	Planning Board 1/5/24 1
1	VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
2	COUNTY OF SUFFOLK : STATE OF NEW YORK
3	X
4	PLANNING BOARD
5	WORK SESSION, PUBLIC HEARING
6	&
7	REGULAR MEETING
8	x
9	Station One Firehouse
10	Third & South Streets
11	Greenport, New York 11944
12	January 5, 2024
13	4:00 p.m.
14	
15	BEFORE:
16	
17	PATRICIA HAMMES - CHAIRWOMAN
18	DANIEL CREEDON - MEMBER
19	FRANCES WALTON - MEMBER (Absent)
20	SHAWN BUCHANAN - MEMBER
21	ELIZABETH TALERMAN - MEMBER (Absent)
22	
23	ALSO PRESENT:
24	MICHAEL NOONE - CLERK TO THE BOARD
25	

1	(The Meeting was Called to order at 4:01 p.m.)
2	CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Good afternoon.
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon.
4	CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Welcome to the Village of
5	Greenport Planning Board's meeting for Friday am I
6	too close to this mic?
7	AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.
8	AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, you're good.
9	CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Okay. January 5th, 2024.
10	It is 4:01 p.m., and I hereby call this meeting to
11	order. This meeting is a public meeting. Our agenda
12	for this afternoon is primarily a continuation of the
13	opportunity for the public to provide the Planning
14	Board with comments in respect to the presubmission
15	application for the development and construction of
16	a hotel at 200 Main Street.
17	The presubmission hearing in respect of
18	200 Main Street is still open pending we did
19	receive the additional materials yesterday and we've
20	not yet had a chance to review them, so it will be
21	scheduled for again for in two weeks for a
22	discussion on those additional materials at that time.
23	Until the presubmission hearing is closed, the
24	public will have the opportunity up until 10 days
25	after the closing of the presubmission to provide

additional comments or input either in person, at a meeting, or in writing to this Board, and that input will be considered by this Board in providing the written report to the applicant, required under Section 150-31(B)(5) of the code.

As a reminder, if you are speaking today, please start by slowly and clearly stating your full and address for the record, as well as to the extent applicable any affiliation you might have with respect to the applicants or application.

In addition, please remember that all comments should be addressed solely to the Planning Board and not to any applicant or other person in the -- in the audience. Thank you.

The first order of business today is to deal with minutes, but I understand that Shawn hasn't had a chance to review them yet, so we won't have a quorum to vote on that, so we'll have to hold that to the next meeting.

And then the next order of business is a continuation of the presubmission conference regarding the application of HF2 Hotel Owner LLC in respect to the construction of a new hotel at the property located at 200 Main Street. The property is located in the CR Retail Commercial District and within the

Historic District. It is located at Suffolk County
Tax Map #1001-14-10-16 (sic) (1001-4-10-16).

The applicant proposes the demolition of the existing building on the property and the construction of a new 18-room inn, together with a retail gallery space to be located in the front of the property abutting on Front and Main Streets.

The applicant made a presentation in respect to the proposed hotel project at this Board's last meeting. At that meeting, we ran out of time for the public to address comments to the Board in respect to the presubmission application and determined that we would continue this opportunity at this meeting.

I know that we received a few letters and emails in respect to the application. I'm going to actually ask the Clerk to the Boards to now read those into the record in the first instance, so, Mike, if you could go ahead and do that.

MR. NOONE: Sure. We received a letter from Charlie Kusziski -- Kulsziski at 433 Main Street. It's about the two separate properties, 326 Front and 200 Main. We read the 326 Front comments into the record at the last meeting. I'll read the 200 Main Street comments.

"Regarding 200 Main Street, I had thought the

gallery had a three-year lease and wonder if the lease was broken by the property owner. I think a hotel on this spot will completely alter the character of the main intersection of the Village. I don't see any benefit for residents in bringing more transient rooms for what I expect to be mostly partiers.

