Speaker 1: That wraps up new business. Old business that 1B was also slipped in unbeknownst to me. I apologize for that. But the good news is, that's gonna slip out just as quick as it slipped in. That shouldn't be on there. So we're done with that. Good job, that was quick. Nice job.

Speaker 2: Check, check.

Speaker 1: And um-

Speaker 2: That's the longest [crosstalk 00:00:24]

Speaker 3: Wait, don't we have a rule, we have to argue about something for at least a good amount of time. [crosstalk 00:00:31].

Sue: No, nothing like a [crosstalk 00:00:32].

Speaker 1: I'll throw John Tuly under bus for that. It's his name is on there, so it's his fault.

Speaker 4: It's actually [inaudible 00:00:41] fault.

Speaker 1: That's our system, yeah.

Speaker 4: [inaudible 00:00:42] I believe, already had [crosstalk 00:00:42] wasn't closed.

Speaker 1: Or the old system where we could make our own rules and [crosstalk 00:00:48]. I don't know.

Speaker 4: So remember our [crosstalk 00:00:51].

Speaker 1: Well, why wasn't it on earlier? Did it just come on at the last minute??

Speaker 4: Well, if you recall, you repealed the local law to make it an ordinance at [crosstalk 00:01:00] I believe, and then at that time John also wanted you to amend the statutes [crosstalk 00:01:10].

Speaker 1: No, I know. I'm just saying, why would the system throw it on today?

Speaker 4: Well, don't ask me about [inaudible 00:01:14].

Speaker 1: Well, that's [crosstalk 00:01:14].

Speaker 4: All I know is it doesn't.

Speaker 1: That's the part I don't get.

Speaker 4: Do you want to explain it?

Andrea: No, I have no explanation for it.

Speaker 5: Yeah, that's a whole new [crosstalk 00:01:26].

Andrea: People think [crosstalk 00:01:27].

Speaker 1: Okay, and then the other piece of old business is the merging of the HLPCHAC, which those of us who were fortunate enough to be here Monday, I thought that was a very informative presentation, I guess, for lack of a better word that we had people from different areas, different areas of expertise that Kingston citizens in, the mayor jointly helped, so we could be open about what's going on, what people's concerns are. There was a lot of information. That is also online now, that meeting, so you can see it. If you haven't, it's probably worth watching.

Speaker 1: It's a lot of interesting information that was presented. There were two representatives from the state that were sharing their expertise on [crosstalk 00:02:24]. Municipalities of similar sizes what they're doing with their historic preservation. Most of them had just one committee, but there was quite a bit of information. I felt it was confusing before that, and now, with all the additional information, I feel like I took a step backwards as far as being any closer to making sense of this. But I think that's because two days is not enough time to really process a lot of the information that was given out. And I'm sure there's more to come.

Speaker 1: But, on a positive note, I think that there looks to be a good working relationship, and I think everyone wants the same thing. We want what's best for Kingston and what's best for the history of Kingston, preserving the history. And I also believe that it's not about any one thing or anything that's happening today. Like, thinking with this and a lot of the stuff that we do, I feel that it's something that 20 years down the road, when people look back and they can say, "They did a good thing," or, "That makes sense what they did." And that's how we ... Especially in a historic topic, that's something I think that's very important for us to be mindful of. What makes the most sense, not just for today but for the consistency of where we're going with all this stuff? And that ... It's easier said than done, but that's my editorial.

Speaker 1: Someone who was there, does anyone want to add anything as far as what direction you think would be a good one to take, and-

Andrea: Well, I have some information to pass out. Kind of, I mean what's on the table is merging HLPC and HAC, so this is a little chart of comparing the two.

Speaker 1: By the way, before you begun, Andrea, I want to thank you for taking this on when Randy put it out there, if anyone wanted to be the point person for a lot of this information, Andrea volunteered. Probably before she knew what she was getting into. But I thank you for that, and I think it's been helpful, and I think it'll continue to be helpful as far as us getting information and, not just us but the public and these committees, as well. So, thank you.

Andrea: Happy to help. So this compares the two, so you'll have everything right there. But there's also some maps, if you're not familiar with the areas. So that when they talk about it the [inaudible 00:05:15] are in the [inaudible 00:05:19] here, you know where they're talking about.

Sue: Pass it around.

