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(Whereupon the meeting was called to order at 5:03 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN BULL: Today is September the 12th, it's Monday, and as Chairman of the HPC, I call this meeting to order.

The first item on the agenda is discussion of progress made on conversations with Stacey Matson-Zuvic, she's the Historic Site Restoration Coordinator for New York State, OPRHP Division of Historic Preservation and other individuals by her recommendation in pursuing next steps on expanding the historic district.

I think where we left last left off on this matter as I mentioned I think last time about some of the contact that I was doing, and I have some hand-outs here (handing). And this first one is a contact list of the State Historic Preservation office. The State Historic Preservation office is broken down as one can imagine into subsets. There is somebody who is
particularly assigned to us on Long Island. Greenport is a certified local government organization, and as a certified local government organization, we're entitled to the program benefits that you find later on in this brochure. I'll read a little bit, just a couple of lines here to give you an idea of what the subject is. Throughout New York State, communities are recognizing that historic buildings/neighborhoods form the core of economically stable and attractive areas, which make an important contribution to the quality of life. Many counties, cities, towns, villages are seeking opportunities to preserve the special character of their communities and neighborhoods and integrate historic resources into planning efforts. So this is certified local government, Greenport is one of them, and eventually we will get to item number 4, which goes into greater detail about this.
Here are some of the technical services, preservation services, which I recommend to your reading. Hopefully there won't be a test later on this, but one of the things they do is they talk about the architectural guidelines of being able to identify buildings in the historic district, which are worthy of preservation. They -- so a part of their effort in this organization of which Greenport is a member is to try to identify what works and what doesn't work. In conversation -- I've had conversation with Dan McEneny, M-C-E-N-E-N-Y, who talks about a regional staff member, her name is Linda Makey, M-A-K-E-Y, and she will help us form a plan in going forward with regards to this idea of ongoing relationship with expanding this historic district. One of the issues is that in developing historic district, you can either target individual buildings in the historic district, or you can try and do a block
of several buildings side by side. And through their efforts what will happen is that they will advise us on which path to go in choosing those buildings. They would come and they would meet here with us to help us plan that. The idea is that with their help and support, we have a better chance for success. Another individual to speak to is speak to an Alex Wolff, W-O-L-F-F, who is the executive director of an organization called SPLIA, which is a nonprofit group on Long Island, and one of their goals is to support our efforts. They're interested in the maintenance of other historic sites. In this, I have a call out to that person, but they haven't returned the call. Another one is the Preservation League of New York, which is a grant program, and there is a Fran Goobler (phonetic) to contact there. This is a call I need to make about that. This is all within that goal of establishing, increasing the size of
the historic district as it would make sense.

MS. WALOSKI: Would we be having side meetings on this to discuss this, or should we be suggesting things individually and bringing it to the group?

CHAIRMAN BULL: So that's item number 3, so yes, and perhaps we would have side meetings to discuss that. There's also the possibility -- we want to work very closely with the Stirling Historical Society, they've requested to be involved in this.

MS. WALOSKI: That's great.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And they have a lot of -- Gail Horton has a lot of experience in that effort, so we'll -- I will reach out to Gail to include her in the dialogue especially since she has so much experience creating this in the first place. The goal here is to do another -- is to do an inventory of what we have and add it to the collection we already have. So that's
my report. Anybody have any questions?

MR. MCMAHON: Not at this point.

I think we're going to be running through this quite a bit it looks like during this meeting.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes, we will go through it with some -- but the idea is -- it's just I think we need to read up on this, I need to make a few more phone calls, and then at subsequent meetings I may be reaching out to individuals to try to fill in the gaps on this. There is I believe a grant deadline, which is in January, and that kind of ties in with item number 2.

MS. BORRELLI: I have some changes that I would like made to the study that they did in the 70's on the houses. I'd like to add to it. How do I go about doing that? Is it going to get rewritten, that entire tour guide?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Are you talking about the brochure that we give to people when they come to visit the Village of Greenport?
CHAIRMAN BULL: I think that's a separate item. I don't know who publishes that, the tour guide to historic sites in Greenport, is that published by the Stirling Historical Society?

MS. WINGATE: I believe it was published by the Village, but I think there's only a handful left, so maybe it's time for a revision and update.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So I'll put you in charge of that.

MS. BORRELLI: I'll try.

CHAIRMAN BULL: If you'd like to take on that responsibility, that would be great, at least to look at it and make suggestions about it.

MS. WALOSKI: Could we bring back some of the buildings on Front Street with this or --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. So that's a very good question. So on the phone call in going over this matter with them, what I discovered is there's only
a few buildings on Front Street which
we could include. I think the butcher
shop is one of them.

MS. WALOSKI: Burt's Books.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Is that an old
building?

