

Present: Mayor William Murphy, Trustees Terry Parisian, Patrick Landewe, Don Hackett, Brian Martin and Vince Buono

Absent: Trustee Jeannine Mayer

Others: Elda Zulick, Jenny Mangione, Aiden Hughes, Ed Quirk, Alex Wade, Gary Rose, Penny Milford, Carole Furman, Liz Hernandez, Elaine White, Myles Putnam, Lanny Walter, Mike Flannigan, Sharon Smith, Robert Ford, Richard Frisbie, Dave Minch, Robin Goss, Josepha Gutelius, Bob Lawless, Prudence See, John and Christine Amodio, Brendan Amodio, Bart Friedman, Stephen and Elizabeth Shafer, Rae Stang, Mike Moriello, Jon Shapiro, Barbara Russell, Mark Proper, Alex Betke, Gary Newkirk, Susan Puretz, Roy Mattea and many others

Public Hearing on proposed Local Law #3/2014

Mayor William Murphy called the Public Hearing to order at 500pm. Trustee Patrick Landewe summarized the proposed law. He advised everyone that the section regarding wedding venues has been removed from Local Law #3. This issue will be dealt with in a separate Local Law to be introduced in January 2015. The proposed law makes some changes on the Zoning Map to include adding a Business Residential District; changing a property from R2 to B1 and a property from R1 to R3, defining the boundaries of the Historic District, updating the use schedule, merging the Planning Board and the Historic Review Board into one; and transferring the approval authority to the Building Inspector for the appropriateness of signs in the Historic District. He also advised all present that the Village Board would not be voting on the law tonight and the Village Board would accept written comments until December 15, 2014.

Mayor Murphy asked that anyone who wished to speak to "stay on point", and state their name and address for the record. He urged everyone to be respectful of other speakers.

Alex Wade read a prepared statement (copy attached). His comments included his experience as Building Inspector for the Village and his experiences with the HRB.

Penelope Milford, a Village resident, spoke. She is against combining the HRB with the PB.

Attorney Michael Moriello spoke in favor of the proposed new Business Residential District.

Richard Frisbie, Chair of the HRB, spoke as a citizen. His comments are attached. He also supports the BR District. He is against the merger of the HRB and the PB.

Carole Furman read a written statement (copy attached) from Judith Spektor, a Town resident. She is against the merger of the HRB and the PB.

Stephen Shafer, a Village resident and Member of the Town Preservation Committee, spoke (copy attached). He is against the merger of the HRB and the PB.

Rae Stang, a Village resident and owner of Lucky Chocolates, is against the merger of the HRB and the PB.

Samantha, the owner of Revolution Bicycles on Main Street, spoke. She said she had to appear before the HRB twice. She said as long as an applicant comes prepared, all goes well. The process seemed fine however one member did digress and tried to make changes to the applicant's wishes.

Susan Puretz, a Town resident, is against the merger of the HRB and the PB (copy attached).

Elaine White, a Village resident, spoke of the efforts to save the Library.

Liz Hernandez, a Town resident but Village property owner, supports the merger of the HRB and the PB.

Dave Minch, a Village resident and current member of the HRB, spoke. He is against the merger of the HRB and the PB. He also does not agree with the proposed map Historic District boundaries.

Joseph Gutelius, a Village resident, does not support the merger of the HRB and the PB.

Brendan Amodio, a Village resident and owner of Mirabella's Restaurant, spoke. He said the HRB does not take financial issues of business owners into account. Some businesses can only afford changes a small piece at a time. Mr. Amodio found that his project changed into the HRB's vision of what the building should be. He felt he had no cooperation from the HRB for 4 years. He also said the HRB provided no written guidelines for him to follow.

John Amodio, the owner of 40 Partition Street, spoke. He said the house was built in 1897 and was not "pre-Civil War" as the HRB has reported. Mr. Amodio said he has owned his property since 1997 and wondered where the HRB was when he put aluminum siding on the house and put an addition on the back. No one from the HRB spoke to him about obtaining any approvals.

Barbara Russell, a Village resident, spoke. She is against the merger of the HRB and the PB. She also urged the Village Board to act as quickly as possible on a wedding venue law.

