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(The meeting was called to order at 7:13 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Folks, good evening. This is the Village of Greenport Zoning Board of Appeals.

Item Number 1 is a motion to accept the minutes of the November 19, 2019 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

So moved.

MEMBER TASKER: Second.

MEMBER CORWIN: Aye.

MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

MEMBER REARDON: Aye.

MEMBER TASKER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

Item Number 2 is a motion to approve the minutes of the October 15, 2019 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

So moved.

MEMBER GORDON: Second.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?

MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

MEMBER REARDON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'll vote aye.

Any abstentions?

MEMBER TASKER: I'll abstain, I was absent.

MEMBER CORWIN: I abstain, I didn't read the minutes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And two abstentions.

Item Number 3 is a motion to schedule the next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting for Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. at Station 1, Greenport Fire Department.

So moved.

MEMBER REARDON: Second.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?

MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

MEMBER TASKER: Aye.

MEMBER CORWIN: Aye.

MEMBER REARDON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'll vote aye.

Item Number 4 is 415 Kaplan Avenue.

Motion to accept the application,
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schedule a public hearing and arrange a site visit for the application of Olinkiewicz Contracting, Inc. for the property located at 415 Kaplan Avenue, Greenport, New York 11944.

Suffolk County Tax Map number is 1001-4-1-6.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: James Olinkiewicz, 621 Main Street, Greenport, New York. Olinkiewicz Contracting. I'm a local contractor, contracting for 415 Kaplan Avenue, Greenport, New York.

I put in an application for a request for a use variance and now I have also put in an application for the interpretation that you have in front of you for the interpretation of Section 150-13(E), which is existing small lots.

So it's my belief that when the code was written that they didn't take into account all possible lots. The area of this lot is 11,400-square feet, 60 percent above what is needed for a lot size to be able to build a two-family home. The lot is 52-feet
wide instead of the 60, which that's in the Village Code for R-2 District, two-family housing.

I understand partially how this was written with the total lot area. I believe the words should have been "and lot width less than prescribed." My belief is that the Village, I guess the trustees who formed this code were thinking about not having lots 70-feet wide by 70-feet deep to be able to put a two-bedroom house on 4,900-square feet. I don't think they took into account or realized that there were lots that were 52-feet wide by 205-feet deep as this one is. So there is -- it doesn't take into account a few lots in the Village. It takes into account 98 percent of them but, of course, this lot, which had a house on it, which there's discussion whether there was a two-family there or not. The Richards had a renter in the house. I was led to believe it had been a two-family house that had gone back to a one-family. You can't find records back 50 years.
I've owned Kaplan Avenue, 411, the two-family house next to it, 419, the house to the right, which was just sold, had become a two-family, they have two apartments in that one, so there's three other houses right in the area. In fact, Mr. Corwin has a house diagonally across the street that's a two- or three-family, I'm not sure. I have never researched that out, so the whole area is a work-force housing community.

I just think that this code -- I'm asking for an interpretation because I don't believe that that type of lot was taken into account when this code was written.

And after the house burnt down -- it had been an existing house, if that existing house was there, it could easily be converted to a two-family. There would have been no issue. It wouldn't even be before the Board.

So that's why I'm asking for an interpretation of the code because if you read it, it's actually kind of written
Zoning Board of Appeals 12/17/2019

poorly for lots that are well oversized. It looks like it aims for lots that are in the Village that are very small, so I don't think that was taken into account, so I'm asking for an interpretation from the Zoning Board before I would apply for the use variance.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Jimmy, you know interpretations require a public hearing?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So no matter what happens here tonight, we're going to schedule a public hearing for you for that and depending on how that goes, if there's still a variance involved, whether it be an area or use, we're gonna have to schedule a public hearing for that also.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Correct.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: As long as everybody's on the same page, knowing that this is not going to be addressed at least until February.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Right, so we
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have the first public hearing and then if you decide it's an area variance, then we go to the next public hearing; if you decide it's a use variance, go to the next public hearing; or if you agree with we go to the next public hearing.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So as long you and the public know so there's no surprises next month --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Right.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: -- we're just going to talk about the application tonight, not the meat of the application. We'll save that for the public hearing.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I just have one or two questions about the application because if anybody in the room is familiar with how the Zoning Board works, it's you. For us to accept an application, it has to be complete and correct.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: We have something wrong there?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm going to
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ask you. I'm not saying it's wrong, I'm
going to ask you about it.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The

application --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The applicant

as the contract vendee is 415 Kaplan Avenue?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: That is correct.

That's the S Corp. It's S Corp.,

incorporated?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Oh, it's an

incorp, okay.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I'm not quite

sure why it was Olinkiewicz Contracting,

Inc.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: But the

application is correct?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The application

is correct.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: You're asking

for an interpretation, so we know that.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: On whether I

have to go for an area variance or use.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The other

question I would have, and I'm sure the
members might have one or two questions also, is about, I'm looking at the plan and I have a problem with the size of the house you're asking for only because there's two different numbers there that kind of have me confused. The first floor being -- I should have it in front of me and I don't.

If you look at the plans, you're asking for a 2,200-square-foot house and by measuring --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: All right, 2,200-square foot is both floors together.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Yeah, but one is 1,300 and one is 11 and change.

