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CHAIRMAN BULL: This is the December 3, 2018 5:00 P.M. meeting of the Village of Greenport Historic Preservation Commission. I am the Chairman or Chairperson Stephen Bull. And on my right.

MEMBER McMAHON: Dennis McMahon.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And on my left.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Roselle Borrelli.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So we have a few items on our agenda. The first item: Item number 1. 863 Main Street. Discussion and possible motion on the application of Stirling Too, LLC. The applicant proposes to remove the fence that is currently on the west side of the property and replace it as well as additional fencing on the north side of the property. SCTM# 1001-2-1-15.

So let's take a look.

MEMBER McMAHON: I see a good reason to remove it. And of course these look like a lot of the samples that we have seen throughout. Do we have one circled or checked?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Let see if it is
MEMBER McMAHON: Good neighbor? Is that the one? Or is that just the --
CHAIRMAN BULL: I don't know. Good neighbor is all we have got so far.

MR. PROKOP: Are there people here?
MEMBER McMAHON: Oh, is someone here?

C'mon down.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Come on up.
MS. TENAVES: Hello everyone.
MEMBER McMAHON: Hello.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.
MEMBER McMAHON: Tell us who you are.
MS. TENAVES: Sophia Tenaves (Phonetic), for 863 Main Street.
CHAIRMAN BULL: So we have your application in front of us. I see the property lines of the application is bordering, I guess, on Washington Avenue.
MS. TENAVES: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BULL: As well as on Main Street.
MS. TENAVES: Correct.
CHAIRMAN BULL: So let's deal with the Washington Avenue side of the property
first.

MS. TENAVES: On Washington we were thinking of the Kennedy Straight. Which is a simple --

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. Right.

MS. TENAVES: It will be -- is it 40 inches, the maximum along Washington?

CHAIRMAN BULL: I don't -- I'm not exactly sure. Is it four feet? But it is along the road. Does that make it four feet?

MS. LINGG: Thirty feet back from the property line.

CHAIRMAN BULL: But it is on the property -- oh, it is inside the property line here in the back.

We are looking at a map. We are looking along Washington Avenue.

MS. TENAVES: Along the garage going west. West this way (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: So from the garage going west along Washington it appears to be very close to the sidewalk.

MS. TENAVES: Right. I believe we are going to be setting back three feet
from the sidewalk to be in line with the
garage.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

MS. TENAVES: And just put a typical
picket fence. Nothing overwhelming. It is
36 to 40 inches in height. Whatever you
recommend.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I would recommend 36.

MS. TENAVES: Thirty-six.

CHAIRMAN BULL: That is the
recommendation on that. We are talking
about the Kennedy Straight?

MS. TENAVES: The Kennedy Straight.

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The Kennedy Straight
from the garage to the edge of the property
along Washington Avenue?

MS. TENAVES: Right. We will meet up
with the other neighbor on Washington.

They have a fence also.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Can you tell me what
kind of fence they have.

MS. TENAVES: They have a picket
fence.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, it is a picket
fence.

    MS. TENAVES: It is a picket fence.

    CHAIRMAN BULL: We have been talking
a lot about getting some harmony in the
fences that go up. So if you have one
picket fence adjoining another, even if
they are not exactly the same that is
perfectly fine. The point is to allow the
property to, you know, to develop its own
identity but we like the openness of the
picket fence.

    So let's talk about another fence.

    MS. TENAVES: Then on the south side
of the property -- those are the photos
that you have. There we're suggesting a
good neighbor fence called The Pierce,
which is a double sided fence. And that
way it looks good for the both properties.

    CHAIRMAN BULL: So that is adjoining
the property that on this --

    MS. TENAVES: Right.

    CHAIRMAN BULL: Property that shows
Marie Ambrosio.

    MS. TENAVES: Right. We have both
properties. So we are going to put a new
fence -- we would like to put a new fence there.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Could you show me where that fence would go.

MS. TENAVES: It would replace this fence here (indicating) but more on the property line.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So it is this part over here (indicating)?

MS. TENAVES: It is this here (indicating) and replace here (indicating) and here (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: So along the west side, the west end of the property.

MS. TENAVES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And along the south side of the property up until where it gets close to the house --

MS. TENAVES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: You are proposing that we have a Pierce fence.