Andrea: So, I mean that's a major issue is whether or not we are in agreement with merging, which, in my opinion, as the research has done, people I've talked to, seems like nobody's disagreeing with it. And just watching the process of doing it, there's emerged some questions, and I don't know [inaudible 00:05:45]. I have that.

Speaker 1: This is what we've got.

Andrea: This-

Speaker 1: Here, take this [crosstalk 00:05:45]

Andrea: This was sent out, too?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Andrea: Okay.

Speaker 1: That's what I've scribbled on. But that's everything from tonight.

Andrea: So yeah. The things that I just passed out would be on the additionals. Everything else is here. So there's just some questions that if we decide to move forward with the merger, that we want to seriously consider, which we could find someplace ... I will eventually find it. Let's see. Sorry.

Speaker 1: While you're looking, Andrea, this state had a motto, [inaudible 00:06:55] motto, and example of what it could or should look like, and in their estimation. But I got the impression from the mayor that that's sort of what we used as our baseline. That's sort of what we used as a guide in what you originally presented.

Speaker 4: Well, there were model codes and all sorts of intervals that go in. Model codes are just that. It models that are supposed to be adjusted and amended for the individual locale. They can be used as a guide, they can be used as a tool, they can be used in part, they can be used in whole. Specific divisions can be called out and incorporated into the legislation. Our legislation was originally based on a model code that was amended to include provisions that are specific for Kingston. The model code is regularly amended, as well. So, that sort of can be used as a tool for going to the provisions that are potentially being changed. For the most part, this legislation is a combination of three or four current subsections in our code and the changes from the one that's currently in the code are significant of those in terms of the actual number of sections. The vast majority of the text is simply a repeat of what is currently in our code.

Speaker 3: I'd just like to say, in the meeting on Monday night, I had the same feeling that Andrea had, that most everybody saw the wisdom of combining the two committees. I was at a different presentation, and they were talking about historic commissions in other cities. City of Philadelphia, a little bit bigger than us, they only have one historic commission, and they only have six members on that commission.

Speaker 3: So, this is the sort of thing that, also they were saying at the event, that it's best to have people with some expertise in historic preservation. It's best to have people on the commission who know aspects of this, whether through academia, through experience, through working as a contractor, what have you. And short of that, if you don't have people with that expertise, then people who are definitely dedicated to this, people who have done a lot of work and have some of their houses, who are dedicated to the study of history in the local area, that sort of thing. When we have two committees, we can't have that kind of focus.

Speaker 3: So, another thing that they were pointing out is that it's quite unusual for there to be two different historic committees. So, I think the idea of putting them into one makes a lot of sense. Another thing that I got out of the meeting-

Andrea: Let me just add-

Speaker 3: Add away.

Andrea: There are ... Actually I couldn't find any cities or counties that actually have two. So this is very rare that we have two. So, I mean, our city has one, too. Just a few more numbers, but-

Speaker 3: 70 I think.

Andrea: Yeah, I mean, having one is kind of the [crosstalk 00:10:27].

Speaker 1: If we could also maybe indulge, for a minute, and just back up. You have Sue [inaudible 00:10:29] from the planning department, you got Tom [inaudible 00:10:30] from the building department, who actually managed the two different committees, and they can speak to the impracticality of the system the way it is now. Sue can also speak to how the zoning subcommittee of the comprehensive plan committee ... That's accurate?

Sue: That's correct.

Speaker 1: Came to the conclusion that the two committees should be merged, and what representation there was from the two committees on your sub-

Sue: Right. Well, in the comprehensive plan itself, it was a goal to consider merging the two commissions under one umbrella. And because they saw the duplicity that was occurring and the frustration that it was creating for different applicants, and Tom and I see it on a daily basis. When an individual comes into our office, and they want to do a sign in one of these districts, they may have to go to the planning board, they have to go to heritage, they may have to go to landmarks, they make have to go to zoning, depending on what the parameters are.

Sue: So we felt that the two commissions, heritage and landmarks, have a lot of the same goals in mind, and that's really to incorporate and encourage not only the preservation, but also to make sure that the design elements are there, that ... What's the word I'm looking for? That are qualitative and conducive to the historic character of the areas. So, that in mind, it's difficult for us when we have applicants coming through our offices, handing them, "Oh, you have to do this one, you have to do that one, you have to do this, you have to do that." And we felt that ... And I support the merging. I truly do. I think it makes it more streamlined. I think that there are other changes that are gonna be coming forward after this that will help as well to streamline some of the planning and zoning aspects of our laws.

