department about the survey.

And basically it would remake it again to the Preservation league. And in that case I believe they have a different kind of a match involved. Where the match for
the New York State Parks Department required an in-kind contribution of labor from Village employees. This particular match requires a commitment of some cash from the Village. Where the Preservation League would take most of the burden of the survey on that budget that was proposed a while back. And the Village would be -- get a very small portion that they would have to pay. This would be -- if we -- if somehow this was co-coordinated with the grant that we made to the New York State Parks Department.

I'm only bringing you what information I have at the present because I haven't had a follow-up call with them. I will be discussing this further with Paul Pallas as to its feasibility and he will, I believe, have to take
this in front of the Trustees for the separate approval because this is a different kind of application.

MR. PALLAS: Yes, it would have to get approved. Particularly if there is a cash as opposed to an in-kind match. If it is a cash match the Village would have to approve that. I note that the deadline application is the 27th.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. PALLAS: Which again is two or three days after the Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. PALLAS: Any formal request you would like to make of the Village Board should be done this week.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes, I will be connecting with Paul about that. Preparing a draft,
clearing this draft with the Preservation League of New York State and if we get -- if they like the draft then I will pass it onto Paul and see if Paul likes it. Thanks. Yes.

MS. BORRELLI: What is the vision or the scope of the grant?

CHAIRMAN BULL: This particular Preservation League, they are also interested in our doing a survey of all of the historic sites in the village, the Village of Greenport. It actually parallels what we are obliged to provide as members of the CLG. Which stands for Community -- no. Certified Local Government.

As a certified local government we are required to, you know, to be doing not only these meetings but also keeping track of the inventory. So this
would be a request for their support on inventory. In this case we're asking all of the inventory. But sometime you can go to the Preservation League if you have one building that you are trying to save. There is other kinds of things you can do for that. So, are there any questions about this?

MR. McMAHON: Not at this time.

MEMBER WETSELL: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So if we go ahead with this it would then be with the blessing of the Historic Preservations Committee. Do I have your blessings to go ahead on this?

MS. WALOSKI: Yes.

MS. BORRELLI: Absolutely.

MS. WETSELL: Yes.

MS. WALOSKI: This is the one that we are taking
photographs of the --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. This is another one of those where we are taking photographs of buildings.

MR. PALLAS: You should probably have a formal --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. So I make a Motion that we approve the attempt to make an application to the Preservation League of New York State for a grant to do a survey.

MEMBER WETSELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.
MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.
MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.
MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

Item 3 has passed.

So now we are going to open the floor to the first piece
on this agenda, which is a public hearing. I am going to first read the legal notice of the public hearing of the Village of Greenport Historic Preservation Commission. Pursuant to Chapter 76, The Preservation of Historic Areas, section 76-5, Certificate of Appropriateness of the code of the Village of Greenport.

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing will be held by the Historic Preservation Commission at the Greenport Firehouse, Third Street, Greenport, New York on Monday, March 7th -- that is a typo. It is March 6th, 2017, commencing at 5:00 p.m.

The Historic Preservation Commission will at said time and place hear all persons who wish to be heard on the application of James Olinkiewicz owner of the
property located at 625 First Street, the former Methodist Church.

The application proposes demolish a 4,500 square foot addition to the original Methodist Church that includes a rear addition dating to the 1960s, and an addition on the south dating to the 1920s, consisting of a Major Alteration. The property is located in the R2 R1 and two family zone of the Historic District. Suffolk County Tax Map: 1001-2-6-49.1

The application is on file with the Village Clerk where it is available for review and inspection. By Order of the Village of Greenport Historic Preservation Commission, Stephen Bull, Chairperson.

So now the mic is open to the public for comment.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Good evening. James Olinkiewicz, 625 First Street, Greenport.

I purchased the Methodist Church building with the additions. The original sanctuary was built after the original church that had been 1840s -- had burned down. The new church was built in 1890, which we did -- we took our view of today. There was a couple of issues that had occurred. After the 1890 original sanctuary there was the addition that was added to the one side and then in the 1960s there was another addition squared up.

The church gave me some information. So I just want to read off some of what they have given me. After many years from 1890 to 1950 it was time to renovate and restore the
buildings. The enormous task of restoring the church foundation walls for strengthening, new plumbing, heating, electrical service were brought up to need. This was 1950. New carpet and church pews were obtained and designed and the chancel was accomplished. The pipe organ was replaced with a new electronic pipe organ. And the chancel structures and furniture were built from solid mahogany found on Shelter Island.

In 1955 Mr. and Mrs. Albert Olsen and family gave a meeting room. The Maran (phonetic) room named after Olsen's Grandchildren.

That was the extra addition around 1960 that we went over.

In 1965 Bishop Wicks dedicated the new pipe organ that
had been donated by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Mills. In 1966 a solid foundation was built under the church by the Mazzafaro (phonetic) brothers. But not under the sanctuary. And you had the addition in 1955 that had the new foundation.

So that is what we were in the field and saw today when you had your site visit.

It had been brought up to me about trying to save as much as possible. Being that I'm a historic guy that likes to preserve old buildings there also comes a point that monetarily it is what is feasible and what is not feasible. So to save the existing sanctuary and restore it because it has been let go for so long is -- you know we have a budgeted number of a half a million dollars to save just the
sanctuary without anything else.

So to try to save more would be cost prohibitive if we are going to make it a one family residence.

