

When we turned this draft in, it was for the Village Board rather than some other body to review, as the whole of our authority is delegated to us by the Board. We did have questions, one very particularly for the board about whether it was time to revise the code to provide more protection for trees in the village. The other I foresaw going to Tom Blair, in the section I had principally authored about affirmative maintenance requirements, and sanctions that would be available if owners neglected to ensure that buildings retained structural viability, as we didn't see how fining an owner would accomplish the purpose; we were talking about a process that might result eventually in forfeiture, and supposed that might be a sticky legal path to go down.

But we weren't at a loss how to draft our contribution, and didn't suppose that it would need to be rewritten, which is what seems to have happened here, with its specificity diluted (mostly by referring it back to the model law, which is what we had been working from along with the existing code, in large part to make it more applicant-friendly: more what we would like to see were we applicants rather than administrators).

I'm standing in here today for Claire, mostly to ask you to look what we have written, and to ask that any deficiencies that are found there be referred back to us for discussion or correction unless the remedy seems entirely obvious to this group.

I am rather baffled about how this got to be a conversation mostly about the CPP's authority over the whole of the village. That's just how it's been for forty-plus years, and there hasn't been an issue about it as far as I've ever heard. In any case that's not a direction we were expected to go in when the assignment was given us. If the Board wants to pursue such a change, I would counsel them that that might be opening a rather large can of worms at this point. But that would be their call.

Chris MacCormick