

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Regular Meeting – October 2, 2006 at 7:30 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Steve Melnyk
Members:	Marcia Watt Scott Latshaw Cristina Lanahan Ken Willard
Alternate:	Paul Zachman
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Melnyk called the meeting to order at 7:30.

1. Pittsford Flour Mill, Schoen Place

Discussion: Todd Longwell submitted a letter stating that the approved, flush-paneled oak doors for the Flour Mill were ordered, but that the manufacturer delivered doors with raised panels by mistake. He is requesting approval to amend the original application to reflect the change from flush-paneled doors to raised paneled doors. The Board stated that although flush-paneled doors are preferred for this style building, the raised-paneled doors were appropriate, also.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the amendment to the original approval to allow the raised-panel doors on the Flour Mill.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

2. Mike Brown, Ben & Jerry's, 5 South Main Street ~ Sign

Present: Mike Brown

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 9/15/06, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/19/06.

Discussion: The applicant presented a proposal for a wood sign, with white letters and the company's logo on a blue background, for the business located at 5 South Main Street. He submitted documentation indicating the dimensions and proposed location for the sign.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Willard, to approve the application for the sign, as submitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

3. Matthew Lennarz, 27 Lincoln Avenue ~ Porch railings
Present: Paul Zachman, Boardwalk Design, Inc.

Application: Submitted, date-stamped and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/19/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing replacing the wrought-iron railing and pipe rail on the front porch of the house with a wood railing. Mr. Zachman submitted the specifications and photographs of the proposed railing, and stated that since the stairs are narrower than the width of the porch, the endposts will be placed on top of the bottom step and the railing will turn into the existing porch columns. He also stated that Village Code requires a railing on only one side, but that he is requesting amending the application to include the option of installing railings on both sides.

Findings of Fact:

- The wrought-iron railing and pipe rail located on the Lincoln Avenue side porch are not original.
- The proposed replacement railing is wood and will match the railings on the side porch.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application for removal of the non-original, wrought-iron railing on the front porch and for the installation of new, all-wood railings in the style to match the railings on the Washington Street side of the house, in the dimensions submitted, with endposts placed on top of the bottom step and railings to turn into the existing porch columns.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

4. Robert Tierney, 17 Green Hill Lane ~ Siding
Present: Robert Tierney

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 9/27/06, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/25/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to install vinyl siding on his house, as described in his application. He had hired a contractor who was about to start work, without approval, but was issued a Stop Work Order by the Building Inspector. The applicant stated that the contractor had incorrectly advised him that a building permit was not required. The applicant stated that the existing wood siding (cedar shakes) on the house has deteriorated and will not hold paint in its current condition. He also stated that the cost of replacing the cedar in-kind is much higher than vinyl replacement siding. The applicant noted that other homes on his street have aluminum and vinyl siding.

The Building Inspector submitted a letter, dated September 29, 2006, listing six properties on Green Hill Lane, two properties on Courtenay Circle, and one property on Heatherhurst Drive that currently have either vinyl or aluminum siding.

Chairperson Melnyk explained to the applicant that the entire Village is a Preservation District, and the APRB is an architectural and preservation review board. Homes located within the Village need not be “historic” in order to be subject to architectural review.

Chairperson Melnyk then discussed the nine properties identified by the Building Inspector's letter as having aluminum or vinyl siding and the following was noted:

- The most recent applications dated from 1998 and 1996, and these involved new construction of an addition and the replacement of aluminum siding with vinyl siding, respectively. Neither application involved the removal of original wood siding.
- There are no records for the approval of vinyl or aluminum siding for three of the properties. It is likely that these either were re-sided prior to the adoption of the preservation code or were re-sided without approval.
- The applications for the other four properties were reviewed over 14 years ago, between 1988 and 1992, and it appears that the standards for review used at that time were different than the standards used by the Board today.

Chairperson Melnyk noted that the Board looked at this issue very closely in 2001 in connection with an application to apply vinyl siding to a home built in 1956 and located on Jefferson Circle. Chairperson Melnyk noted that the applicant's house was built around 1960 and that it is located in a tract that includes homes built in the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's. The house is now of the same age (46 years old) as the home in the prior case, and, based on the current Village Code, the Board previously determined that vinyl is not an appropriate material for a home of that era in the Historic Preservation District.

