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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We're going to begin the meeting.

This is the Village of Greenport, Planning Board Regular Session for November 3, 2016.

Item Number 1, corner of Front and Third.

Pre-submission conference for Dan Pennessi. Dan Pennessi represents owner Mayland Shannon LLC and is before the Board to discuss proposed uses and development of the site located at the corner of Front and Third Streets.

The pre-submission package contains a revised site plan of the proposed building.

The revised project has been favorably considered in the request for variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals, with the exception of the parking requirement and the loading space. The Zoning Board is requesting the Planning Board review the parking requirements.
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The applicant has requested an additional work session meeting before submission of the final site plan review application is filed, to review the updated plans.

The property is located in the WC, Waterfront Commercial District, and the uses are listed as conditional uses.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-5-4-5.

I don't believe we have anyone representing the applicant here.

MR. PROKOP: This is the discussion regarding the possibility of a parking waiver.

There will be a Zoning Board meeting this month between this meeting and our next work session meeting, so if anybody has general comments they might want to make now, otherwise, we can wait and see what action is taken by the Zoning Board.

The discussion was whether there was -- if there is to be relief
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considered by either board, whether it
would be in the form of a waiver coming
from the Planning Board or as a
variance coming from the ZBA.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: My personal
opinion, as I said when the applicant
first came before the Board, if the
project is going to move forward and if
a variance is going to be granted, it
should be for the smaller number of
parking spaces after the payment in
lieu of parking spaces section of the
Village Code was taken advantage of,
that's my personal opinion.

I think the code was written in a
way that was -- it was designed to have
the option of payment in lieu of
parking spaces in recognition of the
fact that there are very few in the
Village, and that money is then to be
used to alleviate the larger parking
concerns of the Village. I don't
think -- I would not be in favor of
voting for a plan that had received a
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full waiver from the ZBA for 30 parking spaces without any reparation for the Village or any sort of payment to alleviate the parking concerns.

It is a restrictive code, that makes it very difficult to build on the lot right now, but I believe that is the intention of the code, it's there to prevent the exacerbation of an already existing problem which is the lack of parking within the Village. That's my personal opinion.

I think the payment in lieu of parking spaces is a viable option for new construction in the Village.

My major concern actually is not the number of parking spaces because I think if we were to grant payment in lieu of parking spaces for this applicant, my biggest concern is still how the vehicles that are going to be parking there would get in and out of the lot, the effect that would have on traffic on the corner of Third and Main.
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Street, Third and Front Street.

Those are my general thoughts on it. I'm waiting to see what the final plans look like.

I don't know if anybody else has any comments or questions.

MR. BURNS: You're suggesting you might avoid parking on that at all?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: No. So my thought is if the plan, if this project is going to go forward, I think it would be prudent for this board to take advantage of the section of the code that allows a payment in lieu of parking. That's essentially all I'm saying. If the project goes forward, I would love to see a full, I believe they required 30 or so spaces, I would like to see those, the initial 20 spaces at the very least dealt with by the provision of the code that allows payment in lieu of parking.

MR. BURNS: I agree.

It seems to me the only other
viable use for that lot would be a parking lot which it was. We used to park there years ago and go to the movies, but it doesn't make sense now.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yeah, I mean, even it's as a -- it's a difficult lot to do anything with, I think, because of the fact that we have the intersection of the State road, Village road, and access from one village to another and the parking issues and the ferry lines have not been resolved yet, hopefully signage and enforcement of the different venues for approaching the ferry will eventually make a difference with those issues, but right now it isn't a resolved issue, but I'm not sure what to do at that point.

Those are my thoughts. Anyone else have any thoughts?

(No response.)

No.

If no one else has any thoughts and the applicant's not here --
MR. COTUNGO: I would just repeat what I said last week, that I think it's a great project, but the site is too small for the project. You can't build that big of a project on that small of a site. It would be great for Greenport to have such a project, but you need three times this amount of land to support that type of structure, so it doesn't work in my opinion.

And I believe even the revised parking plan does not work. Does not work. The loading space does not work. There are certain spots you could not get out of. The aisle width is too narrow. It just doesn't work, not even the ten spaces.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MS. CLARK: I'm in agreement with John.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

We don't actually have anything, this is a continuation of a pre-submission conference, so I don't
believe we actually have any formal binding vote to make tonight. I was hoping we would be able to discuss this with the applicant. I don't know what else to do at this point.

Anyone else have any comments or questions?

MR. PROKOP: What about the idea of -- so you're requesting opinions about the project; what about the idea of the parking waiver in terms of a project at the site, how does the Board feel about that?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: What do you mean, any parking waiver for any development?

MR. PROKOP: Yes. The scope of a parking waiver or the range of a parking waiver that might be considered.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I think there would need to be -- you know, the Village Code allows, I'm generally in favor of sticking with what the Village
Code allows, I'm not really trying to deviate from that too much. The Village Code allows a waiver of up to 20 parking spaces. I think that even with waiver, you need to address the existing concerns, there are other access concerns besides simply the number of spots, the loading zones and the placement of the entrance to the lot, you know, those are concerns. I'd be more than willing to listen to any compelling arguments to justify the placement of it or any reasonable accommodation or plan that would clearly mitigate the parking concerns and issues that we have addressed at this meeting and when we first discussed it a few months back.

Anyone else have any thought or consideration for the lot?

MR. BURNS: I think the number is a problem, but maybe that's the only problem, maybe the fact that we have to accommodate their need for parking and
I don't know the money, the finances, but in order to have a viable project, you've got to have a certain amount of floor space and I agree with John, it's a large project for a small piece of property, but we have other projects in the Village on small lots that work, and this might work well.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I mean, to me, providing ten spaces, providing payment in lieu of 20 other spaces and seeking a variance from the ZBA, if they were granted all of those things, I don't think that would be a disqualifying scenario for me, but there are still other -- that wouldn't be the only thing that would be disqualification for me. It would be -- there are other things that need to be addressed with regard to that. I don't think it's simply the number of spots, I actually don't have an issue with that, it's really the location, it's a difficult place to have an intensity of use, so I
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don't know what a viable option is.

But again, with the applicant not
being here, I don't know how much more
I can talk by myself here.

MR. PROKOP: We can see what the
ZBA says.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: At this point I
would suggest that we table this
discussion until our next meeting and
the ZBA weighs in and the applicant is
here to contribute to our thoughts.

I will so motion.

MS. CLARK: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Motion to adjourn.

MS. CLARK: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

(Time noted: 5:20 p.m.)
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