The lot has three parking spaces, which is not enough for the proposed usage. I think the proposed "gallery" will quickly be turned into a bar. I hope the Board will not grant a variance for a hotel on this spot. Charlie Kulsziski."

Then the second letter is from Suzy Donovan at 300 Fourth Street.

"Dear Chairperson Hammes, members of the Planning Board, Thank you for the opportunity to submit written comments for the Board's consideration related to the application of HF2 Hotel Owner LLC, new construction of 18-room hotel. I have to be out of town on Jan. 5th, but request that the following comments be entered into the record at the scheduled meeting, a continuation of a pre-submission conference related to 200 Main Street, Greenport.

I respect that the owners and their team have invested time and effort in re-visioning this project since it was first submitted in 2022. However, I

- cannot support the property being redeveloped as a hotel. My questions and concerns include:
  - 1) Traffic congestion and parking;

- 2) Incompatible use of this property based on its proximity to the active shipyard, Greenport Yacht and Ship Building Company; and
- 3) Our Village's strong commitment to maintain and enhance our working waterfront.

Front and Main is one of the Village's busiest intersections." The energy" -- "The area already creates confusion and navigational hazards for pedestrians, bicyclists, daily commercial truck deliveries, and the movement of boats and supporting traffic, particularly in the spring and summer months, and into early fall.

A new hotel with 18 rooms geared toward" -"geared towards" -- "geared towards families, plus
full and part-time staff, and other guests and
visitors would inevitably generate a great deal more
traffic and demand for new parking spaces in the area.
There would also be the staggering" -- "the staggering
of incoming and exiting guests to accommodate. There
simply is not adequate parking in and around the site
or anywhere along Carpenter Street, which is partly
residential.

I agree, we're fortunate enough to have the LIRR and Hampton Jitney stations west of the proposed project, and it is true our village is indeed walkable. However, the overwhelming majority of visitors and tourists depend on private vehicles, not only to travel to and from Greenport, but, once here, to get to surrounding beaches, farmstands, wineries, and other attractions. Realistically, how many of these new guests will use public transportation to get to the hotel? Is there any data documenting how many current guests at existing hotels, B&Bs, short-term rentals in Greenport register without vehicles? A quick review of existing Greenport hotel and motel websites show we have about 288 rooms in the Village. This number does not include any B&Bs and STRs.

While I appreciate that the proposed property would operate year round for employment purposes, a number of existing hotels close for the winter.

Apparently it's not profitable for them to stay open year round. This seasonal quality is reinforced looking at hospitality industry's news sources. Our area is categorized as a heavily seasonal market, with Quarters 2 and 3" -- "2 and 3 significantly higher occupancy rates, a key performance indicator in the industry.

If another hotel is permitted to be built, we'd just be ratcheting up traffic volume, parking issues, and frustration at Front and Main during the "high season." The proposed project, with its substantial footprint, would sit directly across from a working shipyard, which has been providing waterfront jobs and servicing vessels in one form or another since the 19th century. A hotel would seriously cramp the Greenport Yacht and Ship Building Company's operations, and the many small businesses and entrepreneurs using that space, during its busiest time of year.

Finally, building a hotel at this location does not align with several stated purposes in the newly revised Zoning Code: Preventing and reducing traffic congestion, sustaining and preserving the waterfront, and ensuring a viable working waterfront and water-dependent uses" -- excuse me. "Viable working waterfront and water dependent uses are encouraged, and others.