If we -- and I think that it is personally an awful thing to convert it to two family. I have had a couple of people want me to save the whole building and make it a two-family residence because it is 7200 feet and it could easily house two families. But I think that in keeping with the neighborhood and the structures and that whole area, that a nice restored one-family home would be the proper thing to do with that.

At some point there is a line we have to draw as to what you can save and what you can't. So I'm trying and I'm going to save the 1890s structure with all
the stained glass in it. We discussed about putting some windows in the back where the 1960s structure gets torn off -- getting torn off so that we can have glass for light and air coming into what would be the kitchen, where the alter is now. And I mean that is pretty much it. We will mast the existing siding to what was there in the 1890s on the areas that we expose when we do our demolition and then slowly work our way around the building and reside it. That is going to be, you know, a slow process. You know, getting a building permit to do half of one side or one side. And then go to the next side and go to the next side because it is very labor intensive and expensive. So that is pretty much it. I think that -- I would like to
save as much as the sanctuary as possible and keep it and restore it the way it is.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So the 1920s addition, do you have any idea of what that square footage was?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I would --

CHAIRMAN BULL: What would you guess?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: My guess would be about 2000 square feet, 1800 to 2000 square feet. And then another 2500 was added on in the 1960s. That 4400 square feet that we would be taking off with approval. And so yeah like 1920 would be 1800, 1900 square feet. being that I'm a builder and can judge that pretty easily and the rest of it is probably 24, 25.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Do you have any elevations or
photographs of the two missing walls from the 1920s?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: No. No. You mean from before the 1920s before the additions?

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. When they put the 1920s on there were two walls that were removed.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: One wall on the back of the church -- of the sanctuary would have been closed off.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. When they put the 1950s on, but they took two walls out.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The 1920s -- oh, in the 1920s addition there were two walls taken out.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah. Yeah. Those walls they took down. So you don't have anything to indicate what those walls looked like.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: No.

Right. Not at all. On the back -- on the back of the building that was built in the 1920s we have no idea of what that easterly side looked like or the northerly side looked like. We only have the one wall where you have the door facing the road and the side that faces south.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And I think you told us that the foundation went down, what just two feet?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: About eighteen inches. The old foundation in the 1920s was only dug down eighteen inches. It doesn't meet code. So we would have to hold that whole 1920s addition up because there was never a foundation put underneath there. They did the sanctuary and they did the new additions.
So we would have to hold the whole 1920s building up, take out the whole foundation underneath and then build a whole foundation that meets New York State code if we had to try to save it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So keeping the 1920s would require -- would the entire structure have to go to New York State code or just the 1920s --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The entire because we would have to -- we would be modifying and it would be more than fifty percent to repair and restoration. The other way we are only just doing -- the bedroom -- the bedroom inside the sanctuary is going to be up on the balcony. And we are putting a kitchen in and a bathroom. So we are well under the fifty percent. We would have everything up to New York State
code. So by modifying everything under New York State code if we had to we would almost have to gut the whole sanctuary out.
Everything would have to be brought up; wire, electrical, smoke, the windows, ingress, egress. Everything would have to be brought up to New York State code which is -- you might as well tear the church down. It is just -- it makes it so impossible.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Anybody else have questions? Thank you.

MR. PROKOP: I think that -- I didn't go on the site visit. I usually would go. Are there any photographs that we can keep as part of the record?

CHAIRMAN BULL: I took two photographs of the street views.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I have
some other photographs when we
went last month.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we
would be welcome to hear more
from the public on people how
they feel about this important
piece of history.

MS. WUND (Phonetic): Jada
Wund (phonetic) 621 First
Street. Directly across the
street from the parking lot and
the church and the rectory. So
of course, I'm concerned. I am
also an artist. I'm going to
give you an example of one of
five paintings I have done to the
back of it. Unfortunately I
didn't have the time to get
everything organized. It also
has some photographs.

It would help for those of
us who are concerned if we knew
exactly what you are calling the
sanctuary and what exactly you are calling -- I gather it is the south end is the 1920s and the back is the '60s or something like that.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Correct.

MS. WUND: If you look at the back too just so you can see.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I see.

The spires that you see here (indicating). That is original. This piece here, which is -- where you see these windows here (indicating) that is all the 1950s.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: 1955.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The 1955 part. What you don't see in this is you don't --

MS. WUND: There is one overhear (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think that --

MR. PALLAS: That is a
garage.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That is a garage or a shed, right?

MS. WUND: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: What you don't see is around the corner -- I could show you on my phone. I took a picture. Camera error. Dismiss that.

So this is the original structure (indicating).

MS. WUND: On Main Street.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Right.

This is original (indicating). This is the original entrance and would be kept as is. And you can see this is the original side facing north.

MS. WUND: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: But this part of the building was added in 1955.

MS. WUND: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That would
be gone except the windows.

James has proposed that these windows would be the ones that would be replaced.

MS. WUND: Not in the rear? Just the ones on the side?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. They would be reused.

MEMBER McMAHON: From the rear of the building.

MS. WUND: Are they stained glass?

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. They are clear glass, but I don't know exactly the source. James, you had an idea about the source?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: We believe that they were from the 1920s structure. And when they put the '60s addition on it, they pulled them out of the wall and put it in the '60s structure. They are not stained glass. It has a wavy glass.
CHAIRMAN BULL: This is again parts that are to be removed. James, I'm not sure about this part of the roof. Is this part of the roof part of the 1920s?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: That part of roof is 1920s that you are looking at.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So this part of the roof here that you see here would be part of the 1920s.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: There is nothing underneath it at the moment. So there is no supporting walls on this particular side. All of this -- As I understand it when they actually built this (indicating) they basically supported that wall on two sides. This is why I was asking before. Do we have
any imagery from that side? We don't have it. And then this other side here (indicating).