Here it is.

One is 1,180, the dimensions of the first floor is 1,180 and the dimensions of the second floor is 1,200, so that comes out the 2,380, that's not 22. And normally we wouldn't care about that. We don't care about that as long as the sideyard is -- just so the application is correct. If the Building Department is okay with him making that correction on the
application, I would be fine with it, I would have to ask the members too.

The other thing I would ask about is your EAF. Question number 2 is, does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other governmental agency, and the answer is no.

Wouldn't a permit from the Village, wouldn't that be a yes answer?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Isn't it a list who, it says Board of Health, DEC --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: There's another spot where it lists if you had to go to any other agency, Board of Health, DEC, EPA, but --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Not here, but we can ask about that too.

MR. PALLAS: I will confirm.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: So then yes, we would need to go for another permit. The answer is yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: It says, question number 7 is the site of the
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proposed action located in or does it adjoin
a state listed critical environmental area,
if yes, identify.

You said no.

I would have to ask if the
freshwater wetlands, perhaps David would
know --

MEMBER CORWIN: Well, I don't
think that that area is designated as
critical, but I believe the western side of
that property is swamp or wetlands.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: It was sent to
the Village architect that reviews all the
plans and in his response back, it said it
did not need any DEC or any other
applications.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, again,
if we go down the page a little bit, does
any portion of the site of the proposed
action or land adjoining the proposed action
contain wetlands or water bodies regulated
by state, federal or local agency?

I'm positive that that's
freshwater wetlands.
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MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Is it regulated by the state? I'm just --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Or local agency. The freshwater wetlands would be state and --

MEMBER CORWIN: And Village.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And the Village.

MEMBER TASKER: John, I can tell you that I'm sure it's wetlands. There used to be a stream running through there and we used to walk along it on the way to school.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: First of all, we're all familiar with the property. The reason I'm so sure about it is that I went to the Southold Town interactive tax map and they give you the percentage of wetlands for a particular piece of property, so the property that borders that to the west is like 97 percent wetlands, so Southold Town has it on their tax map as wetlands. Plus we're all familiar with the property, so that would be something that you can work
out --

I don't think it's something we're
gonna hold up the application for, it's just
something we want to bring out and --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: We'll verify
that and amend the application before the
public hearing.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: With the
Building Department.

Another question on the EAF, will
the proposed action create storm-water
discharge either from point or non-point
resources?

You say no.

And I'm not sure --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: On the site
plan, there's a drywell for the gutters so
there wouldn't be any storm water runoff
from the building, it wouldn't --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Wouldn't the
answer be yes, and then the answer would be
proposed drywell.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I guess you
could list it both ways, right. If that's
CHAIRMAN SALADINO:  Okay.

That's something you might want to talk to them about too.

The last thing I have, and again, maybe somebody can refresh my memory, maybe you or maybe David, has the site of the proposed action or adjoining property been subject to remediation ongoing or completed?

I remember that property when it burned, there was asbestos remediation on the property.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ:  That's news to me but okay.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO:  Do you remember that?

MR. PALLAS:  My memory is the same, there was.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO:  There was a problem and they did the asbestos with the burned-out building, so the answer there would be yes and you would have to describe it.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ:  I'll have to
find that out with --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm sure somebody in the Village would know about that.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Okay. I was told that the Village tore it down.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think they did the remediation.

MEMBER CORWIN: They had a crew there with the whole outfit on, spraying the water, the whole nine yards for the asbestos siding.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: For the hard asbestos siding.

MEMBER CORWIN: What happened was because everything fell in and got bulldozed, I guess that made a mess of the whole siding thing. I'm assuming. I don't know.

But at any rate, there was abatement.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Again, for me, it's just not a problem, just to make the application correct.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Correct. Sure.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: That's what I had.

I'll open to the members.

Any questions?

MEMBER CORWIN: Is there a survey in the file?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: There was a survey that was sent to the --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We have a site plan, we don't have --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The Building Department has the survey.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We're gonna ask them for that.

MR. PALLAS: I don't think I have it in this pack. I'll check in the permit file. If we have it, it would be in the permit file.

MEMBER GORDON: I have just one question.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Excuse me one second.

David, are you done?
MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

MEMBER GORDON: What did you do to try to find the record of whether there had been a two-family house there?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: What I had done is I actually called the past building inspector that was pretty familiar with it, she had informed me that to her knowledge there had been a two-family there prior.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Funny you should mention that because I spoke to the former building inspector yesterday, and she told me she had no recollection if it was a two-family house or not.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So instead of worrying about recollections and stuff, why don't we leave it to the --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Building Department.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: To the current building department.

MEMBER GORDON: I just thought there must be some records there.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: There was also many times that people converted their house to two families without going to the Village. There's still a lot of them in the Village right now that aren't even on the Village records.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No.

MEMBER GORDON: I don't like to hear that, but okay.

MEMBER TASKER: Mr. Chairman, is the concern here, and I'll direct this to Mr. Olinkiewicz as well, that because there may have been a two-family house previously on the property that has now been removed and been gone for more than a year that it's somehow grandfathered in to have a two-family house there?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think that would be better discussed at the public hearing.