Sue: So, we want to be business-friendly. We want to encourage people to come into our community. I'm not saying just give them a blank check. But what we're doing is just trying to make it encouraging and attractive for businesses.

Speaker 1: I think you can finish your thought before kind of circling back, so if you want to continue [crosstalk 00:13:51].

Speaker 3: It was on topic. It was on the topic. One thing that became clear to me, too, is that if we want to be sure that there's predictability in the process, and I think that's been lacking to a great extent ... So, we want to have a historic commission that people are comfortable actually coming to. If they feel like it's going to be an onerous process, the concern is that they will then skip that, and we won't have any control at all. People will do what they want to do. So, if we have to make it something that homeowners can actually take part in and won't feel like it's gonna gum up the works [crosstalk 00:14:29]

Sue: Your point is well taken because that's the thing. It's not only commercial businesses that we are talking about. We're talking about homeowners and residential property owners that have to go through these different processes depending on what project they're looking at. So, I think that's an excellent point, and I think we have to keep that in the back of our minds, as well.

Speaker 3: So, another point that came out, for me at least as we were there, is that part of me kept hearing this and thinking, "This is something that's about rich people." And so we have to be very careful because we want to protect our historic heritage, but we also want to make sure that it's not something that begins to price people out of living in Kingston. And so that's something for us to keep in mind.
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Speaker 3: Predictability though is also about making sure that we've got clear standards, and there is ... The department of the interior, I think, has standards for historic areas, and so, as much as possible, we want to make sure that our standards match theirs, which means that if somebody's moving into town, because a lot of people are moving into town precisely because they like the older buildings, if they understand what the standards are before they move in, we don't have a lot of problems further down the line.

Speaker 3: I think another thing that came out for me, too, was working with people early in the process. When they think about renovating the property, working with them early so they know what the parameters are, so they don't go through several months of process and then all of a sudden, somebody says, "Oh, wait, well this is what the parameters are, not the ones you've been working with." 'Cause that's the sort of thing that really frustrates people and ... You asked about business, but I'm really thinking about there's a lot of people, homeowners, who we need to be involving in the process.

Speaker 1: I think the point about just rich people getting the historic homes, I thought the state did a great job addressing that. 'Cause they kind of countered that with a lot of ... There are a lot of properties that if they're designated historic or in the district, that they get tax credits for. So, I think there's actually, on the other side of that, there's a lot of help for people that might be more interested in that, that might have a passion for the history of that. So, I don't ... 'Cause I thought that, too, but it was a lot less scary when I heard them speak and they gave a lot of examples, a lot of different places where [crosstalk 00:17:02]

Andrea: Worth listening to, 'cause I think it was Erin who then addressed them after [inaudible 00:17:12]. Erin, one of the representatives from the state, was saying that she didn't believe that it was a form of, or helping gentrification. Thinks part of it being the tax credit-

Speaker 3: But people don't know about the tax credits. So that's why they say communication is a really, really important thing here, so that not only do we communicate early in the process what the expectations are, we also make it clear that there is possibilities of helping people so that they're then brought into the process, rather than alienated, because they hear, "Oh, I'm gonna have to use some special material, and I can't possibly afford that, so I'm just not gonna tell the planning department what I'm doing. I'm just gonna do it on Saturday night." Right? So-

Sue: And the city ... If the city has produced, through past certified local government grants, publications and what we typically do at [inaudible 00:18:03]

Speaker 6: ... and what we typically do are try and work very closely with building safety, so if an applicant is interested in a property or developing a property, we'll schedule a sit-down with them together, so that we're both on the same playing field. Then we talk about all of the different requirements. We have brochures that we hand out, routinely. I'm sure you do in your office too, Tommy. So we try. We're trying to not only educate but to coordinate our reviews.

Sue: But that wouldn't ... What you're suggesting wouldn't really take place in the actual language that we're going to develop.

Speaker 7: Right, we're just sending over what we learned on Monday night.

Sue: All right.