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: You don't have it on the north side.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Let me show you the street view. This is important. This is a tiny bit of what you can see.

MS. WUND: I know that. That is the '20s.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That is the 20s. And you can tell by the --

MS. WUND: This would by gone (indicating). This would be gone (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. And this here would be gone because this is the front of the 1920s. So the church would be restored to its original cross form. 

MS. WUND: I guess it is going to be around 3500 feet as
opposed to the 4500 feet that would disappear. So it is a significant part of the building.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. That would be taken away. I love the painting.

MS. WUND: I'm sorry they are not reproducing very well. And I have some of the nicer ones. I thought it was important that I express some aesthetics about it because you all are talking about the front of the church. Obviously that is of greater concerned. Everybody is concerned with the front, but the back has been revealed for quite a long time. And the back has a very distinctive series of roof lines that have a real feeling to them. So it is kind of -- when I heard how much is going to be disappeared, I realized we are going back to a church that
probably that no one really remembers. Because 1960 is -- I wonder about historic. 1960 is seventy years ago. So how old does something have to be to be considered, oh, you know, let's just get rid of this and let's move on. I just -- that is part of it. And part of it is -- I know it is not that important to people on Main Street. But for those of us on First Street, we see that. And in deed, after the fact, after the building is built and approved or whatever and the new building and the parking lot, they could grow giant hedges, put up huge fences and who knows what. All of a sudden it will be moot. But I just wanted to voice my love of the rear of the church and the importance of just saying, eh, eh 1960s -- because, you know, they obviously made an
effort for the back of that
church. So that is one.

I did see the video of the
meeting last week. And I wanted
to say it is a wonderful thing
because I was sick and I couldn't
come. I must say it has changed
the ability to participate as a
community. Although I wish
Eileen had a microphone.

So I just wanted to say
that the assumption that the back
of the church is unimportant and
entirely dismissible and
disposable is not how I feel
about it.

My further concern -- and
this is not pertinent probably
tonight in the Historic meeting.
It will probably come up again in
the Planning Board, but it seems
to me that the Historic Committee
has a right to protest or change
things that go on in the Planning
Board. They are able to. So I figure I will put in my two cents to the Historic Committee right now. My concern is that this wonderful gentleman that has obviously built quite a few buildings and is involved in a great deal of activity here in town, much of which is probably going to be very good for the town -- my concern is if he is allowed, and it ends up that he is allowed to tear down or remove the rear piece, the bigger piece that would create a larger potential footprint for the property, which presumably will get divided from the front at some point, between First Street and Main Street. This would set up an opportunity to build a very large structure. Perhaps outside structure, even if the design conforms to the rest of the
genuinely old building around and across from it.

Mine for example are two pre-civil war houses brought together in the 1890s. One was rolled out from Orient and what I recall from Tom Musell (phonetic) telling me, it was brought over on a barge. I really hope -- and it is obviously what is called vernacular in the architectural circle, my house. So it doesn't have any amazing beautiful, ornate cornices or anything like that. It is very much a bunch of poor people putting together whatever they could at the time. But it does look like an old Greenport house.

There are some very big some very beautiful houses on First Street. So obviously size is not always a consideration,
First Street are all stunningly beautiful examples of those earlier periods. And if we end up with just a big large, you know, square building that just happens to fit for somebody that has a lot of deep pockets this would be a great concern. I just want to put in that too ahead of time. Perhaps I am being heard by the developer and you will try to make roof lines that look like they conform. Not just, you know, what happens to suit the new buyer.

That's -- and I am concerned that the footprint is going to get quite a bit larger. Because the amount of property -- it is I think two lots. I think the parking lot constitutes two lots. Not one. I am not sure about that. It seemed fairly wide to me.
CHAIRMAN BULL: We are interested in the historic part, mostly.

MS. WUND: Obviously.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Of the back of that building. And you introduced a very interesting idea.

MS. WUND: So that's it. That is basically my two cents. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you very much.

MS. WUND: Thank you very much.

MR. DOWLING (Phonetic):

Chris Dowling at 617 First Street. Neighbor of Jada and also across to the street to the parking lot.

We had the house for the over ten years now the looking at that back of the church since we moved in. And my son is not
exactly happy because he doesn't have a parking lot to ride his bike in anymore. But, you know, it wasn't his to begin with.

I think keeping an original Greenport structure is very important for our town. You guys have a very big job to try to keep -- especially as more money, newer money starts rolling into town, your jobs gets harder preserving what is Greenport.

I grew up in Sag Harbor. And the people that moved there and also started the save Sag Harbor movement are the people that sucked the sole out of the village and took the reason why everybody moved there in the first place out. You guys are really in charge of saving the sole of this town and by keeping Greenport Greenport. So I think by keeping that church as
original as possible is a big thing. I -- maybe because it is just the way it is decorated, the back half of the church --
because that wall is kind of blank to me. But I understand the roof lines as Jada says are original to the 1920s structure is a beautiful structure and I think that is very important for the property. Especially when you walk into it. It is really nice. I would at least like to see that part remain with the original sanctuary as well.
The back half -- I know it makes it much larger structure which is hard when you are trying to develop it into a single family home. I think the more of that church that can be saved would be better for Greenport as a whole and for preserving the community and keeping a
precedence that we don't just
tear down old Greenport and make
room for new Greenport. I hope
you look at that.