There are precious few parcels left at the center of the Village that could be redeveloped on or near our waterfront. I believe we're serious about maintaining Greenport's working waterfront economy; if so, we need to frame decisions for our community" --

1	"community's future so that this value is a primary
2	consideration.
3	Respectfully, Suzanne (Suzy) Donovan,
4	300 Fourth Street, Greenport."
5	The next letter we have is from Randy Wade.
6	Randy Wade is at Sixth Street.
7	"Please consider the following comments for the
8	new Greenport Inn at 200 Main Street proposed for the
9	Sweet Indulgences location. This is the wrong place
10	for a hotel right in the center of the Village and its
11	most congested intersection. How will the applicant
12	provide a public benefit greater than the current
13	beloved garden, a focal point arriving in the Village
14	from the west?" Let me let me repeat that.
15	"How will the applicant propose a public benefit
16	greater than the current beloved garden, a focal point
17	arriving in the Village from the west?
18	Parking: Three parking spots are a fraction of
19	what is needed. Hotel guests will park on Village
20	streets as close to the hotel as possible and leave
21	their cars for long periods, as opposed to retail
22	customers, who at least provide turnover.
23	Roads: Removing the preexisting non-conforming

Roads: Removing the preexisting non-conforming building will require bringing both East Main Street up to the standards curb-to-curb, as well as providing

24

25

sidewalk on all three sides. Plans should include the AASHTO template for a 40-foot bus to demonstrate access by the fire truck, as well as whatever trucks are coming into the shipyard. An Auto Turn program in CAD can easily do this and should be certified by a traffic engineer. The turn can be shown using the entire roadbed, although not the sidewalk.

Sidewalks: The sidewalk on East Front Street should be 13 feet, not 10 feet 9 inches, and the clear path should be 8, 8 from" -- 8 feet from 5 feet tree pit to wall. ADA requires a sidewalk on Carpenter Street for new construction. Currently there is "-- "there is little traffic, so people walk in the road. This obviously could not continue with hotel guests driving in and out.

Economic impact: The hotel" -- "the jobs" -"the jobs would be seasonal and low wage when we
already have businesses hurting because they cannot
get staff. The hotel would not provide on-site
housing for a manager. All the staff would be
competing for the limited workforce housing, and if
other properties were bought to supply the housing, it
would be at the expense of current businesses
and their employees who need that housing. A
requirement for all hotel proposals in Greenport

should be 24/7 staff on site for emergencies.

I encourage" -- "I encourage the owners to expand upon the good will generated by their existing attractive and well-run businesses and become a true participant in making Greenport the best it can be.

I urge this Board to help them. Thank you very much."

The next letter comes from Lorraine Keating -- Lorraine Kreahling, Central Avenue.

"In walking by the former Sweet Indulgences on Wednesday, I discovered that ten days before Christmas, on a Friday night, there was a Planning Board hearing to discuss the proposed 18-room hotel on this spot, a structure which before it had been a candy store had been a laundromat. Both of these small businesses supported the year-round population of the Village in both jobs and services.

One of the charming things about Sweet Indulgences was, when confronted with all the empty space out front, the new owners chose to create a garden. Being drawn down by a flowering path to buy chocolates was kind of a magical experience. This was the Greenport that many of us who have been here for decades were drawn to. There was a cross" -- "cross-pollination of year-round Village residents and second homeowners. There was something agreeable and wholesome about it,

and there was something economically sound in the fact that people who ran businesses relied on the Village residents to both support their businesses and to work at them through the winter. Visitors added an extra layer of interest and income in the summer, but were not the sole focus of" -- "were not the sole focus of small businesses which sustained Greenport's economy.

Those of us who live in the Historic District are plagued by" -- "plagued by visitors who park in front of our homes, and sometimes in front of our driveways, or the next" -- "or next to fire hydrants and stop signs, so that they could walk into town.

Our own guests frequently have to park at a distance. Everyone who lives in the Historic District understands that adequate parking must be imperative to the approval of any transient residential" -- "residential hotel.

The Planning Board should also consider the impact of dramatically increasing density on this tiny lot with its narrow side streets. Everyone who lives in this area knows how sharp the" -- "how the sharp corners and blind spots feel like an accident waiting to happen, even with the current amount of traffic. This near impossible task

of getting emergency vehicles into this area, should there be a fire at the marine yards or brewery, should also be recognized. No one with any knowledge of emergency access or egress in these areas could with good conscience approve adding an 18-room residential facility here.