Chairperson Melnyk cited two provisions of the Code as being applicable. First, the portion of the Code dealing with repairs which provides: "Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible, and in the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities." (Section 210-61C.) He also quoted that portion of the Code dealing with alterations: "...contemporary design for alterations and additions to existing properties may be permitted when such alterations and additions do not destroy significant historical, architectural or cultural material and such design is compatible with the size, scale, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment." (Section 210-61A.(1)) Board members then questioned the applicant further regarding the existing condition of the cedar shakes and the possibilities for re-painting and partial replacement of deteriorated shingles. The applicant stated that he was told by a contractor that the entire house needed to be sanded before being painted and that one side and the rear needed to have the shingles replaced.

Board member Watt inquired as to the reveal "to the weather" of the existing shingles and the proposed replacement siding. It was stated that the existing shingles are 13" to the weather while the proposed new clapboard-style siding is 4-5" to the weather. Also, it was stated that the window sills and other trim would be wrapped with aluminum. Member Watt expressed concern that this application would really change the appearance of the house and noted that, in her opinion, cedar shingle is a key feature of the architectural style that is predominant in that neighborhood and that this style is worthy of preservation.

Board members indicated that they are sympathetic to the applicant's economic concerns, but are required to follow the Village Code. Board members pointed out that in the applicant's proposal, the material, as well as the design and style, would be changed, and that there is no acceptable substitute material known to them that mimics cedar shingle.

The applicant indicated that if the proposal for vinyl siding is denied, he would paint. The Board encouraged him to speak to a variety of contractors and to consider replacing deteriorated shingles in-kind either by patching as needed or by re-siding one or two entire sides if needed.

Findings of Fact:

- The house was built circa 1960.
- The house has cedar shakes that have a 13” reveal “to the weather.”
- The proposed vinyl siding would have a 4-5” reveal “to the weather” and it attempts to replicate clapboard-style siding rather than cedar shingles.
- Vinyl is not an appropriate substitute material to replicate wood siding of this era.
- The wrapping of the window sills and other trim with aluminum would alter architectural features of the home.
- Cedar shingles are available and can be used to replace deteriorated shingles.
- A predominant architectural feature of the homes in the neighborhood is the use of cedar shingles.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to *deny* the application to install vinyl siding at the residence located at 17 Green Hill Lane.

Vote: Willard - yes; Watt - yes; Melnyk - yes; Latshaw - yes; Lanahan - yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

5. Joseph Mills, 7 E. Jefferson Road ~ Window/Door replacement
Present: Joseph Mills

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 9/27/06, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/25/06.

Discussion: The applicant is requesting approval to switch the front door with the right front window, because there is currently no entryway into the front room of the house. He stated that the widths of the window and the door are the same, and that he will reuse the existing door and window.

Because this proposal involves relocating the front entry door of the home, which is a significant architectural feature, the Board requested comments from the Board’s preservation consultant, Ted Bartlett.

Mr. Bartlett’s opinion was submitted and read:

“This is a simple American Foursquare house, a house style popular in the early twentieth century. While the foursquares were usually symmetrical in overall form, the front doorways were often not centered or within the symmetrical scheme of the design. The important parts of the house that are symmetrical, the roof with dormer, second-story windows, and general porch divisions (two bays divided by a center post) are significant visual features that would be preferable not to change, and, in like manner, the left window on the first story lines up with the second story above. The components making up the right-hand bay of the porch (the stairs, the doorway, and window) are not in alignment with the overall symmetry; however, the doorway and window in their own way are symmetrical within the symmetry of the right porch bay ... It would seem that a switch of locations of the doorway and window would be in

keeping with the original design symmetry of the overall building and the symmetry of the individual right porch bay. That is, provided that (1) the doorway is relocated to the window opening exactly and visa versa, retaining the symmetrical relationship in the porch bay, (2) the existing doorway and window are reused, (3) existing trim details are reused, (4) and where the doorway opening is infilled, the siding and trim match exactly. In other words a simple exchange of doorway and window would appear to be appropriate. With the doorway relocated, the porch stairs and railing opening will no longer align with the doorway. I am inclined to say that the stairs could be in either position and be considered appropriate. In their present location, they do tend to help focus on the center of the building. My visual preference would be to leave them in the center. However, the applicant may find that relocating them to the side offers more open porch space available. Again, I think either solution will work. Like the doorway and window, though, if the stairs are moved, they should be reused and retain all the existing details in the new location, including railing and intermediate turned post.”

Member Watt stated that according to Village Code, alterations to existing buildings should either be consistent with the spirit of the architectural style or shall alter the structure to an appearance consistent with the architectural styles of historic value existing in the district. She noted that Mr. Bartlett’s opinion supports the conclusion that this proposed change will meet this standard.