Lanny Walter, a Town resident, spoke. He is against the merger of the HRB and the PB.

Mark Proper, owner of Miss Lucy's Restaurant and the CUE, spoke. He has owned Miss Lucy's since 1997. He feels it is important to keep a Historic District however he has found the HRB to be arbitrary at times. He would like to give the HRB another chance to work to improve the review process.

Roy Mattea, a new Village resident, spoke. He wanted to say he loves Saugerties and hopes this issue can be resolved.

Susan Puretz, spoke again saying she has worked for five years with the Town Historic Preservation Committee to write guidelines for the HRB to follow.

Gary Rose, a Village resident, spoke. He is against the merger of the HRB and the PB but went on to say that some of the members of the HRB should not be reappointed. The HRB must be able to work together with property owners.

Elda Zulick, a Village resident and owner of Grist Mill Real Estate, spoke. She was a member of the HRB years ago and everyone worked together to help property owners achieve their goals. She is against the merger of the HRB and the PB but said the HRB must work together with applicants.

There was no one else present who wished to speak. Mayor Murphy thanked everyone who spoke and attended. He went on to say that the purpose of a Public Hearing was to hear both sides of issues. Additional written comments have been received by the Clerk and will be part of the record. Anyone wishing to view these written comments can do so at the Village Clerk's Office.

Motion was made by Trustee Hackett, seconded by Trustee Martin, to adjourn the Public Hearing. Carried unanimously. The Public Hearing was adjourned at 6:55pm.

Regular Meeting

Mayor Murphy called the regular meeting of the Village Board to order at 7:05pm. Trustee Parisian led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Mayor Murphy presented the Minutes of November 17, 2014. Motion was made by Trustee Martin, seconded by Trustee Hackett, to approve the minutes. Carried unanimously.

Trustee Buono presented the Abstract for December 1, 2014: General - \$262,466.61; Water - \$200,340.49; Wastewater - \$112,282.92; Account H - \$544,789.78; Seamon Park - \$4086.20; Short Lived Assets - \$7679.82. Motion was made by Trustee Hackett, seconded by Trustee Martin, to approve the Abstract. Carried unanimously.

Trustee Parisian advised the Board that the DPW serviced the 1st snowfall of the season on November 26th. He reminded residents that the overnight parking ban begins on December 14th.

Trustee Landewe advised the Board that the Planning Board will discuss the proposed merger of the HRB and the PB at the Planning Board's December 10th meeting. The PB will give their opinion on the proposal to the Village Board.

Trustee Buono reported that the STAC Committee met. He is waiting on a new complete streets resolution.

Trustee Martin had nothing to report.

Trustee Hackett extended a "Welcome Home" to firefighter Jim Bach. He has returned from a deployment in Afghanistan.

Mayor Murphy advised the Board that Holiday in the Village is Sunday December 7th. Plans for New Year's Eve on Main Street are being finalized.

Trustee Parisian suggested that the Village Board consider separating Local Law #3/2014 into two parts. He felt that the Village Board should move forward with the zoning changes and the HRB map boundaries and then consider the merger of the HRB and the PB in a separate law. Alex Betke said that the Village Board should review the new guidelines proposed for the HRB and then adopt those guidelines. The consensus of the Board was to separate the two issues and vote on the zoning map changes at the December 15th meeting.

Motion was made by Trustee Hackett, seconded by Trustee Parisian, to adjourn. Carried unanimously. The Village Board adjourned at 7:25pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Frank
Village Clerk

Filed 12/3/14

COMMENTS ON THE HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD

As the Building Inspector responsible for enforcing the decisions of this Board for almost 20 years and as an actual member of the board for a brief period, I would like to comment.

During my tenure, there were three phases of the board. The first was under the Chairmanship of my friend Clifford Steen who actually pushed for the original legislation which created the board. Steen conducted his meetings well, provided accurate minutes, but was something of a dictator. Since I was responsible for enforcing the board's decisions, I started attending the meetings as an observer. One major problem was that Steen would act unilaterally to stop what he perceived as a violation. As he got older, the problems worsened and caused many complaints from property owners. Finally, Cliff was persuaded to step down and Steve Thornton took over as chair.