Speaker 8: I think what Manny and Sue and Andrea are saying makes a lot of sense and I support it. Philadelphia does it that way, New York does it, probably a lot of other places do it but I'm just curious to ask, it makes so much sense and hindsight is 20/20. How do we get into to this situation where we have two organizations.

Jim: [inaudible 00:19:14] can explain. [inaudible 00:19:16]

Speaker 9: The temple [inaudible 00:19:21]

Jim: The temple of knowledge.

Speaker 10: First of all we have to remember that history has changed, there's not an original building in Kingston. That includes the senate house, the court house, your house and my house. And when you give guidance to these folks that are coming and looking for, can I put a porch on? Do we need this window? It's reasonable in manner and minor degree. We have a lot of properties, which are now vacant so fourth.

Jim: Can I just?

Speaker 10: Yeah.

Jim: Doug's question was how we got to the point where we had two commissions with parallel responsibilities and it dates back to the urban culture park commission and creation and that's history that pre dates all of us except yourself.

Speaker 10: Well, I purchased a building from urban renewal uptown. Repurposed it but I was interfered by an architect who built this box next to the courthouse and underneath that box is a beautiful building, which would be equate to what sounded Jefferson's Virginia okay? So, there were two standards going on. And the heritage was kind of a, release of relief of that type of strictness okay?

Jim: Restrictions were formed in response to [inaudible 00:20:54] opportunities that were available at different times.

Speaker 10: Yes.

Jim: So, they formed independently, having jurisdiction over different geographic areas and over time they continued to over lap more and more. It was really just a matter of timing. Legislation was adopted over time, you know that [inaudible 00:21:20]

Sue: [inaudible 00:21:21]

Speaker 7: Did you check cities like Charleston and Augusta or ...

Sue: I checked a whole bunch, [crosstalk 00:21:34] I don't remember off the top of my head.

Speaker 7: Yeah, but I think those other places [crosstalk 00:21:42] I think Hilton Head is the only place where the red roof ended, if you have a red roof or something.

Sue: The only other one that I recall [inaudible 00:21:50] I can find the ones, because I found like six or seven, just out of a quick search so ...

Speaker 7: Any other comments?

Jeffrey: I think I mentioned this last time. I think as we continue this conversation, I think we have a, we are lucky that we have so many expertise in our community that history end [inaudible 00:22:29] architects, preservation experts. And I think it would be important to bring them into this conversation. They know and obviously, Sue and others, they know what they do. I read this and I try to understand it but I don't know why it's left out or what was never there that should be included. So, I think it would be important for ...

Speaker 11: Commissions have met already and talked about it and discussed it and they're aware of it.

Sue: And I do have a list of the things that they are concerned about that has been excluded, so I will try to get that to you. I thought I sent those, clearly they didn't get to you but [inaudible 00:23:22]

Jim: And they were also the version of the draft I emailed this morning and just passed out, addresses those concerns.

Sue: Oh yeah, no [inaudible 00:23:34]

Jim: So we will get to that. There are certain minor changes in the draft that was sent out yesterday that addresses, pretty much all your concerns that were raised. Sue again can speak to this, there is some confusion which I brought to the extent and how they part the HLPC and the HAC participated in the development of the initial recommendations. All the initial zoning revision commission. The then chair of the HLPC was a member of that commission and the chair of HAC was a member of that commission. At that time that was George [inaudible 00:24:10]. George was on the commission and how much he did or didn't participate, Sue can speak to that but he was on the commission just as the HAC chair was on the commission. After the recommendation were made there were additional meeting with the chairs of the two commissions to address the issues and the concerns that they had. And they were fully involved in this process. Actual draft of this piece pf legislation was done by my office after the zoning revision commission completed their work. Based upon, an approach that we were going to address procedural changes in the commissions first.

Jim: As I explained last time the first step in that process was amending the code with regard to the zoning board of appeals. Because the zoning board of appeals was determined to be a bigger priority because it was specifically out of compliance with state law. We did that, I believe in October or November of last year, with the old council. The intention and the stated path forward at that point was to bring this legislation forward next. Okay, given the change in the council in fact another four new members, this legislation and other time constraints based on other issues that are going on, this legislation is presented to this body, as soon as this body was ready to address it. Again, this is a combination of the current pieces of the code that address the powers of the HLPC, the powers of the HAC.

