

**Village of Williamsville
Historic Preservation Commission
Meeting Minutes
March 22, 2016
6:30 p.m.**

Present: Wes Stone, Chairman
Mary Lowther, Member
Kate Waterman-Kulpa, Member
Susan Palmer, Member
Chuck Akers, Member
Dr. Stephen Dyson, Member

Also present: Deborah A. Habes, Deputy Clerk
Basil J. Piazza, Trustee Liaison
Evan Bussiere, Acting Village Attorney

Excused: Anthony Bannon, Member

Mr. Stone opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

ON MOTION by Dr. Dyson, seconded by Mr. Akers, it was moved to approve the minutes of the January 26, 2016 minutes, as submitted.

Unanimously carried.

HPC Model Local Law Review

The members discussed the comments received from James Finelli of SHPO, dated 2/25/16, re the proposed HPC Model Law. Evan indicated that as per Finelli's report, SHPO rejected the Commission's proposed complete removal of economic hardship from the review process. What is the process going to be going forward now? Evan suggested starting an email thread amongst the members and he will re-insert all the language back in for us, then we can go back and begin to cut back a bit after that. We already do certified mail notifications of HPC public hearings.

Comments: What is our process of a C of A for a demolition now? Will we still require a Mayor's Permit for any demolition?

What is the appeals process? Could be a sub-committee composed of the chairs of the ZBA, Planning Board and HPC or each board picks a representative to do this. If denied after this, then applicant could opt to file a lawsuit. Kate wasn't sure about allowing

another group to oversee HPC denials. Mr. Akers suggested that a sub-committee would take all the HPC power away.

Evan suggested it is not against the law to not have further remedy. If HPC follows our standards and is not capricious, we can go on. The stronger our law is, the stronger HPC is.

Evan suggested waiting until all HPC members are in attendance to chime in on this issue. By law, we do not have to have an appeals procedure at all.

There was discussion re the clean copy of the law and several comments were made re verbiage in various parts. Evan made the notations on his copy.

Demolition part is staying in.

Increase fines for any violations from section 23.7? – punitive options – what do we want the amount to be? Evan suggested we can propose any amounts we want and see if SHPO will accept.

Kate believes fines should somehow be based on value of property.

Grant Update

Kate stated that the Village is hiring a grant consultant to look at 45 residential properties on S. Cayuga Rd. that were highlighted as potentially historically significant in the 1997 Reconnaissance Level Survey of Historic Resources. We are waiting to hear back from CLG Office on it. If we get the grant, it will be similar to what we did for Main Street properties. Local land-marking nominations by HPC would follow. Bulk of work will be done in 2017. Then we would go to RFP. She hopes owners of properties will be able to provide some background info on their properties to assist the project.

Susan would like to see the public become educated on the importance of historic structures.

Section House

We shared the recent site plan for new residential development in the S. Long / California Street area. The area is properly zoned for this type of residential development. He stated that the Section House is quite chopped up inside; doesn't think it would do well if moved from its present site; could end up a pile of bricks and stucco. The building's materials consist of asbestos laced stucco on the outside; would take major money and work; Doesn't believe it would be usable to the railway society. If the Station House can stay in place, we might be able to work with it.

Comments included: If Village gives up DPW yard, what would we get in return?

Kate wondered what the neighborhood wants. Traffic should be routed to S. Union. Kate wondered if the roof was saved and building was moved, could it be used as a pavilion for public use? She would like to see the house up close. As soon as sale of the property is finalized, HPC is supposed to be able to enter it. Concluded that HPC will wait to get inside the building before making any decisions.

ON MOTION by Ms. Waterman-Kulpa, seconded by Dr. Dyson, it was moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 pm.

Unanimously carried.

NEXT HPC MEETING
Tuesday, April 26, 2016 at 7pm

Deborah A. Habes,
Deputy Clerk