MS. TENAVES: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BULL: What height were you thinking for that?

MS. TENAVES: Six feet.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh.

MS. TENAVES: What do you recommend?

It is the privacy fence.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: Is that the back of your property?

MS. TENAVES: Is it the back of my property?

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.

MS. TENAVES: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: Well that is appropriate.

CHAIRMAN BULL: It is appropriate.

Okay.

MS. TENAVES: You won't notice it from the street.

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. True.

MEMBER McMAHON: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Six foot Pierce. But it does have those little details, the openings in there which --

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. It has everything. That is part of our --

CHAIRMAN BULL: What kind of newels -- is that correct?
MEMBER McMAHON: It is more of a plank.

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. What is the thing on the top?

MEMBER BORRELLI: Cap.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The cap. Have you decided on a cap to the filler?

MS. TENAVES: I believe it will just be a square like bevel. Nothing elaborate.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So it is like the one I see here.

MR. TENAVES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: In the photograph with the flower on it?

MS. TENAVES: Yes. I don't believe it will be the protruding one.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The protruding one?

MS. TENAVES: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So it is the kind of flatter cap. Would you --

MEMBER McMAHON: That is a continuous rail.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: And there is -- it is not stiffed probably as it is shown in
the photograph.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: So it is a continuous rail with no protruding vertical structural posts. It is 4X4 posts with a cap. It is a flat --

CHAIRMAN BULL: But there are caps at the time --

MEMBER McMAHON: Are there caps?

MS. TENAVES: I believe it will look very nice with the caps.

MEMBER McMAHON: Oh, yes. That is fine. Beautiful. I just didn't know it was in your --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well it says, "undetermined". So this conversation we are getting to is senseless.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I apologize for not knowing the house better. Is it possible that we could recommend that you go with something just a little bit more elaborate in terms of the cap as opposed to something --

MEMBER McMAHON: Well --
CHAIRMAN BULL: Is that something we can do?

MEMBER McMAHON: No. I don't think we should. If its wood -- and anything else that you add to that very simple detail -- and it is a nice simple detail. It is a simple 4X4 cap, bevelled to create a column look. And another thing, you don't see it so much in the step detail because it is covered with foliage. But if you look at the -- if you look at the cap detail in the section next to it. That is all you can really do. Otherwise you have to do something simpler in regards to saving or preserving your fence you can't -- these are actually very fragile. So she is doing the right thing. But it is something.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I do understand and appreciate the fact that the cap -- in this fence that you are replacing, if you notice that fence --

MS. TENAVES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: If you notice the fence we are replacing -- we are getting
that more detail.

MEMBER McMAHON: I see what you are talking about.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yeah. So if it is not an unfair expense I think it would be nice to continue the post detail by providing the slightly higher --

MEMBER BORRELLI: I think it is lovely. The new fence is far supervisor to what is there now.

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. Yes. It is the same fence. It is just that we have options in terms of the cap. It is this fence here (indicating).

MEMBER McMAHON: I agree but --

CHAIRMAN BULL: The options -- we have options of either this cap (indicating).

MEMBER BORRELLI: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Or this cap (indicating).

MEMBER BORRELLI: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I'm suggesting that we go with the cap that more closely mirrors what we are replacing.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yeah, but you know
what this -- the fence being replaced is a contemporary fence.

CHAIRMAN BULL: No. I understand that.

MEMBER McMAHON: I think if you are going to -- this is why we are all here. If you are going to go through the process of trying to put in this Good Neighbor fence, which looks good on both sides, I think we should just slide on the cap detail. Let's let them --

CHAIRMAN BULL: I think we have some consensus about the fence and the height of the fence and the brand of the fence.

MEMBER McMAHON: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I would just like to propose that we go for the cap that appears on the inset of the same fence on the tops of those posts, if there is not any additional expense.

MEMBER McMAHON: That is a great suggestion, but would still leave it up to the owner to make that decision without having us to insist.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So, Joe?
MR. PROKOP: Yes?

CHAIRMAN BULL: In a situation like that where we have a bit of a discussion about -- we were looking at an existing fence that has a little separation on it. And then we are looking at a replacement fence, which is the Pierce fence and then there is the option of more contemporary flat top to the post versus one that has more protruding posts; is this something that we should decide on now or is this something we leave to the homeowner?