Jim: there are a number of reasons why time line wise, it's important for this to proceed now and for the referrals to be made out to the various entities that legally have to have an opportunity to comment. Sue prepared a list of what those entities would be, we have to schedule a public hearing and the process needs to move forward, particularly because you have a new budget year starting and part of the legislation that was never followed requires the different commissions to submit a budget that reflects what their goals are and what they want to do in the coming year. Your budget process is starting August, September okay? So, if these commissions are going to be merged and they're gonna be merged under the planning department, this process had to be done within a certain ... with that in mind. It's now or never.

Jim: We have to send referrals out to county planning, safety planning, [inaudible 00:27:24] save historic preservation. We also have to send notices out to the adjoining towns, which Sue and I figured out this afternoon would be Alstar, Sopas, Redhook and Rhineback. Because believe it or not, despite the fact that the river is separating is, they're still adjoining towns. They would have thirty days to respond. Presumably the public hearing would be scheduled for the same night as your next meeting, okay? And then assuming that the legislation is ready to [inaudible 00:28:01] it would be two reading which would be the first reading would be in July, the second reading would be in August. Which, is Basically when the budget process would start.

Jim: Part of the proposal with one of the issues that has come up repeatedly is that there are Carly provisions in the rough for the commission to recommend land marking either districts or individual buildings. That is a process that costs money and they have no money okay? So if that's something that they're interested in pursuing there has to be a budget, there has to be a separate line, it has to be clarified what department they come out of and where that budget line is.

Jim: There are other issues related to timing that my office is not comfortable talking about in a public session but there is a process that has to be followed moving forward. In terms of the questions that we raised by the members of the HLPC and actually Ronny, that raised these as well when we met, what was it four, six weeks ago. We have adjusted the timeline that we set forth in the original legislation and if I could just walk you through the changes in the initial draft [inaudible 00:29:33].

Jim: I think the most significant change, which I have to give is definitely to Sue, on the second page it says "the mayor shall select membership of the board [inaudible 00:29:52] for practical and appropriate and saved for his discretion" and Sue wanted to make it very clear that the mayor could also be a she.

Speaker 6: [inaudible 00:29:58]

Jim: Yes. So we changed that to his slash/her.

Sue: Thank you, sir.

Speaker 9: You're the next ...

Sue: Oh, no ...

Jim: With regard to the concerns from the HLPC that were raised both in this meeting and on Monday night with regard to their ability to grant emergency relief. We went to the langue of the new model code and incorporated the moratorium language from the new model code that reads "once the commission has issued a notice of a closed designation, it may recommend to the municipal governing board", which is you. I'm sorry there are not session numbers at this point.

Speaker 6: Page 4 [crosstalk 00:31:03]

Jim: No, it's actually 2, 4, it's actually on ...[crosstalk 00:31:10] it's on the eighth page, eight to nine. Just look at mine eight into nine okay? And that is the language that comes directly out of the new model code if you notice that the model code recognizes that fact that the administrative board and the administrative commission doesn't have the authority to issue and emergency water of any sort but they can make a recommendation and then if the governing body decides to move on with that recommendation you can direct our office to seek some sort of emergency relief. But again, that comes right out of the model code that was advocated as the template by the HLCC. So, we end that to address that concern.

Sue: Is that a problem because it's passed through us, that takes time.

Jim: Correct and ...

Sue: Right now the way it's written up, the model, our actual is written, they could decide right then and there without going through us first.

Jim: And they can issue what is legally their own force of lawyer. The fact that it's in the code doesn't mean that they can do it and it doesn't mean that any court would enforce it. And it would lead to protracted ugly litigation. Because basically you would have a commission without any legal process, restricting a private property owner's use of their land.

Sue: That only happened once right, in thirty years?
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Jim: Yeah, it didn't even happen that once okay? A lot of this is meaningless discussion because the last time the commission ... the commission has not pursued designation for either a district or a property in recent memory. They haven't done it and at this point they wouldn't have the resources to do it because they don't have the budget. So, we're basically talking about a hypothetical situation that has not occurred. In any event, the language that we included was language out of the model code that allows the commission to make a recommendation. With regard to the timeline. We had forty five days from this initial application. Given the need for public hearing and the novelties that we're scheduling. What we changed that to was that the public hearing, okay? Which is basically the first hearing, when it's on the agenda for the first time. Would be held within thirty days of submission of the application.