This board contained several women; most in Real Estate. Elda Zulich, Vonnie Bragg and Thomasine Helmoortal were examples. Fran Numerich was also a member. In this era, the board functioned efficiently and effectively. Unfortunately, Steve left to spend family time and the board ceased to function properly.

Rigid preservationists took control of the board and chased the women away. One of the departing members commented. "Those people are crazy. They spend all of their time nitpicking minor issues and don't resolve important matters in a timely fashion. I have better things to do with my time. I quit." Also, minutes became spotty and very late. I received complaints from SHIPPO (NYS office of Parks and Historic Preservation) about missing annual reports, etc. Some citizens complained to the state about the arbitrary actions of this board. At least twice, SHIPO sent representatives to explain how to conduct a meeting and the proper notification and record keeping procedures. Alas, their efforts fell on deaf ears. Word of the problems spread and it became difficult to find replacements for board members when their staggered terms expired. Mayor Yerick finally tried to replace all of the expired terms after members of the board actively campaigned against the Diamond Mills Hotel. (The Hotel is not in either of the Historic Districts) Some property owners resist any regulation and refuse to cooperate, but most are willing to talk. I list some of the cases where the owner's rights were compromised.

1. A two story house on Valley Street: The house had no headroom or legal exit windows on the second floor. Without a permit, the property owner removed the second storey intending to replace it with a full height story. The HRB demanded that he stop and replace the second story as it was with "historic" eyebrow (tiny) windows. The owner walked away from the house and years later it was demolished.
2. Hotel demolition: As building Inspector, I condemned the Southside Hotel after a portion of the exterior brick wall fell into the street and the roof started to cave in. The owner elected to remove the building which required a permit from the HRB. Two of the aforementioned realtors were still on the board. The vote was three to two for demolition. The Chair tried to have a revote, but was stopped by threat of a lawsuit. The two ladies departed soon after.
3. Lachman's Bakery: A local businessman purchased this building which was faced with historic, irreplaceable Carrera glass. The glass panels had started to fall off the building and smash on the sidewalk. Furthermore, the script store sign had left many holes in the remaining panels. The new owner wanted to replace the storefront and presented a rough sketch. The board wanted a "professional drawing". The project languished for over a year until a new Chairman got the problems resolved.
4. Lynch's Marina Ice/coal house. This structure had no foundation, was rotted at the bottom and was listing 15 degrees. I condemned it. The board voted three to two to deny demolition. The owners immediately appealed to the Village Board who overruled the HRB.
5. Boy's and Girl's Club: A local engineer donated his time to designing this new structure after much trouble with zoning issues. Members of the board actually started trying to redesign the building.

Another aspect of the problem is favoritism and uneven enforcement. "Friends" of board members can get away without permits for changes that "enemies" would be sited for. Much of our problem seems to be some unreasonable people who have no clue to problem solving or any willingness to compromise. I was consulted by Rhinebeck before they set up their Historic Review process and explained our problems. One of the most serious problems is the lack of proper guidelines. If the property owner knows what colors and materials are acceptable, it makes the process much easier.

Richard Frisbie 15 Jane St, Saugerties hopefarm@hopefarm.com

Submission for Village's Public Hearing on Local Law #3 2014 on December 1, 2014

Historic preservation is not the work of an elite few; it is the work of anyone interested in and concerned about quality of life in their community. That's why we, both pro and con, are here today.

I would like to begin with an apology to the Mayor. Most people get mad at me for saying true things about them. I thought I had done that, but learned I was wrong – and a lie was told – not intentionally – but I repeated something that was not true. I will not repeat it again. In effect - I told a lie about the Mayor. And for that I am embarrassed and ashamed. This is the most public way I could think of to try and make it right. Please accept my apology.

In my interview with the daily freeman I told the reporter that this conflict was created by basically good people trying to do the right thing, but not always agreeing on what the right thing was. I suggest that we all consider that as we commit our remarks to the public record this evening.

Now I'd like to present some facts.

#The mayor never referred to the "ridiculousness" of the Historic Review Board rulings to me or the Board as a whole, nor did he ever send back rulings for our reconsideration. On the contrary, he was most supportive, especially during the Clovelea proceedings, of our efforts at historic preservation.