MS. WALOSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So Burt's
Books would be another. Perhaps we
would make sure that those are included
in the ones that we would like to have
in the consideration. Then we go
through the steps of finding out if
they have the proper criteria, so that
was one of these hand-outs was that we
need to think about that, whether or
not it would meet the criteria. That's
where we would get some aid from the
experienced individuals who have done
this before who will say well, that
will work, that probably won't work.
It is possible to nominate buildings
and have buildings that we designate as
being important that don't make it to
the final registry. There's three
stages, one is what we deem as important. The next is what would be acceptable to I believe it's New York State Parks people who are in charge of that. And then the next level of that is what might be considered part of the federal program, which is where Greenport is designated as a historic district.

MS. WALOSKI: So this would just be streets in general, or we can specify specific certain buildings?

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think we should start by specifying specific buildings, and then what we'll do is is through consultation with others, we'll find out if we can bridge buildings together and create a block, which might not be possible. The rules have changed somewhat since this process began with the Stirling Historical Society with what Gail Horton was doing, I think they had a much tighter need to have the building side by side, so that would be a question on an approach as
to whether or not we -- how do we tie
in buildings into this program. You
know, and a building that interests me,
for instance, is the power plant.

MS. WALOSKI: I don't want to take
up the time for my own personal
discussions, but would there be grants
given to specific buildings to preserve
them if they were in disrepair?

CHAIRMAN BULL: No, not that I
know of. I don't know if they have a
grants program.

MR. MCMAHON: There used to be a
program, but that was a federally run
program I believe, and that's no longer
-- as far as I know that's been out
of --

MS. WALOSKI: Because that's a
building that's important to save.

MR. MCMAHON: Could I make a
suggestion also that maybe when we're
done with item 1, we could go to 5 so
that we could get -- because we could
go on and on with these next few items,
and if we could get Bob out of here.
He's got American Beech. Could we get through that so we could spare --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Are we through on discussion on item number 1?

MR. MCMAHON: I think we're clear.

We got a good outline, we've got some stuff to read here. I think we'll be re-approaching it as we talk, right, over the next few items. We're going to be a little redundant, so spare him.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Let's move on then, we have acceptance of item number 1, and now we're moving on to discussion of item number 5.

MS. WALOSKI: I think that would be good.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I'll read item number 5. Discussion and possible motion on the application of the American Beech Restaurant. The restaurant is located at 308 Main Street. Applicant is Rob Brown, architect, represents American Beech Restaurant, which has its exhaust duct work visible on Carpenter Street. We
had a site visit today at 4:30 p.m.,
and the location is SCTM#
1001-4-7-29.1.

So I think, Rob, before you make
your remarks I would ask the people to
look at the packet that they had
earlier today. In the packet you'll
find two photographs, and the two
photographs were taken in the near past
of August 2012 that does not show the
ducts on the building. We have a copy
of the original application that was
made on this property, and then
attached to that is -- you'll see there
should be a drawing, an elevation
drawing here, but I don't have it, oh,
yes, I do, I have it, yes, and in this
elevation drawing here what you'll see
is that there are no duct works
indicated on the drawing. And on the
plan view I don't see it indicated
there either. Here it is, if I'm not
mistaken. And on the plan view, I
don't see an indication of the
drawings. So I'm not exactly sure how
it would mix, but it seems like we should hear Rob's argument for why we should love these ducts, but we have had a visit, I have kind of my opinion about what we should do about it. Rob, what are your feelings?

MR. BROWN: Rob Brown, architect, representing Mr. Pelton. Just to answer the question raised by your documentation of the drawings and what's shown and not shown, the fact of the matter is the ducts were added to the kitchen exhaust system after my involvement in that part of the project, and I was not involved with any of the decisions, in fact, the appearance of those ducts was as much a surprise to me as to anyone else to clarify why it's not documented. That said, I am here to represent Mr. Pelton who is interested in resolving this to the board's satisfaction. My first suggestion when this entire thing came up was to paint the ducts to match the building to camouflage them as much as
possible. Beyond that, I am open to
discussion and suggestion.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, I'd like to
hear each of the committee's feelings
about that and --

MR. MCMAHON: I don't -- I
understand, knowing something about
mechanicals and the size of those
ducts, the air requirements, the
configuration of the ducts alone is a
little bit funky. They kind of turn,
and it looks kind of inefficient.
Every time you have a ninety degree
angle, there's some restriction
involved. I don't think that paint is
really going to make them go away.
They're going to be painted funky ducts
at that point. I don't know if there's
a way to flatten and/or create some
kind of --

MR. BROWN: If I may, I did have a
conversation with Mr. Pelton about the
potential for reconfiguring the ducts,
and he was open to that.

MR. MCMAHON: Is there any way to
come out the back of the restaurant at all where the other equipment comes out? I know it's getting very, very crowded back there.

MR. BROWN: Well, the reason that it's so funky and wrapped around the building is because we didn't want those -- when this originally was discussed, he didn't want those pointing out to the street.

MS. WETSELL: But they are.

MR. BROWN: The people who did the duct work wanted to wrap it around in order to get the big boxes that are the intakes off the street side. So I think that wrapping it around the building is potentially the best solution, but I agree, if the ducts were flattened and didn't wrap around each other it might be a better solution. It's my understanding that one was done, and it was deemed not to be sufficient, which is why they wrapped a second one around the first one.
MR. MCMAHON: And there's no room to get it out the side where the existing equipment is?