Jim: The application is submitted and then it's on the next month's agenda. And then forty five days from it being on the agenda, forty five days from the public hearing, they need to render a decision. It basically means they have two meetings to address the application. The initial fifteen days, which is to account for the fact that there are times when meeting is a little later in the month. So at this point, we considered sixty two day, which would be what the planning board has, we decided that seventy five was more viable because it was thirty to put it on the agenda and the forty five in the event that the decision had to be kicked out till next month.

Jim: I think those were Sue and Moreno, the changes that you had?

Sue: I haven't looked at your new version yet.

Jim: I mean there were punctuation that was changed. There are some blanks in the current document.

Sue: My edits.

Jim: There's some sections, [crosstalk 00:35:24] not numbered yet. And once there is elections and before the document is actually sent out to planning and planning is announced my secretary will number the sections so that when they have comments they can make their comments based upon those specific sections.

Sue: Yeah, education.

Speaker 6: Just in addition to what you said, Jim, I think you'll get a better understanding if you make an effort to attend their meetings, okay? Because that's where the behavior and the problems exist with the applicant and the board.

Speaker 13: The problems exist with the applicant and the board. You'll see what goes on. And maybe coming away from that, you'll get a better understanding of why it really should be one commission to get the job done.

Speaker 14: Well, and this is not really about the particular issues with either commission. This is about consolidating the review process and I would just ask him ... Sue, if you could explain the benefit of coordinating the combined review under the Planning Department, so that things are run with the Planning Board. I'm not asking for-

Sue: I think it should go under the Building Department.

Speaker 14: Keep thinking.

Sue: Yeah, I think there's definitely a benefit in combining the two commissions, because both bodies are essentially reviewing and asking the same exact questions of individual applicants. And I, you know, I believe that it is more business-friendly, for us, as the city of Kingston. I also believe it allows us to work more smoothly in getting projects through the review process. I do think, though, and I'm continuing to give this review and thought, one of the things that I would like to see added in here, and I'm not sure, I haven't talked to Dan about it yet, but I think that just as the Planning Board and the Zoning Board members are required to have an attendance level, as also an educational requirement. They're required to get so many hours of education per year. For Planning and Zoning, it's state law, four hours a year. But I think that should be carried through to these commissions. I think it's a very valuable way to bring members up to speed on various topics that are relevant to what they're undertaking and reviewing. So that would be another thing I would [crosstalk 00:38:23].

Speaker 14: And my assumption would be that in response to the referral to City Planning-

Sue: That will be another thing.

Speaker 14: The Board would then send that application to that effect.

Sue: Exactly. And I have given this, Dan's prior version, I did give it a cursory review. We went through all of my comments after he complained about all my little sticky notes. But we did go through it, point by point, and I think it's really coming along. So I think the document, as it stands right now, is ready to be referred out to these other commissions. I think it should be put online, as well, for the general public, which, through the City Clerk-

Speaker 15: I think that's a great point, because I think ... because my next question would be, how do we now get our input and everyone do the same thing that you did? Because I think now it's important that a lot of people, and a lot of people with a lot more expertise than some of us, start to chime in and get their voices heard. And I think that's the next step, as far as how you-

Speaker 14: Well, it's just like I said. You schedule a public hearing for the next Laws and Rules meeting. You refer it out to the ... we said four towns? Four towns, Planning, and so there are several [crosstalk 00:39:54]

Sue: County planning, City planning, yeah. [crosstalk 00:39:56] Yeah. We made the list today.

Speaker 14: It's done in one referral, an attachment that says, "The following entities are being provided with this document and you're invited to next month's agenda."

Speaker 14: I did ask everybody to review the plan last month and this month, and if they had any questions with regard to the content that we could address now. The more that those questions can be addressed now, the better off we are for next month. And if there's some additional tinkering before the referral actually goes out, that's where, hopefully, can be taken care of in the next couple of days.

Speaker 14: Tommy, I mean look. Did you want to speak to any of this?

Speaker 16: Can I ask a question first?

Speaker 15: Go ahead.

Speaker 16: So, if we stick with the public hearing for June, does that mean that the ball is officially rolling, and in the next month we will be ... [inaudible 00:40:56]?

Speaker 14: Well, the ball's already rolling. The ball's already rolling.