MR. PROKOP: I think you are -- if you are going to give the homeowner a choice between two different designs you would have to determine that both designs meet the criteria that they are required to for a post. So if you feel that both designs meet the criteria that you are required to review, then that's fine.

MEMBER McMAHON: That's where I was heading. Just the -- just to say something to you as a contractor, the one that didn't rot with the rest of the fence is probably the one that will hold up better. If I can
ask even say that, which is the one that
you were looking at.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: Because it is not an
apply. The flat ones are apply. They tend
to curl and go away a lot sooner. Just a
thought. Not trying to scare you. Just
saying. I like the flat ones but this
might hold up better for you. Especially
in a treed area. The one that is on the
rotted fence alone is available --

MS. TENAVES: This one?

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. It is
available -- the other ones are a pine.
And this one is carved into the post
itself. So it is a win-win whatever you
do.

MS. TENAVES: Okay. So I will offer
the suggestion to Mike. Is that alright if
he picks one of the two?

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I make a motion
that there are two fences in discussion on
the application. One which is a 36" high
Kennedy Straight fence which runs along
Washington Avenue and as presented in the
custom cedar catalogue. I make -- we make
a motion that we -- that is acceptable
within the neighborhood. As we have
learned from the people who have a house
next to it. So it is in accordance with
HPC's thoughts about how these sorts of
fences make the neighborhood.

With regard to another fence which is
a six foot tall Pierce fence that runs
along the west end of the property and also
along the south end of the property that we
-- that in both cases this privacy fence
works for us. But it is our first
recommendation of the commission that we
recommend the taller fence cap. Which is
actually carved into the post itself.
Which gives a desired aging effect to the
whole piece that -- and also it kind of
adds to kind of historic -- it adds more of
a historic touch to the proposed fence. So
I feel that it is a combination of those
two that would be something that we could
approve.

MEMBER McMAHON: Okay. I agree with
everything you say except the fact that it
is the Committees's first choice. It is a first choice.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes. Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: And either of the two choices is acceptable to the Board.

MEMBER BORRELLI: We can't get technical on the style.

MEMBER McMAHON: No.

MEMBER BORRELLI: It also -- I'm just saying. It depends on the shape of the house. How Sophia wants it to match. You know maybe the roof has a flat line and she wants a flat cap. Or maybe the roof has a pitched line and she wants to -- I really think it is an aesthetic -- it is a beautiful fence. I think it should be left up to the owner for many reasons; cost or whatever she chooses. You want to tell her you want not to have the diamonds or you want hearts or shamrocks. I just think --

CHAIRMAN BULL: We are not talking about that. We are talking about the posts.

Joe, you want to say something?

MR. PROKOP: Yes. Before you vote
CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: A couple of things.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: It is not about the design.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Yes. So we don't have an imagine of the house. So we are leaving it to the owner.

MEMBER McMATHON: Right.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN BULL: To make the final decision. But with the information that we have in front of us and the wisdom of, you know, people who are in the business of the actual -- we do have an idea perhaps, the one that is on the custom cedar catalogue, the associated with the custom Pierce fence. It is a drawing.

CHAIRMAN BULL: You had something?

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

What is your relationship with Stirling Too, LLC?

MS. TENAVES: I'm a member.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So you are part
of the ownership?

MS. TENAVES: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: One thing about this is that the fences you propose to be six feet is leading up to the street, Washington Street?

CHAIRMAN BULL: No.

MS. TENAVES: No. I believe we intend on stopping at 30 feet, before you reach Washington Street and stepping it down to the, I guess, 36 inch level. It won't go six feet all the way to Washington on the west side.

MR. PROKOP: I just want to mention that this is a corner lot. So it has two front doors. So you can only go up to the four feet in the front yard. So this is something that will be inspected by the building inspector to make sure the height is okay on that side. The building inspector determines that Washington Street is the front yard. And the garage is over there.

MS. TENAVES: Right.

MR. PROKOP: So it is not -- but the
Building Department -- just make sure the height of the fence in that -- between the -- I guess what is actually the sidewalk on Washington Street make sure the height is okay. If the Building Department determines that is a front yard because it is on the corner then it has to be limited to the four feet.

MS. TENAVES: It will not exceed on Washington. That is the first fence we discussed. The Kennedy picket fence will run along Washington. It is 36 inches.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And it will intersect this other fence which will be three foot high.

MS. TENAVES: Right, Jack Costello's house, which is next door.

MEMBER BORRELLI: And that will be the six foot fence.

MS. TENAVES: The six foot fence --

CHAIRMAN BULL: It won't be six foot at that point. It will be three foot high and then it will be six feet when it passes the 30 foot mark.
MEMBER McMAHON: Yes.

MS. TENAVES: Right. That is very far back from Washington.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So are we all in favor of this?

MEMBER McMAHON: All in favor. I'm in favor.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I'm in favor.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Aye.

MS. LINGG: Just to be clear, are you making a motion to approve it?

CHAIRMAN BULL: I make a motion to approve it as discussed, as presented in the application.

MEMBER McMAHON: I second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Aye.

MS. TENAVES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So let's see what we have next on our agenda.
Item two: 412 - 414 Carpenter Street. Discussion and possible motion on the application of Megan Strecker and Cameron Dowe, represented by Hideaki Ariizumi, Architect. The application proposes to construct an addition for the property located at 412 - 413 Carpenter Street. SCTMJ 1001-5-1-8.

Please give us some information while we look through this.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes. I thought she is coming here today. I am surprised she isn't here. There is a little history of this project because it is calling to me. Actually it is already started the construction, the renovation. It started with a panel. After construction started they found out that almost half of the building -- it is so terribly damaged. So that is the first thing they decided, to replace.

At the same time while looking the demolition started they realized that possible damage -- we already decided one time. And to get to already have a
different damage is not good enough to have
an openness to the back. And so we decided
to add a little addition. And that is
basically the things that keeps to this
little permission, review. As well as the
ZBA. And as soon as we get past this we
can go.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So has this been
before the ZBA?

MR. ARIIZUMI: ZBA, not yet. We
can't because the Building Department can
not decide until this is done.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Our objection
-- can you show me on these photographs
what we are talking about.

MEMBER McMAHON: Is that the kitchen?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes. The kitchen.

These photographs are all before the
construction started. So the addition --

CHAIRMAN BULL: I understand that.

Before you get to the addition you are
rebuilding the one that is rotting?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Which one of these is
rotted out?
MR. ARIIZUMI: This --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, it is behind the house.

MR. ARIIZUMI: This is already there (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

MR. ARIIZUMI: And this (indicating) and this (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: This is what I see when I am looking here (indicating)?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: This is the view I see. Okay.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Right. This one (indicating). And this is here and this part, this is over here and this is completely off.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Right.

MR. ARIIZUMI: We need to replace this (indicating) and that (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, the addition is this little portion here (indicating)?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I believe you were saying the bump out is indicated on the
plan by an unshaded yet diagonally
indicated square. Its function is the
kitchen?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Right.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Its function is the
kitchen and it will not exceed the width of
the building as seen from the street. It
will be at the same width of the building.

So now in the next set of drawings
we have elevation.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So can you show us
the -- first of the all, I guess start with
the street view. This is the back?

MR. ARIIZUMI: It is the back.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Let's start with
street view. Let's make sure we are all
together on this.

So the street view is this one; is
that right?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So this is the street
view.

MR. ARIIZUMI: This is the view that
is over there (indicating).
CHAIRMAN BULL: Understood. So this photograph here, the roof line is in keeping with the street view as I see in the photographs. And this has already been approved.

So now when we look to the elevation here which I think is the east?

MEMBER McMAHON: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I am looking at the south view. This is the amended addition right here.

MR. ARIIZUMI: This is the addition.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Right. This is the piece we are talking about. And this piece here --

MR. ARIIZUMI: Is replacing.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Is replacing and has already been approved.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So the only thing that hasn't been approved is this little kitchen addition.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So it appears again -- this is the north elevation over here;
is that right?

MEMBER McMAHON: No.

CHAIRMAN BULL: This --

MR. ARIIZUMI: This elevation on this side, this one (indicating). And this is the elevation on this (indicating).

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So it is a one story elevation that appears in both the east elevation and also appears as the west elevation.

