

VILLAGE OF GREENPORT

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK STATE OF NEW YORK

-----X

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

REGULAR SESSION

-----X

Third Street Firehouse
Greenport, New York

March 6, 2017
5:08 p.m.

Before:

STEPHEN M. BULL - Chairman

DENNIS McMAHON - Member

SUSAN WETSELL - Member

CAROLINE WALOSKI - Member

ROSELLE BORRELLI - Member

EILEEN WINGATE - Village Inspector

KRISTINA LINGG - Building Department

Clerk

JOSEPH W. PROKOP - Village Attorney

PAUL PALLAS - Village Administrator

I N D E X

PUBLIC HEARING Pages 14 - 47

Application of James Olinkiewicz, with applicant proposing to 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. Applicant James Olinkiewicz is proposing to keep and restore the original 1881s church sanctuary and remove the later addition as shown on the survey. The old church sanctuary is to be converted into a single family residence. The property is located at 625 First Street, Greenport, New York 11944.

ITEM # 1 Page 6 - 8

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.

SCTM: 1001-02-06-46.

ITEM # 2

Pages 48 - 94

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.

SCTM # 1001-2-6-49.1.

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 # 3 Page 8- 14

Discussion on obtaining a possible grant from the Preservation League of New York State with an application deadline of March 27, 2017.

ITEM # 4 Page 94 - 95

Motion to accept the minutes of the February 6, 2017 meeting.

ITEM # 5 Page 95

Motion to schedule the next HPC meeting for 5:00 p.m. on April 3, 2017.

ITEM # 6 Page 95

Motion to adjourn.

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

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

1 application of Dawn Polewac, for
2 the property located at 602 First
3 Street. The applicant proposes
4 to build a two-hole split rail
5 fence 135 feet along the north
6 side of the property.
7

8 So, Joel.

9 MR. DAILY: That is
10 correct.

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

14 MR. DAILY: Yes. Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN BULL: Introduce
16 yourself, please.

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

21 CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.
22 So Joel, it looks like indicated
23 on here that the fence is going
24 to be 24 inches tall.

25 MR. DAILY: No. It is

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

going to be 36.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, I see.
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?

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

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

1 applications. One was for the
2 survey that we were going to be
3 doing, the 20th Anniversary
4 survey that was approved by the
5 Trustees. And the second project
6 was a one day workshop.
7

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

20 And basically it would
21 remake it again to the
22 Preservation league. And in that
23 case I believe they have a
24 different kind of a match
25 involved. Where the match for

1 the New York State Parks
2 Department required an in-kind
3 contribution of labor from
4 Village employees. This
5 particular match requires a
6 commitment of some cash from the
7 Village. Where the Preservation
8 League would take most of the
9 burden of the survey on that
10 budget that was proposed a while
11 back. And the Village would be
12 -- get a very small portion that
13 they would have to pay. This
14 would be -- if we -- if somehow
15 this was co-coordinated with the
16 grant that we made to the New
17 York State Parks Department.

18
19 I'm only bringing you what
20 information I have at the present
21 because I haven't had a follow-up
22 call with them. I will be
23 discussing this further with Paul
24 Pallas as to its feasibility and
25 he will, I believe, have to take

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

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,

1
2 clearing this draft with the
3 Preservation League of New York
4 State and if we get -- if they
5 like the draft then I will pass
6 it onto Paul and see if Paul
7 likes it. Thanks. Yes.

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

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

21 As a certified local
22 government we are required to,
23 you know, to be doing not only
24 these meetings but also keeping
25 track of the inventory. So this

1
2 would be a request for their
3 support on inventory. In this
4 case we're asking all of the
5 inventory. But sometime you can
6 go to the Preservation League if
7 you have one building that you
8 are trying to save. There is
9 other kinds of things you can do
10 for that. So, are there any
11 questions about this?

12 MR. McMAHON: Not at this
13 time.

14 MEMBER WETSELL: No.

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

21 MS. WALOSKI: Yes.

22 MS. BORRELLI: Absolutely.

23 MS. WETSELL: Yes.

24 MS. WALOSKI: This is the
25 one that we are taking

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

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

1
2 on this agenda, which is a public
3 hearing. I am going to first
4 read the legal notice of the
5 public hearing of the Village of
6 Greenport Historic Preservation
7 Commission. Pursuant to Chapter
8 76, The Preservation of Historic
9 Areas, section 76-5, Certificate
10 of Appropriateness of the code of
11 the Village of Greenport.

12 Notice is hereby given
13 that a public hearing will be
14 held by the Historic Preservation
15 Commission at the Greenport
16 Firehouse, Third Street,
17 Greenport, New York on Monday,
18 March 7th -- that is a typo. It
19 is March 6th, 2017, commencing at
20 5:00 p.m.

21 The Historic Preservation
22 Commission will at said time and
23 place hear all persons who wish
24 to be heard on the application of
25 James Olinkiewicz owner of the

1
2 property located at 625 First
3 Street, the former Methodist
4 Church.

5 The application proposes
6 demolish a 4,500 square foot
7 addition to the original
8 Methodist Church that includes a
9 rear addition dating to the
10 1960s, and an addition on the
11 south dating to the 1920s,
12 consisting of a Major Alteration.
13 The property is located in the R2
14 R1 and two family zone of the
15 Historic District. Suffolk
16 County Tax Map: 1001-2-6-49.1

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

24 So now the mic is open to
25 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

1 buildings. The enormous task of
2 restoring the church foundation
3 walls for strengthening, new
4 plumbing, heating, electrical
5 service were brought up to need.
6 This was 1950. New carpet and
7 church pews were obtained and
8 designed and the chancel was
9 accomplished. The pipe organ was
10 replaced with a new electronic
11 pipe organ. And the chancel
12 structures and furniture were
13 built from solid mahogany found
14 on Shelter Island.

15
16 In 1955 Mr. and Mrs.
17 Albert Olsen and family gave a
18 meeting room. The Maran
19 (phonetic) room named after
20 Olsen's Grandchildren.

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

24 In 1965 Bishop Wicks
25 dedicated the new pipe organ that

1 had been donated by Mr. and Mrs.
2 Robert Mills. In 1966 a solid
3 foundation was built under the
4 church by the Mazzafaro
5 (phonetic) brothers. But not
6 under the sanctuary. And you had
7 the addition in 1955 that had the
8 new foundation.
9

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

13 It had been brought up to
14 me about trying to save as much
15 as possible. Being that I'm a
16 historic guy that likes to
17 preserve old buildings there also
18 comes a point that monetarily it
19 is what is feasible and what is
20 not feasible. So to save the
21 existing sanctuary and restore it
22 because it has been let go for so
23 long is -- you know we have a
24 budgeted number of a half a
25 million dollars to save just the

1 sanctuary without anything else.
2
3 So to try to save more would be
4 cost prohibitive if we are going
5 to make it a one family
6 residence.

7 If we -- and I think that
8 it is personally an awful thing
9 to convert it to two family. I
10 have had a couple of people want
11 me to save the whole building and
12 make it a two-family residence
13 because it is 7200 feet and it
14 could easily house two families.
15 But I think that in keeping with
16 the neighborhood and the
17 structures and that whole area,
18 that a nice restored one-family
19 home would be the proper thing to
20 do with that.

21 At some point there is a
22 line we have to draw as to what
23 you can save and what you can't.
24 So I'm trying and I'm going to
25 save the 1890s structure with all

1 the stained glass in it. We
2 discussed about putting some
3 windows in the back where the
4 1960s structure gets torn off --
5 getting torn off so that we can
6 have glass for light and air
7 coming into what would be the
8 kitchen, where the altar is now.
9 And I mean that is pretty much
10 it. We will mast the existing
11 siding to what was there in the
12 1890s on the areas that we expose
13 when we do our demolition and
14 then slowly work our way around
15 the building and reside it. That
16 is going to be, you know, a slow
17 process. You know, getting a
18 building permit to do half of one
19 side or one side. And then go to
20 the next side and go to the next
21 side because it is very labor
22 intensive and expensive.

