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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I'd like to begin the meeting.

This is the Village of Greenport Planning Board Work Session for August 25, 2016.

Item number 1, Stirling Square, 300-308 Main Street.

Continued discussion on the application for site plan review. An amendment to the previous site plan approved on November 4, 2015 is required.

The applicant Robert I. Brown, Architect is representing Stirling Square LLC, Brent Pelton. The applicant has proposed to remodel four existing apartment units into five inn units and one handicap accessible unit on the ground floor for a total of six additional inn units, bringing the total of inn units for American Beech Inn to 11 inn units.

The proposal includes a renovation of Suite 308C, a ground floor space,
into a lobby for the inn, incorporating
a new glass facade with interior and
new exterior seating and a water
feature in the courtyard.

At the August 4, 2016 meeting of
the Planning Board, the applicant told
the Board that he would like to use
308C for events and retail sales.

The proposal includes additional
bluestone hardscape for easier handicap
accessibility and several ramps
providing accessibility to each of the
commercial units.

Proposal for cover over the
existing cedar pergola which covers the
dining patio for the American Beech
Restaurant. An extension of the wood
pergola to the north has been
eliminated.

The property is located in the
Historic District. The Historic
Preservation Commission will be
reviewing the exterior installation of
the ductwork for the kitchen exhaust at

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service
(631) 727-1107
the September meeting.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-4-7-29.1.

Mr. Brown, would you like to say anything to start?

MR. BROWN: We have submitted a revised plan, and you have before you a letter for Mr. Pelton that I received this afternoon which hopefully clarifies the situation concerning the use of the proposed lobby. We have taken out event space as a use.

And above and beyond that, if you have any questions, I can try to answer them as best I can.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I do not see that any -- in the letter Mr. Pelton indicated you did find a manufacturer for an awning, retractible awning.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So is that going to be part of --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

I have submitted as a separate
application since we had withdrawn from
this application to this Board and to
Historic Preservation.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

So now the -- I don't have in
front of me a revised plan.

It essentially has, as indicated
in Mr. Pelton's letter, it's no longer
going to be an event space, it's just
going to be, 308C is going to be
essentially a lobby, essentially a con
lobby.

MR. BROWN: A conventional hotel
lobby with some gift retail.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So a --

MR. BROWN: And reception for
incoming or checking out guests.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: A reception
area with some retail sales.

Are you going to -- it says there
won't be any alcohol sales.

MR. BROWN: That's correct. The
beverage counter is gone.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's gone
MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So not coffee or any --

MR. BROWN: If there is coffee, it will be on a -- put on the table somewhere.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Is what you have submitted, does that reflect the most current imagining that Mr. Pelton wants?

MR. BROWN: Yes. To the best of my knowledge, yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That puts the retractible awning over the --

MR. BROWN: That's actually on a separate document, the awning.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Is that a separate application from this?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So we have one application, use evaluation application where 308C has a lobby space --

MR. BROWN: Yes.
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: And there is a separate application for the awning.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

And that involves Historic Preservation as well.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So you submitted a site plan just indicating the use of the lobby space, correct?

MR. BROWN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That's the most recent one. I don't have it in front of me, that's why I just want to verify with you.

Does anyone have any questions?

MS. WINGATE: Would you like it?

MR. PALLAS: We haven't received the awning site plan in time for this meeting.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. PALLAS: That's not it. That's the prior meeting.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

All right. So do we have -- where are you with this, Joe?
ATTORNEY PROKOP: I don't think that they can be considered as separate site plan applications. I mean, my recommendation would be to consider it as one application because they're both Type 1 actions because there in the Historic District, and I don't think that you can have two different Type 1 SEQRA reviews going on at a property at the same time. I don't think that that is --

MR. BROWN: Can I ask if the SEQRA review that is going on includes an awning?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: No, but we could amend it to include the awning.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So has anyone had a hearing on that?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: No. Nobody has gotten back to us yet.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So we could include the addition of the awning, fully retractable awning into that, can we approve that or does it have to be a
ATTORNEY PROKOP: My recommendation would be to have just one application because it is significant due to the Historic District. If they were minor changes in the property, there wouldn't be a Type 1 action, I think it would be okay, but because of the significance, I think it should be --

the other thing is the letter that we got said anticipated liquor sales, and I mentioned that that is a mistake and it should have said with no alcohol sales.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I believe it says with no anticipated --

MR. BROWN: It says no anticipated alcohol sales.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think that probably he meant to say there's no alcohol sales because I think that's going to be a question with the Board.

MR. COTUNGO: I'm not happy with
the word anticipated.

MR. BROWN: I can't speak for

Mr. Pelton on that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

So there are two separate

questions here: One is the lobby space

and the other being the awning. The

issue with the awning, I believe

originally was a matter of if it's an

affixed awning that it becomes that you

need a variance because a certain

amount of --

MR. BROWN: Yeah, it is a

retractible awning.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: But now it's a

retractible awning, so that alleviates

that issue.

If that is amended to the plan and

I think that would be a moot point that

would be addressed by the retractable

awning. That was just a coverage

issue, that was not, I don't believe

anyone on the Board had any issue with

it being covered up. It was the fact
that it's not allowed in the code. Does anyone have any other concerns or questions with regard to this?

MR. COTUNGO: Do you have to wait for the Historic Board?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We can't move -- there still is, I believe it was said at the September meeting Historic Preservation Commission would be doing their discussion, previously they weren't going to move forward until that had been addressed, and it was an existing nonconformity that had to be addressed before we could move forward.

MR. BROWN: May I ask if we know when in September the Historic Board is meeting?

MS. WINGATE: I believe it's the 12th.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Does anyone have an issue with the use of the space as a lobby?

MR. COTUNGO: No.
I only have an issue with the letter that says anticipated.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Pelton couldn’t be here tonight, but he fully intends to be here next week at the Planning Board.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: That has to be amended to show to remove -- was it amended?

MR. BROWN: It was amended. That was submitted.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: And something that says no alcohol sales, if that’s your plan.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I would assume retail sales are a permitted use for how this is zoned, commercial retail.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It looks like it’s a permitted use.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Is that CR-1, is that the --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes, Retail Commercial Zoning.
CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Personally, I have no issues with the lobby; I think it makes perfect sense for the inn.

The larger question is the conversion of four existing apartments to hotel rooms. I don't know if anyone has an issue with that. I don't. It seems a fair use of the property.

Does anyone have any question with that?

MR. JAUQUET: No. We covered that.

MR. BURNS: What this discussion means is the whole complete plan still has to come before us as a complete plan.

MR. BROWN: Including the awning.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. BROWN: I can have that before the Board by tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do we need additional time to -- can we discuss it at the next meeting or do we need to
push it back?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think you can discuss it, yes.

I think it would be administratively easier as far as the process goes if it was just an amendment. I mean, you took it off as an amendment, why don't you put it back on as an amendment, so we don't --

MR. BROWN: That's fine.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It will make everything a lot easier.

MR. BROWN: I have no problem with that.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: If that's okay with the Building Department.

MR. BROWN: I can provide the Village with plans by mid-day tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Anybody have any questions or concerns?

MR. PALLAS: I haven't reviewed the plans myself. I would just like to take a look at them, make sure what was mentioned was covered; but just to be
clear that you're aware of the request for the letter that says no anticipated alcohol, I think the Board is looking for something more affirmative than that.

MR. BROWN: Understood. I will be in touch with Mr. Pelton.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do we have any other business to discuss this evening with regard to this?

MR. BURNS: No.

MR. COTUNGO: No.

MR. JAUQUET: No.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do you have any questions for us?

MR. BROWN: No.

I will have revised plans for you tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Do you think there is possibility of including this next week?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It will still be on the agenda certainly if there's
an amended plan. I think essentially this plan -- we have gotten so many iterations of the plan, but I --

MR. BROWN: I can appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: -- certain of exactly where we're at. This is still technically a pre-submission conference.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: That would be the major achievement if we could just get something that is what we're looking at, you know --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: A finalized rendering.

MR. BROWN: I'm just thinking about reporting to Mr. Pelton about where we stand.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That's my question as well because we have gone back and forth so many times, it has been a revised plan. I believe we accepted it and that's why we're under the timeframe, that's why we had to get extensions of the timeframe. Now we
had another amendment to the plan.
Does that delay the timeframe; do we
have to vote?

MR. PALLAS: I think you would
need to wait for Historic Board, so I
think you would have to request an
extension, but I think you at least
have a sense of where you are. If
you're calling that the final plan, you
would have a sense of where you are and
then the outcome of the Historic
Board's review, then you would come
back here again when that's concluded
for the next approval motion.

MR. BROWN: Hypothetically, would
it be possible to get an approval
conditional upon Historic Preservation
if the Board was so inclined?

MR. PALLAS: I can't recommend
that to the Board. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So it seems
like regardless, we have to wait for
the Historic Board to do their review
of the application; so it doesn't seem
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as if we can move forward, certainly
this evening.

We will look at and discuss the
amended plans you're going to submit
tomorrow at our meeting next week, but
at the moment it seems like we are
still -- we have to wait for the
amended plans and review those.

MR. BROWN: You will have those
tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

So does anyone else have any
questions or comments with regard to
this application?

MR. JAUQUET: No, I don't.

MR. COTUNGO: I don't.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I'm going to
make a motion that we move on to the
next item on the agenda.

Do I have a second?

MR. JAUQUET: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.
MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAM McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item number 2, vacant lot east of 217 Monsell Place.

Table discussion of the pre-submission conference for Bryan Nicholson pending ZBA determination.

The applicant proposes to develop the vacant parcel which he is currently under contract to purchase. Bryan Nicholson is before the Board to discuss the proposed construction of a one-family house on the property located east of 217 Monsell Place.

The pre-submission package includes a site plan, floor plans, and elevations. The project as proposed will require one variance.

It is scheduled to be on the ZBA agenda for the September meeting.

A revised site plan will be submitted for consideration upon the completion of the Zoning Board Appeals process.
Proceedings - 8-25-16

The property is located in the R-1, One-Family Residential District of the Village of Greenport.

The property is not located in the Greenport Village Historic District.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-2-2-29.

Are you speaking on behalf of the applicant?

MR. FARRELL: Yes. My name is John Farrell, I'm with the law firm of San Wan Coschignano, 333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 601, Uniondale, New York.

I believe the application is still pending with the Zoning Board, you know, it's a pretty modest house. The variance, we believe is minor. Based on the development in the area, it probably makes the most sense for the Zoning Board to grant that variance, but we'll have to see when we get there.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Does anyone
have any questions or comments with regard to this application?

MR. JAUQUET: I'm still promoting the reduction of the bedroom space, and creating more living space on the grade level instead of three-and-a-half full bathrooms and four bedrooms and one room for kitchen, living, and dining in a one-family house; and my idea is to, at least on the plan, call the downstairs bedroom a living room or a family room and do a three-quarter bathroom instead of a half and a full on grade.

If it's truly a one-family house and given the problematic nature of overstuffed houses, overpopulated houses and multiple -- and the car situation that happens.

I'm not sure you're familiar with what happens in Greenport --

MR. FARRELL: Yes, I'm familiar.

MR. JAUQUET: -- on some of the blocks.
Anyway, that's my recommendation, and that's what I'm going to vote on. If it stays the way it is, I'll be voting against it.

MR. BURNS: You weren't here last time.

MR. JAUQUET: No.

MR. BURNS: The reasoning there is to accommodate his grandparents --

MR. JAUQUET: Right.

MR. BURNS: -- who can't climb stairs.

MR. JAUQUET: It's still a single-family house being developed like any developer would develop a single-family house.

MR. BURNS: Because you wouldn't do it that way, doesn't mean that he can't do it that way.

MR. JAUQUET: Right. I mean, a three-quarter bath and a room downstairs that can function both as a bedroom and as a family room, at least on the plans could still work for other
custom uses the tenant wants to make
use of that.

I mean, anyway --

MR. BURNS: Well, that applies to
almost every house in the Village. The
new owner could use --

MR. JAUQUET: A new owner can do
anything, but, you know, we've got two
houses, small little houses, small
little lots on vulnerable blocks in
a -- with a Village history that, you
know, has had abuse and situations that
can't now be turned around.

Anyway, that's my -- what else did
you talk about?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I think that
was the gist of the conversation, that
was the central -- my personal opinion
is that, to me the plan seems to fit in
with zoning regulations of the Village.
It may not be an ideal setup. It seems
to fit to me, and I don't feel I have
any grounds to do anything, so that's
my position. I believe Ben has a very
similar position. I believe John would say --

MR. COTUNGO: Yeah, I agree with Peter.

MR. BURNS: What do you agree with?

MR. COTUNGO: That a house with that many bedrooms should definitely have more living area, and the idea of just changing the name bedroom to living is not acceptable. That was proposed at the last meeting, just changed the name.

MR. BURNS: I understand you can say that as an architect, you would suggest that to a client, but you're not the architect.

MR. COTUNGO: I say that as a resident of Greenport, not as an architect.

MR. BURNS: You sure would object to my house.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I believe there are a number of -- I don't think this
necessarily is outside the norm of the Village. I think there are a number of homes in the Village that are built out the extent of the lot that would not be fitting with the code. Current regulations, I mean, this is generally conforming. There is a variance, but it's really just about the site of the home, not about the actual size of the home or anything in that regard.

MR. JAUQUET: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I understand where you're coming from; I just think it's an appropriate use for it, and I don't see any reason to vote against it.

MR. FARRELL: If I can just address that point real quick.

Whether or not it's labeled as a bedroom or living room, the fact of the matter is the footprint isn't changing. The number of occupants of the dwelling are not changing. The bedroom is necessary because there are elderly
people involved, and they can't do the stairs.

At the end of the day, you know, and I'll get into this more on the next application, I guess; this is a site plan review application. You're talking about site issues, so under the code that's traffic, parking, landscaping, and negative impacts on deterioration to the environment. If this was in a wetland or adjacent to a wetland, I could see those issues coming up.

The interior layout is really outside the purview of this Board because the Board of Trustees hasn't granted the architectural review authority, so whether they have a bedroom on the first floor or an extra living room on the first floor, it's not going to increase or decrease the impact that the structure is going to have on the site.

MR. JAQUET: I would disagree.
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with you on the point that the Planning
Board does have purview over quality of
life in the Village, and any kind of
impact that a structure might
contribute to that. It's not allowed
in the code for the Planning Board's
definition of what the Planning Board
does, but we do have purview over
what's built, how it's used, and what
the impact of the architecture could
have on too many people in a house, you
know --

MR. FARRELL: That outside --
that's an architect --

MR. JAUQUET: It's the Planning
Board -- I'm just going to make a point
for the audience.

MR. FARRELL: Okay.

MR. JAUQUET: The Planning Board
has the power to help regulate the
quality of life in the Village, and
architecture interior and exterior
contribute to that, so.

MR. FARRELL: I understand that,
but --

MR. JAUQUET:  You can't disagree --

MR. FARRELL:  -- in terms of the short-term rental issue, I believe the Board of Trustees had a meeting this afternoon where they're looking to amend the rental permit ordinance of the code to address that issue, so to the extent --

MR. JAUQUET:  We're working on it too.