Speaker 16: Yeah. But I mean, we don't have to schedule a public hearing for June. We can schedule it for July.

Speaker 14: If you schedule the public hearing for July, then the legislation cannot be adopted until September and you miss the budget cycle.

Speaker 16: And what would be the downfall of that?

Speaker 17: Take the money from the balance.

Speaker 14: You know, I mean, there are other reasons, again, to move this thing forward that I'm not gonna discuss in a public session.

Speaker 15: Jim, we [crosstalk 00:41:37]. We need to vote, I think, to resolution, to call for a public meeting next month.

Jim: Well, yeah. The public hearing, you should-

Speaker 15: Public hearing.

Sue: And the referrals.

Speaker 14: And the referrals. It's the referrals and [crosstalk 00:41:50]-

Jim: To the County, to the City.

Speaker 14: And the answer to your question is, you know, the opportunity for members outside of the commission, and outside of the entities, to offer their opinion is at the public hearing. And generally, what we do is we schedule the public hearing and we leave an opportunity for written comments to be submitted after the public hearing, all of which can be considered.

Sue: Right.

Speaker 16: So then it would be time to have all that considered?

Speaker 14: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker 15: So then after the public hearing they'll leave like a 10 day window to decide other additional information in writing?

Speaker 14: Yep.

Speaker 15: Something along those lines.

Sue: And I can work with either Dee or Carly to get it on the website, the city's website.

Speaker 14: I believe it's already on. Dee, you put it on?

Sue: Is this current one on?

Dee: This latest version went on-

Sue: Today?

Dee: Well it's [crosstalk 00:42:46] in the agenda packet, so if they look at this packet they can see it.

Sue: Oh, okay. But, it's not-

Dee: It's probably not [crosstalk 00:42:52]

Sue: It's not identifiable, that's the thing that we need to do.

Dee: Right, it's just called "The Agenda." So we can take that out and just-

Sue: Yeah, we're gonna have to ... So, the normal layperson went on the city's website, they're not gonna think about going to the laws and rules committee agenda, and then looking at the agenda packet. That's my point. I think it needs to be maybe more prominently listed.

Jim: So getting back to ... do we need a resolution for that, then? [crosstalk 00:43:33]

Sue: You don't need a resolution to post it on the website, but you do need a resolution to schedule the public hearing, and to do the referrals.

Speaker 15: All the others had to do the referrals. Are they two separate ones? Or, can I just put them all on one?

Sue: One.

Speaker 15: I think I need [inaudible 00:44:00], excuse me.

Speaker 17: [inaudible 00:44:10], and eventually [crosstalk 00:44:25]. Didn't we change it with the last one? The old one? I think he did, didn't he? [crosstalk 00:44:36].

Jim: The ability, so that all the other residents that will all be residents at the time of appointment. Is that gonna carry 'em through this commission?

Speaker 14: Yeah, it's ... do you have the draft?

Speaker 16: There's ... look in the center page of the [inaudible 00:45:01] ...

Jim: What folder?

Speaker 16: The new draft.

Speaker 14: Everything other than city residence is [crosstalk 00:45:04]. Everything other than city residence is a requirement [crosstalk 00:45:04].

Jim: Okay. So there it is. [00:45:17]

Speaker 14: Yep.

Speaker 16: June is going to be the 20th.

Speaker 17: June 20th?

Speaker 16: [inaudible 00:45:26] alternate version of [inaudible 00:45:28].

Speaker 17: I'm sorry?

Speaker 16: [inaudible 00:45:29] additions here that, in terms of the membership, not on a current [inaudible 00:45:29]. Helpful, I think.

Speaker 17: [inaudible 00:45:29].

Speaker 16: [crosstalk 00:45:29] commission numbers.

Speaker 15: So that's an addition?

Speaker 16: Yep.

Speaker 15: [inaudible 00:45:44] comments.

Speaker 14: 80 percent.

Speaker 17: Bill, one or the other.

Speaker 16: [inaudible 00:46:16].

Jim: I've had plenty of coffee. I could also just run downstairs [inaudible 00:46:22].

Speaker 15: [crosstalk 00:46:22], this would include [crosstalk 00:46:31].

Speaker 14: [inaudible 00:46:31] and referring to the poll's legislation to ...