24 So that is pretty much it.

25 I think that -- I would like to

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

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

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

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.

1
2 So we would have to hold the
3 whole 1920s building up, take out
4 the whole foundation underneath
5 and then build a whole foundation
6 that meets New York State code if
7 we had to try to save it.

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

13 MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The
14 entire because we would have to
15 -- we would be modifying and it
16 would be more than fifty percent
17 to repair and restoration. The
18 other way we are only just doing
19 -- the bedroom -- the bedroom
20 inside the sanctuary is going to
21 be up on the balcony. And we are
22 putting a kitchen in and a
23 bathroom. So we are well under
24 the fifty percent. We would have
25 everything up to New York State

1
2 code. So by modifying everything
3 under New York State code if we
4 had to we would almost have to
5 gut the whole sanctuary out.
6 Everything would have to be
7 brought up; wire, electrical,
8 smoke, the windows, ingress,
9 egress. Everything would have to
10 be brought up to New York State
11 code which is -- you might as
12 well tear the church down. It is
13 just -- it makes it so
14 impossible.

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

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

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

25 MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I have

1
2 some other photographs when we
3 went last month.

4 MR. PROKOP: Okay.

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

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

23 It would help for those of
24 us who are concerned if we knew
25 exactly what you are calling 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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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 be 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

1
2 opposed to the 4500 feet that
3 would disappear. So it is a
4 significant part of the building.

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

8 MS. WUND: I'm sorry they
9 are not reproducing very well.
10 And I have some of the nicer
11 ones. I thought it was important
12 that I express some aesthetics
13 about it because you all are
14 talking about the front of the
15 church. Obviously that is of
16 greater concern. Everybody is
17 concerned with the front, but the
18 back has been revealed for quite
19 a long time. And the back has a
20 very distinctive series of roof
21 lines that have a real feeling to
22 them. So it is kind of -- when I
23 heard how much is going to be
24 disappeared, I realized we are
25 going back to a church that

1
2 probably that no one really
3 remembers. Because 1960 is -- I
4 wonder about historic. 1960 is
5 seventy years ago. So how old
6 does something have to be to be
7 considered, oh, you know, let's
8 just get rid of this and let's
9 move on. I just -- that is part
10 of it. And part of it is -- I
11 know it is not that important to
12 people on Main Street. But for
13 those of us on First Street, we
14 see that. And in deed, after the
15 fact, after the building is built
16 and approved or whatever and the
17 new building and the parking lot,
18 they could grow giant hedges, put
19 up huge fences and who knows
20 what. All of a sudden it will be
21 moot. But I just wanted to
22 voice my love of the rear of the
23 church and the importance of just
24 saying, eh, eh 1960s -- because,
25 you know, they obviously made an

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

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

1 Board. They are able to. So I
2 figure I will put in my two cents
3 to the Historic Committee right
4 now. My concern is that this
5 wonderful gentleman that has
6 obviously built quite a few
7 buildings and is involved in a
8 great deal of activity here in
9 town, much of which is probably
10 going to be very good for the
11 town -- my concern is if he is
12 allowed, and it ends up that he
13 is allowed to tear down or remove
14 the rear piece, the bigger piece
15 that would create a larger
16 potential footprint for the
17 property, which presumably will
18 get divided from the front at
19 some point, between First Street
20 and Main Street. This would set
21 up an opportunity to build a very
22 large structure. Perhaps outside
23 structure, even if the design
24 conforms to the rest of the
25

1 genuinely old building around and
2 across from it.
3

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

21 There are some very big
22 some very beautiful houses on
23 First Street. So obviously size
24 is not always a consideration,
25 but it is if the big houses on

1
2 First Street are all stunningly
3 beautiful examples of those
4 earlier periods. And if we end
5 up with just a big large, you
6 know, square building that just
7 happens to fit for somebody that
8 has a lot of deep pockets this
9 would be a great concern. I just
10 want to put in that too ahead of
11 time. Perhaps I am being heard
12 by the developer and you will try
13 to make roof lines that look like
14 they conform. Not just, you
15 know, what happens to suit the
16 new buyer.