But the Board also has the responsibility of looking at the long-term effects of continuing to approve winter ghost businesses. It must ask how more and larger hotels serve the greater good of Greenport Village residents rather than a select few. Do we really want to become simply a town where outsiders come in to eat and drink at restaurants which are too expensive for the average Greenporter? Do we understand what we stand to lose by turning historic Greenport into an exclusively" -- "into exclusively a food-and-drink and spa facility destination? On the practical" -- "and on the practical side, is this a business model that really works for anyone?

I hope that you as Planning Board members will take into consideration the Village that you know and love, and how these decisions, including the Greenporter's request for an addition to an already sprawling, somewhat awkward structure have an impact

on our Village's historic feel and charm; how the added vehicular and pedestrian density will adversely affect our narrow streets and sidewalks; and how these choices will not produce more employment in the winter months.

Lorraine Kreahling, 150 (sic) Central."

And the last one comes from Michael Collins of Manor Place.

"To the Planning Board, Village of Greenport.

Regarding: Hotel Proposal, 200 Main Street and

326 Front. My apologies for last minute with this

letter. I cannot make the meeting today, but I would

like to provide input.

These two projects are just too over the top for the postage stamp properties. Parking, parking, parking. We can no longer allow development in the Village when the project cannot support a large majority of the parking space requirements. We will be digging ourselves into a deep hole with no recovery possible.

For a developer to address the public and state that we have" -- "we only have a perceived parking problem should be a red flag. This group is so out of touch with Greenport. This is just an investment group. If approved, the property will probably be up

for sale not long after completion.

Informing us that visitors can park at the train and Jitney parking areas is ridiculous, it will not happen. Also stating that employee housing will be provided is a bold wishful statement, good luck with that.

We have all played a part in creating the Greenport Village Magic Kingdom, but there must be strict limits, and we can also say, 'No, thank you.' Michael Collins, 232 Manor Place."

CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Thank you. I'm now going to open the meeting up for anyone from the public who wishes to address this Board. Please remember to state your name and address for the record. If you have an association with the applicant, please also disclose that when you, please, come up to the podium.

KEVIN BARRY HEANEY: Thank you very much. My name is Kevin Barry Heaney, I live at 506 Carpenter Street in the Village of Greenport.

I have grave concern about the appropriateness of this project. There is no question that Front and Main are the heart of the Village of Greenport, and as a cardiologist would say, we are going to clog the heart with this project.

There is no actual record, because the Airbnbs

remain under the law, but on Carpenter Street there are six, on Bay Street there are two, on Central there are three, in addition to the hotel, which is American Beech, which provides no parking. There is no option for parking at this point in time, let alone to add.

I did a quick survey this morning and the average cost for an August weekend for two nights in Greenport is 600 to \$1100 a night. No one paying that kind of money is going to walk from the train station to here.

(Laughter)

KEVIN BARRY HEANEY: Let's be realistic. If you're talking about Park Avenue in Manhattan, or in San Francisco, or Boston, that's acceptable, but people don't come -- the people who are paying those prices are not coming on the train.

Right now, in the basement of the Library is an arts project called "Preservation, Not Speculation". It's impossible to see this project as anything but speculation. It is not good for the customers, who are not going to be satisfied with the lack of conveniences provided, and it's not good for the Village.

The final thing I want to say is in 1991 there

was something called the Oakland Fire. In the Oakland Fire, 450 houses were burned, 150 multiple dwellings, 50 people died, and 400 were injured. The San Francisco Chronicle points out that a chief problem, which was a vegetation fire -- obviously, we do not have dry vegetation here, but we do have gasoline and flammable products, as Steve Clarke pointed out when he was here. The chief problem, the San Francisco Chronicle pointed out, was narrow roads crowded with parked cars, many parked in front of fire hydrants, preventing fire trucks from getting to the fire.

If our goal is the preservation of Greenport, not putting it on the open market for speculation, I beg you. I'm not opposed to some development, but this development is out of scale and excessive, will not serve the Village of Greenport, and really will be not a great service to those who choose to use it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Thank you. Anyone else?

ELI MARTIN: Good afternoon. My name is

Eli Martin, and I live at 182 Central Avenue, on the corner of Carpenter. I agree with all the testimony that's been coming forth on this project. I just want to make a few notes.

The lot coverage ask, which is 19% over the required lot coverage of 40%, that's a big ask, especially coupled with the ask for 18 parking spaces to be eliminated from the project.

I also note that the three parking spaces they're providing would back up into Carpenter, which is already constricted and narrow. Carpenter has a 30-foot width, and East Front Street at the curve is 20-feet-4-inches, and it opens up, if you can use that term, to 22 feet as it approaches Front Street. It's a very tight street. It should probably be a one-way street. I don't know if anybody has ever looked at that, but that clearly, clearly would help, even now without development.

I have no issue with the architecture, trying to compliment Main Street, and also the shipyard architecture. That I think -- I think they tried to do a good job, but it just feels like they're shoehorning this large project into a very tight inappropriate spaces. It's like a square peg in a round hole, just doesn't work.

And the fact that they're asking for so much lot coverage and parking variances, I don't see any public benefit in granting those variances whatsoever, and that's probably part of the criteria for the Planning

Board to grant those.
Let me see if I have anything else here.
Oh, trash, recycling, there's no indication of how
that's being done.
Also, I question having hotel spaces on the
ground floor there. It's you know, it's a little
noisy. And if you know, most of the hotels are up
one, one flight, so I'm not sure that's such a great
idea.
Let's see if I have any notes. Anyway, that
those are my comments. Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Thank you. Just two point
on your comments. One, the variances will be heard by
the ZBA, as opposed to the Planning Board.
ELI MARTIN: Oh, it will, okay.
CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Though, obviously, the
issues with those will be part of the overall picture
the Planing Board will take into account.
ELI MARTIN: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: And on the garbage and
recycling, and that type of thing, that has all
that was something that the Planning Board asked for
further details on and has been included in the
materials that were submitted yesterday by the
applicant, but we have not yet reviewed those.

improvements to the area, such as adding curbs and

25

sidewalks. Subsequently, we were asked to meet the Fire Department Wardens to present and discuss our proposed ideas. After reviewing our projects and asking questions, I had one major concern, which was the ability of fire trucks to access Carpenter Street via Central Avenue and East Front Street, which is the proposed site of the hotel.

What has changed in 40 years? Traffic. Traffic on Carpenter Street due to the addition of two restaurants, a brewery, STIDD Systems and several Airbnbs. The traffic consists of produce trucks, linen delivery trucks, beer trucks, liquor trucks, and, of course, garbage trucks, three or four times a week in the summer, as well as UPS and FedEx deliveries, and increased general traffic. If the firemen had concerns 40 years ago, I'm sure they have more reason for concerns today.

Traffic congestion is a problem and a safety concern. A two-story hotel, adding more cars and delivery trucks, is a hazard and an unnecessary addition to our Village. And, really, what does it do to enhance the charm of a historic village or improve the lives of our residents? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Thank you. Just one followup on that so that you're aware. We are in

1	discussions with the Fire Department. There was
2	somebody from the Fire Department at the last meeting
3	who expressed concerns. The Planning Consultant is
4	working through those issues, and will be providing
5	technical advice to the Planning Board on that as soon
6	as possible, but that's something that we're very
7	focused on. Anyone else?
8	(No Response)
9	CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Okay. I don't know if the
10	applicant wants to say anything or
11	MARK BOYLE: (Shook Head No)
12	CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Okay, go ahead.
13	LORRAINE KREAHLING: Lorraine Kreahling,
14	157 Central. That was my letter. It's pronounced
15	Kreahling. Thank you.
16	MR. NOONE: Sorry.
17	(Laughter)
18	LORRAINE KREAHLING: Thank you for reading it.
19	I just want to say that the idea of the density of
20	this project, I understand abstractly thinking about
21	it. I mean, I know from working and writing about
22	real estate and development that and working for
23	Economic Development, that these things look one way
24	on a page and somehow else when you actually live in
25	the community or in the land, near the land.