Speaker 13: This commission will be presenting [crosstalk 00:46:42].

Speaker 14: Also, the county planning board ...

Speaker 13: Say again?

Speaker 14: Also, the county planning board, city of Kingston, referring to proposed amendments to the zoning code, the proposed amendment to the city code, [inaudible 00:46:43] sections there [inaudible 00:46:43] ...

Speaker 15: Proposed amendments.

Speaker 14: Also, county planning, city of Kingston planning, New York State [inaudible 00:47:10] reservation ...

Speaker 15: Hold on, you talk faster than I [inaudible 00:47:16].

Speaker 14: [inaudible 00:47:16]. The town of [inaudible 00:47:19], the town of [inaudible 00:47:22].

Speaker 15: [crosstalk 00:47:23], please.

Speaker 14: Where's that missing name, Sue?

Sue: I don't know, I gave it to you.

Speaker 17: I've got the list.

Jim: Of unnecessary ...

Sue: How about I ... I can determine that.

Speaker 13: What's that? You can determine ... ?

Sue: Well, I work with the clerks on this.

Speaker 14: [inaudible 00:47:52] there, could we ... ?

Jim: Piracy, right? What's that?

Speaker 16: [inaudible 00:48:09].

Speaker 15: Okay, I finally got it. Bill, just before you begin, this gentleman over here had a question [inaudible 00:48:48].

Speaker 14: If it's a question, if it's a commentary, I'll take it, if it's a question, I'll take it, but [crosstalk 00:48:54]. We're not [crosstalk 00:48:54] from anyone. This is not a public hearing, so let's be consistent.

Speaker 15: I'm being consistent [crosstalk 00:49:02]. So a resolution to schedule a public hearing on June 20th, 2018, to address the possible merger of historic landmarks and heritage area commissions, this will include referring the proposed amendments to Ulster County planning, Kingston planning, town of Ulster, New York state, SAPO, [inaudible 00:49:25].

Speaker 14: So we have a more [inaudible 00:49:28], before [crosstalk 00:49:31]?

Speaker 15: There is a ... let me get a motion in a second, and then we'll go on to questions. Can I get a motion that? Seven.

Speaker 14: There is currently a section in the draft, in the definition part of the draft, that states demolition money [inaudible 00:49:58], and that was inadvertently left blank. The definition of demolition by [inaudible 00:50:05] comes from demolition by the wood section, which I have, looking at it here, this is a really [inaudible 00:50:14] disrepair, so as a result, the deterioration of [inaudible 00:50:19], which will, in the judgment of the HLHAC, produce a detrimental effect on the character of the property itself, and that is the first subsection of the demolition of [inaudible 00:50:28] section, but you can carry over into the definition section.

Speaker 14: So, in the final draft version that we sent out in the fall, that language will be inserted at that point. In addition, the final draft that will be sent will include section numbers and subsection numbers so that when comments are made, they can refer to a specific subsection.

Speaker 16: [crosstalk 00:50:58] on the ...

Sue: You say it's not gonna be on there tomorrow, so I can put that on [crosstalk 00:51:03]?

Speaker 14: When the final ...

Speaker 16: No, I mean, when that goes online right now, the public [inaudible 00:51:09] add that ...

Speaker 15: Right. So everyone will have it with the definition as of tomorrow.

Speaker 16: Well, as long as we get ...

Sue: Dan.

Speaker 15: All right, any further questions before we vote on this resolution? I will take the vote. All in favor.

All: Aye.

Speaker 15: Opposed? There we go. So I think that it's important that we continue to get input, even prior to the public hearing, rather than waiting for that.

Sue: Huh?

Speaker 15: I think that it's important that we continue to get input from our constituents, and that everybody knows [crosstalk 00:52:03], so that we have as much as [crosstalk 00:52:08].

Speaker 14: [crosstalk 00:52:12] prior to the public hearing, [crosstalk 00:52:14] record of the public hearing, [crosstalk 00:52:14].

Speaker 15: All right, I think we have a lot of homework. I think this is a positive thing, though. I think we're doing a good thing. I think the more feedback we can get, the better this [crosstalk 00:52:43]. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Jim: Motion.

Speaker 15: Motion to adjourn.

Speaker 17: Second.

Speaker 15: All in favor?

All: Aye.

Speaker 15: All opposed?
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