MR. BROWN: Directly out, no, because of the -- it is all servicing make up air for the hood over the stoves, and the hood itself I believe and the exhaust for the hood would make it impossible to run intake ducts directly out that wall. That's how it was explained to me.

MS. WALOSKI: I think I'm probably the only one that has viewed the ducts that really doesn't have a problem with it. I think they are bulky, but I think they're honest, they're industrial looking. I don't think that they really disturb the view, and I walk down Carpenter Street all the time. I'm in the minority here. I think it's a little bit, like, Cristo (phonetic), so to me, good, bad, or indifferent sculpture, it's sculpture looking. I have no problem with it. I would have a problem with it if there
was an odor or a noise coming from it, but if that's not the case, then as visually I don't see it as a problem.

MS. WETSELL: Well, I have a different view. I think that this is not the back of the building, this is the side or front of the building because of the face that it's on the street. And it looks to me like this is one of those things where they put one out, and then they said oh, we need more, put another one out, let's make it go around it, and doesn't look like it was designed in any way. And the industrial look is usually fairly sparse, spare looking and a few big beautiful items that have a certain look to them in style, and this does not, and it's just stuck on there.

MR. BROWN: Fair enough.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I have a real issue with them. I think in part because of your remarks about the bad design overall and what you were saying, Rob, about how they added the
second one on because the first one wasn't sufficient, and I had the privilege of actually looking into the kitchen or being invited into the kitchen and seeing where the hoods are, and so I'm somewhat familiar with this issue, but it seems that it should be properly designed and it should not intrude onto the street, and if you look at any of the houses across the street, they don't have such appendages visible coming out of their buildings nor can I find another one in Greenport that has this kind of duct work that intrudes onto the public space in this particular way. So I think that because this project is not through, right, there's going to be more work being done on this property?

MR. BROWN: On the courtyard and in the front buildings, yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So that perhaps there are other options to having this redone from scratch.

MR. BROWN: Well, obviously one of
the problems that is raised here is
that this building essentially has
three fronts, and the one side that is
the back for lack of a better term that
is hidden is not available mechanically
just in terms of the space for running
the ducts directly out that side. It's
obviously important to keep them as
close to the building as possible, but
I don't know how this could be resolved
without something exposed on that side
of the building.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Are you saying
they couldn't run straight out the back
if they redid the entire --

MR. BROWN: No, I raised that --
that was the first question I raised,
can they be run straight out to the
fenced in area, the loading area as it
were, and because of the fresh air
intake -- I'm sorry, because of the
exhaust from that hood, there's no room
for bringing the air in as well as
pushing it out.

CHAIRMAN BULL: When I was
examining the back of the building,
which you called that -- that one area
where they have, I guess, it's the
back, it looked like the exhaust vents
were topped out well above the top of
the building.

MR. BROWN: There are certain
minimum distances I think that have to
be maintained between the intake grills
and the exhaust grills.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Is that a zoning
thing?

MR. BROWN: No, it's purely a
mechanical thing.

MR. MCMAHON: You wouldn't put
these things next to something that's
drawing air at the same time because
it's --

MR. BROWN: You would just be
pulling the same air back in.

MR. MCMAHON: Like your fresh air
returns in your house are set away from
your air feeds so that one is not
acting against the other.

CHAIRMAN BULL: But even when one
has a chimney, and it's about twenty feet --

MR. MCMAHON: That might meet the requirement. I think maybe perhaps the HVAC people should look into this a little bit, and if nothing else, maybe we can create some kind of a flat facade. What you can make up sometimes, and I'm not an expert in this field, is when you have a ten inch round, if you can create that same amount of inches within a flat space, you could flatten something against that --

MR. BROWN: A rectangular --

MR. MCMAHON: Maybe rectangular would be the way to go, tuck it in next to the building, perhaps even some sort of a wooden facade could be added to it to make it look as though it were part of --

CHAIRMAN BULL: But the actual intakes itself are not even on the side wall of the building, the intakes are at back of the building.
MR. MCMAHON: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So those pipes --

MR. BROWN: It's my understanding from what was explained to me, the duct work that runs from those intakes that are up high into the --

MR. MCMAHON: Kitchen space?

MR. BROWN: Actually they're the exhausts, the ones that are up are the exhausts, and the duct work that runs from the hood up to those exhaust grills is what's in the way of going straight out that wall for the intake.

MS. WETSELL: Can that be changed?

MR. BROWN: Not without totally rebuilding that entire wall.

MS. WETSELL: Why is it that -- I mean, this has been a restaurant for a million years in various iterations. Why was it never a problem before?

MR. MCMAHON: It's just kitchen design.