#That's why it came as a surprise when the owner of Mirabella's told a fellow board member and me that he'd "gone around us and called the Mayor to get permission to have skylights on his porch." As an historical note: during the period we are supposed to be preserving, a skylight looked like a small greenhouse on the roof. You can still see one on the left when driving down Partition Street hill, on top of a building just south of Montgomery St. Mirabella's owner was frequently reminded to look at the historic buildings around him for the period elements he should incorporate into his design. Instead, because he wanted a modern sports bar in the historic district, he said he called the mayor. The result, with many unresolved and unenforced rulings still surrounding it, sits hideously there for all to see.

#In the "be careful what you wish for" dept, when the Historic Review Board asked for a solution to the dual map situation, meaning maps of the Local Designated District and the Nationally Designated District, it never occurred to us that the Village Board's solution would be to make one district smaller than the two. We expected all the currently covered buildings to be included, not the exclusion of some, as the new law proposes.

#A member of the Historic Review Board did not suggest combining the two boards. He merely pointed out that when appearing before the combined boards of Rhinebeck he had 5 pages of

application to fill out and was told if it was incorrectly done it would be returned. He was also told it was usual for professionals hired by property owners to appear before them, not the owner. That is far more complex than what we do now, so while you may have only one application fee, you'll also have to pay a professional.

#Make no mistake - the Historic review Board has no enforcement capabilities – please remember that when you hear that we were trying to close businesses – all we ever did was our job – part of which was to report infractions of the historic preservation law that the mayor and village board swore an oath to uphold. That bears repeating – the mayor and the trustees swore an oath to uphold the law. The Building Inspector has the enforcement responsibilities. That is part of the law, too. He told me last week that when he didn't enforce the law it was because he could not afford to lose his job. That is the position our volunteer board is in now. Personally, I think that when a person can get fired for doing his job, something stinks.

#Some people don't seem to understand what a CLG is.

The New York State Certified Local Government (CLG) Program was created as part of the 1980 federal initiative to encourage local governments to help communities protect, preserve, and celebrate their historic and cultural resources. There are currently 81 CLGs in New York State. We were one of the first.

Saugerties Village Historic Business District, created in 1982 as part of the Certified Local Government status granted Saugerties by NYS, has a five member board that oversees the historic guidelines adopted by the Village as Historic Preservation law. The Town has a similarly functioning Commission and is also a CLG.

#A bit of misinformation being reported lately is that no businesses have applied for a CLG grant. Actually, that statement is correct, but misleading. The CLG grants are for the municipalities, and they are only awarded to Certified Local Governments in good standing. - See more at: <http://nysparks.com/grants/certified-local-government/default.aspx#sthash.f1Be70uQ.dpuf>

#Should this law be passed and the Historic Review Board's duties be given to an expanded Planning Board, every member must have history backgrounds and a pronounced and evident desire to preserve our history, or the CLG status is removed immediately. That is directly contrary to what the Village attorney told the Planning Board on November 10th. The difference may be put to the fact that he only left a message on Julian Adam's voice mail, while I spoke to Julian Adams directly at his request. So who is Julian Adams? Julian W. Adams is the Director of the Bureau of Community Preservation Services - See more at: <http://nysparks.com/shpo/contact/#sthash.Bg2SZbcn.dpuf> He is the person in command that everyone speaks to for guidance on CLG and preservation issues.

#And yes, the Village has applied for and received at least one CLG grant. More than 2 years ago the Mayor signed, with the Town Supervisor, for a joint publications grant for Town and Village Guidelines. It is mostly boiler-plate stuff that everyone in historic preservation already knows, with our history and photos included to illustrate the guidelines. You see, for our first 25 years there was no application to the Historic Review Board, people were given an application with Building Permit scratched out asking for info that was not relevant to Historic Review. And, for the first 28 years there were no guidelines. Now, with the completion of the Publications grant, both have been accomplished.

#Now, let's talk real money. The NYS tax credit program is targeted toward census tracts where the State Median Family Income is equal to/less than \$69,202. Saugerties' estimated **median household income** in 2012 was \$51,127. In other words – we qualify.

The Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit is available statewide for National Register-listed properties.