17 That's -- and I am
18 concerned that the footprint is
19 going to get quite a bit larger.
20 Because the amount of property --
21 it is I think two lots. I think
22 the parking lot constitutes two
23 lots. Not one. I am not sure
24 about that. It seemed fairly
25 wide to me.

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

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

1 exactly happy because he doesn't
2 have a parking lot to ride his
3 bike in anymore. But, you know,
4 it wasn't his to begin with.
5

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

14 I grew up in Sag Harbor.
15 And the people that moved there
16 and also started the save Sag
17 Harbor movement are the people
18 that sucked the sole out of the
19 village and took the reason why
20 everybody moved there in the
21 first place out. You guys are
22 really in charge of saving the
23 sole of this town and by keeping
24 Greenport Greenport. So I think
25 by keeping that church as

1 original as possible is a big
2 thing. I -- maybe because it is
3 just the way it is decorated, the
4 back half of the church --
5 because that wall is kind of
6 blank to me. But I understand
7 the roof lines as Jada says are
8 original to the 1920s structure
9 is a beautiful structure and I
10 think that is very important for
11 the property. Especially when
12 you walk into it. It is really
13 nice. I would at least like to
14 see that part remain with the
15 original sanctuary as well.

17 The back half -- I know it
18 makes it much larger structure
19 which is hard when you are trying
20 to develop it into a single
21 family home. I think the more of
22 that church that can be saved
23 would be better for Greenport as
24 a whole and for preserving the
25 community and keeping a

1 precedence that we don't just
2 tear down old Greenport and make
3 room for new Greenport. I hope
4 you look at that.
5

6 I haven't seen how these
7 lots are going to be subdivided.
8 I know there is an application
9 for that. How entrance and
10 access to the Main Street side of
11 that will be done. Is there
12 going to be parking spaces where
13 the 1920s structure is or -- I'm
14 not sure where parking is going
15 to be for that. It is going to
16 change the whole look of that
17 whole structure for Main Street.
18 There is going to be parking
19 where there used to be a
20 beautiful building. I think all
21 of that has to be looked at. I
22 haven't seen the site plan for
23 all of that. So I am not sure
24 how access is going to be. I
25 think it is important to save as

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

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

1
2 to add on about the two-family
3 versus one-family home. And
4 indeed, if it looks, you know,
5 beautiful it will be fine. But
6 there are two-family homes. If
7 it needed to be a two-family home
8 I wouldn't be inconsistent with
9 the neighborhood, as long as it
10 isn't a two-family home with
11 18,000 people living in it. That
12 is a different story. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.
14 More public comment. We are
15 ready for it, please. Anyone
16 else? Please. Tell us your
17 name, your address.

18 MS. CABIN (Phonetic): My
19 name is Marcia Cabin (phonetic)
20 and I live directly across the
21 street at 636 Main Street. I
22 look right at the church. It is
23 beautiful. It is lit up at
24 night. And I live next door to
25 the Baptist Church. They use to

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

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

1
2 looks like traditional cedar
3 shake. So James also explained
4 to me, due to the nature of the
5 vast square footage of sides he
6 will take it in small portions.
7 The -- an approach the Village --
8 on a side by side basis and his
9 restoration of that seems to be
10 very committed to the restoration
11 of the original sanctuary.

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

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

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

MS. CABIN: Really? Okay.

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.

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

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.

1
2 So let's continue the
3 discussion.

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

18 MEMBER BORRELLI: You
19 know, putting aside investments
20 and purchases and building and
21 how much it costs to restore,
22 just looking at it from a
23 historic point of view, I wonder
24 how historic 1920 is compared to
25 1880 or 1890 when the building

1 was actually -- what we have
2 now, the church has actually been
3 built. The 1920s portion
4 addition to the 1890s church was
5 done in a fashion that still the
6 workmanship was done beautifully.
7 They did with the corbels, and
8 the whole thing. The front
9 entrance, the stained glass. The
10 two stained glass markings front
11 doors. It unites the sanctuary
12 to the 1920s part, they unite
13 very nicely. They look very nice
14 together.

15
16 So I was thinking, like I
17 said, money aside, restoration,
18 either pick it up, if it were
19 possible to move, as I had
20 mentioned before. Like they have
21 done many times in Greenport.
22 They have done it since the
23 early, mid 1700s. They picked
24 old farm houses up and shipped
25 them off down to Orient. They

1 moved the Webb (phonetic) house
2 in the 1800s over to Orient.
3 They moved I don't know what over
4 to Shelter Island. So they have
5 always picked up homes in
6 Greenport and moved them. We
7 moved the schoolhouse from the
8 North Road, the little red
9 schoolhouse down to the -- the
10 fire department picked it up
11 again and moved it back over to
12 the Old Blacksmith shop in the
13 middle of the Greenport Village.
14 So I wondered if we moved that
15 structure to the back and made
16 that a beautiful home facing
17 First Street, which would be
18 keeping in line with what goes on
19 on First Street and turn that
20 structure so that the front
21 entrance on Main Street is now
22 facing First Street. I don't
23 know. I am just thinking off the
24 top of my head here.
25

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

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

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

it. So you are talking about saving maybe 25 feet of the facade 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

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

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

1
2 1960s addition, obviously -- I
3 don't know where their heads were
4 at to make something so
5 completely different than the
6 original structure. it just
7 doesn't match at all. They
8 didn't use any imagination to try
9 to make the workmanship or any of
10 it -- it is all cinder block. It
11 is all just nothing. So that
12 historically really has no value
13 even if it is from 1960. That is
14 whatever. Whatever you would
15 like to do what that.

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

25 MR. OLINKIEWICZ: If there

1
2 is someone that would like to
3 purchase and move it, I would be
4 happy to try to find somebody.
5 The other thing is to avoid
6 parking issues. So people don't
7 see cars park in the front of the
8 church. If you leave the 1920s
9 addition on you can't get around.
10 There is that little eight foot
11 alleyway. I tried pulling around
12 the back. You would wind up
13 forcing the parking area to be in
14 front of what you are trying to
15 save. Nobody is going to want to
16 drive their cars down the eight
17 foot -- nobody would want to do
18 that anyway and get behind the
19 building. You are going to have
20 to provide a parking lot in the
21 front on the left-hand side of
22 the church. That takes away from
23 the whole look of what we are
24 trying to restore and keep. We
25 are trying to keep the beauty of

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

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

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

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.

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

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

1
2 if you are going to have a
3 neighbor attached to your
4 building. Whoever is going to
5 buy that and keep it restored is
6 not going to want to have another
7 family right behind them. They
8 are not going to want to go out
9 in their yard and do that. I
10 think that by trying to save that
11 little --

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

16 MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I have
17 gone through all different
18 scenarios all ways from Sunday to
19 try to find out what would be the
20 best way to save as much of the
21 church as I could. I can save
22 the stained glass and the
23 sanctuary and the earliest
24 portion of the church. At some
25 point I becomes then, you know --

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

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

1
2 can't dissect this building and
3 expect it be a usable portion of
4 this house. We can't sit here
5 and then start to talk about --
6 he has beat this thing to death.
7 I can tell he has because I -- I
8 respect especially the neighbors,
9 from the artist standpoint. I
10 see these lines all the time and
11 I understand exactly what you are
12 talking about, roof lines and
13 peaks.

14 My house is the same way
15 in regards to the plaster details
16 come together. I understand your
17 point and from your neighbor as
18 well. Yeah. You guys looking at
19 that site plan. You have -- you
20 have a whole different approach
21 in regards to your feelings. I
22 mean you're right there. So I've
23 got to understand. You guys -- I
24 haven't been able to review that.
25 That is not our job here.

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

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

1 really respect that whole -- that
2 point of view. We're doing the
3 best we can here in Greenport to
4 slowly approach things. In
5 regarding to this building here
6 restoration, a true restoration
7 gets rid of almost all
8 appendages.
9

10 Everything, you know,
11 every house in Greenport,
12 including yours and including
13 mine, including all of my
14 neighbors are a combination of
15 one addition after the other.
16 And I am telling you a lot -- a
17 lot of times they are just really
18 badly done. And my own house
19 included. So I had to pick a
20 period -- which I think is what
21 you're talking about when you are
22 talking about this church. You
23 pick a period. You can't satisfy
24 everybody. I had to pick a
25 period at my house. It goes back

1 to the 1840s. I looked at the
2 1910 pictures when they put the
3 round porch on it. I went, wow,
4 that is a period I can respect.
5 That is a period I think I can
6 draw the lines on my house and
7 kind of pull it back together and
8 make it look like, you know,
9 there was one thought involved.
10 But sometimes the obvious little
11 add-ons are cool as well, You
12 know, when you see the obvious
13 period change.

14
15 I think in respect to the
16 church I think the quainter the
17 better. That is only my feelings
18 on it. I think you start peeling
19 off these layers and you get back
20 to the spires. You get to see
21 how cute and quaint it was at
22 that time. Instead of trying to
23 load it up and present a problem
24 for the current owner.

25 His pocketbook is not my

1
2 concern. That is not what this
3 board is all about, but you have
4 got to understand too, you want
5 to see this thing done right and
6 perhaps in a timely manner. You
7 have got the loping off of these
8 extra parts and it is going to
9 suck the life out of the project
10 and slow it down considerably.

11 MEMBER WETSELL: I don't
12 that --

13 MEMBER McMAHON: That is
14 just my opinion.

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

25 I think you are right that

1
2 our job is not to consider how
3 much it is going to cost. It is
4 to consider the historic whole.

5 MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Part of
6 it has to be taken into
7 consideration because the fact
8 that you guys start to implement
9 ideas that impact the structures,
10 that could push me passed the 50
11 percent rule for New York State.
12 Once I go passed that 50 percent
13 rule I pretty much have to gut
14 the place, inside/outside. I
15 would have to tear the building
16 apart to bring it up to code;
17 rewire, replumb it, smoke alarms.
18 I mean there is -- it is --

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

24 MR. OLINKIEWICZ:
25 Demolition does not count in

1
2 renovations. Demolition does not
3 count in New York State for the
4 renovation of the structure that
5 you keep.

6 MR. Dowling: Just looking
7 at the site plan here if the
8 1920s portion was retained and
9 the 1960s portion was taken off
10 you have 12 feet of space on the
11 north side of the property to put
12 a wider driveway. The fire
13 engines could get through and
14 vehicles and there is plenty of
15 room for parking. Where you only
16 have eight and a half on the
17 south side. By taking off the
18 1960s part and leaving the 1920s
19 part you have plenty of room for
20 the driveway.

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

23 MR. DOWLING: Main Street.

24 CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, that
25 is from First Street.

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

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

1 have to be tonight, but I think
2 at some point the discussion has
3 to be within the framework of the
4 considerations you are required
5 to make under Chapter 76. So it
6 is in Chapter 76. It is also on
7 page 4 of the draft that was
8 circulated.

9
10 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

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

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

19 MR. PROKOP: So the
20 criteria that we need would be
21 whether the submitted plan would
22 be compatible with the principles
23 of Chapter 76. Would not be
24 visually offensive or
25 inappropriate -- I don't know if

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

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

1 the site of adjacent lands. And
2 would not adversely affect the
3 functioning, economic, stability,
4 property, health, safety and
5 general welfare of the community.
6

7 Then there is
8 determinations that you need to
9 make which is -- some of which I
10 just mentioned. But again
11 whether the property which
12 contributes to the character of
13 the Historic District shall be
14 retained and their historic
15 features altered as little as
16 possible.

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

23 CHAIRMAN BULL: So I think
24 one thing that I have heard
25 tonight, that hadn't occurred to

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

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

1
2 did look like in the 1890s.

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

10 MEMBER McMAHON: I would
11 have to agree. I know the Board
12 is split on this matter. I think
13 we have to consider what is best
14 for that building lot and the
15 building itself. And I know and
16 I understand those architectural
17 details that make that
18 outcropping look as nice as it
19 did I think in practicality --
20 and I think we are not seeing the
21 big picture in regards to that
22 church sitting on what would
23 appear to be a lot. And not
24 crammed into an area which it is.
25 I mean that house next door is

1 right on the property line. So
2 to give it a little breathing
3 room and to see it again as it
4 stood when it was originally
5 constructed I think is pretty
6 important. And I think it is --
7 the still Board still -- we
8 maintain our integrity, if we had
9 any, that in that we're doing the
10 right thing.
11

12 CHAIRMAN BULL: I think
13 the applicant has also talked
14 about his maintenance and the
15 reuses of the architectural
16 elements of the 1920s, the
17 stained glass windows that are
18 currently there. The large
19 window that is alongside -- moved
20 there. We don't know for sure,
21 but it does have the rippled
22 glass from -- that was added to
23 the 1955 addition. That was
24 probably taken from the back of
25 the 1920s, but we don't know that

1
2 for sure. But it does maintain
3 the character. It is not where
4 suddenly the back end of the
5 property we are finding a sliding
6 glass doors or something that is
7 inappropriate. I think --

8 MEMBER BORRELLI: Can I
9 just ask a question?

10 CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

11 MEMBER BORRELLI: Just to
12 interrupt. The project -- this
13 is for Jim. So we maintain the
14 original church. The original
15 sanctuary. The left goes, which
16 is the 1920s. The back goes,
17 which is a little part of the
18 1960s. So then the project --
19 I'm trying to remember. There is
20 the house in the back that you
21 purchased as well, right? That
22 two-family home in the back that
23 faces --

24 MR. OLINKIEWICZ: It is a
25 one-family.

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

MEMBER BORRELLI: Its 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 --

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

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

1 building or demolition permit,
2 the Commission shall be guided by
3 the following principles as they
4 apply to the exterior features of
5 any structure which is a landmark
6 or located within a historic
7 district.

8
9 So we are talking about a
10 demolition and we're talking
11 about the preservation of
12 exterior views.

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

22 We are talking about the
23 demolition of the 1920 and we are
24 talking about the demolition of
25 the 1950s.

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

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 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

1 neighboring properties and public
2 view including the portion of the
3 property's front facade. Portion
4 arrangement of windows, openings
5 within the facade. Roof shape
6 and rhythm of spacing and
7 properties including the set
8 back.
9

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

14 The importance of historic
15 and other architectural features
16 in this -- to the significance of
17 the properties. What we are
18 highlighting is the 1920s is
19 important to members of the
20 Board. Where others it is also
21 important.

22 The United States
23 Secretary of the Interior for
24 rehabilitation and guideline
25 rehabilitating historic

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

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

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

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.

1
2 I think as many of these things
3 that you are discussing that
4 could be in either illustrations
5 or photographs or renderings, I
6 think it would really be
7 important -- I know you were
8 there and you saw it, but -- and
9 that is important too, but it is
10 just my suggestion that you
11 create a record when you decide
12 this. You know, pictures, we are
13 going to move this over here.
14 That kind of thing.

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

19 MR. PROKOP: I don't think
20 so. It is just a suggestion.
21 Because the kind of thing that I
22 am hearing is -- it is great that
23 we are discussing that but just
24 to respect the process and the
25 record and of Village and this

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

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 --

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

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

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

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

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

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.)

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

STATE OF NEW YORK

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK

I, Barbara D. Schultz, a Notary
Public within and for the State of New
York, do hereby certify:

That the within proceedings is a
true and accurate record of the
stenographic notes taken by me.

I further certify that I am not
related to any of the parties to this
action by blood or marriage; and that I
am not in any way interested in the
outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have here
unto set my hand.



Barbara D. Schultz