Findings of Fact:

- The house is a simple American Foursquare house, built circa 1925.
- The placement change will not alter the essential style, and is consistent with the architectural style, of the house.
- The historic materials (including the door, window, and trim) are being preserved and reused.
- The placement change will not cause the destruction of any historical materials.
- The symmetry of the openings will be maintained.
- The proposed infill for the doorway opening will match the existing siding and trim.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Watt, to approve the application, as submitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

6. Mark Schenkel, 70 South Street ~ Porch addition

Present: Mark Schenkel, owner

Paul Zachman, Contractor

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 9/19/06.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing a front porch addition for the house located at 70 South Street. The applicant submitted dimensioned drawings of the proposal, and stated that this is a modification of a previously-approved design. He stated that the proposal is for a full porch extending the length of the front of the house, with a small gable over the front entrance that replicates the gable on the front of the house. The material for the addition is painted cedar. The applicant also is proposing a railing measuring 30 inches in height, and two, six-inch, round Tuscan fiberglass columns. The roof and gutters will match existing.

Findings of Fact:

- The Board has approved fiberglass as an alternate material for porch columns in new construction.
- The new addition to the structure will be done in such a manner that if removed, the essential form and integrity of the structure would be unimpaired.

Motion: Chairperson Melnyk made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw, to approve the application, as submitted.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.***
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

Member Watt left the meeting at this time.

7. Chris Frank, 28 Church Street ~ Porch alterations

Present: Chris & Heather Frank

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 6/26/06.

Discussion: The applicants are seeking approval for the removal of a side porch in the rear of the house. The applicants stated that the porch was removed because it was in a severely damaged condition. Since the removal of the porch, their neighbor has installed a fence on the property line within close proximity to the house. A restoration of the porch would restrict passage between the fence and the porch, as it would result in only a six-inch clearance between the porch and the fence. The applicants are requesting approval to not replace the porch. At a prior meeting, Board Members had suggested that the applicants contact Bero Architects, through Historic Pittsford, to learn the history of the house and the removed porch to aid in the determination of whether the porch is an historically significant architectural feature.

The applicants submitted the Bero Report. The summary of the report stated that the porch was a significant feature of the house and advised that removal should not be permitted. However, the report also included a possible alternate design for a new porch to replace the original in a way that will permit access to the backyard on the driveway side. Member Zachman and other Board members stated their opinion that the design suggested by Bero appeared unusual in that the porch would be too high off the ground. Other possible design alternatives to replicate certain features of the porch were discussed.

The Building Inspector noted that any design alternative other than a full restoration of the original porch would require the applicants to receive a zoning variance, since any such alternatives would not comply with current Village set-back requirements and would not be “grandfathered”. Because of significant safety concerns, the Building Inspector could not provide any assurances that such a variance would be granted. The Board noted that this would be an impediment to implementing the alternative Bero design recommendations.

The Board acknowledged that the applicants have done a great deal of work to update the house and preserve the original features of the house. Board members also noted the following:

- The porch door, which is not visible from the public way, was replaced with a window, which has changed the functionality of the porch.
- The original porch's proximity to the property line creates a significant functional detriment and a safety concern.
- The porch was in a deteriorated condition and the historic materials have been destroyed.

Member Zachman stated that the proximity of the porch to the property line and the neighbor's fence is a unique and significant hardship, which creates a serious impediment to rebuilding. The Building Inspector stated that the rebuilding of the porch would create a significant safety concern as it would impair fire department access. Member Watt noted Section 210-62A(2) of the Code which states: "Nothing in this article shall be construed to prevent the construction, reconstruction, alteration or demolition of any exterior architectural feature which the Building Inspector, with the advice and consent of the APRB, shall determine is required by public safety because of dangerous or unsafe conditions."

Member Lanahan stated that the porch is a significant feature of the house, but not the only defining feature, and that without the rear porch the house remains a clearly identifiable Queen Anne style house, because of the remaining architectural elements.

Findings of Fact:

- The porch was in a deteriorated condition.
- The historic materials were destroyed when the porch was removed and, therefore, are not available for preservation or use in restoration of the porch.
- The porch door has been replaced with a window, which has changed the functionality of the porch.
- The door that was altered was not visible from the public way, and therefore was not subject to APRB review.
- The APRB did not approve the removal of the porch.
- The porch in its original location created a safety concern in that it substantially limited access to the rear of the property.
- A fence has been installed along the adjacent property line, further impacting the significance of the setback issue.
- New construction, other than an exact replication of the original porch, would require a zoning variance from the three-foot minimum setback requirement and would create a significant safety concern.