State tax credit programs include the New York State Historic Homeownership Rehabilitation Tax Credit, New York State Historic Tax Credit Program for Income Producing Properties, and the Barn Tax Credit.

Municipalities and not-for-profit organizations are eligible to apply to the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation for CLG grants for the acquisition, improvement, restoration and preservation of parks, historic properties and resources. Since 2001, that office has awarded nearly 300 historic preservation and heritage area grants under this program, totaling over \$54 million.

#In addition, at the request of this Village Historic Review Board, the Village adopted the Ithaca Law, a property tax reduction law which eliminates, for 5 years, a tax increase on higher assessments due to restoration and rehabilitation of historic property. Then, for 5 years thereafter, the taxes can increase by only 20% a year until it is a full ten years before the historic property is taxed at 100% of assessed valuation.

#Historic Preservation involves actions that safeguard and renew a community's irreplaceable assets and is a powerful yet underutilized economic development and environmental stewardship strategy. Through activities like building rehabilitation, neighborhood reinvestment, and sensitive new construction, historic preservation reinvigorates local landmarks, increases property values, stabilizes business and residential districts, creates more jobs than new construction, returns vacant or underutilized buildings to productive use and improves the quality of community life. In addition, Heritage Tourism, which significantly adds to local coffers, is something I reported at the Planning Board Public hearing. Hopefully someone else will address that tonight.

We're talking real money and real benefits to property owners in the Historic Districts as well as the community as a whole. Never-the-less, with passage of this law the Village is throwing it all away – everything.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE VILLAGE BOARD

Re: Local Law 3
December 1, 2014

LET THE HISTORIC REVIEW BOARD DO ITS JOB

The proposed legislation you have in front of you calls for the dissolution of the Village Historic Review Board (HRB). I certainly do not want to believe that the Village Board is proposing this because the members of the HRB have displeased you. If I may be so bold, I want to tell you that if this is the case, it is not good government. If you do not like what a volunteer board has to say, you do not disband them and muzzle their speech. Rather, you work together to come up with a reasonable, hopefully mutually agreeable, solution.

If the HRB needs to improve its process, then let's work together to tweak the process of reviewing paint colors and sign designs as well as approving appropriate improvements to historic buildings. What is important is to keep the reservoir of knowledge of historic preservation of the existing HRB members. Can they do it better? I'm sure they can, as can everyone do their jobs better, but don't throw out the baby with the bathwater.

The volunteers on the Historic Review Board each have years of historic preservation experience that is being put to good use protecting the historic character of the Village of Saugerties. Turning these issues over to a Planning Board the members of which are not qualified under NY State law will not achieve the same results. You are in danger of throwing away this volunteer expertise. I know we are told that Rhinebeck does it this way, but we are not Rhinebeck which has a paid staff to back up its Planning Board. I find it interesting that previous to this issue whenever Rhinebeck or Woodstock is raised as a comparison, those in decision making positions always say that Saugerties is different. Now is the time to be consistent with that message: Saugerties is not Rhinebeck or Woodstock.

Further, the proposal would add only two people to the Planning Board with historic preservation expertise which would by definition mean that they would be outvoted on these issues when there is a controversy. Saugerties has its own ways including a deep reliance on volunteer expertise which to date has served us well.

If the Planning Board were to take on this additional burden, it would necessitate additional staff to assist, costing the taxpayers money. It would also cost each applicant money since they would have to hire professional experts to get them

through the process. Compare that with the existing process before the HRB where the professionals are on the HRB and offer their services for free.

And still further, I am informed by the NYS Office of Parks Recreation & Historic Preservation that each person on the board must be qualified with historic preservation expertise. We do not have that on the Village Planning Board.

The Planning Board has different responsibilities and should be left to do those well. We certainly do not want to send the message that historic preservation is of lesser importance in Saugerties, nor that we want to avoid enforcement of the regulations. Streamline, yes, but do not dissipate or ignore these important regulations that have made Saugerties the success it has become.

I understand that this proposed legislation is before you because you have heard complaints from a few business owners who did not like that they had to go to the HRB to make visible alterations to their historic property. While I understand that this may appear to be a bothersome responsibility, it is instead a necessary protection of the economic well being of the entire Village.