I haven't seen how these
lots are going to be subdivided.
I know there is an application
for that. How entrance and
access to the Main Street side of
that will be done. Is there
going to be parking spaces where
the 1920s structure is or -- I'm
not sure where parking is going
to be for that. It is going to
change the whole look of that
whole structure for Main Street.
There is going to be parking
where there used to be a
beautiful building. I think all
of that has to be looked at. I
haven't seen the site plan for
all of that. So I am not sure
how access is going to be. I
think it is important to save as
much of it as possible. Keep
Greenport Greenport. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you

so much.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: James
Olinkiewicz again. I understand
the property adjacent's concerns.
I just want to point out that
another property that I am
involved in right now is the
restoring of the Meson Ole
building which the original part
of it was built in 1842. The
village had had ideas of tearing
that building down. Okay. It
was coming up to a vote at the
Village Board. I stepped in. I
bought the building. I saved the
building. I restored the
building. That's what I do.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

Oh, more. Good.

MS. WUND: I just wanted
to add on about the two-family versus one-family home. And indeed, if it looks, you know, beautiful it will be fine. But there are two-family homes. If it needed to be a two-family home I wouldn't be inconsistent with the neighborhood, as long as it isn't a two-family home with 18,000 people living in it. That is a different story. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

More public comment. We are ready for it, please. Anyone else? Please. Tell us your name, your address.

MS. CABIN (Phonetic): My name is Marcia Cabin (phonetic) and I live directly across the street at 636 Main Street. I look right at the church. It is beautiful. It is lit up at night. And I live next door to the Baptist Church. They use to
have a historic steeple. That fell down. And it has been replaced by something that is not so historic. It is out of proportion, I think. I am just curious on how you will handle those -- those two steeple -- I don't know what they are called.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: They are being restored.

MS. CABIN: They are? And all of the woodwork and all of that will be wood, not vinyl?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: That was from the 1890s. We will restore it to that.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes, James was pointing out to me when I was looking at one of the steeples. It looked like it got struck by lightening or something that you can see the skullet shingles (phonetic) underneath the vinyl siding. And then below it it
looks like traditional cedar shake. So James also explained to me, due to the nature of the vast square footage of sides he will take it in small portions. The -- an approach the Village -- on a side by side basis and his restoration of that seems to be very committed to the restoration of the original sanctuary.

MS. CABIN: Just out of curiosity, is the plan -- I don't know if this is the right time to ask the question -- parking. Is that to be to the north of the building?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The existing driveway that comes into the back parking lot that goes all the way through we are going to try to loop the parking lot to the back of the building so three sides of the church would be seen without the cars.

Not that it matters, but thumbs ups. Sounds beautiful.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you so much.

Okay. Anyone else? Going once. Twice. I move that we close the public hearing.

MEMBER McMAHON: I second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The public hearing is now closed.

Now we move to Item 2 on the agenda: was the continued discussion and --

MR. PALLAS: I apologize.

As a point of information, the code requires that you render a decision within thirty days.
Your next meeting is within thirty days. So there is no requirement to actually vote tonight. You would need to vote at the following meeting.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And that would be -- there would be no further time after that?

MR. PALLAS: Correct.

MR. PROKOP: You could ask the -- if you want additional time you can ask the applicant for additional time.

CHAIRMAN BULL:
Understood. Okay.

MR. PROKOP: Was that your question?

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. Yeah. That was my question. It was: Can time be extended?

MR. PROKOP: Yes, it can.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So there is a method in which time can be extended.
Okay, so continued discussion and possible motion on the written decision regarding the Methodist Church project that was introduced at the January 2017 HPC meeting, with continue discussion at the February 2017 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 sanctuary is to be converted into a single family residence. The property is located at 625 First Street with the church sanctuary fronting on Main Street. HPC members have requested that there be a site visit for Historic Preservation Commission Members at 4:15 p.m. before the scheduled meeting. We were all there.

SCTM # 1001-2-6-49.1.
So let's continue the discussion.

MEMBER WALOSKI: My feeling is that I don't have any problem with the 1960s portion being removed. I think it is very important to the historic street landscape of Historic Greenport to keep the main sanctuary. That is part of the whole look of the church. And from the 1920s to now, that is what people have been seeing and it is a lovely building and I don't see any reason why it should be removed.

MEMBER BORRELLI: You know, putting aside investments and purchases and building and how much it costs to restore, just looking at it from a historic point of view, I wonder how historic 1920 is compared to 1880 or 1890 when the building
was actually -- what we have now, the church has actually been built. The 1920s portion addition to the 1890s church was done in a fashion that still the workmanship was done beautifully. They did with the corbels, and the whole thing. The front entrance, the stained glass. The two stained glass markings front doors. It unites the sanctuary to the 1920s part, they unite very nicely. They look very nice together.

So I was thinking, like I said, money aside, restoration, either pick it up, if it were possible to move, as I had mentioned before. Like they have done many times in Greenport. They have done it since the early, mid 1700s. They picked old farm houses up and shipped them off down to Orient. They
moved the Webb (phonetic) house in the 1800s over to Orient. They moved I don't know what over to Shelter Island. So they have always picked up homes in Greenport and moved them. We moved the schoolhouse from the North Road, the little red schoolhouse down to the -- the fire department picked it up again and moved it back over to the Old Blacksmith shop in the middle of the Greenport Village. So I wondered if we moved that structure to the back and made that a beautiful home facing First Street, which would be keeping in line with what goes on on First Street and turn that structure so that the front entrance on Main Street is now facing First Street. I don't know. I am just thinking off the top of my head here.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Can I address that?