Motion: Member Watt made a motion, seconded by Member Latshaw that, based on the foregoing finding of facts, the alteration of the home as it currently exists is approved, subject to completion of SEQR review by the Board and specifically noting that the historic materials have already been destroyed and that the rebuilding of the porch, either as it formerly existed or in the style proposed by the architectural consultant, would present a significant safety concern in that the setback from the neighbor's property would be only six inches.

Vote: Willard - yes; Watt - yes; Melnyk - yes; Latshaw - yes; Lanahan - yes. **Motion carried.**
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

8. First Presbyterian Church, 21 Church Street ~ Painting/Siding

**Present: John Leyland, Trustee
Jeffrey Wright, Trustee**

Application: Submitted and date-stamped on 9/12/06, and building inspector reviewed on 9/19/06.

Member Watt noted that she is a member of First Presbyterian Church and, therefore, has a conflict and will abstain from voting on this application.

Discussion: The applicants had presented information to the Board at the March APRB meeting, stating that the house at 19 Church Street, often referred to as the ARC house and owned by the First Presbyterian Church, has a paint problem. Inquiries about the age of the house indicated that it was built in the early 1800's. Previous attempts to correct the paint problem have failed, and the appearance of the building has continued to deteriorate. A study of the paint problem was done by Bero Architects, and a report, dated April 9, 1999, was provided by them with recommendations. The church has followed many of the recommendations suggested in the Bero report, but the paint has continued to peel off, and painting has become an increasing expense. The report suggested some possible reasons for the paint problems, such as moisture problems, inadequate ventilation, and paint build-up. The Board had suggested that the applicants investigate further to discover the reason that the paint is not adhering to the clapboard. A group of church members who have studied the problem are proposing replacing the wood siding with hardiplank. The applicants stated that the use of hardiplank siding would preserve the visual appearance of the house and solve the peeling paint problem. Member Lanahan pointed out that hardiplank is not without problems, and that the Church should address the moisture problem prior to replacing the wood siding with hardiplank.

Chairperson Melnyk stated that there are two separate issues that need to be addressed: (1) Determination of whether the existing clapboard is deteriorated and, therefore, that replacement is necessary; and; (2) Whether the substitute material (hardiplank) can be used as an alternative to wood clapboard siding. He further stated that the experts have stated that there are many sources of moisture, and he questioned the applicants as to what steps they have taken in an attempt to address the moisture access points.

Member Zachman pointed out that the ARC House has catastrophic paint failure, a system failure, because of the lack of a vapor barrier, and the best practices recommendation is to remove the paint and re-paint, but that the likelihood of failure would be very high. He further stated his opinion that removing the siding and replacing it with back-primed material would likely increase the probability of success, and would be the best, long-term solution. The Board reviewed and discussed the findings set forth in various documents provided by the applicant including: a Report of Bero Associates Architects dated April 9, 1999; a letter from The Sherwin Williams Company dated April 3, 2006; a Report of Site Visit prepared by Steve Jordan dated May 26, 2006; a letter from Accent General Painting Contractors dated March 22, 2006; a letter from Adam's Creative Concepts (not dated); and a letter from Steve Jordan dated September 26, 2006.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, that the existing siding is deteriorated, based on the moisture problems that currently exist at the house; the applicants have attempted to mitigate the problem, but still have paint failure on the existing clapboard.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – abstain; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

Findings of Fact:

- The house was built circa 1816.
- The house has the original wood clapboard siding.
- The siding has catastrophic paint failure.
- Remediation was attempted with spot sanding, priming, and repainting.
- Remediation was attempted with soffit ventilation.
- The applicants have determined that there is blown-in insulation in the walls, which can not be remediated, and which further exacerbates the moisture and paint problems.
- The existing siding is no longer serviceable.
- The most effective way to address the paint peeling is to back-prime the siding, which requires removal of the siding.

Chairperson Melnyk cited the portion of the Code dealing with repairs: “Deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, wherever possible, and in the event that replacement is necessary, the new material should match the material being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities.” He also referenced Preservation Brief # 9: “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.”