The HRB recognizes and helps to protect why people come to Saugerties to visit, to invest, and to live here. It is why Saugerties is on the upswing and has improved greatly over recent years. The historic character of the Village of Saugerties is the draw. I know this from my own personal experience, from talking to many visitors at the Saugerties Farmers Market, and from talking to real estate professionals. Why would you want to support the dissolution of the board that is responsible for making sure that this historic character is maintained? Preservation and business are prospering together. Let's keep it that way.

Please rethink this damaging legislation and vote it down.

Judith Spektor
311 Van Vlierden Road
Saugerties, NY 12477
judithspektor@aol.com
917-741-5524

Comments on the proposed amendment to dissolve the Historic Review Board and make the Village of Saugerties Planning Commission the Review Board for the Historic District. To be read at hearing on December 1 2014

My name is Stephen Shafer. I am on the Town Historic Preservation Commission now. My wife, Lizbeth, is a past member of it. We have lived in Saugerties since 1992.

Handing over Historic Review to a slightly-expanded Planning Board seems driven by reluctance to commit fully to the *practice* of Historic Preservation. Most people in Saugerties would say they like the *concept* of Preservation. Not so many, however, understand there are state laws to realize that concept. It is law that designations and decisions about certificates of appropriateness (COA) for changes on designated properties must be made by a group of individuals each of whom is highly-qualified in Historic Preservation. The Village is fortunate to have such an Historic Review Board, all volunteer. To dismantle it in what is basically a corporate takeover is saying "Preservation *done right* hurts the Village more than it helps." I disagree with that.

Merging the Historic Review Board and the Planning Board *would* mean fewer meetings on the Village schedule. This apparent time-saver would not, however, speed up approvals for work on designated properties unless at the same time it enfeebled Historic Preservation, a certain outcome of adding two members of the current HRB to the five of the current Planning Board. The two could be outvoted whenever on too high a horse about Historic Preservation.

The supposed time-saver might work like this: As of now, someone who wants an OK from the HRB can bring them preliminary drawings, before investing in a finished proposal with architect's drawings for the Planning Board. She has to go to two meetings. If at one meeting the Certificate of Appropriateness could be granted and presentation made to the Planning Board, that would save time. Sounds good, right?

Problem: The applicant would have to bring to that meeting costly finished drawings for the review function not involving Preservation, not sure whether the COA will be granted the same day. The only advance assurance of that would be knowing that Historic Review is a breeze, presided over by a board deep on Planning but shallow in Preservation. Otherwise, the

applicant would still have to go to at least two monthly meetings of the dual-function Board and no time would be saved. At the first he would seek a C of A; if that's granted, then ready the more expensive presentation for next month's meeting.

There's a much better option than discounting Historic Preservation in Saugerties. Using the newly-completed guidelines for Historic Preservation in Saugerties, <http://saugerties.ny.us/content/Laws/View/12> a building owner can self-prepare for a productive meeting with the HRB. *That board wants to work with applicants; its members know about tax abatements under Preservation law that may save money, and would much rather negotiate than slam the gavel. There are many building owners in the Historic Overlay Districts who have found the HRB very reasonable to work with.* [This part in italics I did not speak, trying to save time]

Guidelines for Historic Preservation in Saugerties, prepared by the Town Historic Preservation Commission and the Village Historic Review Board, can be found on paper at the Town Hall, the Village Hall, the Library and the High School Library. They are also viewable and downloadable on line <http://saugerties.ny.us/content/Laws/View/12>

Stephen Q. Shafer MD

Elizabeth J. Shafer JD

8 Mynderse St. Saugerties 12477-1704

845 246 4947

Susan L. Poretz
158 Buffalo Road
Saugerties, NY 12477

Phone: 845-246-1823

Email: poretzs@newpaltz.edu

December 1, 2014

Statement at Public Hearing

I stand before you today to encourage the ^{six} ~~four~~ Village Trustees to engage in a mutiny at your official meeting on December 15th.

Your mayor has publically proclaimed that he is glad that the Historic Review Board "think they know what's best for everyone...and that they have thwarted two major improvements." By Mayor Murphy's comments quoted in the two past issues of the Saugerties Times, it would seem more likely that it is the Mayor who thinks he knows what's best for everyone.