And I was thinking about it. I think I was looking at the plans today, and I believe that they're about the same size, the lot there is about the same size as my lot for my house. And I was thinking there are more people proposed to be staying in that hotel than there are people that live on our block. So that gives you an idea about what we're talking about with density. It's not just parking, it's humanity.

But people bring their cars, and some people bring two cars. And it's not a judgment on people who love their cars, although I wish more people didn't love their cars so much, but that realistically, that much humanity and that much congestion will do -- it won't make anybody happy, including hotel guests.

And one of the things everyone who has ever been in a hotel knows is you look for a view. Well, there's not too much to look at. I mean, Steve's shipyard is great, but I don't really think that's what you want to see when you look out a hotel room.

So I would -- I would advise the folks developing this, I'm sure their intentions are noble, or maybe not noble, but they want to do right by the community, but I would advise them to perhaps look at a -- outside the box, maybe even for younger people a green plan that you -- part of the idea would be that

you can't bring your car, and that they have free bikes, and they have access to the vineyards through a shuttle, and they would have geothermal heating and cooling, like my house has, to really get you into the next generation. Because, you know, eating and drinking are fine, we all do it and we all enjoy it, but what else does Greenport really have to offer? So we need to start thinking of something bigger than just bringing people in to get their nails done, and, you know, getting smashed. Okay, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: Anybody else?

(No Response)

CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: All right. We really appreciate everybody's comments. We appreciate the work that the applicant has been doing. I think, so that people are aware of the next steps, we did receive the additional materials requested from the applicant. The Planning Board will be reviewing those and getting input from our consultants. So they are -- this presubmission will be continued for our meeting on the 19th. Hopefully, we will have received all the input from the consultant by then, and we'll be able to have a dialogue with the Planning Board.

Depending on where we are at that point, we may or may not close the presubmission hearing. It will

1	depend on whether we've gotten kind of all the
2	information that we think we need to be able to issue
3	the report back, which, hopefully, we'll be in that
4	position to do. If we do, we'll close the public
5	hearing. It will still be 10 days after that for the
6	public to provide any additional comments. The
7	Planning Board will then work with the consultants and
8	Counsel to put together a report to send back to the
9	applicant. We have up to 45 days after the closing of
10	the presubmission to do that. At that point, it will
11	be up to the applicant as to whether and in what form
12	it wants to file its final and complete application,
13	and then there will be another series at that point of
14	public hearings based on the final application.
15	So that's what I have on that. I think then
16	we're going to move on to the next item, which is any
17	other Planning Board business that may properly come
18	before the Board. I guess, Shawn, Dan, do you guys
19	have anything?
20	MEMBER CREEDON: No.
21	MEMBER BUCHANAN: No.
22	CHAIRPERSON HAMMES: I'm just going to raise one
23	point. As this Board may recall, the Board of
24	Trustees, when they adopted the amendments to
25	Chapter 150, indicated that they'd be providing

25

	Planning Board 1/5/24 27
1	
1	CERTIFICATION
2	
3	STATE OF NEW YORK )
4	) SS:
5	COUNTY OF SUFFOLK )
6	
7	I, LUCIA BRAATEN, a Court Reporter and
8	Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do
9	hereby certify:
10	THAT, the above and foregoing contains a true
11	and correct transcription of the Planning Board Work
12	Session, Public Hearing and Regular Meeting of
13	January 5, 2024, to the best of my ability.
14	I further certify that I am not related to any
15	of the parties to this action by blood or marriage,
16	and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of
17	this matter.
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
19	this 15th day of January, 2024.
20	
21	Lucia Braaten
22	Lucia Braaten
23	
24	
25	