MR. FARRELL:  To the extent that, you know, would be a concern of this Board, that issue is going to be handled by the Board of Trustees and code enforcement, you know, if my clients were to violate those provisions of the code, there are substantial fines involved; $500 a day for a first violation and up to $5,000 after multiple violations, so, you know, to clamp down on the number of bedrooms in a house as a code
enforcement tool --

MR. JAUQUET: I'm not saying it's a code -- I'm not associating with code enforcement, I'm associating with the quality-of-life purview that our Board has. It's not technical.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I will, Mr. Farrell, thank you for your comments, and they're very respected, and I will advise the Board, I'll talk to the Board about the issues involved with this and we'll have the same comments, I guess, about the second application.

And not to get into the fray because I really don't want to, but I think that -- I'll withhold any comments for tonight, and I'll advise the Board.

MR. FARRELL: Okay.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Prior to the next time they see you.

Thank you for your comments.

MR. FARRELL: Thank you.
MR. JAUQUET: What about a three-quarter bath down there?

MR. FARRELL: I would have to talk to my client about that. I don't know that they're ready to make that change. They think the bathtub is helpful for the elderly --

MR. JAUQUET: I would think that a walk-in shower is better for the elderly.

MR. FARRELL: I don't know. I'm not a doctor.

MR. JAUQUET: My big concern is that a house, and it's a single-family house, whether he's got a special use for it for his elderly parents or not, it's still a single-family house, and it's got a lot of bedrooms, and it doesn't have much living space. You know, the kids -- everybody that does their homework is in the TV room and in the kitchen at the same time.

MR. FARRELL: Right.

MR. JAUQUET: That's my problem.
MR. FARRELL: Right, that's -- I mean, look, I have a house that is slightly bigger than this one. We spend all our time in the living room and the kitchen, and it's going back and forth around the wall to get into the kitchen; with an open space, I mean open concept, there's something that's very popular now.

MR. JAQUET: I know it is.

MR. FARRELL: And a lot of people are combining that space because when you entertain, where does everybody congregate? In the kitchen. You can expand that space out into the larger living room, it makes it much more comfortable, much more inviting, much more accommodating for guests and things like that. I mean I'm not an expert on interior design, but I know that open concept and floor plans such as the ones that they're proposing are very popular right now and most people either spend their time in their
bedroom or in the living room watching
the TV, and it's one big space, and I
think it's big enough to accommodate,
there are four bedrooms, there is no
saying that all four bedrooms are going
to be occupied by full adults. If
there are kids, there are kids, but,
you know, choosing a house of this
size, which is not a large house, I
mean, you're talking about a footprint
of less than a thousand square feet, I
think it's 800 --

MR. JAUQUET: It's a
1,700-plus-or-minus-square-foot house.

MR. FARRELL: Over two floors,
it's not built to --

MR. JAUQUET: The bedrooms
upstairs are like, you know, about as
small as they can get.

MR. FARRELL: I understand that,
but how people choose to live is not my
concern.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So at this
point again, we're -- so we're actually
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talking about the second application
because this first item that we are
technically on is still before the ZBA,
so the one we're discussing right now
is before the ZBA, we can't act on it
regardless. We're still waiting for
that.

So I'm going to make a motion to
move on to item number 3, which is -- I
believe we don't have anything to do
with item number 2 this evening, so I
make a motion to move on to item number
3.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. COTUNGO: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

So now we are talking about item
number 3 which is essentially what we
have been talking about.

Is there anyone else who would
like to speak to this application this evening?

MR. FARRELL: With regard to item number 3, I just need to clarify a few points.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Sure.

MR. FARRELL: I'm a little confused about what happened -- I read the minutes from the hearings. I'm a little confused about what happened at the last hearing. It looks like there was some kind of vote taken on the pre-submission and it looked like it was a tie vote. I'm not sure where that stands, and what the impact on the application is.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: What was before the Board last meeting was an application for pre-submission review. Basically it's considered a pre-submission conference, and the Board voted on that pre-submission plan, and basically voted not to accept it because it was, as I understand it,
was two to two; so it didn't -- there was no approval of the plan.

However, the idea of a pre-submission conference is to try to work out details and questions on the plans, and see if there is any willingness by the applicant to address concerns of the Board. That didn't take place, and so it can move, apparently the applicant wants it to move ahead although the Board indicated that it wasn't in favor of the plan; I think the applicant still has the ability to move ahead if that's what they'd like to do.

So now it's before us as a regular application, and we go through a process of accepting the application and then putting it on for action.

So tonight would be only to accept the application or not accept it, and next meeting would be for vote.

I just wanted to bring to Chairman McMahon's attention that we have a
four-person vote for tonight, and one of the things you might consider doing is to table the acceptance vote until next meeting, a week from tonight; and then do the acceptance and the approval votes at the same meeting.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Right now it appears as if we have a split vote and wouldn't be able to move forward regardless, so I think that's a reasonable way to move forward, we would at least have a full board. If there is going to be a denial, it would come from a full board as opposed to just a four-member board.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think that would enable me to have some time to make some comments to the Board and give advice.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Does anyone have any thoughts or comments with regard to that?

MR. FARRELL: I just wanted to quickly go through, you know, just some
minor points just to have it on the
record. We had a brief discussion
about the authority of the Board with
regard to site plan approvals, et
cetera. From looking at the code, I'm
not sure that the Board of Trustees had
given the Planning Board authority on
site plan over single-family and
two-family dwellings.

If you look at Chapter 150-30,
that section states in all cases where
this Chapter requires approval of site
development plans by the Planning
Board, no building permit shall be
issued by the Building Inspector except
upon authorization of, and in
conformity with the plans approved by
the Planning Board.

I bring that up because I went
through every section of the code. And
there are multiple references to site
plan approval, but they're all in
sections dealing with commercial
districts and commercial uses. For
example, all of the commercial
districts, CR, they have the following
language: In a -- insert this
commercial zoning district here -- no
building or premises shall be used and
no building or part of a building shall
be erected or altered, which is
arranged, intended or designed to be
used in whole or in part for any use
except as listed below and all such
uses will be subject to site plan
approval in accordance with Article 11,
Section 150-30.

Now, that language carries through
for the general Commercial District as
well as the Waterfront Commercial
District. That same language is not in
the R-1 and R-2 Districts. In fact, it
does appear -- I have to take that
back, it does appear in the R-1
District, but only as it relates to bed
and breakfast. It does not say that
single-family homes or two-family homes
are subject to site plan review.
I understand that that's the, I believe that's the way the Board has handled things in the past, I'm just not sure that that was the intent of the Board of Trustees when these provisions were enacted. It's also required in multi-family dwellings, when you create a multi-family building and apartment units.

So I just wanted to bring that up.

I also want the record to reflect that the comments, I guess, regarding the design of the house should be incorporated, actually all of the testimony from the previous application, item number 2 should be incorporated into the testimony with respect to item number 3.

I will say that I spoke to my client --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Your comments or the Board's comments?

MR. FARRELL: Everybody's comment.

I think the entire testimony for item
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number 2 should be included into item number 3, and we're talking about the same house style, the same design. I don't think we need to get into the same back and forth. This way the record is clear that we're bringing all those comments in.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Thank you.

MR. FARRELL: I did have an opportunity to speak to my client, they would agree to do the three-quarter bath on the first floor if that would satisfy the Board.

MR. JAUQUET: All right.

We're not going to make any decisions until --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: My recommendation is that the Board adopt a motion to adjourn the acceptance vote until next week.

MR. JAUQUET: We can have another week to --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I have to speak to the Board, I'm going to provide some
input to the Board regarding legal questions.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Does anyone else have anything to add to this before we move on?

Essentially, the attorney has advised us that he has the few items that he would like to counsel us on as we previously discussed, I do think, especially since right now it looks like it would be a split vote, would be a no vote, it would be in the best interest of the Board to have a full-Board vote, the yay or nay at the next meeting.

So I'm going to make a motion to table this discussion to the regular session next Thursday.

MR. COTUNGO: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.
Thank you very much.

Item number 4, motion to accept use evaluation application for Rachel Mysliborski doing business as Woodstruck, LLC.

The applicant has opened a retail boutique at 313 Third Street, within the Sterlington Commons.

This is a permitted use in the CR-Commercial/Retail District.

This property is not located within the Historic District.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-6-2-23.

Do we have anyone speaking?

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Rachel Mysliborski.

My husband and I, Mark, 1500 Stars Road, East Marion. We're proposing a use evaluation application for retail store in which we sell furniture, wood furniture, and that is about it.

One correction I wanted to make is that our legal name is Woodstruck LLC;
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however, we're doing business as

Island's End Woodcraft.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That looks like
what's on the application. Woodstruck
LLC would be Island's End Woodcraft.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: You got it.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: This says open a
retail boutique; can you just give us a
little more description?

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Yes.

My husband makes wood furniture,
we have a shop at our home in East
Marion. We do small fixes, repairs,
that sort of thing, refinishing, all
within our structured line, and we sell
the pieces here in Greenport. We sell
some candles, all U.S.A.-made products,
at least we try to do 90-plus percent
American made. That's really our
purpose is to help people repair their
furniture. Sometimes we bring in
estate pieces, repair them for sale.
That sort of thing.

If you have any questions, I'd be
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happy to answer.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do we have
general floor plan of the --

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: I do.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do you have
one?

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: It should have
been with the application, I thought.

MS. WINGATE: Yes. It's not much,
but it's there.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I see it.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: I blew it up, I
blew up the actual plan. We haven't
changed anything inside; we just
literally painted and added our
products.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's
essentially one open space.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Correct, one
open space with two columns in the
middle, yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The counter for
sales and --

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: The counter is
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also movable. We have made no permanent structural changes at all.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I imagine there is negative garbage being generated.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: We bring our garbage home.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's just a use evaluation application. Does anyone have any -- I believe this is a permitted use.

MS. WINGATE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Does anyone have any issues, questions, comments with regard to this application?

MR. BURNS: The sign.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So the sign is, I can see it's larger than what is permitted.

MS. WINGATE: No.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: No.

MS. WINGATE: The size is good, you're not allowed to have signs above the roof corner, so how you mount it on the roof is a problem.
I had missed that originally and Glynis brought it to my attention, so they're going to have to find a different location for the sign.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: We're more than happy to do that. The problem with the location is we do not have a gable end that is facing anything public. The back of the gable end of this particular building faces the backyard of a residential area.

If you have any recommendations as to where else you would like us to put it, that would be wonderful. We did speak with our neighbor Brian Arm Physical Therapy, he does not have a problem with us sharing part of his side of the building to put a sign up. We prefer not to, but the other issue is that where our eave is very low. We're very hidden in the back of Sterlington Commons and therefore it's very difficult to get the attention of the public which obviously it was our
choice when we decided to rent it, I understand that, but if the Board has any recommendation, I'd like to hear about that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I don't personally have any recommendation. Is this -- is that existing now or just a Photoshop?

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: No. We put that there, we were under the understanding, we were wrong, that because it was a private property that the sign would not be under Board approval. We were wrong, ignorance is not a defense of the law, I understand that.

Like I said, we would be more than happy to move it. Where, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I don't personally have any issue with the sign, but if it's not allowed, it's not allowed, so we wouldn't be able to approve an application with the sign as it were. If you plan to remove it or move it --
MS. MYSLIBORSKI: We would be happy to do that. Is there any -- so basically, all it's saying is that -- because it's not attached to the roof, my understanding of it was that it couldn't pierce the actual roof, which it doesn't, it's attached to the vinyl of the dormer, just wondering if you look below from the parking lot, you wouldn't be able to see that. The other buildings have a gable end that they can put signs up on, so unless we can share the side of another building, that's fine.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Why don't you go to the ZBA?

MS. WINGATE: There was also the possibility of a detached sign, you were limited to size. I really haven't looked at the code.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I'm not very familiar with the section of code you're referring to, so I will take a look at it before the next meeting.
MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I believe it's currently not allowed.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: We'll remove it, and what happens from there?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I have no issue with the use, I mean, that's essentially what we're looking at, if the sign is currently not conforming, that would have to be addressed; otherwise, I have no issue with the use.

MR. JAUQUET: Same here.

MR. COTUNGO: I have no issue with the use. I don't really like the sign there. As an architect, I don't like that you bridge two dormers with a sign.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: I don't either.

MR. COTUNGO: That's like against all architectural rules.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: How do you get to that conclusion; I'm curious, as an architect what is --
MR. COTUNGO: Because dormers are meant to be freestanding, not connected with a sign. That wasn't the purpose of constructing dormers, I think it's an insult to the architectural integrity of the building.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: You can't really see the building from the parking lot, that was the problem.

MR. JAUQUET: Can't you put the sign freestanding on a post at the entry into that walkway?

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: That would be great.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Can I make a suggestion? We had decided that procedurally we would accept use applications as a Type 2 action, and also we would approve them at work sessions if there was nothing that needed to be discussed, so the motion that I would recommend if the Board is okay is to adopt lead agency status, determine that it's a Type 2 action for
purposes of SEQRA, and approve the use
review application, but deny -- do we
even have an application for the sign?

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Yes.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: So deny the sign
application and just leave it at that
and let her figure it out. She should
go to the ZBA.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: As far as the
use of the building, we'd all like to
move on, we have no issues with that.

If the sign is not allowed as it
is, then it's not allowed.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: It will be taken
off.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Go to the ZBA
and make a request to them or change
it, that's up to you.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That's the best
way to move forward today, so I'm going
to make a motion that we adopt lead
agency status for purposes of SEQRA,
make a determination this is a Type 2
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action and make a declaration this will not have any significant negative impact on the environment.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. COTUNGO: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

I make another motion that we approve the use evaluation application without the sign portion of the application, approve the proposed use.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

And I guess third part would be a motion to deny the sign application because it does not conform to the
specifications in the Village code.

Do I have a second?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

If you would like to go to the ZBA for the sign, that's up to you or if you would like to move it.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Are there area -- one last question.

Are there areas on the building or around thereabouts that would have been acceptable because I'm -- you know, we're very --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I don't know.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: So it's not allowed, but we don't know where it is allowed?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: You have to get a professional to look at that, hire a design professional.
CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Thank you.

MS. MYSLIBORSKI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All right.

Let's move on to item number 5.

Item number 5, 11 Third Street.

Motion to accept use evaluation application for Christian De Leon.

The applicant proposed to open a barbershop at 311 Third Street, within the Sterlington Commons.

This is a permitted use in the CR Commercial/Retail District.

This property is not located within the Historic District.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-6-2-23.5.

Hello.

MR. ARNOLD: My name is Jordan Arnold. I am appearing with Mr. De Leon just to make sure that nothing gets lost in translation.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Sure.

MR. ARNOLD: Just full disclosure, I'm an attorney, but I'm not appearing
in my capacity as an attorney, just a
very good friend of Mr. De Leon.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So this is an
application, the same development as
the previous one for a barbershop,
which I believe is a permitted use in
the Commercial Retail District.

Does anyone have any comments,
questions with regard to this
application?

MR. COTUNGO: No.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do we have any
issues with -- is there currently a
sign out front?

MR. ARNOLD: I don't believe there
is, no.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Is there -- was there a formal
sign application submitted?

MS. WINGATE: Yes, but he has the
same situation, they're on the opposite
sides of the building.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay, so the
same thing.
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MS. WINGATE: Same thing.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Again, so does anyone have any issue with the use as proposed?

MR. COTUNGO: No.

MR. JAUQUET: No.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The sign itself, I have no issue with the sign; obviously if there is an issue with where the sign is going to be located, we will have to deny that as it doesn't conform to the code; but otherwise I think we can move forward unless anyone has any questions or concerns.

I'm going to make a motion for purposes of SEQRA we adopt lead agency status, type this as a Type 2 action, determine it will have no significant negative impact on the environment.

Can I have a second for that motion?

MR. COTUNGO: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?
MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

I make a motion to deny the sign application as it does not conform to the code as existing. If the applicant wishes to go before the ZBA or do something different with the sign, he's free to do so.

Do I have a second for that motion?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

And finally, I make a motion to approve the use evaluation application as submitted without the signage.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. JAUQUET: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?
MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The motion carries.

Thank you very much.

Item number 6, vacant lot on Sixth Street.

Motion to accept the application for site plan review and subdivision approval for Michael Kimack.

Mr. Kimack represents Sixth Street LLC, and has applied to subdivide the property.

The proposed subdivision creates one substandard lot at 6,557.4 square feet which has an existing two-family house and one conforming lot at 7,531 square feet. The subdivision has created several nonconforming setbacks, which will need variances.

This property is not located within the Historic District.

Suffolk County Tax Map number
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1001-6-3-5.

Are you the applicant?

MR. PFLANZL: Yes, I'm the owner.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Is there anything you would like to say about the application?

MR. PFLANZL: The current house is a two-family house. We are willing to give up one family, we want to make it into a one-family house and therefore build another house in the rear lot. I bought this property with my friend. I want to have the front house and he wants to build another house in the back.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

If you can just please, I'll give you pen and paper, if you could write down your name and state your name afterwards for the record.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Are you Michael Kimack?

MR. PFLANZL: No, Michael Kimack is the expediter, but he could not come
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today.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I'm sorry, thanks.

MR. PFLANZL: My name is Wolfgang Pflanzl.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Are you representing Sixth Street LLC?

MR. PFLANZL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: As noted from what I just read, this does require variances so we would have to deny the application, and it would be sent to the ZBA for their review. That's just because we don't really have a choice but to deny it.

We can discuss if anyone wants to bring up anything with regard to the application, but right now I think the only thing we can do is deny it.

So if anyone wants to speak, feel free.

MS. McENTEE: Joann McEntee, 242 Fifth Avenue.

One of the things -- and just
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researching this property, I'm a bit concerned because I've noticed that this property -- I went to the Town of Southold and looked at the property tax card today, and the property tax card says .12 that he is assessed in paying taxes on, which the 5,227 square feet.

Now, I understand that the survey is different with the application here. I do have some maps that do appear that the lot does look like it is .30.

I am concerned that, one, that the Village of Greenport possibly has been losing thousands of dollars as well as the Town of Southold losing thousands of dollars throughout the years on this property.

I do have a call in, again, on Monday to the Town of Southold to rectify it. Somebody was not there to assist me further.

The difference here is 8,961 square feet. It is alarming, so I am not quite sure why if this is 5,227 and
then we're subdividing it where it says
here to be 6,557 and 7,351 which equals
14,188, where does the 227 come in?
This is kind of very concerning.

One of the things that I would
suggest is, one, before we even
consider moving forward with the
subdivision or moving it on to the next
level, is really straighten out this
issue first.

Is there another property that's
involved; is there a deed that really
needs to be addressed?

One thing I was concerned about
originally is, you know, just looking
at the agenda, it said vacant lot on
Sixth Street, so I'm looking all around
for this vacant lot on Sixth Street. I
did look up the tax map number, not an
issue because I can, but there are
people that don't realize, some of the
public do not realize that, that they
have access to this information on the
internet or do not have the time. It
would have been more advantageous for the agenda to have a street on it, rather than just vacant lot, as it usually does. It also does not state whether it's in an R-1 or R-2. I generally know, but generally the public does not know, but it does say that it's not in the Historic District so --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: This was your comment from yesterday?

MS. McENTEE: This is my comment, my letter.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I apologize. I didn't realize what you were saying, but you're absolutely correct.

When I got this agenda that said, it just referred to it as item number 6, and the description vacant lot on Sixth Street is my language because I was trying to add something, it was only referred to as item number, but you're correct, it should have referred to it as a lot number, and I'm the
final person that reviews these agendas
and it is my mistake because you're
right, there is a house on the lot and
from now on it should be referred to as
the number of the house.

Do you know what the number is?
MS. McENTEE: I believe it's 429.
MR. PFLANZL: 429 Sixth Street.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: 429 Sixth Street?
MR. PFLANZL: Yes.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: So I didn't understand, when I heard that you commented, I didn't understand what it was, but thank you for making it right.
MS. McENTEE: Okay.
The bigger issue really is what is the lot, is it .12 which is 5,257 square or is it as it's stated here, 14,188, and why are the taxes so far less because obviously it's less currently.
I called the Village of Greenport today, they could not give me an answer.
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as to what he was paying taxes on, other than stating that the Town of Southold says this is what the assessment value is; and this is what Greenport will submit the taxes to our property owners.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Did you get a copy of the assessor's card when you were there at the Town?

MS. McENTEE: I did not, but I will get that on Monday.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I can look it up tomorrow, but if you want to get that we can look at it and make comments, if it's appropriate to make a comment to the Town.

MS. McENTEE: Again, is this unfair for me to say not to move forward until this issue is straightened out; could this lot have been subdivided at another time, or is it part of Corwin Street which leads right into it?