And he is jamming his vision of what he sees as best for everyone down everyone's throat. But he cannot do that without your help, and I ask you to not support his plan to merge the Historic Review Board with the Planning Commission. Today, you will hear (and have heard) knowledgeable people give witness as to the worth of keeping the Historic Review Board in place as is. And while the process may seem onerous to the Mayor, it is one that safeguards the community's heritage.

He has called the Historic Review Board a "nearsighted few" and yet, ^{it seems that} ~~once again~~, it is the pot calling the kettle black. Many cities across the US rue tearing down historic structures—take Kingston's post office as an example. And while obviously the house that provoked this battle is not in the same realm as the P.O. it is a coherent historical part of the village's architectural legacy.

Further, while the Mayor gives as his reason for the destruction of the safeguards to the Village's historical legacy as economic, he is nearsighted about the actual benefits of the current Historic Review Board. Three of the five charges in the ordinance which created the Board are to: Stabilize and improve property values in designated historic districts; Protect and enhance the Village's attractiveness to visitors and the support and stimulus to the economy thereby provided; and Strengthen the economy of the Village by preserving its historic assets and thereby ensure the harmonious, orderly, and efficient growth and development of the Village.

The nearsightedness of the Mayor to the benefits of having CLG status and an independent Historical Review Board composed of professionals who will not be cowed by the demands of the mayor is at stake here. I encourage and urge you, the Village Trustees, to vote to preserve the Village Historic Review Board as it now exists.

Sincerely,

Susan Poretz



Mary Frank

From: halfmoon613@gmail.com on behalf of Nancy Campbell <nancyo@hvc.rr.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2014 2:32 PM
To: Mary Frank; Bill Murphy; tparisian@hvc.rr.com; Vince Buono; bmar@hvc.rr.com; Don Hackett; jeannine mayer; Patrick Landewe
Subject: Historic Review Board

Hello Mayor Murphy and Village Board,

I've read in the paper that the Village is considering combining the Historic Review Board (HRB) with the Planning Board.

I suggest that you think carefully about such a change to our zoning law, as it can have major unintended consequences. Is this a first step in the eventual dissolution of the HRB.? I was a member of the HRB for a few years, serving with Dave Minch, Elda Zulick and others, and I feel that it provides an important service towards the long term health of the Village. To maintain the certification by the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation as a Certified Local Government, the Village must maintain an historic preservation review commission. The Village was ahead of its time in 1985 when the Historic Business District was established. Let's not step backward nearly 30 years later!

The Village of Saugerties should be rightfully proud of the fact that our historic business district was one of the first to be so designated in New York State, way back in 1985. The establishment of this "district" was meant as a celebration of architecture ranging in period styles from the late 19th to mid 20th century, all of which have combined to make our village into the bustling, desirable and unique place that it is today. Preserving that architecture, and the little details that make the Saugerties village what it is, is what the HRB is about. The fact that our buildings and signs are held to a higher standard with careful attention to architectural details should be something that we all support. I believe it has helped sustain and build the reputation of the Village as one of the "coolest small towns in America."

The process of submitting plans for review need not be complicated, *as long as the zoning law of which it is a part is observed regularly, applied consistently and enforced equally*. This is our law! It should be a simple, up-front, clearly outlined step for any building owner considering exterior renovations or additions *before* any construction begins. The Village HRB, planning board, building dept, Village Board and building owners should consider themselves partners, not adversaries, in the preservation and beautification of our village..

Let's live up to our own words, and remain "friendly, *historic*, Saugerties." I suggest that before changing our zoning law, you look carefully at what the HRB has accomplished these past 29 years, and hold a workshop with it, the planning board and building inspector to discuss perceptions, problems and solutions. I expect that you'll find ideas on how a smooth and painless review process can be implemented without throwing out an important facet of village government.

Nancy Campbell
159 Market Street

Mary Frank

From: Bill Murphy
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 8:59 AM
To: Elizabeth Hernandez
Cc: Mary Frank
Subject: RE: Historic preservation

Hi Elizabeth,

Thanks so much for your letter of support, it is greatly appreciated. If there is any way you could attend the Public Hearing at 5PM tonight, that would be Great as well.