MEMBER BORRELLI: Yes.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The only problem with that because we had the southern side of the 1920s addition that has the foundation on it, which I showed to you --

MEMBER BORRELLI: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The east side was attached to the exiting building. So there is no wall there. There is no existing 1920s wall there. It is just a blank --

MEMBER BORRELLI: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: -- to the church. The rear wall of the 1920s building they took out.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: And moved the windows out and changed all of that. And the west wall they took out three quarters of
it. So you are talking about saving maybe 25 feet of the facia area of a building that is like 150 feet all the way around. You are missing three walls.

MEMBER WALOSKI: So that is half of the house, right?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: You are missing more than half of the house there.

MEMBER WALOSKI: You only have one and a half walls.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: It is almost impossible to do. To try and build and then cut the building off the building to separate it --

MEMBER BORRELLI: My other thought was to keep it as is. Keep the sanctuary. Separate that. And make the original 1890s church a one-family beautiful home. Take the 1920s addition from the left side, put
in a separate entrance, which it already has and make it like many of the homes, the brownstones, whatever you call them. They share a wall, many homes.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: You mean make it a two-family house?

MEMBER BORRELLI: Well, yeah. Not a two-family. I would make it two individual homes or however.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: That has to be subdivided and set back. We can't do it. It has to be either a two-family home or separate on different lots.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So the first idea was the stronger of the two ideas.

MEMBER BORRELLI: So pick it up.

CHAIRMAN BULL: If you could.

MEMBER BORRELLI: The
1960s addition, obviously -- I don't know where their heads were at to make something so completely different than the original structure. It just doesn't match at all. They didn't use any imagination to try to make the workmanship or any of it -- it is all cinder block. It is all just nothing. So that historically really has no value even if it is from 1960. That is whatever. Whatever you would like to do what that.

I wonder how much does it cost on the 1920s building to demolish it. So maybe the cost in demolishing you might better spend in -- maybe there is somebody out there that wants to just purchase it, you know, at a reasonable rate and move it somewhere. I don't know.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: If there
is someone that would like to purchase and move it, I would be happy to try to find somebody. The other thing is to avoid parking issues. So people don't see cars park in the front of the church. If you leave the 1920s addition on you can't get around. There is that little eight foot alleyway. I tried pulling around the back. You would wind up forcing the parking area to be in front of what you are trying to save. Nobody is going to want to drive their cars down the eight foot -- nobody would want to do that anyway and get behind the building. You are going to have to provide a parking lot in the front on the left-hand side of the church. That takes away from the whole look of what we are trying to restore and keep. We are trying to keep the beauty of
the sanctuary. I understand the desire to save that doorway and that look but it is --

MEMBER WALOSKI: But there is a driveway.

MEMBER BORRELLI: There is a driveway and people will park in their driveways.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah, but I did actually notice that somebody had clipped the corner of the building a number of times.

Did I hear that it would be impossible -- if as -- if it was to remain entirely as is you could not make a two or multi family dwelling on that site?

MS. WINGATE: It could not be a multi family dwelling because there is just not enough square footage.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So a multi family dwelling is out if those
three structures were to remain connected as one structure?

MR. PALLAS: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: It could be two family.

MS. WINGATE: It could be two.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It could be two but it can't be three?

MS. WINGATE: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: In a two family situation you could have one family who have an entrance to the 1920s.

MEMBER BORRELLI: To the church.

CHAIRMAN BULL: To the church. Well to the addition. And then another entrance into the original --

MEMBER BORRELLI: Church.

CHAIRMAN BULL: -- into the 1880 and there would be separate entrances.
MEMBER BORRELLI: Which there are two front doors right now.

MS. WINGATE: It would have to be single ownership.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The owner would have to sublet --

MEMBER WALOSKI: Rent.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Or rent the other portion and then two families could live in that combined -- if the 1920 and the 1880s were to --

MEMBER BORRELLI: Do you think that is feasible? You don't think that there is somebody out there that would like to live in the more important sanctuary?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I don't think that -- this is going to be a high end residence. I don't think that the money put into the sanctuary is going to be worth it
if you are going to have a neighbor attached to your building. Whoever is going to buy that and keep it restored is not going to want to have another family right behind them. They are not going to want to go out in their yard and do that. I think that by trying to save that little --

MEMBER BORRELLI: How about an artist loft right there or some sort of you know, make a one large lofty --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I have gone through all different scenarios all ways from Sunday to try to find out what would be the best way to save as much of the church as I could. I can save the stained glass and the sanctuary and the earliest portion of the church. At some point I becomes then, you know --
MEMBER McMAHON: I think we are getting away from what we are supposed to be addressing. I don't think we should be approaching the way this should be used. I understand that we are trying to reach some kind of a compromise here. I think we have to approach this -- if you are looking at his project, the practicality in regards to what he would have to do to bring this thing up to code and how far reaching it then extends back into that project -- I am speaking from a builder's standpoint because that is what I am. If you wanted to go through the trouble of saving some architectural details that were part of that facade, that is about the only choice he has in regards to resale of anything in a practical manner. You just
can't dissect this building and expect it to be a usable portion of this house. We can't sit here and then start to talk about -- he has beat this thing to death. I can tell he has because I -- I respect especially the neighbors, from the artist standpoint. I see these lines all the time and I understand exactly what you are talking about, roof lines and peaks.

My house is the same way in regards to the plaster details come together. I understand your point and from your neighbor as well. Yeah. You guys looking at that site plan. You have -- you have a whole different approach in regards to your feelings. I mean you're right there. So I've got to understand. You guys -- I haven't been able to review that. That is not our job here.
CHAIRMAN BULL: That is not our job.

MEMBER McMAHON: You guys -- we kind of have to look at it with blinders and hope what happens down the line for you guys is something you are going to be happy with. Something that aesthetically is going to be very pleasing. Anything that gets done or has to be done on that property also is coming before this Board as well, you understand.

In regards traditional lines, details and that sort thing, we are all on that. So hopefully that will give you some kind of solace in regards to what happens.

I am from Sag Harbor, Southampton. I see exactly what you are talking about. I know that as well as you. And I
really respect that whole -- that point of view. We're doing the best we can here in Greenport to slowly approach things. In regarding to this building here restoration, a true restoration gets rid of almost all appendages.

Everything, you know, every house in Greenport, including yours and including mine, including all of my neighbors are a combination of one addition after the other. And I am telling you a lot -- a lot of times they are just really badly done. And my own house included. So I had to pick a period -- which I think is what you're talking about when you are talking about this church. You pick a period. You can't satisfy everybody. I had to pick a period at my house. It goes back
to the 1840s. I looked at the 1910 pictures when they put the round porch on it. I went, wow, that is a period I can respect. That is a period I think I can draw the lines on my house and kind of pull it back together and make it look like, you know, there was one thought involved. But sometimes the obvious little add-ons are cool as well, You know, when you see the obvious period change.

I think in respect to the church I think the quaint the better. That is only my feelings on it. I think you start peeling off these layers and you get back to the spires. You get to see how cute and quaint it was at that time. Instead of trying to load it up and present a problem for the current owner.

His pocketbook is not my
That is not what this board is all about, but you have got to understand too, you want to see this thing done right and perhaps in a timely manner. You have got the loping off of these extra parts and it is going to suck the life out of the project and slow it down considerably.

MEMBER WETSELL: I don't that --

MEMBER McMAHON: That is just my opinion.

MEMBER WETSELL: -- that getting rid of everything that isn't original is the best way to go. I think that particularly the 1920s addition which is very visible from the street is very much a part of the historic building. Original, not original. I don't think that matters.

I think you are right that
our job is not to consider how much it is going to cost. It is to consider the historic whole.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Part of it has to be taken into consideration because the fact that you guys start to implement ideas that impact the structures, that could push me passed the 50 percent rule for New York State. Once I go passed that 50 percent rule I pretty much have to gut the place, inside/outside. I would have to tear the building apart to bring it up to code; rewire, replumb it, smoke alarms.

I mean there is -- it is --

MEMBER WETSELL: You are already passed the 50 percent with the addition that you want to tear down is bigger than the church.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Demolition does not count in
renovations. Demolition does not count in New York State for the renovation of the structure that you keep.

MR. Dowling: Just looking at the site plan here if the 1920s portion was retained and the 1960s portion was taken off you have 12 feet of space on the north side of the property to put a wider driveway. The fire engines could get through and vehicles and there is plenty of room for parking. Where you only have eight and a half on the south side. By taking off the 1960s part and leaving the 1920s part you have plenty of room for the driveway.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Is that an approach from First Street or --

MR. DOWLING: Main Street.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, that is from First Street.
MR. DOWLING: If you look at this driveway now you can here see -- this is Main Street. But here (indicating). This section you have room. Without taking away from --

MR. PALLAS: Mr. Chairman,
excuse me.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Good point.

MR. DOWLING: So save this part (indicating). You still save the primary view.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And you are shifting the driveway.

MR. DOWLING: Yes. It would be more pleasing.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, thank you for bringing that to our attention.

MR. PROKOP: Can I make a suggestion?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes, please.

MR. PROKOP: It doesn't
have to be tonight, but I think at some point the discussion has to be within the framework of the considerations you are required to make under Chapter 76. So it is in Chapter 76. It is also on page 4 of the draft that was circulated.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: You can do it next time. You don't have to do it tonight.

MR. PALLAS: Excuse me one second. Could the audience please -- the transcriptionist is having trouble hearing. Thank you.

MR. PROKOP: So the criteria that we need would be whether the submitted plan would be compatible with the principles of Chapter 76. Would not be visually offensive or inappropriate -- I don't know if
you want me to read them now?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Would you please read it. Yes.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So compatible with the principles of Chapter 76 of the Greenport Village code. Would not be visually offensive or inappropriate by reason of poor quality or exterior design -- excuse me, poor quality of exterior design. But not in a similarity or visual discord in relation to the sites or the surroundings. Would not mar the appearance of the area. Would not impair the use, enjoyment and desirability and reduce the values of property in the area. Would not be detrimental to the character of the neighborhood. Would not prevent an appropriate development and utilization of
the site of adjacent lands. And would not adversely affect the functioning, economic, stability, property, health, safety and general welfare of the community.

Then there is determinations that you need to make which is -- some of which I just mentioned. But again whether the property which contributes to the character of the Historic District shall be retained and their historic features altered as little as possible.

These are the goals of Chapter 76. Any alteration of an existing property. And then it goes on. There is a list of considerations that need to be made under Chapter 76.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I think one thing that I have heard tonight, that hadn't occurred to
me before, was the importance of
the 1950s, '60s view and those
lines. I think that -- the idea
of taking the original structure
of the main sanctuary and
returning it to its original form
without the 1920s and the 1950s
alteration appeals to my historic
sense of restoring that
neighborhood or that portion of
the neighborhood to what it once
was before. And I think that --
were in a kind of an odd time
travel job here to decide here
what is historic and what isn't
historic. And I'm in favor of
the applicants zeal and desire to
make this a practical project
that would be suitable, not only
-- well to the new owners that
might be there someday, but also
to the idea of in keeping with
the historic nature of that
portion of Greenport of what it
did look like in the 1890s.

So I'm in favor of the applicant's proposal, as much as it pains me maybe personally to see those two facades removed but I think it is in keeping with making the project both doable and historic in its outcome.

MEMBER McMAHON: I would have to agree. I know the Board is split on this matter. I think we have to consider what is best for that building lot and the building itself. And I know and I understand those architectural details that make that outcropping look as nice as it did I think in practicality -- and I think we are not seeing the big picture in regards to that church sitting on what would appear to be a lot. And not crammed into an area which it is. I mean that house next door is
right on the property line. So to give it a little breathing room and to see it again as it stood when it was originally constructed I think is pretty important. And I think it is -- the still Board still -- we maintain our integrity, if we had any, that in that we're doing the right thing.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think the applicant has also talked about his maintenance and the reuses of the architectural elements of the 1920s, the stained glass windows that are currently there. The large window that is alongside -- moved there. We don't know for sure, but it does have the rippled glass from -- that was added to the 1955 addition. That was probably taken from the back of the 1920s, but we don't know that
for sure. But it does maintain the character. It is not where suddenly the back end of the property we are finding a sliding glass doors or something that is inappropriate. I think --

MEMBER BORRELLI: Can I just ask a question?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Just to interrupt. The project -- this is for Jim. So we maintain the original church. The original sanctuary. The left goes, which is the 1920s. The back goes, which is a little part of the 1960s. So then the project -- I'm trying to remember. There is the house in the back that you purchased as well, right? That two-family home in the back that faces --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: It is a one-family.
MEMBER BORRELLI: It's a one-family. That faces First. That stays?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Correct.

MEMBER BORRELLI: The church is going to stay. In place of -- we have that big now open space because that back is going. What is going there?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: That is going to be the yard for the sanctuary. It going is going to be the backyard.

MEMBER BORRELLI: And the parking lot out to First Street?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: That is a separate lot.

MEMBER BORRELLI: What is going to go there?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: There was a house there. The church bought it and bulldozed it and put the parking lot there. If
you look at the Village records
you could see what the house
looked like. It will probably be
the same as what was there. We
could probably find that. Do you
have the records.

MS. WINGATE: Do you know
what year that was?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: '75.

MS. WINGATE: That is two
years before our first --

MEMBER BORRELLI: But the
house got demolished, which was
the Cleaves (phonetic) house to
the left -- so looking at the
library there used to be a house
there where the garden is now. I
think that was '70 -- I'm trying
to remember from Eileen's papers.
'74 or '78 or something. They
took that house down.

MS. WINGATE: They took
that house in 2006. They took
that house down after fairly long
conversation.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So based on the reuse thought, we are talking about the reuse of elements --

MEMBER BORRELLI: I am getting back --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Go ahead.

MEMBER BORRELLI: -- to the whole design. I am thinking about -- because I am stuck in my own head about what I was thinking about the 1920s but listening to Dennis and then listening to Steve and understanding of the economics of the whole thing and making it viable I would love to see the church restored in a way -- in a home -- in a church as opposed to knocking a church down, obviously. Keeping those steeples so that the duck house that was the Townsend (phonetic) house across the street has
something beautiful to look at.
The front door is amazing.

    In the interest of being able to finish that project, I do understand what Dennis and Steve are saying. So -- I don't know. I am just thinking out loud here. I would like to see it beautiful and maybe that would be the way to go.

    CHAIRMAN BULL: Would you like more time to think about it? We could postpone this to the next meeting.

    MEMBER BORRELLI: I don't know. Can someone else make that decision?

    MR. PROKOP: I think that the only recommendation I have -- and again it doesn't have to be tonight -- you go through the list of consideration. Similar to what the Zoning Board does. Just because this is obviously an
important project -- you go through the list of considerations --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Do you have that list for me? I don't happen to have that in my notes. I would appreciate if you had that list.

MEMBER BORRELLI: It is number eight on page four.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It is in the code. We'll take it from the code. I think it is a good idea to go through that list and talk about each of these pieces.

MEMBER BORRELLI: I mean if he builds another house on that lot eventually we are going to have to approve that house anyway.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. Is that true, Paul? If a house is put on the parking lot area it is under our domain or under --
MR. PALLAS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Any new construction like that.

MR. PALLAS: Yes.

MEMBER BORRELLI: They can't put a post modern or some sort of abstract --

MR. PALLAS: They can apply for or make an application that you have to approve.

MEMBER WALOSKI: New construction --

CHAIRMAN BULL: New construction is not what we are talking about.

Let's talk about just this project and the approval criteria. We are just going to review the approval criteria now. It starts with paragraph A: In consideration of the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness either alone or in connection with the application for a
building or demolition permit,
the Commission shall be guided by
the following principles as they
apply to the exterior features of
any structure which is a landmark
or located within a historic
district.

So we are talking about a
demolition and we're talking
about the preservation of
exterior views.

One: Properties which
contribute to the character of
the Historic District shall be
retained with the historic
features altered as little as
possible. Nothing would happen
to the main manse. All of those
elements we have been reassured
will remain.

We are talking about the
demolition of the 1920 and we are
talking about the demolition of
the 1950s.
MEMBER WALOSKI: That should fit into the same guideline. That should be preserved as much as possible.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And we are taking that into consideration now. That is the important work we are doing now. We are thinking about and we are in a difficult decision about what stays and what goes.

Two: Any alteration of an existing property shall be compatible with its historic character or in the character of the surrounding Historic District.

So in a sense by restoring the church to its original appearance without the 1920s, that works as well as leaving it in.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Keeping it.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Both views, they both work.

New construction shall be compatible with the Historic District in which it is located.

So we have been reassured by the applicant that if demolition occurs he is going to restore the rest of it accordingly.

The new -- if -- what we also have been told is that there is going to be no other new construction beyond actually the preservation of what we've already got. Whether what pieces are kept.

Let's go onto B. In applying the principle of compatibility the Commission shall consider the following factors; The general design, character and appropriateness of the property of proposed
alteration or new construction.

Well, we are considering the general design. The scale of the proposed alterations and new construction in relation to the property itself and surrounding properties. And we've heard that it might be giving a little bit more air around the building if we agree to this demolition. We have also heard that if we keep it in place there is a chance to move the parking to the opposite side. So that if the parking lot was brought in on the opposite side there was would be a chance to keep it.

Texture, materials, colors and their relation to the similar features of the other properties and the neighborhood.

That was all going to be kept.

Visual compatibility with
neighboring properties and public view including the portion of the property's front facade. Portion arrangement of windows, openings within the facade. Roof shape and rhythm of spacing and properties including the set back.

That is all being considered. No matter which way we go. The applicant has reassured us.

The importance of historic and other architectural features in this -- to the significance of the properties. What we are highlighting is the 1920s is important to members of the Board. Where others it is also important.

The United States Secretary of the Interior for rehabilitation and guideline rehabilitating historic
buildings, February 1978 review.

So that is the approvals criteria that we are addressing as a group. So do you feel more comfortable about making a decision today or postponing it?

MEMBER BORRELLI: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. I make a motion that we postpone the decision about this to our next meeting. That will give a chance to consider this because it is difficult and it is an important decision and it should not be taken lightly.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: So the matter is to save the whole 1920s structure or just the side from the road that faces with a set of doors? Right. So because we
have to clarify that. Right because you can't save the whole 1920s structure but could we save the dorset and like a little four foot --

MEMBER BORRELLI: Were you going to put a garage at all?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: No. So you can get the look of the front of that front door there.

MR. PROKOP: Can I make a recommendation?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. Hold that thought.

MR. PROKOP: I think to respect the process and the important decision that the Board needs to make I think -- I think that Mr. Olinkiewicz is making great comments and this is a great discussion but I think for the future -- we are concerned about the past, but for the future we need to make a record.
I think as many of these things that you are discussing that could be in either illustrations or photographs or renderings, I think it would really be important -- I know you were there and you saw it, but -- and that is important too, but it is just my suggestion that you create a record when you decide this. You know, pictures, we are going to move this over here. That kind of thing.

MR. DOWLING: Would that require re-opening the public hearing so he can make the submittal?

MR. PROKOP: I don't think so. It is just a suggestion. Because the kind of thing that I am hearing is -- it is great that we are discussing that but just to respect the process and the record and of Village and this
Board, you know, I think it would be good to get a couple more pictures in the file so everybody can visualize what we are talking about.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: Unless you disagree with me.

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. No. I thought we had some pictures in the file already on this structure. But I do know that one of the pictures we do have does not show the 1920s facade.

MR. PROKOP: Maybe that is the problem. You are right, there are a couple of pictures here.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think that we, as in our duties, need to have a complete set of pictures from the applicant with a clear picture of the front of the 1920s and also --
MEMBER WALOSKI: And how it relates to the other building.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. So we have that very clearly done.

It has been brought up that there is a view from the back that we hadn't considered. So we need to have from you pictures of all sides.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: You have everything from the 1920s front. Everything you have --

MEMBER BORRELLI: What happens to the little garage?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The garage was built in 1980 something. It is going to get lifted to one of the lots from one of the houses. It is going to be picked up and moved.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a motion that we ask the applicant to give us more images to be -- before we can make a final
decision. And we postpone our
decision to the next meeting.

MEMBER McMAHON: I second
it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in
favor?

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.
MEMBER WALOKSI: Aye.
MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.
MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: So you
will have a vote at the next
meeting?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The only
reason why is this holds up my
whole subdivision application
with the Planning Board.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

Understood.

There is a motion, Item #
4 to accept the minutes of the
February 6, 2017 meeting. Have
we seen those minutes? Do we
accept them?

MEMBER WETSELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Motion to schedule the next HPC meeting for April 3 at 5:00 p.m. Do we all agree?

MEMBER WETSELL: I think a motion to accept that --

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a Motion to adjourn.

MEMBER WETSELL: I second that.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER WETSELL: Aye.

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER WALOSKI: Aye.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you very much.

(Meeting adjourned 6:24 p.m.)
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