MR. BROWN: I think the hoods were insufficient. You know, they started with the hood as it was, and Mr. Pelton
and his restaurant team realized that they were drawing fresh air in from the rest of the restaurant and creating a negative pressure air space that was to some people uncomfortable. I think nobody ever just paid attention to it before.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Is that the case where when you sometimes open up a door of a restaurant, it sort of stays closed because you have so much suction inside the restaurant that it's --

MR. BROWN: That's exactly right.

MR. McMAHON: I think without beating this too much, perhaps could we suggest that maybe if it would be acceptable to anybody else here on the board that we could ask that the HVAC people propose something, and if it would be acceptable to flatten the ducts, tuck them against the house, and maybe it's a cleaner line against the restaurant, and if need be, to create some kind of facade that maybe looks like it's something that goes over that
kitchen door and it's meant to be, it has purpose.

MR. PROKOP: I have a question. My recommendation would be to motion to table it, you know, with the revised plan to come back, but I've been holding off to ask this question, I think that anything that's done on that part of the building is going to require a permit, isn't it? Doesn't that building go right to the --

MR. BROWN: That portion of the building actually steps back from the property line.

MR. PROKOP: And there's no setback requirement?

MR. BROWN: Not to my knowledge.

MR. MCMAHON: It was a garage, so it was meant to be on the street. I don't know how it shows on the survey.

MR. BROWN: The southern half of the building on that side is on the property line. It then jogs in I think it's about fifteen inches and continues north, so that area is within the
property line.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

MS. WETSELL: Yeah, I see it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So tabling this I think is a good idea, and I think also getting the HVAC people in on this to come up with a different design approach. It's just that as much as I have a great respect for Frank and Terry's and others who expose infrastructure, I make a motion that we table this. Is there a public comment that people want to make about this?

MR. BROWN: May I just ask something?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Pelton's primary concern -- he's willing to do whatever maintains the efficiency of his kitchen and satisfies your requirements. Our primary concern at this point is we've been before the Planning Board for the other work since I think March, and the Planning Board at this point is holding up that application until this is
resolved. Is there any sort of mechanism that we can use to allow the rest of the Planning Board application to go forward?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Not that I know of. I'm fairly new on the job, but I don't see why we should not -- we've asked for some time to have this resolved, and it has not been resolved, so we had to have a site visit, and then we -- I've gone there, and I've had my change of opinion, so I don't see --

MR. MCMAHON: This is -- this particular item is holding up the rest of the work?

MR. PROKOP: No, that's not correct. Actually what happened is a brand new revised plan was submitted to the Planning Board and accepted at its last meeting, and that has -- that was another question I was going to ask, the site plan that we have, the awning was dated 2014, but the last revision is August 18, 2014, but the Planning
Board has a site plan that has a
revision of August 2016?

    MR. BROWN: I may have misdated
that. It may be a typo.

    MR. MCMAHON: If there's been
something approved by the Planning
Board, I would hate to see that this
one particular item in the back of the
restaurant or the side of the
restaurant is holding up anything else.

    MR. PROKOP: When I said accepted,
I didn't mean approved. Nothing is
holding up the Planning Board, the
Planning Board just got the latest
version of the application at their
meeting a week ago, so that nothing has
been holding it up. There's been
continual changes to application.

    MR. BROWN: My understanding is
they would not act on the application
as it stands now before the Planning
Board until the Historic Board -- in
fact, I did ask the Planning Board if
they would give a conditional approval
subject to the Historic Board's
approval, and that was denied.

MR. PROKOP: They just got this awning -- just at the last meeting we saw the awning for the first time. The awning was -- you're right, you had an application in March with an awning, but then you took the awning away.

MR. BROWN: Granted it has been modified on several occasions, but at the last Planning Board meeting I thought it was made pretty clear that they would not consider it until the Historic approved everything.

MS. WALOSKI: Steve, we can't separate the awning from the structure, duct work?

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think we could separate the awning from the duct work.

MR. MCMAHON: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BULL: But I don't think that this matter of the duct work is at all resolved.

MR. BROWN: No, I'm not suggesting that it is.

MS. WALOSKI: We can table the
duct work.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I make a motion we table the duct work.

MS. WALOSKI: I second that motion.

MR. MCMAHON: All in favor?

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MS. WETSELL: Aye.

MS. BORRELLI: Aye.

MS. WALOSKI: Aye.

MR. MCMAHON: Aye.

If I may, it's not really part of what I should be doing, but if that fifteen inch jog exists there, is there a possibility that you can create some kind of facade that maybe looks like it's a part of the building that maybe could even be sided and then the duct work could be buried within that space.

MS. WETSELL: Good idea.

MR. BROWN: It's not something I haven't considered.

MR. MCMAHON: That might be a way to get out of this and everybody be happy, and then it's not something that
everybody would have to look at. It would look like an overhang that is meant to protect somebody coming out of the kitchen and/or even some down lighting that could provide -- be useful as well.

MR. BROWN: Interesting.

MS. WETSELL: I think it's important that any ideas that they come up with be presented to us before you go ahead and do it again.

MR. BROWN: That would be my preference as well.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Otherwise it could be a long and painful process.