-----Original Message-----

From: Elizabeth Hernandez [mailto:elizabethhernandez865@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 7:49 AM
To: Bill Murphy
Subject: Historic preservation

I am writing to support wholeheartedly your position on reorganizing the historical preservation committee. We need to find a way to keep SAugerties unique, but we also need to help business succeed here. And more parking will go a long way to bring us toward that goal.

Thank you for doing this difficult work.

Liz Hernandez

Sent from my iPad

I thank the Board for their kind attention to the statements I make here.

FIRST - I'm going to make a comment on the *impropriety* of this hearing.

- In all the Village Board minutes of year 2014 there is not one resolution recorded from the board on dissolving the HRB.
- There is a mention of the early stages of discussion on the Sawyer Bank proposal and the creation of a new zone for business/residential, but nothing that shows there was discussion and a vote to utilize the attorney's services for this drastic change to a whole section of the zoning code.
- I consider the attorney's work on this an improper use of the taxpayer's monies.

My remaining comments regard the lack of logic in these actions which could probably have been resolved without all this had there been a resolution, discussion and the vote of a strong board. I sat on the committee that drafted the town's ordinance and so I know that the way this was done is quite irregular.

In my opinion, which is also shared by the Certified Local Government program, there is no more expeditious way to conform to section 210-20 of the code than to have applications reviewed by a *certifiably-qualified* board.

QUOTE: ".....it should not take twenty minutes to approve a sign".
That twenty minutes is the time of a professional architect, two of the most respected building craftsmen in the area, one of our most knowledgeable history writer-researchers and a representative of a family that has been doing business on Main Street since the 1940's!!!

The HRB has always been constituted of this caliber of citizen volunteers who have always, in fact, been busy businessmen and women of this community. Those twenty minutes are given *free* to their business *peers* because it is worth it to them to preserve the historic identity of this community for the sake of *all* our business identities.

It would appear that the bulk of the criticism about the HRB not being *business-friendly* is coming from those that have never had any business experience.

- You'd be hard pressed to find among yourselves, the ZBA, or the Planning Board a fraction of the business experience of the present HRB.
- This is not a criticism of the background you need for what you do quite well. It is a statement of why the HRB is what it is.
- Believing those critics who do not know what they are talking about is not in the best interest of our community or our businesses.

Touting that this change is *business-friendly* couldn't be farther from the truth.

- It places the Zoning Enforcement Officer as the reviewer of sign applications.

- The ZEO has no background in graphic design or the historic periods of design and architecture or anything near the developed sensitivities a five member HRB has always brought to the business district.

Since the National Register Historic District designation first became an invitation to businesses to set up here in the historic district-the HRB review process is what has caused new businesses to look at themselves as part of a unified street *character*. This conformity to a visitor-friendly *identity* is essential to creating a thriving business. The HRB review is the first introduction of a new business to our sense of community. It is not something that is done with a..... tape measure.

The assumption that the Planning Board can have the preservation expertise the HRB has always brought to the table does not meet the standards the community and the state expect.

The HRB is a professional group and its members have reputations in this community. This expectation that they are not important has been countered strenuously because that is what reputable experts do when facing a danger to what they know about. The official permitting of unapproved, inappropriate construction and this issue of lax enforcement will not go away by changing the law. There will always be active and critical professionals in this community to question bad behavior.

Everyone here knows that the decisions of the HRB on critical elements of the Secretary's Standards have not been enforced. If the thinking is that the Planning Board will just go along, the **conflict** this will bring their way will soon change that.

We who were doing business here thirty and forty years ago remember when the main business sign in this business district was "**For Rent**". Removing the framework which helped to turn that around is an extremely bad idea and voting for this change will, for certain, give you a legacy that falls squarely on the wrong side of history.

I urge the Board of Trustees to listen to reason and view this whole episode as a teachable moment.

There is a reason this has become an issue and it doesn't have anything to do with the HRB's dedication to the businesses of the village.

Look to the appalling attitude that you have demonstrated toward the volunteers that serve on your boards and learn to show some appreciation.

Respectfully submitted for the December 1, 2014 public hearing on changes to the Section 210-20, B(2) of the municipal laws of the Village of Saugerties titled Local law 3 of 2014.

Michael Sullivan Smith.