I don't believe so, because a line
is drawn right there, but it is kind of concerning.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: The Board has to deny the application, they don't have a choice, so I think if there's anything that has to be straightened out, it would have to be straightened out before it goes to another Board.

This Board will be it for tonight for the application. It's a mandatory denial.

MS. McENTEE: Thank you.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Unless somebody disagrees with me.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: No. It's my understanding we would deny the application because it's not conforming and it would have to go to ZBA.

If there are issues that are -- if something's wrong with the tax map, that's not really something we would rectify, but it would certainly be rectified before any application could go forward anywhere whether it would be
ZBA or anyone else.

We have a stamped survey here, so if there is an issue with that, I'm not really sure who would be the appropriate person to address that.

Again, the plans as submitted would have to be denied regardless.

Anyone else have any different thoughts?

MR. COTUNGO: He definitely needs more information on his application whether he goes to the Zoning Board or comes back to us, he definitely needs what's called a zoning analysis or zoning compliance table where you list on each lot what the area is, what the lot coverage is, whether it's a front yard setback all on the chart so it makes it easier for people to diagnose what's going on here. Even this survey is not that clear. I'm reading it and it should show the driveway coming in on this street, and it should propose some kind of house.
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MR. PFLANZL: We are proposing that.

MR. COTUNGO: It's a little unclear too, there's a two-story dwelling and then there's going to be a 440 square foot addition.

MR. PFLANZL: That is going to be the new proposed addition which we need a variance for because we're doing --

MR. COTUNGO: You're taking down part of the house --

MR. PFLANZL: Yes, we're taking down that current addition, and we want to build a new addition.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Does anyone have an opinion as to whether or not this is incomplete, is it good enough that we can deny it or is it simply --

MR. COTUNGO: I think it's complete enough that you can deny it, but I'm just trying to give some advice how you should proceed.

MR. PFLANZL: Right.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I don't know if
we have a scale requirement for the Village. I don't know that the ZBA can -- is that scale too small for the ZBA?

MR. COTUNGO: It's hard to read.

MS. WINGATE: For the survey?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes.

MS. WINGATE: That's standard.

MR. PALLAS: Before it goes to ZBA, it would have an outline of a house which isn't there yet. It can't proceed in this manner to the ZBA, so this, you know, he is just showing --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: You're saying this is essentially incomplete at this time.

MR. PALLAS: For the subdivision process at this stage of the subdivision, following the process, this is the first pass, but it needs Zoning Board, so that they would have to refine this application significantly to go to Zoning and assuming that they attain approval, it
would come back here with more detail
from Zoning, plus subdivision detail is
required with code.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So either way,
we will be denying this application.

MR. COTUNGO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I'm going to
make a motion that we deny this
application as it requires variances
that we cannot grant.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. COTUNGO: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Thank you very much.

Item number 7, 201 Manor Place.

Motion to accept the application
for Site Plan review for Eastern Long
Island Hospital.

Applicant John Condon has been
authorized to submit plans for a
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30-inch seawall/curb on the east, south, and west sides of the hospital.

The proposal also includes the construction of a raised concrete platform for a new electrical generator located in the rear service area.

This property is not located within the Historic District.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-2-3-2.

Is there anybody who would like to speak on behalf of the applicant?

(No response.)

Does anyone have any -- my understanding is that this is a safety measure or precaution in case there's flooding, it would -- it's raising the generator; is that correct, and providing a seawall in case there's flooding issues.

MR. PALLAS: That was the intent as provided to us by the applicant, yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.
Does anyone have any comments or questions?

MR. PALLAS: Just for the Board's information, this requires a wetlands permit from the Village Board of Trustees which, the process starts tonight with the Village Board.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: This is already on their agenda?

MR. PALLAS: It's on the agenda to schedule a public hearing for the wetlands permit.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay, so they're going to take lead agency status for purposes of SEQRA; is that right?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes. I think that would probably be best, yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Because we can't do anything until they approve it.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So then, unless anyone has anything else to say about it, I'm going to suggest we table it.
until the next meeting, give the Village Board time to address this, to get the wetlands permit.

I'm going to make a motion to table this to the next meeting, next work session --

I'm going to make a motion we table this until the September work session.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. JAUQUET: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item number 8, motion to approve the Planning Board minutes of the July 28, 2016 and July 7, 2016 meetings.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.
MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item number 9, motion to adjourn.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. COTUNGO: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. COTUNGO: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Thank you very much.

(Time noted: 6:15 p.m.)
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45/22 46/12 52/5 56/21 60/4 61/9 65/12 69/13
70/8 71/7 72/24 73/18 73/19
yesterday [1] 64/12
yet [2] 9/21 70/12
YORK [4] 1/2 1/7 21/15 76/5
you [109]
you're [15] 16/2 18/10 19/5 22/21 25/17 26/14
27/7 33/11 46/23 49/24 64/17 64/24 65/3
69/11 70/15
your [7] 13/16 30/9 30/24 40/22 40/20 60/20
64/11

Z

ZBA [16] 20/8 20/20 34/4 34/6 49/17 52/9
52/17 54/10 58/9 61/14 67/19 68/2 70/3 70/5
70/11 70/13
zoned [1] 13/19
zoning [12] 13/25 20/24 21/17 21/22 24/21
39/5 68/13 68/15 68/16 70/22 70/24 71/3