MEMBER TASKER: Well, is that what this revolves around?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I didn't consider that.
MEMBER TASKER: Because I'm asking why is it being asked.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I didn't ask. I don't know. I think it's a vacant lot, it's unimproved property.

MEMBER GORDON: I'm the one who asked about it and I did because I thought in that case, there might be pre-existing, non-conforming, if not building, an improvement on that lot, therefore, 150-13 wouldn't be relevant at all.

MEMBER TASKER: Because --

MEMBER GORDON: But maybe not. You're right, this is something we should discuss at the hearing.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think we should just keep this conversation to the application as far as if the application is complete and correct. All the other discussions we could do for the record at the public hearing.

How is that?

Jack, anything?

MEMBER REARDON: Jimmy, I have a
question about the wording that you wanted
to change in the interpretation. You said
you want to change one word.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: It just seems
that --

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: You would
like that?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: It just seems
that in my mind, my interpretation,
everybody's interpretation is different --

MEMBER REARDON: I just want to
mark it so I know which word you're talking
about.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Which has a
total area and lot width less than
prescribed.

MEMBER REARDON: So in paragraph
E, second line, the word or to and?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Or to and, and
that's, I mean and that's -- I'm not sure if
that's what they meant at all or not but it
just seems like interesting that an
eleven-and-a-half-thousand square-foot
property couldn't put a two-family on where
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a seventy-five-hundred square-foot property could because there is so much more room for parking and family to have area and stuff like that, it' seems like it wasn't thought about extra-large properties that may be influenced by that.

MEMBER REARDON: You could have a significantly large property that's bottlenecked, you know, at a particular point, so you really couldn't accurately access the back for parking.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Again, maybe we'll make this part of the public hearing this way it's on the record.

MEMBER TASKER: We can, I would specifically address that at tonight's meeting with regards to how that came about, whether or not the intention was or or and, and the way it's written is or, and I don't think we should take lightly a question that asks us to amend the Zoning Code.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, we can let the --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I'm asking for
an interpretation whether it's gonna be a
use or area.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We can let the
applicant make his point, ask that question,
we can hear from the public, there's gonna
be a public hearing and we can hear from the
public and we can make the decision based on
what we know and what we hear.

MEMBER TASKER: I'm content with
that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'd rather not
get into the meat now without the benefit of
the public being able to speak. Right now
the question in front of us is, are we gonna
accept this application.

MEMBER CORWIN: I second the
motion you made to accept it.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm gonna make
the motion that we accept the application
for --

I'm sorry, one last thing, and I'm
sure that it's relatively minor but again to
make the application correct, you're the
contract vendee, I have a note from the
owners that they have your, you have their permission to progress this application. These are usually notarized, maybe that instead of just, so we know it's the owners that are saying okay as opposed to you, like, writing this up in your truck before you came in.

We're not going to take care of that tonight, we're gonna give you a month to take care of that, just so you know.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Okay.

And I'll get in touch with the Building Department and how they want the couple items amended so the application is correct.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm going to make a motion that we accept this application.

So moved.

MEMBER CORWIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?

MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

MEMBER TASKER: Aye.

MEMBER CORWIN: Aye.
MEMBER REARDON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

I don't think we need a site inspection, right, it's a vacant lot. We're all kind of familiar with it; is that okay with the members?

MEMBER CORWIN: For the interpretation, we don't need a site inspection.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. But just for the process. Okay, so we don't need a site inspection.

We're gonna set the public hearing for 6 o'clock, we set them all for 6 o'clock on January 21 and that will be for the interpretation. Okay.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Thank you.

Have a Merry Christmas, everybody.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: You too.

Thank you.

Item Number 5 is 326 Front Street, it's a continuation of a public hearing regarding the area variances requested by

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service
(631) 727-1107
ANVK Holding Trust, the Greenporter Hotel, for the property located at 326 Front Street, Greenport, New York 11944.

The Suffolk County Tax Map number is 1001-4-8-29-30-31.

MR. CUDDY: Good evening. My name is Charles Cuddy, C-U-D-D-Y. I have an office at 445 Griffing Avenue, Riverhead, New York.

I'm here specifically to discuss -- I want to make sure, I have a low voice, you can hear me -- the parking at this site. I understand that's an issue that's going back and forth.

It's a little bit strange to me to discuss parking for this site when you look at the site and see the parking that it has. I've been in Southold Town, and I've lived in Southold Town since 1969. Every year, Greenport talks about parking. People talk all summer long about parking. This site has parking but we're here to discuss does it have adequate parking to go forward with this application.
I think the exemption that you have at 150-12(C) applies. The reason I think it applies is that this is a single parcel. You don't you the term lot in that definition, you use the term parcel.

The Town itself, the Village, excuse me, has for years recognized this as one single site. The COs that were given to the new owner --

By the way, there have been only two owners since 1957. The Levins were the owners and they used parcel, as many of you know, as the Greenporter Hotel now for years and years. In 2000, it was taken over by the present owner, so there's just been two owners.

The Village itself, when it gives out the COs it recognizes that this site is just one site. So I'd like the give you three of the COs that were issued in 2000, 2001 which identified the three lots 29, 30 and 31 as one unit. So if it's recognized for the last 20 years that it was one unit, the question I guess here is, we go to 1991,
which is the date of the code provision that I just talked to you about, was it a parcel then. The Levins thought it was because they relayed it as one parcel to the present owner in 2000.

I'm also going to bring up to you a certified copy of the deed to the present owner showing they treated it as one parcel.

There is a question, apparently, physically as to how the parcel was used. It was used for the hotel and it was used, the two lots which is 29, 30, 31 was hotel lot, those lots we are saying to you were used for parking.

I have an affidavit from David Kapell, who, as you know, he has an office right across the street from the site. Mr. Kapell is saying in effect, and I'll hand it up to you, that the off-street parking is contiguous to the hotel, and it's been used continuously since he came in 1981.

So we're saying to you that as far as we're concerned, this site has had
parking as it is now for many, many years. In fact, if you add that time '81 to now, we're talking about 29 years, excuse me, more than would have. We believe that the exclusion, the exemption set forth 150-12(C) applies.

For the first time I was told this afternoon that there seemed to be contrary evidence, I had never seen that and never heard that before. I would like the hearing to stay open so we can get adjoining owners besides Mr. Kapell to verify exactly what he is saying in his affidavit. If there is a problem with what he is saying then he is away at this point, I would say bring him back, so he can testify because I think there should be no question in your mind as to what the actual use of the site is. I believe the exemption applies.

Even more importantly, if the exemption didn't apply, it seems to me that this site has three lots to it. Two of the lots, the vacant lot measures 17,000 feet, a little more than 17,000, one is six five,
the other is ten six. The hotel lot is over
20,000 square feet. If you take even 1,000
or 2,000 feet from that lot which could be
used for parking, you have over 18,000 feet.
Your code says 300 square foot for a park
area, that's not the parking space, that's
the area so you can have an aisle coming out
of there. If you take that and you put it
in 18,000, you get 60 spaces.

So here are 60 spaces off-street
that can be used for parking, and I couldn't
understand why there would be a problem in
seeing that and granting any variance that
they're looking for.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Just to
interrupt, have you been to the property?

MR. CUDDY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Your
contention is there is 60 --
I'm sorry?

MEMBER REARDON: No. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Your
contention is, just so it's clear in my
mind, I'm not disputing your contention, but
Zoning Board of Appeals 12/17/2019

just so it's clear in my mind, your contention is, there's area on that site for 60 parking spaces?

MR. CUDDY: Using that mathematics, I'm saying it is.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: How about the reality of the situation? You have a building that occupies some of that space --

MR. CUDDY: I understand not all of it though. And I'm thinking at that point there is enough space for cars and there always has been. They have not had cars parking outside, they have cars parked in there, that's what I understand.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Nobody is disputing that the current configuration of the hotel, there is ample parking, there's 32 rooms for 32 parking spaces. There is a variance to reduce the size of the space to nine feet so that would increase the demand by four if they don't get that variance, but I don't think that's what's in front to Board now. What's in front of the Board now is twenty additional hotel rooms.
MR. CUDDY: I understand that.

What I'm saying to you is, it would appear to be mathematically that it would be appropriate to have that many spaces.

What I'm also saying to you, going past is that is 150-12(C) applies for this site, it's a parcel.

You don't use the term lot in the code, you use the term parcel and parcel is not defined in the code. Parcel is usually thought of as a contiguous amalgam of lots. That's what the term here is, it's parcel; so it's not just the lot we're talking about, we're talking about these lots together as one parcel. They were conveyed that way, they were used that way, so this exemption should apply.

I would like to hand up to you the affidavit I have. I would like the hand up to you certificates of occupancy. I also have the statements from the Town of Southold assessors, the assessor's cards which show that this parcel was put together
in 1957, 1958 and 1967. It's been used simultaneously, I think, by both owners, all of it, and that's our contention, therefore the exemption should apply.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay.

If I may, I'll hand this up to you.

(Mr. Cuddy handing up documents.)

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We're going to give this to the clerk so they can make copies I just wanted to --

MR. CUDDY: I also have for you a certified copy of the deed to the present owner which shows that the lots were conveyed as one unit, so I would hand that up to you too.

(Mr. Cuddy handing up documents.)

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We had asked for it twice also, for, as long as you're providing COs, because I had looked in the Village's building file and I don't, I couldn't find a current CO for the property. I found a temporary CO that expired. It had a six-month lifespan to it and expired, but
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I couldn't find a current CO for the property.

MR. CUDDY: I was trying to find the pre-existing CO which I thought probably issued many years ago. I had to foil it, I've only don't that a day ago, but I haven't received it yet.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Is it our understanding you're going to ask to continue the public hearing?

MR. CUDDY: Yes because I would like to get additional affidavits from adjoining owners.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: If it's okay with the Board, I'm gonna give these to the Building so they can make copies for us unless we want to look at them now, we can hear anything else Mr. Cuddy has the offer.

MR. CUDDY: No.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Anybody want to look now or wait for the copies.

MEMBER CORWIN: No.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Thank you.

MR. CUDDY: Thank you.
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CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Before I open it up to the public again, I have some comments from the Planning Board.

We had asked the Planning Board to weigh in on this application and they did. I was prepared to read them.

So they had asked, the Village of Greenport Planning Board had asked that this be read into the record, their comments on the application and then after I read this into the record, we'll open it up to the public for whoever wants to weigh in.

This is to the Village of Greenport Zoning Board of Appeals from the Village of Greenport Planning Board and it's dated November 19, and it's re. application of ANVK Holdings Trust.

Please accept the following comments with respect to the above-referenced application as requested on October 15, 2019 by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Request for area variances from 150-12(B) Bulk and Parking Regulations.

As per the plan provided by the
applicant, the proposed structure will stand 37 feet from grade requiring a variance of two feet from 150-12(B) of the Village Code. Additionally, a proposed structure containing three stories where only two stories are permitted by Village code. Although the Planning Board understands that other hotels have gotten an approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals to exceed the maximum permitted height for 35 feet and to include the third story, it should be noted that none of those hotels were adjacent to abutting residential properties. The Planning Board is concerned that the grant of the requested height variances will create a looming effect on the abutting residential properties and set a precedent for future development along Front Street.

Furthermore, some members of the Board feel that once the now two separate buildings are connected, the aesthetics of Front Street may suffer by becoming overwhelmed by the proposed monolithic structure.
The Planning Board appreciates that the applicant took into account the comments at the pre-submission conference with regard to stepping back the third story and attempting to soften the appearance from Front Street; however, the Planning Board still has significant concerns about the proposed request for area variance from 150-16 paragraph 1 bulk and parking regulations. In addition to the variances needed in respect of the additional third floor per the plans provided by the applicant a total of 31 parking spaces are indicated therein, thereby requiring a variance of 27 spaces for the additional hotel rooms. As all are aware, perhaps the single greatest planning obstacle confronted by the Village of Greenport is parking or the lack thereof. It's hard to imagine that the granting of a variance will not compound or exacerbate the parking problem. The Planning Board believes that the required parking should be considered, assuming that that restaurant is operating, as it is.
likely at some point in the future, someone may desire the reopen the restaurant. At a minimum, the Planning Board believes that payment in lieu of parking provisions 150-12 and 150-16 of the Village code should apply in respect of any shortage of parking spaces from that required.

This is just the cover letter. So having read that -- did the applicant get this? Did the Planning Board send this to the applicant also?

MS. PITTORINO: I didn't see it.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: If you want the Village to make copies or you can get it off the --

MR. PALLAS: I'll check with your attorney to see if that's -- I think that was classified as internal communication, if I recall correctly; but I'll confirm that with the Planning Board attorney if that was releasable.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay.

Is there anyone else from the public that would like to speak?
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MS. BERRY: Can I add a couple comments.

I would like to -- Glynis Berry, Studio a/b Architects.

I would like the add another comment in support of what Mr. Cuddy said, in the past application, the Village did view this as one parcel because the setbacks are designed, the whole thing is designed with setbacks as though the outer edge were of the parcel, not to individual lot lines; so it's yet another example how historically these lots have always been looked at as one parcel. It's just another --

I don't understand why this project is being denied the same consideration for as-built conditions relative to parking, why there is discussion of, you know, requiring purchase of additional lots when that's not required for the previously developed parcel and it's in your code, again, that they're exempt from parking regulations, so I don't know why people aren't recognizing the code.
Again, the height is not from the grade right at the -- it's from the center of the road, it's actually less, and the only thing is really the railing and the chimney so, you know, I really don't think it's an impact.

I'm happy to continue to answer questions. I think we have designed it so it's not monolithic at all. It's in pieces and has varying setbacks and has always been that and it has always been setback, so I don't think that's an issue. We have done multiple drawings for you to show that. So I think we have gone out of our way to answer those issues and really incorporated in the design.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The Building Department is here. We might ask them the reasoning behind the requirement that they feel the applicant need for parking without stepping on the Building Department's toes, it was my understanding it was because it was three separate lots and two of them weren't previously improved that --
But the head of Building Department is here, maybe ask him.

MR. PALLAS: Mr. Chairman, what you just stated is exactly right, that was the process that we want through. We received documents from the applicant a prior survey dated year 2000 which do, in fact, show two of the three lots unimproved.

MS. BERRY: Should I read it again for the record?

MEMBER TASKER: Mr. Chairman, can --

MS. PITTORINO: This is --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Excuse me.

MEMBER TASKER: Can I interject regarding specific points with respect to what is required for this. I think we may have been overlooking in our consideration, which may have been in the thought process at some point, if you look at section 150-16 talking about parking and loading regulations, that's the section that waives parking for pre-1991 buildings, but it also goes on to say as follows, any and -- here
I'm confused between the suggestion that there is another type of land, we've got land, we've got parcel, we've got lot, I think there was another term, but the village ordinance reads "any land which is developed as a unit under single ownership and control" which is what I believe we have here, "shall be considered a single lot for the purpose of these parking regulations."

I don't know whether that's been considered in the past before. I can't be the only one who's ever looked at that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think that's the point that Glenys is trying to make.

MS. BERRY: Exactly.

MEMBER TASKER: By I hadn't heard the ordinance.

MS. BERRY: I read it a number of, numerous times, maybe you weren't here.

MEMBER TASKER: I missed -- the important meeting, I don't I was here.

MS. BERRY: Right. I don't think you were here.

MS. PITTORINO: Hi. Deborah
Rivera Pittorino for the Greenporter.

So, you know, we're discussing here whether or not my property qualifies under the provisions for properties for land developed prior to 1991. The Greenporter three lots were all used for the Greenporter; they were never used for anything else. I don't believe there is anything in the code that says this tree has to be there and this green space has to be here and this parking has to -- it was all used for the Greenporter.

So in the old plan, the exterior parts were the green areas, and the interior part was parking lot. Basically, what we did was we flipped that model, so where the pool the now used to be parking lot, the center of the property used to be the parking lot. That parking lot extended out quite a way and then people used to park on the lawn whenever we had events there. We had to rip out a lot of the grassy area that was there because it was clearly being used for parking. I guess they didn't want to
spend additional money to put additional blacktop on it, but it was being used for parking. And I have the affidavit from Dave Kapell, and I also have two other neighbors here that can tell you and will sign the affidavit that says they have been there since the early 60s and all three lots were used for the Greenporter.

It's funny because one night I was dreaming and I remembered that I had the plans that Jack Levin gave me when I bought the hotel and I have the original plans from 1957 that show that all three lots were part of the original plan and actually, it shows that two of the spaces were developed because where the original building is one development, that big black asphalt was the other lot, and then the thin piece around the edge where it's green, that was used as like, you know, people would put tents there for events, or people could put their lawn chairs out there and take sun, but it was an amenity for the guest. It was all part of the hotel.
I have the original, but they're in really bad shape. I have had copies made, may I give you one of these.

(Ms. Pittorino brings up a document and speaks from the dais.)

So this is the original plan.

Right here you have, this is the hotel. This is where the black asphalt parking was, here. One development, two developments. Then here at Fourth Avenue, it sort of cuts in strangely which is why we only use part of it for parking and we left green space on the outside, but if I had to take those back to create more parking that I don't need, I don't need it, my customers don't need the parking, I will if that's what you want me to do.

This is from 1957 and I'm happy to, if any of you want to come look at the original plans, I have them, I just didn't want to leave them here because they're -- these are copies, you can have them but I think it's quite clear.

I also have -- from the closing
documents I also have the description of the property in the closing documents and there were very interesting descriptions as part of the closing documents. So it describes, it has three parcels and one of them, where it charged me for the tax, it says combined real estate transfer tax, so it was always treated, those three lots, as one property.

(Ms. Pittorino returns to the podium and continues speaking.)

So that land, and I believe it's very important that we use that term, that land was always for the Greenporter, it wasn't for any other purpose. If it was for any other purpose, I would like to know what it was and then we can look into it further.

Can anyone tell me what that other purpose was?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Us, you mean?

MS. PITTORINO: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I don't want to guess for the public record, but if you have three separate tax maps, if you have three separate tax lots and according to
this, the original hotel was on one of them --

MS. PITTORINO: It was on two of them because it shows you where the parking was.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm looking at the building and the lot.

MR. PALLAS: The square next to it is where the parking was. The parking was in the center.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No.

My point is you asked me to venture a guess --

MS. PITTORINO: Um-hum.

I think, if I have to follow the law, then you have to follow the law and the law refers specifically to the land, it doesn't refer to the lot, it refers to the land.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Can we read that again. I am not sure that's the case.

MS. PITTORINO: Please read it again, I would welcome it.

MEMBER TASKER: Any land which is
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developed as a unit under single ownership
and control shall be considered a single lot
for the purpose of these parking
regulations.

So it kind of comes at it both
ways in terms of those terms.

MS. PITTORINO: Also, in this
schedule here, it part of the deed, it tells
you when they purchased every lot which
significantly pre-dates 1991.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Do you want me
to review all this now? There's is a big
silence, I have to read all this now and
four other members are going to have to read
it.

We're going to give this to the --
Are these for the Board?

MS. PITTORINO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We're going to
give this to the Building Department,
they're gonna look at it, they're gonna make
copies for us.

I think, I think you requested
that the public hearing stay open, so we
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have some time with this. It will give the
Building Department a chance to look at
this, make copies, distribute them to the
Board and give us a chance to read them and
we can go from there.

MR. ARIZUMI: Hideaki Arizumi, Studio a/b/ Architects.

Just maybe it's repetition, but in
terms of height description about the
Planning Board report, is not really fair at
all because actual building is like 31 feet
if you really measure from bottom of the
building because it is 33 feet, not 37 feet
in the drawings from the elevation of the
road to the top of the roof, it's 33 feet,
not even 35 feet, so I don't know where the
37 came from so just attacking, it's not
fair, so I think we need to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think we got
that number from your application.

MR. ARIZUMI: No.

MS. BERRY: Well --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think you
two should talk.
MS. BERRY: Yeah.

There is a difference between the height of a building and the height as measured from the crown of the road because -- the average crown because her parcel -- I forgot -- it's a couple of feet, like about three feet or even four feet higher than the road, so the building itself is not 37-feet tall, but I have, we have to measure it from the road, so we've got that extra feet; but the actual building is, like he said, 33 feet even with the railings, you know, and the facade is even less, so it's -- the building itself -- that description makes it seem like the building is that tall, and it's not; it's the height relative to the road which is very different because of the site.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: You have explained that to us and we kind of know that, but we also know that the Building Department considers anything affixed to the building at the roof should be included in the height.
Also, didn't you revise, ask for an additional four-feet variance for --

MS. BERRY: Yes.

Just for the chimney for the kitchen just in case because we're hoping we can get it below that, but we looked at some and some of them have an extra piece on the bottom, so we're not the mechanical engineers for this, so we wanted to make sure that the chimney could go up.

And technically, we still don't think that those should be considered because even in your own code, you say things like antennas and stuff like that are exempt, usually it's bulkhead that are included, so we think --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: You don't think an exhaust system --

MS. BERRY: No.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: -- permanently affixed to the building.

MEMBER GORDON: No, it's not the roof.

MR. ARIZUMI: Obviously it's not
the roof. The code is saying top of the roof.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We don't have the international fire and building code in front of us.

MR. ARIZUMI: No, it's zoning codes.

MS. BERRY: Both. In fact, when I started, I give references because the definition is roof, and I think we comply, quite frankly, with the height.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The example you give us is antennas.

MS. BERRY: And --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: --

MS. BERRY: If you look at state code and other codes, those things are not considered part of the height, so there are pertinences, you know.

But anyway, I'm repeating myself but it seems -- we don't want it -- the language that is used makes it seem bigger than it is, so that's why we're trying to correct that.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Are you referring to the Planning Board's comments?

MS. BERRY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, that's their comments and they gleaned their information from the pre-submission conference and the site plan that you submitted to them.

MS. BERRY: But they sited it slightly differently so it reads differently. So it makes the bulk seem bigger than the fact, that's why we're trying to correct the image.

MR. ARIZUMI: Even the drawing submitted, there is no number that says 37 feet, it's 33 feet that the drawing says. I just reconfirming that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Is there anyone else from the public that would like to speak.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No.

Any members for those comments, questions.
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(No response.)

No.

I'll make a motion that we continue this public hearing at the request of the applicant.

MEMBER GORDON: Second.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?

MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

MEMBER REARDON: Aye.

MEMBER TASKER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

David, did you vote?

MEMBER CORWIN: I don't see why we have to have a motion, but I'll vote aye.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We'll continue this to our next meeting.

The only thing I would ask if from the applicant or the applicant's attorney is, from looking at what you gave us about the previous CO, I still don't, and we have asked twice before, I still don't see a current CO. The only CO addressing the hotel was a temporary CO that was the
lifespan was six months, it expired six months after the date it was issued.

MS. PITTORINO: The one you have, the one he gave was the temporary one?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I didn't see the current CO.

MS. PITTORINO: The one that we have is not a temporary CO, and also there seems to be an issue with the documentation of the Village. The Village also misplaced our original site plan, they couldn't find it, so luckily, we had a copy of it, so I'm happy to give you a copy of my CO, I will provide additional copies, but we have copies of COs that are not temporary.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Are they included in the package that --

MS. PITTORINO: I believe they are.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay.

I just say that because when the application first came in front of us, we had looked, I had looked, we had looked at the Building Department file and we didn't
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see a current CO; so there was a temporary
CO that expired, there was not a current CO.

Okay. That's it.

Nobody else, no comments?

(No response.)

Item Number 6, we're gonna put a
pin in because we're going to continue the
public hearing for the Greenporter Hotel.

Item number 7 is any other Zoning
Board of Appeals that might come before the
Board.

If anyone from the public has a
question or comment.

(No response.)

I'm going to propose something to
members that the Planning Board had a
meeting, their last meeting and a few of
their members had expressed concern about
150-12 and 150-16, and it was suggested by
them that the Planning Board write a letter
to the Village Board to consider modifying
that code. They also suggested, perhaps, a
joint meeting between the Planning Board and
the Zoning Board.
Some of my colleagues will tell you I'm not a big fan of joint meetings, they tend to -- it's hard enough for us five to agree at times, now it would be ten opinions trying to form a consensus, but I think this suggestion kind of has merit, so we can suggest to the Planning Board that we're on board with a joint meeting or we can compose a letter ourselves to the Village Board about how this Board might feel about modifying Chapter 150-12, 150-16.

So I would ask us to -- I know the trustee has it on her work session report, she's gonna to address the Village Board at the work session on Thursday, this Board might think about some comments or perhaps composing a letter to either support or not that modification to the code.

So do we have any thoughts about that at all?

MEMBER CORWIN: I'm not in favor of a joint meeting, I will tell you that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: How about the portion of the code that we would like to
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modify?

MEMBER CORWIN: I don't know what modification they're going to propose, and I'm not too big on the idea of modifying the code in the middle of an application.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: It wouldn't affect this application.

MEMBER CORWIN: Then we've got plenty of time, so we don't have to worry about it.

MEMBER GORDON: There is no code committee these days, right?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No.

MEMBER GORDON: That would really be, to my mind, the proper process.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: There is no code committee. There's suggestions from the statutory boards, the decision is ultimately to the Village Board. We don't draft code, we don't modify code.