MR. BROWN: It already is, yes.

MS. WETSELL: And expensive.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So in the spirit of moving on from number 5, let's discuss number 6, which is the discussion and possible motion on the application of the American Beech Restaurant located at 308 Main Street. The restaurant has applied to install a retractable awning to cover the outdoor
dining area. The new awning is to be installed over the existing cedar pergola. This is SCTM# 1001-4-7-29.1. We should have the paperwork on that. Are you all familiar with this?

MS. BORRELLI: Yes.

MR. MCMAHON: Yes. There is some existing awning that's over that bar area?

MR. BROWN: No, it's gone now.

MR. MCMAHON: It's what?

MR. BROWN: It's gone.

CHAIRMAN BULL: No, I think it's still over the bar area. I was there today. But there's nothing over the dining area.

MR. BROWN: That was part of the original bar approval.

MS. WETSELL: What is the material for this proposed awning?

MR. BROWN: I'm sorry?

MS. WETSELL: What is the material for this?

MR. BROWN: It would be canvas with metal and plastic rails and a
motor to pull it back in and push it out. If I may, just a little bit of history. The reason that there had been an awning originally on our Planning Board application and then removed, for your information, and is now back, is that we were originally assured by a manufacturer's representative that they had an awning that could retract and extend the full twenty-two feet of the pergola, and after a little research we discovered that in fact it only went sixteen feet. Subsequently we found a manufacturer in Sweden and a local distributor who would represent them, and they do twenty-two feet, and that's why we came back with the awning. We didn't think we could do it, then we discovered that we could, so here we are.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I don't have in front of me, have you picked a pattern and coloring?

MR. BROWN: It would be solid white to match the white of the awning
over the bar. The bar is striped, the awning over the bar is striped, and we're proposing just the white to match the white stripe of the awning over the bar.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Would that be vinyl or canvas?

MR. BROWN: I believe it's canvas.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Good luck keeping it white.

MR. BROWN: It's an off-white.

MR. MCMAHON: In that spirit, I would like to make a motion to approve that awning that he's proposing.

MS. WALOSKI: I second that motion.

MR. PROKOP: Can I just ask a question, when will it be retracted?

MR. BROWN: It would only be extended when either sunlight was distracting to the people dining underneath it or if it was raining.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we have a motion that's been seconded, any other questions about this awning? All in
favor?

MS. WETSELL: Aye.

MS. BORRELLI: Aye.

MS. WALOSKI: Aye.

MR. MCMAHON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: You get your awning.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

If I may, just as a personal note, not regarding anything about these applications, as somebody who served on this commission for a long time many years ago I want to wish you a lot of luck in extending the historic district. We tried unsuccessfully many times, so sincerely I wish you luck.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: And if there's anything that I can do just as a citizen to help, please call on me.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Will do.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Since we're going through things, why don't we go on to the garage door, which is item number
7. Discussion and possible motion on the application of Dawn Polewac. The application proposes the replacement of garage doors at 602 First Street. I have a color photo of the doors, looks like a garage door to me. This is the old door?

MS. WINGATE: I was told somebody would be here but --

MR. MCMAHON: Is this the garage door, is this it?

MS. WETSELL: Yeah.

MR. MCMAHON: That's fine as far as I'm concerned.

MS. WETSELL: What is the material?

MR. MCMAHON: It's meant to look like leaded glass.

MS. WALOSKI: Steve, you don't have a picture of what the garage looks like, just the doors?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Just this fragment is the door.

MS. WALOSKI: So we don't know how it sits in the building?
CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, it looks to me like it's two doors.

MS. WALOSKI: I'm just talking about the form of the building itself, how these doors look --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah, we don't have that.

MS. WALOSKI: It looks like it's sort of shaker siding.

MR. MCMAHON: This appears to be a panel door. If you look closely, you'll see the hinges are located in those locations, and those appear to be one, two, three, four panels.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MS. WETSELL: It's a plastic polystyrene --

MR. MCMAHON: Yes, which we accept.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And they have a lift handle, which is similar to what was already here. And it has --

MS. WALOSKI: Is the door polystyrene, it's not wood?

CHAIRMAN BULL: No, it says its
color is ultra gray, oak medium finish. And it has a mechanical chain drive to open it with a half horsepower engine, and it has a double pane clear glass, but it looks like leaded here or something.

MR. MCMAHON: Yeah, that's a leaded design clearly. I mean, where are we going here? I mean, whether it's clear glass or a leaded design, like you said, it's a garage door, so I've got no problem with it. It's got a paneled look to it, so I mean that's along the same lines.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah, I understand the windows for light as they had them before. I'm not particularly happy with the leaded look.

MS. WETSELL: Me either.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Because it's sort of making a statement by being leaded and it might conflict with the house.

MS. WETSELL: It doesn't go with the house. The house is Victorian, and this is supposed to look Victorian.
MS. WALOSKI: It's a little pseudo Victorian.

MS. WETSELL: It's very pseudo, yeah.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I don't know, this is just from a Home Depot catalog.