MR. ARIIZUMI: I know it is --

little house but it is big.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Well it has had a long history and this is going to add to the history.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes. Pot luck. And we are adding more even.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. You don't see it from anywhere. It is a lovely addition is what I am going to pipe in. I know this house very well. My house is only four houses, five houses north. It is lovely to see that somebody is doing something nice to it. I am pleased to see that is part of the whole process.
No street view, single story. You can look at the keeping of the lines of the house in the roof and the pitches, the windows. Which we are always concerned that they are true divided light. I would imagine that we would approve everything that was already on the property. And it would be the true divided light in that kitchen?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: And of course the siding will match. Is there any other considerations by the Board that we should consider at this point?

MEMBER BORRELLI: He put a new roof also. He's got that in there.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I find that the addition is in keeping with the already approved elements. And that as far as it is in keeping I think with the nature of the house and also --

MR. ARIIZUMI: Just to make it clear, please.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. ARIIZUMI: The exterior siding
is what you call --

MEMBER BORRELLI: Hardy --

MR. ARIIZUMI: Right now this is --

MEMBER McMAHON: Double cedar?

MR. ARIIZUMI: No. It is not cedar.

MEMBER McMAHON: Oh, asbestos. It is asbestos.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Asbestos. It must be changed.

MEMBER McMAHON: Yes. We all know that.

MR. ARIIZUMI: So we decided the Hardy --

CHAIRMAN BULL: So the Hardy plank is going to be used throughout the entire renovation?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. That is important.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes. And the roof -- they decided. I don't know why, but they decided the roof, most of the roof -- at least one side needs to be replaced. So that part will be changed. Right now it is
orangy shingles. Which they decided to go
over pewter grey.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Very pretty.

MR. ARIIZUMI: And the whole house --
MEMBER McMAHON: Right. That's good.

A good choice. Pewter grey rather than
pink like the shingles, the asbestos
shingles.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So I make a
motion --

MR. PROKOP: One moment.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: I have to ask that we go
into Executive Session. There is something
I need to bring to your attention.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So we will go
into Executive Session where we will stop
recording.

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. Executive
Session for a brief moment.

(Whereupon, an Executive Session was
held.)

CHAIRMAN BULL: We are back on the
record.
MR. ARIIZUMI: This is a big surprise.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Unfortunately some issues have come to light for which we were not prepared. So it is on the burden of the Historic Preservation Commission to see the previous application that should have been made to the HPC, that may have been made to the HPC.

MEMBER McMAHON: That was the one that came before.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Because we don't have that previous application --

MR. ARIIZUMI: I wasn't on prior. So what I can do?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Oh, so what --

MR. ARIIZUMI: I was surprised.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. I am with you. I am totally surprised. This has never happened before.

According to the approval criteria that we have in the Building Code of 76-6, we are supposed to consider the entire structure. And I was lead to believe in starting this conversation that this
particular building had come before the
HPC. It has now become -- there is now a
question of whether or not it did actually
did come before the HPC. With no prejudice
to this, we need to see the application
before the HPC that the approval criteria
has been met because this question has come
to us.

We have approval criteria that we
have to follow, but we can not follow
approval criteria for a portion of an
entire building when it actually has been
represented to us that the rest of this
building has been presented to us.

So I make a motion that until we have
better information, regrettably --

MR. ARIIZUMI: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. ARIIZUMI: This package is all
the same. What I can have?

CHAIRMAN BULL: I believe the course
of action that I would recommend -- this is
new for me. I think the Building
Department will assist you in this matter.

Everything that you have here that you go
back -- you represent this as if the request is for the entire structure as if there is no HPC approval. That you represent it as the entire structure.

While we have had this conversation today, I think we have from the three members of the HPC that are present, I think we are getting a favorable impression of this construction and the quality and thoughtfulness that you have put into this renovation. The thoughtfulness that you have applied to the fact that -- because I have often seen this particular house and wondered how could actually survive being so close to the dirt.

So I think that -- I can not forecast approval. We don't -- there is a sufficient amount of information that I regrettably say that we must --

MEMBER McMAHON: If I may --

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: This is exactly what we like to see in regards to the amount of information submitted to us. I think you have to reapply. Am I not that correct?
You have to reapply --

MR. PROKOP: It has to be stated as approval for the entire building. Not just --

MEMBER McMAHON: Correct.

MR. PROKOP: He is doing the entire building.

MEMBER McMAHON: We need the application for that?

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: We can not do it as what we see there.

MR. PROKOP: He can amend the application. He can come back here next month. And this will be on next month again.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So that is the legal path. And that is the easiest path.

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I thank you for your time and bringing this to our attention.

MEMBER McMAHON: Could I just -- it says in your notes, windows replacing same size -- if you would just put -- tell us if it Anderson and what series, true divided
light. That is the only thing I see
missing. We just talked about the roof.
Is there anything else missing?

MEMBER BORRELLI: The doors. Like on
the right. Maybe a description on that.

MR. ARIIZUMI: With the window there
is --

MEMBER McMAHON: Oh, there is a
window in your schedule.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: That is great.

CHAIRMAN BULL: I am not sure exactly
how the front porch is to be addressed.

That is the only thing.

MEMBER McMAHON: The columns.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The columns.

MEMBER McMAHON: Style.

CHAIRMAN BULL: How to maintain that.

It doesn't look like that is happening on
what I have here.

MR. ARIIZUMI: And the door is

scheduling.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So that would be an
area, to me as minimal as it is, as it was,
a little attention on that detail would be
important.

MR. ARIIZUMI: My intention is those
are simplified.

MEMBER McMAHON: Absolutely.

MR. ARIIZUMI: In the renovation --
it is to preserve what is.

CHAIRMAN BULL: As long as that you
stay -- that will come up. The treatment
or the development of the porch.

MEMBER McMAHON: The street scape.

CHAIRMAN BULL: The street scape
looks in conjunction -- again going back to
the 76-6 approval criteria it is important
that the renovation that you are
undertaking matches the characteristic of
the neighborhood. Which the renovation
reinforces the, you know, what was already
there and just replacing it. For instance,
those details on that roof. Which are of
-- those will all be preserved?

MEMBER McMAHON: Or replaced with
something similar.

MR. ARIIZUMI: The soffit detail?

CHAIRMAN BULL: Yes.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Actually that is -- we
didn't discuss too much about it. So we will, legal term, preserve.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Please do. I see it is not here on the elevation. That detail that we see here will come up for discussion.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: And I want you to succeed in your application.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BULL: If you have any questions or if you want to send us drawings, I will be happy to look at them.

MR. ARIIZUMI: Okay.

MEMBER McMAHON: All those synthetic details are approved by the Board, just so you know. If you are going to put those back in place and anything coming off the column or what your ideas are, and any rails on the application. Is there going to be rails?

MR. ARIIZUMI: The front, no. There is no.

MEMBER McMAHON: Just columns.

MR. ARIIZUMI: No. The only place
they are putting on the really back and
that deck.

MEMBER McMAHON: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BULL: Okay. So I make a
motion that we allow the applicant to
provide us with more details because that
is what we need.
So all in favor of that motion.
MEMBER McMAHON: I second.
CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?
MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.
MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.
CHAIRMAN BULL: This application has
been postponed awaiting a new application.
Thank you.
Okay. Item number 3: Continued
discussion and possible motion of the Board
to begin the development of appropriate
policies for specific Historic Preservation
Commission criteria on such commonly
considered items as: Windows, doors, and
fences in the Historic District.
There are no new developments.
Item number 4: Discussion and
possible motion of the Board to pursue
efforts to enlarge the Village of Greenport
Historic District.

I have not made the necessary calls
to people who would advise us on how to do
that. I need to do more on that and we
will postpone that until the next meeting.

Item number 5: Motion to accept the
minutes of the November 5, 2018 meeting.

MEMBER McMAHON: I second.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Item number 6:

Motion to approve the minutes of the
October 1, 2018 meeting.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Motion to approve.

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Item number 7:

Motion to schedule the next HPC meeting for
5:00 p.m. on January 7, 2019 at the Third
Street Fire Station. Does that work?

MEMBER BORRELLI: Yes.

MEMBER McMAHON: So far so good.

CHAIRMAN BULL: So I make a motion to
do that. Do I have a second?
MEMBER BORRELLI: I second that.

CHAIRMAN BULL: All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BULL: Motion to adjourn.

All in favor?

MEMBER McMAHON: Aye.

MEMBER BORRELLI: Aye.

(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded.)
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