MEMBER TASKER: Part of the fact that we're going to be potentially in the position of suggesting changes to the code which we are then going to have to enforce,
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I think there might be a moderate conflict there; otherwise, I'm in support of Mr. Corwin's concerns and feelings about such a joint meeting.

    CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, if you guys recall, I was never in favor of joint meetings, but --

    MEMBER TASKER: I'm with you, John.

    CHAIRMAN SALADINO: But if it --

    All I think is that in -- the law was passed in 1990, they refer to the buildings that were improved, properties that were improved prior to 1991. All I think is that Greenport is a really, really different place today than it was from 1990, and I think a discussion about that portion of the code in this day and age is justified, so however we add our opinion, if we choose to add our opinion to the discussion is one thing and how we add our opinion is plan B.

    So if the members don't feel it's appropriate to comment about this, we won't,
if we have an opinion, we'll offer it.

Kinds of like easy.

No. Okay.

Item number 8 is a motion to adjourn.

So moved.

MEMBER TASKER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor.

MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

MEMBER TASKER: Aye.

MEMBER CORWIN: Aye.

MEMBER REARDON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'll vote aye.

Thank you, folks.

(Time noted: 7:20 p.m.)
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small [2] 4/19 7/4
so [90]
soften [1] 37/6
sold [1] 6/4
36/20 36/2 41/21 49/2 51/7
51/8 57/2 57/17
somebody [2] 15/7 16/4
somehow [1] 19/17
someone [1] 38/2
something [7] 8/24 13/25 14/3
14/5 15/4 20/15 56/16

sorry [3] 23/22 30/21 30/22
sort [1] 45/12
Southold [5] 13/18 13/22
26/19 26/20 32/24
space [6] 30/7 31/9 31/12
31/20 43/11 45/14
spaces [9] 30/10 30/11 31/4
31/19 32/6 37/14 37/16 38/7
44/16
speaking [1] 46/11
speaks [1] 45/6
specific [1] 41/17
specifically [3] 22/17 26/11
47/18
spend [1] 44/2
spoke [1] 18/12
spot [1] 11/15
spraying [1] 16/11
10/13 21/24 22/2 30/3 30/6
47/9
square-foot [2] 21/24 22/2
ss [1] 61/3
stand [1] 36/2
started [1] 52/10
state [8] 1/2 12/3 12/23 13/3
13/6 52/17 61/3 61/7
stated [1] 41/5
statements [1] 32/23
Station [1] 3/13
statutory [1] 58/19
stay [2] 29/12 48/25
stepping [2] 37/5 40/22
still [6] 7/17 19/5 37/8 51/12
54/22 54/23
still don't [1] 54/22
stories [2] 36/6 36/7
storm [2] 14/12 14/19
storm-water [1] 14/12
story [2] 36/12 37/5
strange [1] 26/16
strangely [1] 45/12
stream [1] 13/12
26/4 28/18 28/20 30/11 36/19
36/23 37/7
structure [3] 36/2 36/5 36/25
Studio [2] 39/5 49/8
stuff [3] 18/18 22/4 51/15
subject [1] 15/10
submission [2] 37/4 53/7
such [1] 59/5
suffer [1] 36/23
SUFFOLK [4] 1/2 4/7 25/6 61/4
suggest [1] 57/8
suggestion [1] 58/24
suggestion [2] 42/2 57/7
suggestions [1] 58/18
summer [1] 26/22
sun [1] 44/23
support [3] 39/7 57/18 59/3
13/17 14/16 16/3 17/2 21/21
23/3 26/12 47/22 51/11
surprises [1] 8/9
survey [4] 17/7 17/10 17/14
41/8
swamp [1] 12/12
system [1] 51/19

T
24/11 30/3 30/9 44/23 45/15
takes [1] 5/18
talk [4] 8/13 15/5 26/22 49/25
talked [1] 28/3
talking [5] 21/13 29/4 32/15
32/16 41/22
talks [1] 26/21
tall [2] 50/10 50/17
TASKER [1] 1/16
tax [8] 4/7 13/18 13/23 26/5
46/7 46/8 46/24 46/25
technically [1] 51/12
tell [5] 13/10 44/6 46/18 57/2
57/23
tells [1] 48/9
temporary [6] 33/24 54/25
55/5 55/9 55/16 56/2
ten [2] 30/2 57/5
tend [1] 57/4
tents [1] 44/21
term [7] 27/5 27/6 32/10 32/11
32/14 42/5 46/13
terms [3] 48/7 48/7 49/10
testify [1] 29/17
than [9] 5/8 19/16 21/16 29/5
29/25 50/9 52/24 53/13 59/17
Thank [5] 25/19 25/22 34/24
34/25 60/15
that [225]
that's [34] 5/2 6/9 6/23 9/9
10/20 12/4 24/25 15/4 15/14
17/3 21/21 21/21 21/22 22/9
26/14 26/14 30/7 30/7 31/15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>village</td>
<td>27/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit</td>
<td>4/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice</td>
<td>26/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vote</td>
<td>8/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wait</td>
<td>20/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want</td>
<td>20/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>20/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td>20/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we'll</td>
<td>6/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we're</td>
<td>29/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we'd</td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weigh</td>
<td>2/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welcome</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>went</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were</td>
<td>22/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>western</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wetlands</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>