MS. WALOSKI: And the fact that it's wood grain but it's not wood, and we don't have a piece of the -- to see what it looks like. I am a little bit skeptical.

MR. MCMAHON: The thing is that you don't have lot of choices. This is a panel decal, the panel is meant to be wood. If you don't have a wood grain, you have a flat grain, which looks a lot more commercial. So in regards to this, it's not going to look a hundred percent because it's not going to be wood. Polystyrene is what that need insulation value wise to make this door happen. It's never going to look like a wood door regardless. If you choose not to go with a wood grain or you think that's offensive, you're going to
end up with a flat vinyl garage, and that's not --

MS. WALOSKI: But you could --

MR. MCMAHON: Yeah, but essentially you're asking these people to do a wooden door when this door is acceptable by the panel, by us.

MS. WALOSKI: It may be accepted by us.

MR. MCMAHON: Well, I mean the material is accepted through this board.

MS. WETSELL: It has been accepted before?

MR. MCMAHON: Yes, polystyrene product is more like -- if you put it in the vinyl category, it's more like vinyl sash and the vinyl Marvin products that we've approved. But you're not going to come up with something that's wood, you can't ask them to go through the maintenance of a wood door when it's not -- well, you can ask them to, but it's not fair.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I'm agreeing with
you on that point. I have no issue
with the polystyrene.

MR. MCMAHON: No, it gets painted,
and it is what it is. Perhaps it's
coming in that oak color that it's
stated to be --

CHAIRMAN BULL: I do have an issue
that it might not be in keeping with
the rest of the character of the
building and that we don't have a color
photograph to look at.

MS. WETSELL: We need to see a
better photograph of it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Since I think
we're involved with these approval
criteria that we have here.

MR. PROKOP: I was going to
recommend -- you know, I missed this on
the last approval for American Beech,
it went too quickly, and I'm sorry, I
apologize to the board, but I recommend
that when you do any approval or even
consider an application that you go
through the criteria. The kinds of
things you're talking about now are
good, they're relevant in fairness to the applicant, but you're going to need to go through the criteria.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So in response to that, this criteria that we've gotten and received before talked a little bit about texture, materials, and color, and the similar features of other properties in the neighborhood, that's a consideration, so, you know, which includes visual compatibility, importance of historic architectural other features, you know, that needs to align itself with here. So respecting the need of the owner to have a method of getting in and out of the garage that works, I think they also, because they're in historic district, need to perhaps show us other samples that would work for that including just taking, you know, and bringing us color photographs that we could put perhaps against a larger photograph against the whole building and then make a much more easy determination. I have no
issue with the material, the use of the polystyrene at all. This door that's here isn't Victorian either.

MR. MCMAHON: Right.

MS. BORRELLI: That's what I was thinking. I mean, the door is obviously a huge improvement over what they have, and for a historic district, the door is looking a lot more historic to me than what they've actually got going, I say what's the point in not approving it? I think it's nice.

MR. MCMAHON: It's a medium oak finish.

MS. WALOSKI: I don't know how it looks with the rest of the house.

MS. BORRELLI: Medium oak finish.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Those are marketing words that are selling a product to a homeowner that you could buy at Home Depot. It has nothing to do with what it really looks like. It's advertising. It's a product description.

MS. BORRELLI: They must know what
they're buying, and they want to buy --

CHAIRMAN BULL: I don't know that

they know what they're buying.

MS. WALOSKI: And I don't know

that they know what they're buying.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I mean, they're

asking us to buy a product that we --

MS. BORRELLI: So they submitted

this because they don't know what
they're buying and they just want to
change the door to anything Home Depot
wants to sell them, and they never
picked out a door, is that what you're
saying?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well, I'm saying

they represented just one exhibit, and
it's not in color, that's not -- that
is hard to see that it meets the
criteria, the approval criteria that
we're supposed to be --

MR. MCMAHON: That chair is medium

oak (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: I'd love to have

that --

MR. PROKOP: I don't think this is
respectful to -- if this the way this came in, as a black and white photo?

MS. WINGATE: No, it came -- that came in black and white.

MR. PROKOP: It would be difficult to make a responsible decision with all due respect to the -- sorry.

MS. BORRELLI: It says oak medium finish, ultra gray oak medium finish. To me that says dark gray or medium to dark.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I understand. It's an interesting description. It's a tiny little photograph in black and white. It's inadequate.

MS. WETSELL: Maybe if we can ask them to present something we can actually see.

MS. WALOSKI: I'd like to see.

MS. WINGATE: They were told to bring a photo of the garage, they were told to bring more, but they're not here.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I make a motion that we table this until we have
evidence of -- and make a suggestion to the individuals that they come up with stuff that's more appropriate, and especially since they're not here, to share that information with us.

MS. WETSELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MS. WETSELL: Aye.

MS. BORRELLI: Aye.

MS. WALOSKI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Those opposed?

MR. MCMAHON: Opposed.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So moving on now to item number 2. Discussion and motion to approve draft letter to the Village Board of Trustees requesting the use of a grant writer for the purposes of initiating a new inventory of all village properties. Greenport is a Certified Local Government (CLG) with New York State Council of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation this eligible to make a funding request with certain matching services provided by the
Village. Discussion of other possible funding agencies to contact.

This was discussed somewhat in my earlier remarks. There are deadlines that need to be respected, there's nothing we need to make an application to in 2016. The matching services are somewhat similar to the ones that we currently are providing by meeting together. Our time has some value.

And I wrote a draft of a letter, which I found to be satisfactory and sent out to them today. So we can have a discussion about this, it seems like a great opportunity, and I handed out some paperwork there on the certified local governments.

Next item? Can we move onto the next item? Okay. I made a Google form, you should all have it in front of you, which is a form that can be filled out on the internet, and with this Google form it allows anybody to make -- nominate a structure for an expanded historic district. The form,
the copy on the form needs to be approved and perhaps improved. It currently says the title here is Greenport HPC requests, nominations for new structures for the expanded historic district. Then it goes on to say in the description, the Greenport Historic Preservation Commission HPC is soliciting village citizens and visitors, local historical societies, and the HPC members to nominate new structures for possible inclusion in the expanded historic district. Please use this form to make nominations, telephone or e-mail me, or perhaps we should change that, if you have any questions about this form. The form itself has a short description of the site, which you would type that in. It has an address of the site, it has the reason why you believe the site should be included, and then it has contributor name, e-mail, and phone number for follow-up. The answers get grouped together on Google on a spread
sheet that could be useful to the HPC for a form of planning of what sites people would like to nominate. So I propose that we might take a form like this to the Stirling Historical Society. And what do you think?

MR. MCMAHON: It's simple. Keep it simple. I don't think the village would go for not starting to amass certain properties to see what you can come up with see. If you are, again, grouping in sections. Front Street is going to be difficult because, you know, some of those structures were owned by IGA, things like that. It doesn't make sense to group those into something that's not going to ever come to anything. So I think maybe on an individual basis I think you probably stand a better chance of expanding and/or just nominating, that's probably the best word to use in regards to -- because some people who have existing properties were not informed at the time that they were in historic.
district, and it could become sort of a legal issue. There's nothing you can do to make them change their vinyl fence and/or again, they are grandfathered in to a situation that maybe they don't want to abide.

MS. BORRELLI: I had a question about that. I have a property that I would like to nominate as soon as possible, but I don't know what the owners -- what the owner might think about that or what anybody -- say I nominate it, and it's very good reasons, and historically it's all documented and research --

MS. WINGATE: Can I say something? According to the code, section 76-3F3 and 76-4 leave the final nomination to the State, to the Village Board. So you can -- all you're fundamentally doing is making a collection of properties that we value, but the final decision -- so those properties then go to the Village Board, and the Village Board will then send them to the State.
MS. WALOSKI: It's just for consideration.

MS. WINGATE: This is all about consideration.

MS. BORRELLI: So the owner has no say in whether their property is in the district or not?

MR. PROKOP: The owner would be notified.

MS. BORRELLI: Can the owner object and say I don't want my property included in the historic --

MR. PROKOP: They could say that. I think the ultimate decision would be with the Board of Trustees, but I don't know that they would override an owner's wishes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think when I was talking to the people here at the State level, they also respect the owner's wishes to a certain degree. So you can't force somebody to do something that they don't want to have done. We might be able to in certain extreme cases, but it could be litigious.
MR. PROKOP: We have a historic district as compared to a landmark building. So, like, an example of a landmark building is, you know, Nathaniel Hawthorne's birthplace or his homestead.

MS. WINGATE: We have two in total.

MR. PROKOP: When a building comes in to a historic district, it doesn't mean that there can never be a change, it just means that they have to meet certain standards. So it's not like a freeze on a building. Often when development is threatened at a historic place that's not landmarked, the residents will try to have it landmarked in order to preserve it. That isn't a situation that we're in here, but we have a district where it's really the district that's historic, not individual buildings except -- but however, this board is supposed to maintain historic standards through that district, but you're not freezing
the changes to any particular building,
if I said that so --

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think that's what I have heard as well, and apparently there could be some -- there's some flexibility going forward that you could have a historic district, possibly add individual buildings that might be outside of that district and make that into --

MR. PROKOP: That's right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we create a larger district in a way, but those outlying buildings where in the past had to be fused inside the district are now -- you can highlight some of those if you'd like, if there's some architectural importance.

MS. WINGATE: Also within the district we have buildings that are viewed as noncontributing.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MS. WINGATE: So it works both ways.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So a
noncontributing building is a building
that was built later or is not --
doesn't have any features that we want
to preserve.

MR. MCMAHON: Yeah.

MS. BORRELLI: So I'm not sure
that -- I don't know, whether or not to
proceed because I don't know if I'm
going to -- it's a particular home, a
large estate home that's outside the
historic district that we've never
really -- and I've managed to research
a lot on it, and I could make a case
that it is -- was originally owned by a
House of Representatives for Greenport,
and the home was built in late
1840's-'50s, so I would like to bring
that to the forefront, nominate this
house, but I don't know, given what you
said and whatever, would that even be a
possibility?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes, nominate it.

Put the reasons down as reasons why it
should be nominated, that's what this
form is all about.
MS. BORRELLI: Even though it's not part of the district, and it's too far away to add into the district.

MR. PROKOP: We'll figure that out.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That's what we're trying to do is we're trying to identify those buildings, and at the very least we'd like to have an inventory, which is another part of this process, I think, where at least if we identify them, we can add them to the catalog of what Greenport once was, even if they don't make it to the end. I think that's what the Stirling Historical Society is trying to accomplish.

And then any further discussion on item number 3.

MR. MCMHON: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Moving to item number 4, discussion of the steps required for the Village of Greenport to prepare, improve, and finish the 2016 Annual Report required by the
Village to maintain its Certified Local Government (CLG) status.

So we talked about the CLG before. It is a status that has to be maintained from year to year. Our committee is a part of that process. They, in their infinite wisdom, have prepared a form to be filled out showing our progress, and Eileen has filled out their form, and it's one of the worst spreadsheets I've ever seen. It goes up and goes down, so it's, like, a gigantic L shape.

MS. WINGATE: And it goes sideways too.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It's way off. You couldn't see it except perhaps on the computer if you had a patience to navigate that whole spreadsheet. So a part of this process I think going forward would be to -- in making this report, I think Eileen, is this an annual report based on 2016.

MS. WINGATE: This is an annual report, yes.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Based on 2016, January through December.

MS. WINGATE: I usually get it in the end of January.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we need I believe to spend a little time just documenting the activity that took place earlier this year, which I think would be good for own records of our progress to satisfy the needs, so that's what -- are there any other steps that need to be done, Eileen, that you're aware of?

MS. WINGATE: It's about number of applications, number of applications approved, it's about tracking consistent problems. You know, one of the things that they're worried about is demolition of historic buildings. That's not one of our problems necessarily, but it's about statistics and identifying problems, repeated problems, and figuring out if our code matches our problems.

CHAIRMAN BULL: As an example of
the garage door that we were talking
about earlier, is that a good example?

MS. WINGATE: Or vinyl siding,
yeah, we have fencing, we have
handrails, you know, they're simple,
but they're looking for consistency.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Any further
discussion?

MS. WINGATE: No. Help with the
spreadsheet is always a good thing.

MR. PROKOP: Can you e-mail the
spreadsheet around as an attachment?

MS. WINGATE: Was I able to mail
it to you?

CHAIRMAN BULL: You did. I didn't
even open it up, it was so impossible.

MS. WINGATE: I can. It's a
really silly document.

CHAIRMAN BULL: We'll have to look
at that. So I think you should mail it
around to all the members.

MS. WINGATE: I will mail the 2015
annual report.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Perfect. And then
we'll have a chance to see what that
looks like and it will put you to sleep at night.

MS. WALOSKI: We have a long winter ahead.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Moving on to the other items on the agenda, a motion to accept the minutes of the July 11, 2016?

MR. MCMAHON: I will make a motion to accept the minutes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I second the motion. All in favor?

MS. WETSELL: Aye.

MS. BORRELLI: Aye.

MS. WALOSKI: Aye.

MR. MCMAHON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a motion to accept the minutes of the August 1, 2016 meeting?

MS. WALOSKI: I make a motion to accept the minutes of the August 1, 2016 meeting.

MR. MCMAHON: Second it.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MS. WETSELL: Aye.
MS. BORRELLI: Aye.

MS. WALOSKI: Aye.

MR. MCMAHON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: There's a motion to schedule the next HPC meeting for October 3rd, or we should make a motion. October 3rd, I won't be here that day, I will be in Ireland, so but you could have a meeting without me.

MS. WALOSKI: When will you be back?

CHAIRMAN BULL: I would be back on I believe, I have to check, on the 12th, which is a Tuesday after Columbus day.

MS. WALOSKI: Why don't we do that?

MS. BORRELLI: The next Monday would be the 17th.

MS. WINGATE: Or you could do without an October meeting. The only thing pending is the 308 Main Street.

MS. BORRELLI: And the garage door.

MS. WALOSKI: Why don't we do it
on the 17th?

MS. WINGATE: October 17th.

MS. WALOSKI: Is that okay with everyone?

MS. WETSELL: Makes sense.

MR. MCMAHON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I heard a motion, October 17th. All in favor?

MS. WETSELL: Aye.

MS. BORRELLI: Aye.

MS. WALOSKI: Aye.

MR. MCMAHON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a motion to adjourn.

MS. WETSELL:

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MS. WETSELL: Aye.

MS. BORRELLI: Aye.

MS. WALOSKI: Aye.

MR. MCMAHON: Aye.

(Whereupon the meeting is concluded at 6:07 p.m.)
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