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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: This is Village of Greenport Planning Board Work Session, May 26, 2016.

Item Number 1 is 2 Front Street.

Motion to accept the use evaluation application from Crazy Four Inc., represented by Callie Brennan, President.

The applicant proposes to reopen 2 Front Street, formerly The Coronet, under the name Crazy Beans.

The proposed restaurant use is a permitted use in the CR, Commercial Retail Zone.

The property is located within the Historic District and is subject to coordinated review.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-4-10-17.

No physical changes appear to be proposed for the space except for the replacement of tables and chairs and replacement of the awning. The current layout incorporates 60 seats.
A sign permit is needed if new signage will be introduced. Since the project is in the Historic District, the Historic Preservation Commission will need to approve the sign permit.

There is no indication on the plan of how the trash will be handled, so you need to have that in the final proposal.

Did anyone want to speak on this?

MR. MARTINO: Hello.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Hello.

MR. MARTINO: How are you?

I'm Tim Martino. Callie and I --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Before you step down and for anyone else who wants to speak tonight, if you can just sign your names so the stenographer can have everyone's information.

MR. MARTINO: Sure.

So we own two Crazy Beans restaurants. We have one in Miller Place opened about four years ago. We opened a store in Stony Brook Village
two years ago. I also own a technical machine shop.

We are just looking to bring the Crazy Beans out to Greenport, which is one of our favorite spots. We would offer breakfast and lunch and bring our Crazy Beans name out here. We look forward the working with the Village.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Does any member of the Board have any questions or comments?

MR. BURNS: I have one.

Can't you consider leaving the name Coronet on it; we have seen that for how many years, a hundred years?

MR. MARTINO: Yes.

Since '49. We will leave the plaque that says Coronet Circa 1949 above the front door, but Crazy Beans is our brand.

MR. BURNS: I was sort of talking facetious because I know you need to change whatever needs to be changed to your brand and so forth.
CHAIRMAN McMAHON: This seems to be pretty straight forward; it's been essentially the same use since 1949. It seem like you're planning on doing roughly the same thing.

MR. JAUQUET: Did you gut the inside?

MR. MARTINO: No.

We are not making any great big changes on the inside, only cosmetic. Our theme, the Crazy Beans's theme is retro '50s, black and white tiles, and so on. It's fun.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So it's an older, a retro feel to the place?

MR. MARTINO: Yes.

MR. JAUQUET: Where are the other ones; Miller Place and where else?

MR. MARTINO: Stony Brook.

MR. JAUQUET: Stony Brook.

MR. MARTINO: In the little Stony Brook Village, corner of the Stony Brook Village Center.

Anything else?
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Any other questions?

(No response.)

MR. MARTINO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Just one thing to your plan. However you are going to be handling your trash, I don't know if it's on site or continuing however it's been handled, I'm sure that's fine; just include that in your plans.

MR. MARTINO: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Anything else?

(No response.)

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

Do I have a second for that?

MS. CLARK: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item Number 2 is 219 Main Street.

Motion to accept the use...
evaluation application from Juniper Spirit Merchants, represented by Robert Place. The applicant proposes to reopen 219 Main Street, Claudio's Liquor Store, under the name Spirited Wine and Liquor.

The proposed use is a permitted use in the CR, Commercial Retail Zone.

This property is located within the Historic District and is subject to coordinated review.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-4-10-22.2.

Again as with the last application, no physical changes appear to be proposed for the space.

A sign permit has been initiated but no details were presented. Since the project is in the Historic District, the Historic Preservation Commission will need to approve the sign permit.

Again, no indication of how trash would be handled was indicated on the
submittal.

Also, the hours of operation were not indicated.

Other than that, I don't have any other notes.

Does anyone have any comments or questions with regard to this? Is there anyone that would like to speak?

MR. PLACE: I'm Robert Place.

Like I said, I'm looking to open up the liquor store to do basically what it was doing before. Our selection is going to be a little bit more on artisanal liquors, local, from abroad, smaller distilleries, things of that nature.

In terms of trash, it's primarily recycling cardboard.

I'm not sure if there's any other questions that the Board has.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Not right now.

Essentially, again similar to the last application, it's been a liquor store as long as I'm aware of. The
only thing you will need to do because it's in the Historic District is whenever you have signage completed, you need to submit the proper sign application.

MR. PLACE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: You will have to go through the Historic Preservation Commission.

MR. PLACE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Other than that, anyone with comments or questions?

(No response.)

Okay. I'm going to make a motion to move on to the next item.

Do I have a second for that?

MS. CLARK: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item Number 3 is Row off Front
Motion to accept use evaluation application from William F. Claudio Inc., represented by Janice Claudio.

The applicant proposes to use the east side of the applicant's dock to offer boats for sale.

The proposed use is a permitted use in the CR, Commercial Retail Zone.

This property is not located in the Historic District.

Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-5-4-25.

I do have a couple questions on this one.

It doesn't appear any physical changes were proposed to the property.

There is a note here that in the past signage and wind-blown flyers were issues.

First I'm aware of that, we should expand on that.

A sign permit should be incorporated as part of this.
application.

There are questions as to is there going to be someone physically present? If so, what will the hours of operation be; and where will they be located? Will there be any physical furniture of structures introduced? If there temporary, where will they be stored at night? Will there be any storage of boats, trailers, or other items on land?

This parcel is unusual, as it's basically an extension of the park or thoroughfare.

While the sale of boats appears to be an allowed use, fitting the marine character of the W-C zoning, this use can impact the transient nature of the dockage serving and economically supporting the Village. This proposal is minor to the overall dockage, but may set a precedence. Discussion of a cap for the percentage of slips assigned to sales on docks serving the
Village might be appropriate to preclude the future conversion of a high percentage of the dockage from transient use. At the same time, support of economic viability and flexibility for property owners with a seasonal restriction should also be respected.

With regards to this last statement, I think it would be the purview of the Board of Trustees to discuss any limits on percentage of slips used for transient or personal; that's not really for this Board to decide.

Other than that, I don't have any further notes.

Jan, would you like to speak?

MS. CLAUDIO: Sure.

I am Janice Claudio.

So Claudio's Marina runs three restaurants and last year we positioned some boats on the western and northern corner of our property. It is not more
than four boats at any time. It was a leased space to Strong’s Marina, so they had boats. It’s kind of an added activity for the waterfront. They did staff it with one or two people. There are no trailers on the property. They leave after the Maritime Festival. They’re all new boats, and it’s just kind of fun.

I don’t remember your other questions.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Will there be any sandwich boards or placards or any sort of --

MS. CLAUDIO: They mounted a TV on one of the pilings, and they ran a looping video last year; so there was that.

During the Maritime Festival, a table was set up, also on our land, and they had brochures just because that was a bigger event going on with that; but no, they stay on the boats. They give people rides on the boats if
they're interested. Most of the deals actually get concluded at Strong's. It's just a way to show boats in the water for them in a kind of populated area.

For us it's a way of increasing activities on the property. It's a little corner of the dock. It doesn't effect the transient dock so much because it's a little space.

MR. JAUQUET: You had boats there last summer.

MS. CLAUDIO: We did.

MR. JAUQUET: It said Strong's, I remember the loop, the video loop; and they were all in the water.

MS. CLAUDIO: Right.

MR. JAUQUET: I remember it, maybe that's from Maritime.

MS. CLAUDIO: There might have been one trailer.

MR. JAUQUET: Yeah, I think --

MS. CLAUDIO: I would encourage that truthfully, but I can't remember
if there was.

MR. JAQUET: They had maybe two
or three --

MS. CLAUDIO: Right. And they
have one of the salesperson signs and
then (inaudible) they got a second
person.

There is a camera on that's on our
building so that we can be watching all
the time. It's a little lease thing
from, well they're not even setup for
Memorial Day, but in theory, it should
be Memorial Day up to Maritime.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: To me, it seems
to be fitting to the character of the
Village.

MS. CLAUDIO: We're a little
marina and we have boats, that's what
we do.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Does anyone
from the Board have --

MR. BURNS: For clarification,
it's actually on the west side of the
dock.
MS. CLAUDIO: No. It's on the west side of our big dock, on the east side of our little dock, in front of that gray building. It was the building for, you know it was the machine shop from the -- historically it was --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The bait shop.

MS. CLAUDIO: Next to the bait shop.

MR. JAUQUET: Next to the bait shop.

MS. CLAUDIO: It's next to the bait shop.

MR. JAUQUET: It's a storage building, it's really very nondescript.

MS. CLAUDIO: Right, gray.

MR. JAUQUET: Is there a pier in there on the, just on the west where you have the --

MS. CLAUDIO: Yes. A little, like, small dock.

MR. JAUQUET: It's a little -- it's a floating dock.
Proceedings - May 26, 2016

MS. CLAUDIO: No, it's a stationary dock. It's part of the machine shop which is what that gray building was of ours; it's not storage. The Mills owned it before us. We bought it in 1982, the Claudio family from the Mills; and before that, it was a machine shop for the Holtz family (phonetic).

MR. JAQUET: Do we have any concern about signage, video monitors and that, or is it --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I think the video monitors are on their building existing.

MS. CLAUDIO: It's on our piling.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The camera and any electrical stuff, that should be indicated on the plan.

MS. CLAUDIO: That's not even -- that's on the building itself; that's not even on the water. It's on the building that looks at the water. It's a security camera.
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: You said there was a TV with --

MS. CLAUDIO: That's on the piling.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So that would -- you just want to note that in the application.

So that would connect to your electric?

MS. CLAUDIO: Yes. It's connected with an outlet and cord.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's not in the Historic District.

MR. JAUQUET: I see.

MR. BURNS: Long as it doesn't interfere with traffic coming in and out of the Village.

MS. CLAUDIO: No. It's in the corner there.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's primarily just the boats being docked there.

MS. CLAUDIO: It's primarily showing their boats in the water for Strong's and picking up on our, you
know, business.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Anyone have any questions or concerns?

(No response.)

So I'm going to make a motion to move on to the next item.

Do I have a second?

MS. CLARK: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item number 4 is 440 First Street.

Just a slight correction to make in this, it originally said consideration and possible action on the revised sketch plan; it actually should read continued discussion and possible action to consider sketch plan.

Applicant Eric Urban has revised the site plan for sub-division originally submitted on June 8, 2015.
The proposed subdivision would divide the existing 13,627-square-foot lot into two parcels. Parcel 1 would be 11,405-square feet and include the existing single-family house. Parcel 2 would be 2,222-square feet and include the existing two-story frame carriage house.

This sub-division would create two sub-standard lots and other nonconformities on both parcels requiring Zoning Board of Appeals variance approvals.

This property is located within the Historic District and is subject to coordinated review.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-4-7-1.

As we noted the last time this application was before us and as the applicant has noted in the materials they submitted, this would have to be denied by this Board because it is creating two substandard lots. We do
not have the authority to approve it, you have to go before the ZBA. We're going to allow anyone who wants to speak on it, to speak today. I do want to just note for the record's sake that you would need to be convincing the ZBA to approve the variances, then it would possibly come back to us after the fact, but it's really not up for us to decide whether or not to allow the variances, so let me just read off a couple of the issues.

Some of issue of nonconformance:

The proposal is to subdivide the existing lot into two lots. The existing lot is 100 feet by 136.25 feet. The total parcel size is 13,627-square feet.

Further, it is a corner lot so that gets some additional difficulties for the proposed subdivision. As per Chapter 150 Zoning Code of Village of Greenport Article 5, District Bulk and
Parking Regulations, the schedule of regulations 150-12, the existing lot size complies with current code, but the subdivision would not comply with the following:

The minimum lot area required for either a one-family or two-family dwelling is 7,500-square feet. If divided, the lot sizes would be 11,405 for one lot but only 2,222-square feet for the second, introducing nonconformance where there was none, representing only 29.6 percent of the minimum requirement or a 70.4 percent variance.

The larger lot will still support a two-family residence. The smaller one, just a one-family home. There is a potential exemption that would allow a two-family dwelling on the even smaller lot, although minimum square footage for dwelling areas would be difficult to meet. This means that the lot could support three dwelling units.
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if subdivided. The original lot size
does not support multi-family housing,
a conditional use, as the lot size of
less than the 15,000-square feet is
required, and that's section 160-8B,
subsection 2B of the Village Code.

Item number 3, article eight
Nonconforming Uses and Nonconforming
Buildings 150-20, Subsection A5 reads:

Shall not be re-established if
such use had been changed or replaced
by a conforming use. There is no
inherent right to re-establish
nonconforming lots.

Item number 4, the minimum lot
width is 60 feet. If divided, the
width of the small lot would only be 45
feet, needing a variance of 25 percent.

The Minimum lot depth for a lot in
R-2 is 100 feet. The smaller lot only
has a depth of 50 feet, representing a
50 percent variance. The larger lot
would have a portion of its depth
reduced to 91.3 feet, 8.7 percent
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variance. Both introduce nonconformance where there was none.

Item number 6, one side yard needs to be a minimum of ten feet, with the aggregate being 25 feet. If the lot were to be subdivided, the side yard of the small lot is nonconforming. Also the distance between the existing house and the lot line is only 7.3 feet.

Item 7, the rear yard required is 30 feet. If one includes the right of way as the property of Parcel 1, then this is met for the large lot, but not for Parcel 2.

Number 8. The lot coverage maximum is 30 percent in an R2 zone. The footprint of the garage is 618.84. This is 27.8 percent, so the existing garage complies.

The minimum livable area is 1,000-square feet. This needs to be calculated according to the definition of Floor Area, Livable in Section 150-2 as the building does not appear to meet...
this minimum requirement.

If subdivided, it is conceivable that the owner of Parcel 2 may want to build up. Since the setback does not appear to be compliant with the five-foot setback for accessory structure, increasing the height of a principal structure so close to the lot line could have a negative impact on adjacent properties.

As stated before, this project will need to be forwarded to the Zoning Board of Appeals. This property is in the Historic District, so any physical changes to the structure will need to be presented and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Financial Hardship, this property is not the primary residence of the owner. It may also be used as a two-family residence without subdivision.

There is some additional information requested, I don't know if
you'd like to speak on this before I read off some of the other items. There are just some additional items that are more information.

MS. MOORE: Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Number 1, show parking for two cars for each parcel and any proposed changes to the access drive.

Please correct and give dimensions for the right of way, a dashed line does not appear to be 25 feet from the lot line as the house setback from the east lot line is 47.8 feet and the current line does not appear to be over 50 percent of the setback.

The 25-foot setback cited for the garage from the west boundary of Parcel 2 does not seem to be accurate. Please give the distance from the garage to all property lines.

Provide lot coverage for both lots.

Calculate the livable area of the

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service (631) 727-1107
garage, using the definition in section 150-2.

Provide a compliance table for both lots.

We can give you all this.

MS. MOORE: Please.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Would you like to speak?

MS. MOORE: Good evening Patricia Moore. Eric Urban is here as well. Thank you for discussing the application with us. We do welcome your comments.

The last time we were here, there was some discussion about the desire to, Mr. Urban's desire or dream would be to renovate both structures. Realistically, financially it may be impossible to renovate the main house, and one of the comments that was made at that meeting was leave enough acreage so that if somebody wanted to make a B&B out of the larger structure or some other use that would be
acceptable and allowed in the code to
leave enough acreage for that. Also
there is some beautiful trees that
provide esthetics here on this property
and in order to do that, that's why we
shrank the building on Parcel 2 because
the goal would be to just take the
carriage house and convert that as a
dwelling on that parcel, leaving all of
the remaining land on Parcel 1 to give
the maximum flexibility for that house
to be renovated and adopted for use of
that building, so this is very unique
in the sense that we have two existing
structures, we are -- certainly we
could have come to the Board or will go
to the Zoning Board with a much more
even lot between the two parcels;
however, to create two more evenly
sized parcels would undermine and
possibly impede the redevelopment of
Parcel 1, the big house, which is
really the emphasis here.

So we will welcome those comments,
we'll take them back with us. I'm sure they are many of the same issues and comments the Zoning Board would want us to address, so that gives us a good outline of the information that we will present to the Zoning Board, so that would be our next step.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MS. MOORE: We're here really to get any additional comments you might have, that will very helpful to us. The first time it was before you, we didn't have that detail, but this time that amount of detail would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We can provide you a copy of this.

MS. MOORE: Very useful. Thank you.

MR. JAUQUET: I have a couple of questions.

MS. MOORE: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. JAUQUET: How much is it going to cost you to renovate that house --

MS. MOORE: It costs --
MR. JAUQUET: Have you ever had anybody look into that because it's Historic District, that's a big factor in the whole idea.

MS. MOORE: Right.

MR. JAUQUET: Us and the Zoning Board of Appeals.

MS. MOORE: I'm sure.

MR. JAUQUET: So what's the idea there?

MS. MOORE: Eric.

MR. URBAN: There is a significant amount of money that's going to have to go into the main house; and number two --

MR. JAUQUET: Have you had an engineer come in and give you a number?

MR. URBAN: I've had architects and --

MR. JAUQUET: What are they saying it is?

MR. URBAN: You know, I did this over a period of time, and obviously there were, numbers have changed,
32
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economic decisions and timeframe have changed. I'm going have do get a lot of that updated, okay, but obviously, money was always a factor.

MS. MOORE: He's asking like budget-wise, just generically.

MR. URBAN: Let's put it this way, I mean if I can't do both the way this is, it's not going to work out.

MR. JAUQUET: Right.

MR. URBAN: If it doesn't give me the opportunity, otherwise my risk is too high and I won't do it.

MS. MOORE: I think at the last hearing, in our last presentation, we gave you the update of what had already been invested. If I remember off the top of my head, you will remember better, there was a whole side of the building that had been reconstructed; the roof was new, electrical, I think --

MR. URBAN: Electrical, plumbing, sewer line, everything.
MR. JAUQUET: How close is it to being a teardown?

MR. URBAN: Far from it.

MR. JAUQUET: I mean, you know, these things collapse at some point, but you have done a lot of remedial work, so it's like in between.

MS. MOORE: Yes.

MR. JAUQUET: It's like in between being a wreck and not a wreak.

MS. MOORE: Well, it's far from being a wreck in that all the infrastructure, the things you don't see, that investment has been done. The porch was, you know, questionable about the structural soundness, so it was really just the porch, and that was structurally supported so that it wouldn't be an issue, but that's cosmetic more than structural.

Ideally, do you replace all the clapboard or do you paint it or do you replace windows or do you improve the windows that are there? It's financial
decisions that are going to be made and it depends really on the pocket of the individual.

MR. JAQUET: I was just wondering if you had the numbers.

My other comment is, the trees seem like a big problem.

MS. MOORE: In what way?

MR. JAQUET: In the fact that they overwhelm the property. My opinion is that I would take those trees out and reveal the house for what it is like the other captain's house on First Street. That's my opinion.

MS. MOORE: That is not my thinking.

MR. JAQUET: It's just my opinion.

MS. MOORE: I think it's funny because I would hear the complete opposite opinion from another Board member.

MR. URBAN: I personally can't speculate on what somebody else might
do. I can tell you what I'm trying to do.

MS. MOORE: I mean, can those trees be trimmed? Yes. But taking them down, I mean, I don't know.

MR. URBAN: I believe the trees lend character; and I'm going to keep them. That's all in the site plan.

MS. MOORE: The whole reason we changed the design was because we sensed that there was a lot more interest in preserving those trees than in removing them; and even though we could certainly create a lot line through covenant to put a condition on the removal of trees and preservation of trees.

MR. JAUQUET: Yeah well, maybe a botanist or an engineer, it's just that all the shadow, you know, creates a paint job every year with a building like that, all the moisture and algae that grows on there. That's why I brought it up because it seems to be a
problem with the site.

MR. URBAN: It's one of the big reasons why I considered going for a very expensive roof on that house.

MR. JAUQUET: Yeah.

MS. MOORE: Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Questions?

Comments?

(No response.)

MS. MOORE: Will those comments be sent to us?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We will have them sent.

MS. MOORE: Thank you.

And then we'll proceed with the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Is there anybody else who wants to speak on this motion before we move on?

(No response.)

Okay.

I'm going make a motion to the move on to the next item.
Do I have a second?

MR. JAUQUET: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item number 5 is 211 Carpenter Street.

Continued discussion on the application for site plan review. David Kapell, representing Old Shipyard LLC, located at 211 Carpenter Street, has proposed to convert an existing two-story building into a first-floor tasting room and one second-floor apartment. The property is in the CR, Commercial/Retail District.

Both uses are permitted in the CR Zone. The property has been vacant for some time. All mixed-use buildings are required to have a fire suppression system by the NY State Fire Prevention and Building Code. The property is
located in the Village Historic District and is subject to coordinated review.

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-4-10-11.

I don't see either of the applicants, the applicants or its representative here.

Anyone have any comments or questions on this? We had requested a few minor issues with regards to the right of way, and handicap accessibility; they said they would be addressing that.

I'm going to make a motion to move on to the next item.

Do I have a second for that?

MS. CLARK: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. PLACE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

MS. WINGATE: Is this tabled until
next month?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: If they want to -- I mean, I think we would keep it on the agenda for next week. If they want to speak on it at that time, they can, but otherwise.

Item number 6 is 300-308 Main Street.

Continued discussion on the application for site plan review. An amendment to the previous site plan is required. The previous site plan was approved on November 4, 2015. The applicant Robert I. Brown, Architect is representing Stirling Square LLC, Brent Pelton.

The applicant has proposed to remodel four existing apartment units into an additional five temporary residential inn units, and one handicap accessible unit on the ground floor, bringing the total of rental rooms for American Beech Inn to 11 rooms.

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.

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

The proposal has specified a retractable awning over the existing cedar trellis which covers the dining patio at the American Beech Restaurant.

The plan also calls for an extension of the wood pergola to the north. The property is located in the Village of Greenport Historic District and is subject to coordinated review.

The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the proposal at the April 4, 2016 HPC meeting and approved the change in facade, but asked the applicant to explore other options for
the dining patio.

The Historic Preservation Commission has asked that the project remain on the agenda pending an alternative to the retractable awning.

All additional changes to the site plan will be reviewed at the June HPC meeting.
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I don't believe I have any notes on this.

Do we have any revised notes or changes to the original comments that we had the last time?

MS. WINGATE: You have a set of --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I know, but there was an additional --

MS. WINGATE: Additional notes, no.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Robert Brown

Architect.

Your comments were pretty
self-explanatory. We have made some revisions to the plans which include your accessibility on the ground floor which will actually require us to go back to the Historic Preservation Commission because that requires a change in that facade on that unit.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: You're on the agenda for them for this coming month; is that correct?

MR. BROWN: That seems to be up in the air. I was under the impression that we were, but that may be being held over.

MS. WINGATE: To Zoning?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: No. To the HPC.

MR. BROWN: HPC.

MS. WINGATE: Yeah.

No. I don't believe --

MR. BROWN: They told us we were being held over.

MS. WINGATE: Yeah, I --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I'm sorry.
MS. CLARK: It says June, June HPC meeting.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: There was a discussion regarding the units at the last meeting that I attended, and I wasn't at the last meeting, there was a discussion with the Board about the fact that the apartments had to be year round.

MS. WINGATE: Yeah, they're --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: No, the units will be hotels, so they will not be residential.

If they remained residential units, they would have to be year round. If they were converted to commercial use, than accessory for apartments don't apply.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That was my understanding.

MR. BROWN: We did modify some of the accessibility to other ground-floor units, so they are all accessible now.
MR. PELTON: Brent Pelton, the owner of Sterling Square American Beach.

Following last month, we had an in-person sit-down meeting with Paul, Glenys and Eileen, as well as Rob, and that was really helpful for us to be able to go through the comments and try to come up with a better plan, so what you have now hopefully reflects that.

MR. BROWN: Hopefully reflects that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do we have any questions or concerns from the Board with regards to the application, commercial units, expansion of the hotel?

MR. JAUQUET: No, I don't.

Are you renting the --

How is the rental going on motel units.

MR. PELTON: It's great. We're almost full for the season.

MR. JAUQUET: For the season?
MR. PELTON: For weekends during the summer.

MR. JAUQUET: Did you get any feedback on those rooms?

MR. PELTON: We were just named, today -- CNN Travel said that we were one to best new hotels of the year.

I don't know, we have had some really good feedback.

MR. JAUQUET: That's what I'm asking.

MR. BROWN: Just as an aside, Hospitality and Design Magazine is giving the restaurant an award.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So there was a question that I believe was being addressed with the HPC with regards to the awnings, whether they were going to be retractable or not, have you explored any options?

MR. BROWN: We have been exploring options, and we do have a proposal to submit to --
contention was they were looking for an alternative to retractable awnings?

MR. BROWN: No.

The issue was a retractable awning, the Maximum travel distance you can get is 16 feet, the pergola is 22 feet, so we're trying to work out how to make up that difference.

We have some proposals to show the Historic Preservation Commission.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Questions or concerns?

MS. BERRY: I just have one. You mentioned that you would be putting some drainage within the courtyard, but I don't see it here; have you changed your mind on that?

MR. BROWN: Well, we left the whole drainage issue open at this point because Mr. Pallas was going to make some suggestions or determinations about the areas that we cannot drain; so I was hoping he was going to do that all as a package.
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MS. BERRY:  Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON:  So the stone paving is going to extend throughout the courtyard?

MR. BROWN:  Yes. Surrounded by gravel where there is, where it's required, and that, in fact, would be part of the drainage system.

MR. JAUQUET:  That is your idea of tying the entire campus together?

MR. BROWN:  Exactly.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON:  So the reception lobby is not going to be, it's not another bar space, right; it's just a general reception area for a lobby for all of the units; is that correct?

MR. PELTON:  For all of the units, plus I'd like to be able to do an event space. We have a lot of inquiries for people wanting to do dinners, et cetera, et cetera, and it would be very nice to have a separate space so that we can accommodate guests without
CHAIRMAN McMAHON: In regards to that, I'm guessing all food would then be prepared off-site or somewhere else in the building, or in the existing restaurant then?

MR. PELTON: I think that would be fair to say.

MR. BROWN: There wouldn't be a separate kitchen provided for that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Just because that would be Health Department requirement.

MR. BROWN: Even it's a small space, with especially having turned over about a third of it to the accessible ground-floor unit made the space even smaller.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I do also have a question on if you are going to be serving any sort of drinks, whether it be coffee or tea or anything, if there would be some Health Department requirements with regards to that,
whether or not that would be included
in the restaurant or how that would be
handled because if there's any food or
beverages being served on-site there in
the lobby, than there would need to be
the appropriate storage for them and
trash removal, et cetera for any of
those items, so if you are planning on
incorporating that, make sure that's
included as well, just for the
reception of the lobby area that would
need to be, make sure that everything
is compliant with the Health Department
whether everything is being prepared
there or served there.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: This is subject
to a coordinated review. I don't know
if we have the responses back.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Did we send
out --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I have to check
with the Clerk.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Is it in the
Historic District?
Proceedings - May 26, 2016

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So then it would be -- so we have to send out the letters and see if -- I don't know if you sent them out or not, we'll have to check.

MR. PELTON: I don't think it was sent out. I think we'd like to start the process.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Normally, the best thing to do is wait until the application is set, the plan is set, so if this is the planning that they're going to use, we'll use that for the notice.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

The only other concern is whether the HPC comes back with their comments.

MS. WINGATE: HPC was hoping that you would get to a point that they can --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: With regards to use, they'd like some --

MS. WINGATE: With regards to use
before they start looking at the esthetics of the of square.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Do we have communication on that; did they send that?

MS. WINGATE: In writing, no. That was just a conversation. They're not on the June agenda because there's too many little pieces that are still moving around.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I don't know that you can make a decision without a coordinated review.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yeah.

I think perhaps at our next meeting, we can accept the application, so we can begin the process, send it to HPC and ask for their review of the esthetics, the exterior esthetics, and we can make a decision from there. I think that --

MR. BROWN: You can't accept it today?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We can't --
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this is just a work session, so it would be not next month, next week.

We're not accepting any applications tonight, we just discussing them to make sure everything is clear, so if there is one or two small pieces missing, we can then have it for the next meeting.

Does anyone have any question or concerns about use or about the overall layout of the plan?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Can I ask something?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Sure.

Come to the podium.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: James Olinkiewicz, 131 Third Street, Greenport.

I just have a couple of questions for clarity. I mean, he has done an unbelievable job with the Square, the place is beautiful, restaurant is beautiful, the rooms are beautiful. My only question is being a landlord that
rents out apartments was are the unit
that we're going to turn into inn, are
they going to still kitchens, are they
going to be efficiency?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: No. There not
allowed to have any kitchens. That's
prohibitive.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: That was it.

Thank you so much.

MR. BROWN: Are there any other
comments or issues to be addressed
between now and next week, that we can
address between now and next week?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Not that I'm,
not that I have.

Anyone else?

MR. PALLAS: Just the drainage, we
can talk tomorrow about that.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Any other
questions or comments.

I'm going the make a motion to
move on to the next item.

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

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item number 7, 131 Third Street.

Continued discussion on the application for site plan review at 131 Third Street, formerly Meson Ole.

Applicant 131 Third Street

Greenport Inc., represented by James Olinkiewicz, proposes to reconstruct and create new uses for the existing building, located at 131 Third Street, in the CR, Commercial/Retail, District.

The proposed renovation includes the division of the first floor into two restaurants and the addition of three residential units on the second and third floors. All proposed uses are permitted within the CR, Commercial/Retail District.

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

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service
(631) 727-1107
Proceedings - May 26, 2016

Suffolk County Tax Map number 1001-6-2-23.2.

Any comments or questions from the Board?

(No response.)

Mr. Olinkiewicz, anyone else.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Just a quick thing, so everybody knows and it's on the record.

I had listed the property on loopnet two months ago when I was extremely frustrated with where I thought some avenues the Board was going to this and that, the possibility of having being sent to the ZBA for seven to ten months with a timeframe, so had listed the property in frustration.

It has come off the market. My intention is to put three workforce housing units upstairs, which I already have two of them spoken for, and the two restaurants downstairs. I'd like to proceed with the project.
MR. JAUQUET: I was wondering about that.

Any interest in the restaurants.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I have an interest in one of the restaurants right now, so they would like to see it framed up and put together because, you know, we've had two meetings so far, we talked on the phone many times, but they, of course, want to see what it's going to morph into.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Whether you chose to sell or not, it's immaterial to the merits of the plan is really all we're --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I understand that. I just wanted the Board to know where I am.

MR. JAUQUET: I'd like to know.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Clarity.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Any comments or questions?

MR. PHELPS: Hi. I'm Brian Phelps, contact manager for Sterlington.
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Commons in Greenport. Mr. Olinkiewicz's neighbor.

It's my understanding, prior to this use, it was a rooming house with a restaurant on the main floor historically?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I believe there was a rooming house at one time. We started to look into the history, but I don't know the full history of the property.

MR. PHELPS: The code is that it would be accepted as the rooming house?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It's not acceptable as a rooming house.

MR. PHELPS: Sterlington Commons does support his application for the apartments because we feel it's a de-intensification of putting offices up there we're going to have our parking lot encroached on more of a regular basis, no fault of his because if the need parking, they go to a parking lot.
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The owner of the property has asked me to come here and say he would support this project, Sterlington Commons of Greenport LLC. Three apartments are a more stable entity there. You will end up with 1.5 parking spaces needed for the apartment. His parking lot holds a heck of a lot more than that. The alternatives are what? Office space, where you have daytime use clogging up our parking lot and his, so I just wanted to come here and I was asked to come here by the person engaged me to say we do support the application.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Thank you.

Would anyone else like to speak, comments, questions at this time?

(No response.)

Okay.

All right. I make a motion to move to the next item.

Do I have a second?
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MR. BURNS: Second.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Just trying to find out what happens next.

Do you vote to approve it? Do you wait until next week to approve it?

Are my site plans approved?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. This is just a work session, so next week is when we do any voting.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Okay.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. PLACE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Item number 8, Motion to approve the Planning Board minutes of April 7, 2016 meeting.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries. Item number 9, Motion to accept the Planning Board minutes of the April 28, 2016 meeting.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

MS. CLARK: I want to go on record as not voting for item number 8 because I wasn't a member of the Board, and I don't want to be on record as agreeing to it.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Item number 10, motion to adjourn. Hold on.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: We have a question I need to discuss. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Take your time.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think we have
a discussion on item number one and two.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Sure.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: This Board is allowed, under the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Regulations, Boards are allowed to determine what actions are designated as Type 2 and Type 1, and in this Board has previously determined that, in general use evaluation applications are a Type 2 applications, and therefore not subject to SEQRA, but the other thing about a Type 2 action is if it's in the Historic District, it does not get elevated to a Type 1 action, it stays as a Type 2 action, and therefore no coordinated review is required.

I believe this Board has previously determined that on use evaluation with no change in use in the Historic District, a coordinated review would not be done. In the last year,
there has been a couple of applications
that got reviewed but anyway, you could
do it if you want to, but I just wanted
to bring it to your attention that
generally where there is a use
evaluation where there is no change in
use, this board has determined it was a
Type 2 action.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I think that's
the way we would like to go with it
because it is essentially a
continuation of the previous use.
There is no, it's not really a site
plan evaluation as much as it is a use
evaluation application. Use
evaluation, if there is no change in
use, there is no change in intensity or
any reason to think there would be any
adverse effect in any way.

That's the precedent that we have
been setting and, I think that clearly
I feel it is the most appropriate.
There is no sense, the signage would
still need to go to the Historic
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Preservation Commission, but as far as a use review, I don't think it's necessary to have a coordinated review.

MR. JAQUET: Is there better language than using the words coordinated review, should it be Type 1 or 2 and whether it applies.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: You can just determine that it's a Type 2 action and then automatically there is no coordinated review.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So when we make a SEQRA determination at the next meeting, we can just specify that as a Type 2 action, it's not required --

MR. JAQUET: That would address --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's simply a signage review by HPC.

MR. JAQUET: That way, you will address the State Law that Joe was bringing up.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We will take lead agency status and make a SEQRA
determination as Type 2 status and move on from there.

Any other question or concerns.

(No response.)

Item number 10, motion to adjourn.

Can I have a second?

MR. JAUQUET: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MR. JAUQUET: Aye.

MS. CLARK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Motion carries.

Thank you very much.

(Time noted: 6:00 p.m.)
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