Chairperson Melnyk cited a Preservation Brief put out by the Secretary of the Interior which lists the circumstances that have been determined to warrant consideration of substitute materials in historic buildings: (1) Unavailable historic materials; (2) Unavailable skilled craftsman; (3) Inherent flaws in the original material. Member Melnyk stated his view that these criteria have not been met in this case as wood siding is still readily available and, if back-primed, would be serviceable for the purpose. Member Latshaw stated that since the applicants have identified the moisture issue and their attempts to remedy the problem, and the Board has determined that the current wood siding is deteriorated, in this particular situation, based on the ability of the applicants to demonstrate their attempts to rectify the problem, he would not be opposed to the change to hardiplank. Member Lanahan stated that she does not object to hardiplank, per se, but she is concerned with setting the precedent of allowing replacement of wood siding with hardiplank whenever a resident claims to have a moisture problem. Member Watt stated her opinion that an applicant should be required to present a significant demonstration of remediation, prior to being granted approval for replacement siding. Member Zachman pointed out that the cost of removing the clapboard would probably be prohibitive for most residents, so he does not anticipate a large number of applications requesting this.

The Board reviewed a dimensioned drawing showing a comparison of hardiplank and traditional wood clapboard siding. While there is a slight difference in the profile, some members noted that hardiplank with a smooth finish, once painted, gives the visual appearance of wood.

Findings of Fact:

- All wood windows, trim and sills will remain.
- All wood corner boards will remain
- The hardiplank will have a smooth (non-textured) finish and will be brush-painted in place after it is installed.
- Although the profile of the hardiplank siding is slightly thinner than that of wood siding, once painted, hardiplank has the visual appearance of wood.
- The hardiplank siding will have the same “to the weather” reveal as the existing wood siding.
- The hardiplank siding will be installed in the same manner as wood clapboard siding.

- The APRB has previously approved the use of hardiplank for new construction and for replacement of non-original siding.
- Based on the manufacturers' representations and the input received from experts, the hardiplank is more likely than wood to successfully retain paint over a longer period of time in the circumstances presented by this application.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the change from clapboard siding to hardiplank, based upon the previous findings of the Board that the existing material is deteriorated and that all efforts have been made to mitigate existing moisture issues within the house, based on its utilization as a multi-person dwelling.

Vote: Willard – yes; Watt – abstain; Melnyk – no; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

9. Paul Schenkel, 18 Rand Place ~ Siding

Present: Paul Schenkel

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 8/24/06.

Discussion: The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing original, 6-inch reveal, cedar clapboard siding on his house with hardiplank siding. The applicant stated that the wood siding does not hold paint, and it has been necessary for him to repaint the house every 2-3 years. He stated that he has investigated other options, and he has concluded that replacement of all original cedar clapboard with new hardiplank clapboard is the best solution for his problem. He listed the various steps that he has taken to mitigate the problem, such as adding bathroom exhaust fans, soffit and ridge vents, and high-efficiency, forced-air furnaces. He further stated that he is proposing replicating the existing house, with the same reveal, window trim, fascia, etc., and that he will paint after the material is installed.

Member Zachman stated that part of the problem is that over the years, there is an accumulation of paint build-up, and the chemical composition of today's paint does not have the rejuvenative properties of earlier paints, provides less seal, and therefore, allows moisture to penetrate, and the resulting expansion and contraction of the wood causes the paint to peel, typically much quicker than in the past. He further stated that cement fiber, or cementitious, clapboard, while still somewhat porous, expands and contracts to a very negligible degree, and therefore, will hold paint better than wood.

Chairperson Melnyk cited Preservation Brief # 39, listing factors contributing to moisture problems: (1) Type of building; (2) Materials; (3) Construction systems; (4) Type of soil.

Findings of Fact:

- The date of original construction is circa 1920.
- The existing wood clapboard is original.
- The applicant tried to mitigate the paint problem through ventilation modifications and continues to have a 2-3 year cycle of replacing paint.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, that based upon the applicant's repeated attempts to address the moisture issue, for example, by soffit vents and ridge

vents, bathroom fans, and gutter extensions being added to the house, the Board finds that the existing clapboard is in a deteriorated state.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the application for the replacement of the original cedar clapboard and the material change from cedar to hardiplank, the trim detail to match the existing exactly, the finish to be smooth, hand-painted, and caulked after installation.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – no; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.

Member Items:

Minutes:

Motion: Member Latshaw made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the August 7, 2006 minutes, as amended.

Vote: Willard – yes; Melnyk – yes; Latshaw – yes; Lanahan – yes. ***Motion carried.*** **This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on October 2, 2006.**

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chairperson Melnyk adjourned the meeting at 11:30.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary