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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We're going to begin. We don't have microphones tonight.

This is the Village of Greenport Planning Board Regular Session, October 1, 2015.

First item, public hearing for the site plan application for Stirling Square LLC, Brent Pelton, owner.

The Planning Board has determined that for purposes of SEQRA this is a Type I action requiring a public hearing.

The property is located at 300-308 Main Street. The property is located in the Historic District and the CR Commercial Retail Zone.

Suffolk County tax map number 1001-4-7-29. 1.

The public hearing is still open. We will accept any comments if there are any.

There were two letters that were submitted that we'll read into the record, so I'll begin with those quickly.

First was an e-mail I received
from Trustee Doug Roberts, he had asked that I read this in.

Let's see.

His comments begin, at the end of the Regular Meeting of the Village Board of Trustees, I reminded the mayor that he agreed to poll the Board to see if we wanted to provide any response to the Planning Board on 300-308 Main Street. The consensus was that there was no response aside from Trustee Phillips' e-mail and my comments at your last meeting. The mayor turned to the clerk and asked her to let the Planning chair know that the Board has no comments.

I understand that as of today, Wednesday, 9:30, the clerk's office reported the Village Board of Trustees had not yet provided comments to the Planning Board about 300-308 Main Street. Anybody who watches the meeting on Channel 22 or reads the minutes when they are eventually published, will be able to see clearly that this Board of Trustees has no substantive comments to provide on 300-308 Main Street.
In the earlier part of the meeting, in response to comments from the podium by Mr. McDermott, the applicant, I asked the mayor who was responsible for leading the coordinated review process. His response was that he did not know and this was new for all of us and he expects we will get better at this as we go on.

This has been a very uncoordinated coordinated review with the mayor unable to tell us who is responsible for coordinating the review. The clerk's office is, as I understand, the central communication point between our boards. Please do not penalize the applicant for a bad process at Village Hall. Let's all agree to get better at this next time. The public deserves nothing less.

Added to that, we got a nice letter from a neighbor supporting the project, praising the owners as good neighbors. I am not aware of any neighbor that has brought any negative comments to date. Opponents of AirBNBs should be
thrilled at the addition of five new regulated, taxed, safe rooms on the market to reduce the number of renters who appear in your neighborhoods on summer weekends. The code is clear that change of use in a historical district does not require parking. That previous boards did not honor the code prior applications has no bearing on this board and this application.

What great sin the owners of American Beech committed? That of not being born and raised in Greenport, unlike other prominent cases in town recent months, they haven't opened their business or built massive structures using potentially very toxic substances without a permit. Our process may be flawed, but they followed it anyway.

Let's all move on. Approve this. We've got real issues our Building Department needs to focus on. There are kids in town that go to sleep every night in unsafe homes that could burn to the ground or may or may not have heat. Let's focus on
the issues that matter in terms of code
enforcement. Best of luck to you in your
process and to the folks at American Beech
with their new business. Doug Roberts,
Trustee.

The second letter is from Michael
and Ingrid Edelson. It reads: Dear Board
Members, we live on the corner of Bay and
Carpenter directly across the street from
American Beech Restaurant. Since its
opening, we have not noticed any increase in
illegal parking other than the usual that
occurs on holidays as the recent Labor Day,
during Maritime Festival, July 4th, Memorial
Day, Tall Ships, et cetera. This is always
an issue throughout the village because of
the increased influx of visitors. Nothing
new here that a greater police effort could
not fix.

Ever since the property was bought
and underwent its current transformation,
the owner and staff have been zealous in not
disturbing us. Repeatedly they have
apologized for any inconvenience during the
There is no reason to believe that they, American Beech, will attempt to take advantage of us as neighbors or the Village of Greenport and its laws. Sincerely Michael and Ingrid Edelson.

Are there any other comments?

MR. BROWN: Robert Brown, architect for the project.

Just one last comment before the hearing is closed. If it's not a conflict of interest, I own the building across Bay Avenue from the project, and I have no objections.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Thank you.

MS. MUNDUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Are there any other comments?

MR. PROKOP: I just have -- since Mr. Brown is up.

Do we have a sign application as part of the application? Did you want us to approve a sign also? Is this for a sign --

MR. BROWN: I believe the signage had
been submitted and approved.

MR. PROKOP: And approved.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: I just wanted -- and then
the Village -- I think -- I just want to
mention -- I'll just use now as the
opportunity to mention, since you're up
there.

I think there is, unless somebody
corrects me, I think there is a mistake in
the application, which I think that Sterling
Square LLC, Sterling with an E, I believe is
a former owner of the property, and if I'm
not mistaken, the property is not owned by
Stirling Square LLC, Stirling with an I;
does that sound familiar to anybody?

MR. HILBRAND: It always was an I,
always meant to be an I.

MR. PROKOP: That's different form --
because I have --

MR. HILBRAND: I'm one of the previous
owners, and it was always an I. It was
always tremendous confusion, but --

MR. PROKOP: There's a deed dated
September 23, 2014 that is from Stirling,
Stirling with an I, LLC, it was signed by
somebody who is unrelated to these
proceedings and it's to -- the deed is to --
excuse me, Sterling with an E to Stirling
with an I, and I believe that the record
owner is -- I'm only mentioning this because
all of our paperwork including your
application is Sterling with an E but I
don't think Sterling with an E is the owner,
I think it's Stirling with an I.

MR. HILBRAND: It's Stirling with an I.
Sterling Square LLC with an I. It's
partially that because --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Please come to the
podium.

MR. HILBRAND: Jaap Hilbrand. I've
lived on Stirling Street, and I partially
own Stirling Square, so in writing the
checks, and it was always the typical
confusion, what are we doing here, and May
Watson who was writing them, and wrote all
the checks, et cetera, so she would be the
one to ask, but it was definitely with an I.
MR. PROKOP: Now it's an I. The record owner is with an I, so we just want to make sure all the Village paperwork is straight with that.

MR. HILBRAND: Right.

MR. PROKOP: So everything that comes out of this now will be Stirling with an I.

MR. BROWN: If the application was incorrect, it was a typographic error and we'll certainly correct it.

MR. PROKOP: No, it's okay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Are there any other comments?

Okay.

Then I'm going to make a motion to close the public hearing portion of this. Do I have a second?

MS. MUNDUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Onto item number one of the agenda.
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which is continued discussion and possible
motion on the review of SEQRA considerations
for the application for Stirling Square LLC,
Brent Pelton, applicant.

The property is located at 300-308
Main Street. The proposed five-room inn is
a permitted use in the CR Commercial Retail
District. The property is located in the
Historic District and the CR Commercial
Retail District.

Suffolk County tax map number
1001-4-7-29.1.

So we could -- I don't know if you
have had a chance to read it, these are --

MR. PROKOP: Sorry to ask a question.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's okay.

MR. PROKOP: Does anybody mind, I'm
sorry. There's a couple things we need to
clear up.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That's fine.

MR. PROKOP: Mr. Pelton, a couple, two
meetings ago or so at the end of the meeting
you were trying to hand up site plans that
had seating on it, if I'm not mistaken. It
says in the minutes, when you got done speaking, you said, I have site plans with the seating indicated, and I don't think that those ever -- we asked you to go through the Building Department and wait and not hand it in at the meeting, but I don't think that those ever made it into the file.

MR. PELTON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: We need to get the site plan with the seating in the back.

MR. PELTON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: Just showing it, please. We have a site plan that's dated June 24, 2015, and it's updated June 28, 2015, but there is no seating indicated on them. Just because there's outside use of the property, we just need to have it indicated.

MR. PELTON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. That's the only other comment I had.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

I will note also that one thing on the plan, there was one dry well that was indicated, a second was installed as well,
that drawing is forthcoming, it has been
installed already.

Other than that --

MR. PROKOP: The first thing we need to
do is talk about SEQRA.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: I did draft really as a
discussion point of a SEQRA resolution.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: It's in here.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: So this would be -- it's
regarding -- it's site plan approval for the
exterior changes and creation of a new inn
with five rental rooms on the second floor.
The subject building which planning was
subsequently amended by site plan by
Fairweather Brown dated June 24th and
updated on July 29th, and the most recent
exterior plan that we have is January 14,
2015, that doesn't show seating.

If I'm not mistaken, that might
have been supplemented.

MR. BROWN: If I may.
MR. PROKOP: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Technically, that should be just Robert I. Brown, Architect, not Fairweather Brown.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. Thanks.

So in anything we're doing, do you want us -- because we got some documents that say Fairweather Brown --

MR. BROWN: Yes. Mr. Fairweather retired, so it's, technically, it's Robert I. Brown, Architect.

MR. PROKOP: All right.

So we'll change E to an I and we'll change Fairweather Brown to Robert I. Brown.

Thank you.

Is it AIA; Robert I. Brown, AIA or just Robert I. Brown?

MR. BROWN: Robert I. Brown, Architect PC is the business.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. Thanks.

So we reviewed the -- this is the third paragraph.
MR. PROKOP: We reviewed the application and on February 5, 2015 granted site plan approval.

It should not say and an approval of the use variance use evaluation. On February 5th we only granted the site plan approval.

We were advised on June 26th that the subject property was in the Historic District.

On August 27th, we adopted lead agency status and we set a public hearing for August 27th. I'm sorry, for the -- so it should be August 6th where it says -- let me just confirm that.

Yes. August 6th, I'm sorry. So where it says in the bottom paragraph August 20th, that should actually be August 6th.

We adopted lead agency status, determined that the portion of the application was a Type I action for purposes of SEQRA and initiated a coordinated review with a public hearing at the August 27, 2015 Work Session.
We then opened a public hearing on August 27th which was adjourned several times. There were no comments from -- except I had -- I added Mary Bess Phillips, now we have to add Trustee Roberts.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: And then we had --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes, that was Ingrid and Michael Edelson.

MR. PROKOP: Oh. That's where I put the neighbor of the property. Okay. I put neighbor, I'll put Ingrid and Michael Edelson.

MS. MUNDUS: Also Mr. Brown said that he did not object as a neighbor across the street.

MR. PROKOP: Right. Okay.

So now we adopt lead agency for purposes of SEQRA. These are the actual resolutions, we're adopting lead agency, we're determining that the application is a Type I action, we have the long form, a Type I action, we have a long SEQRA form for my file. It's not showing any significant
negative impact.

Put in two conditions that we normally have. On the top of page 3, this first line, but these can come out or change, no exterior amplified music.

I think that there were some other things that we wanted to talk about.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The dry well, Mr. Brown is going to provide a -- first there were two dry wells installed. One was indicated on the original application, the second one was later added as well. He's going to provide a drawing indicating the second dry well.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

And then what about the drainage, is it being retained on the property? I have that covered in the formal resolution that we're going to get to in a second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I believe the dry wells were added to mitigate that, but I think there was some pre-existing nonconformance, but that was not required to be remedied as I understood it.
Work Session 10/1/15

MR. PROKOP: So most of it I have. The dry well was -- I'm sorry. So we just need the plan submitted?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: What about, will runoff be retained on the property, is that not possible?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I think that it was existing, we didn't require any --

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So we'll take it off.

What about future review of the site plan?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The only thing that we are missing would be, you know, as long as we have the plan showing the second dry well and the drainage, that would be the only thing we need follow-up on.

MR. PROKOP: The seating, we need a seating --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Oh, the seating, excuse me.

MS. BERRY: There is one other thing.

A continuous handicap accessible
route from the sidewalk to the building.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Which you saw that it was installed.

MS. BERRY: No, I didn't actually.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, you should. It's beautiful. It's a five-foot wide bluestone side, bluestone path.

MS. BERRY: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It really -- it's beautiful. It looks like it's always been there, and it works well.

MS. BERRY: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So please take a look at it, and we also installed the handrails up the stairs.

MS. BERRY: I saw the handrails, but I didn't see the --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Take a look, it looks good.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay. We would want to just have that noted as well, so we got those items indicated as well.

MR. PROKOP: So that would be the plans for the second dry well, I'm going to add

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service
(631) 727-1107
that in.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: Also the seating plan --
site plan showing outdoor seating.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So if we have those
in hand, we don't have a need for follow-up?

MR. PROKOP: Now, with regard the
SEQRA, we would be adopting lead agency
status, determining that this is a Type I
action, and also determining that it will
not have a significant negative impact on
the environment.

If you look at page 3, I've listed
all the things that we're supposed to
consider as far was impacts on the
environment.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So no substantial
adverse change in existing air quality,
ground or surface water quality or quantity,
traffic or noise levels; a substantial
increase in solid waste production; a
substantial increase in potential for
erosion, flooding, leaking, drainage
problems.
The second item will not result in removal or destruction of large quantities of vegetation or fauna; substantial interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; impacts on habitats or other significant adverse effect on natural resources, impairment of the critical environmental area, and will not result in the creation of material conflict with the community's current plans or goals, will not result in the creation of a hazard to human health, will not result in substantial change in land use, and will not encourage or attract an additional large number of people to a place for more than a few days, will not result in the creation of material demand for other actions, will not result in changes in two or more elements of the environment, each of which is not significant, but when reviewed together are significant, two or more related actions each of which is not significant but when reviewed together are significant.
MS. BERRY: Could I just raise one issue?

I don't see anything relative to deliveries for parking. I don't see any direction about deliveries or not blocking traffic on certain streets; so, you know, maybe you want to consider a directive to avoid having any blockage of traffic on adjacent streets, and if leaving it open, that if there is a problem in the future, delivery hours could be limited or something like that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Some of the restaurants, particularly on Main Street, have limited delivery hours to early in the morning, but this street does not have the same level of two-way traffic that that does and wouldn't, I don't believe that a truck stop in the back would have the same effect.

Also the, you know, this SEQRA determination was split into two actions, one for the restaurant use, one for the inn.

The restaurant use, it's been a
restaurant for longer than I've been alive.
It's going back thirty-plus years. That street in the back, there is already no parking allowed on that street, and if there were to be some sort of plan of action for mitigating risks, I think it would have to be a Village-wide plan, one that addresses all the properties on the street and in that area.

MS. MUNDUS: Especially since there are two other restaurants that have an exact -- it would be very unfair to put a condition like that for this restaurant and not the other ones.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I do think that we could separately recommend to the Board of Trustees that they review parking in the Village and all throughways and ensure that there is safe access to those areas. I don't know if there is going to be deliveries made there because of the level of traffic on that street, and the fact that parking is already prohibited there, I don't know that any particular time of day would
be more or less dangerous to block access
than any other.

MR. BURNS: That's my conclusion, but
when somebody does park on the opposite
side, it blocks the traffic.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Which is, you know,
but it is already outlawed, so just
enforcement of the existing parking
regulations, I think would be sufficient
too.

MR. PROKOP: Did you have any other
comment for tonight? It's important that --
I'm not sure if there is anything else about
the application you want to talk about.

MS. BERRY: No.

MR. PROKOP: I think, you know, with
this resolution and the one following it, I
think you could vote on it and I'll just do,
you know, I'll bring a clean version to the
next meeting. We can vote on it again.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

I'm going to make a motion that we
approve the SEQRA resolution that we just
went through. We will provide an edited
copy which is entered into the record at the next meeting, but adopt resolution as we discussed today.

Do I have a second for that motion?

MS. MUNDUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

So the SEQRA resolution is completed, but we do need to finalize the application; is that correct?

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Did you want to go through the findings and determinations now?

MR. PROKOP: You know what, if you could bear with me for a minute, maybe I can make it through this quickly. I'll just explain to you what I attempted to do.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Sure.

MR. PROKOP: So I had -- in the beginning, I just wrote down what the
application was for, you know, it's one and two, one is for the first floor renovations to remain a restaurant. Second floor renovation change from an office -- it should actually say attic storage. I picked up office from the -- there was an office there, I think, but on the application it said attic storage, and then site plan approval for exterior changes to the site of the subject building.

Then I have basically a history of where, you know, just the background information about this building. It's actually one of three buildings on a larger property. It's in the Commercial Residential District. It's about a 4400-square-foot building, two floors of 2200 square feet.

And then on page 2, I have the proceedings of the application, so somebody, you know, couple years from now, if you go back you'll see all the things that happened. I went back and I actually made a copy of every agenda and attached to it the
minutes from that meeting, so it's going to
go in the file.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: I have them here and that
way people will be able to go back and see
what we looked at.

This is, you know, pretty much a
summary of what happened at every meeting
and all the meetings that we had.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: One note, I think
the original application was November 18,
2014 instead of '15.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. Yes.

I'll change the names here as we
agreed to whatever they're supposed to be.

I have to change also that we
closed the hearing tonight.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: Planning Board adjourned
public hearing, it's going to say, and then
I'm going to add about the comments because
we received additional comments.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.
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October 1st, we voted to close the public hearing, we adopted a SEQRA resolution.

Okay. And subject to, not limited to the filing of plans for the new dry well, that's right. I'll take out the drainage requirement, and that it's not a conditional negative declaration, it's just a negative declaration and then also, I have to add in about the seating. That was a condition of the SEQRA, that was seating plan.

MS. BERRY: Joe, if you're showing things they've already put in, show the handicap accessibility too so it's on record.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

Okay, so they're going to have to file a site plan showing the second dry well, the seating and also the handicap access route.

All right. These are our findings, the property is in CR Zoning District, the applicant is an architect representative of the owner. That's the way
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the application came in.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: In the minutes at one point, there was discussion about whether there has to be handicap access to the second floor and also whether any one of the rooms has to be handicap suitable, and Mr. Brown, you gave an opinion at one or two meetings that you did not feel that it had to be. Do you still feel that way?

MR. BROWN: Yes. There was a discussion with the Building Department and that was the determination.

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

And I also have in here a finding that the application is exempt from the parking requirement because of the exception and 150-12C of the Village code.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: And then I have a determination is -- Historic Preservation -- oh, so here is another sticky thing about this. So the Historic Preservation Commission approved the exterior of the
building, but they didn't approve the fence.

    MR. BROWN: They did. That was applied for as well, separately.

    MR. PROKOP: Okay. So now the fence is approved.

    MR. BROWN: Yes.

    MR. PROKOP: Okay. I have to change that on here. That didn't come into any of our minutes. But the fence is now approved.

    CHAIRMAN McMAHON: No. It was done, I believe it was a subsequent meeting.

    MR. BROWN: It was the separate meeting of the Historic Commission because the design had not been finalized.

    MR. PROKOP: Okay. Then finally, the application for site plan approval, use evaluation for the renovation of the first floor and exterior for a restaurant and reconstruction of the second floor to be used as an inn hotel with five rooms is approved subject to the following.

    I have exterior proceeding is not approved until the applicant submits an exterior seating plan; is that what you want
to do or do you want to just have him submit a plan?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I would like them to submit the plan, that's it, as is, you know, reflecting the current --

MR. PROKOP: Applicant will submit amended site plan showing existing conditions.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: With seating, second dry well, and handicap access route.

So that's what one will be.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: And then for two --

MR. PROKOP: Two drops out because they got the fence approved.

Here's something -- I'm sorry, here's something else that came up.

If you look at the site plan, I took a good look at the site plan, we never really talked about this unless I missed it, but in the site plan on the north side of the building by Carpenter Street, there is a number of small little things like a cooling box, you know, thing like that, one or two
cooling boxes and dumpster and stuff that we never really looked at the buffering or the shielding; is that okay?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: There is shielding, there's a fence.

MS. MUNDUS: There is a fence all the way around that.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. So we'll just take that off, that's fine.

So four comes out because it's -- five comes out, six stays, but six is outside amplified music.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: What is number six?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It was the no outside amplified music, it's a condition on all restaurants.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. We're not going to review this, so seven comes out because we're not going to review it unless there is an issue.

So that will be the resolution.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

So then unless there is an objection, I'm going to make a motion that
we approve this and we --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could I see this before we approve it or do I have -- I think it all sounds right.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: It's -- sure. I mean --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Or can we just read over it one more time?

MR. PROKOP: We're going to adopt an edited version at the next meeting, so if you -- we can get you a copy of this at the next meeting, so we can get you a copy of this with the changes, and I'll try to do that over the next couple of days, and we will provide the copy to you and if you have any questions about it, it could come up at the next meeting.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. But we'll approve it tonight and -- okay.

MS. BERRY: Does that mean we need to make the next meeting a regular meeting as well as a work session?

MR. PROKOP: I think we're going to vote on it at the work session.
CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes, because the vote to adopt it is, now it's just accepting a formalized edited version of it.

MS. BERRY: So you're making the resolution tonight and you're going to accept it at the next meeting?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: Yes. The edited version.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So I'll make a motion that we adopt the finding and determinations as written and discussed with the edits we discussed and we will adopt a clean version at the next meeting.

Do I have a second for that?

MS. MUNDUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

MR. PROKOP: Did you want to send back a message, communication to the Board of Trustees to consider legislation regarding parking, traffic and deliveries?
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. As a separate issue I think we would like to work with the Board of Trustees to address not only this application, the parking permits behind this building, but how things have changed over the past years, so what, if anything, the Village can do to mitigate the problems with parking --

MR. BURNS: -- and deliveries.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: -- and deliveries.

MR. PROKOP: So the way to communicate to them would be basically to pass a resolution saying whatever you want to say.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All right.

So what were the items we would want to address?

Parking and traffic flow in particular on Carpenter Street.

MR. BURNS: Main Street between South and Bay.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Main Street.

MR. BURNS: Actually South becomes Central.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: South and Bay.
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MS. MUNDUS: Almost all the public comments and concerns were about Carpenter Street.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. I mean, I think it -- but I think the problems that we have here are not unique to that stretch. I think the entirety --

MR. BROWN: May I ask a question? I'm sorry to interrupt.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Sure.

MR. BROWN: Based on the vote that you just took, can we make the application for the CO?

MR. PROKOP: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

Second of all, as an owner on Bay Avenue, Main Street and Front Street, if you would like any input on thoughts about traffic from a licensed architect, I'd be more than happy to submit.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes.

I would like -- personally, I would like it to be the three Village boards, the Planning Board, the Board of
Trustees, the Zoning Board, as well as the Business Improvement District and any other interested parties, anyone else who wants to be involved in this. I don't know if we would get any input from the State because we do have twenty-five to go through.

MR. PROKOP: I think that is a good question. I think the State has sort of abandoned from the part that, you know, from Front Street to the highway.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: For example, at the corner of Central and Main Street, there is that stretch of three or four cars that are being clipped every single time a truck --

MR. PROKOP: Where is that?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: At the corner of Central and Main Street in front of Goldin Furniture.

MR. PROKOP: Central Avenue?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. Going down towards the Masonic Temple, or what was the Masonic Temple.

MS. MUNDUS: Everyone we know has had a near --
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The traffic, it's simply, I don't think wide enough for parking on both sides of the street, and there are --

MR. BROWN: And it is my understanding that Main Street between Front Street and North Road is not a State road, that is my understanding.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Main Street between Front and --

MR. BROWN: And North Road. The State does not take jurisdiction over it.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay. Because that was my question.

MR. BROWN: That's how I understand it.

MR. PROKOP: That's what I meant by the sort of abandoned it.

MR. BROWN: Because I know the Village has to file it, the State won't file it.

MS. MUNDUS: So that's why they made the ferry move, they looped the ferry on the other side of the village then.

MR. BROWN: I think that --

MS. MUNDUS: I mean, that's a State
sign.

MR. PALISTINE: Frank Palistine (phonetic).

On that date, it may matter or not matter to you, but I recall when we were working on that project, tractor-trailers, I believe, were saying they had to go down to where Di Angela Leather is in order to come up to go down that street, so, you know, in the big picture, if you're thinking one-way or something, maybe somebody ought to either talk to one of those guys or incorporate the thought of tractor-trailers.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: That's my thought, if there is an issue behind these three restaurants and down, further down, I know Bruce's and others had issues with deliveries in the back of their places. I think it needs to be addressed Village-wide and the entire pattern, understanding how all that is interrelated.

So I'm going to try to get some bullet points for a resolution and then we can request some discussion and action by
the Board of Trustees.

MS. MUNDUS: I would add also, it's not just the restaurants that have loading issues on Carpenter Street. There are sometimes large forty-foot flatbeds, and large yachts arrive on trailers to the shipyard also, so it's not just restaurant loading.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

So do we want to restrict this request for a review to particular streets or just the Village in general; are we going to open it up to the entirety of the Village?

MR. BURNS: I don't see how you can restrict it because each --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Everything plays off another. It needs to be reviewed.

MR. PROKOP: You might say, like, of particular concern, just you know, say --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All right.

So review of all traffic flows and parking throughout the Village, including but not limited to parking traffic on...
Carpenter Street --

MS. MUNDUS: Did you say a particular -- I would hate for Carpenter Street to get buried in all the miasma of the rest of the Village because it's really the most important part, I mean.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Particular --

MR. BURNS: Recently people have been using Carpenter Street more and more in order to avoid Main Street.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. I live on Central and I don't go up there.

MS. BERRY: I think you should also put some general language about looking at the zoning regulations and types of parking and, sort of, the weight or the implication. For instance, overnight parking requirements, like, if somebody is staying in a room overnight, it's a different kind of parking than commercial parking, and then I would also put delivery dates and time of day conflicts.

The other thing is to continue to consider the pedestrian.
CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The what?

MS. BERRY: To continue to consider the pedestrian in your evaluation because the thing that you're worried about with clipping the mirrors, that also keeps it very safe for pedestrians because all cars have to slow down to stop, so that has to be carefully looked at because if you open it up so people just go, you could be opening up another -- granted, it's an issue, but can you solve it in a way that also protects the pedestrians.

MS. MUNDUS: I'm sorry, I didn't get your name.

MR. PALISTINE: Frank Palistine.

MS. MUNDUS: Mr. Palistine also recommended that we consider the needs of tractor-trailer trucks as well and the drivers' needs.

Thank you for that.

MS. BERRY: There might be seasonal issues, and how you deal with temporary need to be in there too because Greenport certainly has --
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MS. MUNDUS: Well, this is just a recommendation. We're not giving them a cookbook on how to solve the problem, we're just recommending that they look at key items, right?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. If it's on record -- what I'll do is if we can get a list of all these bullet points and then I could just work on the wording to actually get everything together and I'll submit it, if that's okay with you, then I would --

MR. BURNS: Yes.

MS. MUNDUS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So right now, review of all traffic.

MR. HILBRAND: It's always ironic when you listen to some of these things that go on. The major reason a lot of things don't quite fit in Greenport traffic-wise, is that we have pedestrian crossings that are invisible.

Hello folks.

If anything happens, make them clear and make more of them.
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CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Even as much as I do like the planters throughout the village, there is one right on the corner by your shop that when you pull up there in a vehicle, it actually makes the visibility even worse, which is already a difficult turn there, then with the planter there, you can't see anything.

MR. HILBRAND: Another -- I personally have another reason for that, but it is really a Greenport reason, as we know on Saturday, especially Sunday, we got tons of motorbikes, and one of the ways to slow them down is what I have done is simply use the crosswalk to make them stop. To great chagrin of all the motorbikes, but it's the only legal way to get any reaction, so if you make recommendations, go after the crosswalks.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess you guys are all familiar with all the problems going to be raised on Main Street, right? I mean, I have a fairly large truck and everybody always has to stop and move to the side. I
mean, I don't know how realistic it is in flow, but if it was one way, that might alleviate that everybody is pulling to the side. I mean it's constant.

MS. MUNDUS: It's very true that that is the hazard to pedestrians because people stop and then when they see an opening, they gun it to go quickly, which if a pedestrian walks out at that point, that's a danger.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't know how realistic that it is, it just happens on a daily basis.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I believe there was a traffic study done a few years ago, 2009 is when the last one was done. I actually haven't seen that personally, that would be, I think a good place to start.

MS. BERRY: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So far some of the bullet points would be, review of all traffic patterns in the village, in particular parking and traffic flow on Carpenter Street, Main Street in between Center and South, or -- I would say Center
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and Front.

MR. BURNS: That's right.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Center and Front.

MS. MUNDUS: Ben, you're the long-timer here; can you explain why is some part of Main Street narrower than the northern part?

MR. BURNS: Predates me.

MS. MUNDUS: I mean, was one part of it widened or something because --

MR. BURNS: I arrived here in '71, and it was already that way.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think it's puzzling. It may have to do with trees, who knows because at one point, all the trees were destroyed.

MS. MUNDUS: I love that one-way idea. I mean, that seems like --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You also have to incorporate Front Street into that idea, you know, of it's two-way up to one point, then it's one-way.

MS. BERRY: Yes.

That was -- they spent quite a bit of time trying to figure Front Street out,
because they did look at a one-way operation and then opted to remove the parking on the park side as the compromise.

MR. BURNS: I was present at a number of conversations about this through the years and the only major changes we made was to remove parking on the south side of Front Street, which was a big.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Again, sorry to keep interrupting, but also if the one-way traffic is there, I believe if you go with diagonal parking, you could fit more cars, you know, just cars on one side diagonally parked. You can actually get more cars on the one-way street that way parked.

MR. BURNS: The way people drive out there.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: When you guys do comment, if you could just come up because she has to be able to see you as well as hear you.

MR. HILBRAND: Being part of the solution is always what I have in mind, and as several of you know, I only ride a bike
in Greenport, and on a bike, you see a lot of things. I also warned a lot of people when they don't pull the mirrors in, to pull the mirrors in if they like their mirrors, and you would be surprised how many people totally ignore it, they cannot be bothered.

For those of us who have been here for twenty, thirty years, U-turns were never ever done in Greenport, now they're a daily matter in Front Street and in Main Street, people make U-turns, so we can go on and on and on. If you're going to make suggestions --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Enforcement of existing regulations.

MR. HILBRAND: Absolutely. You can go on and on.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay. Once again, let me try to -- if you have anything to add at the end, let me know, it's fine, I just want to go through the items I have so far, the bullet points here.

Review of all traffic patterns in the village, in particular parking and
traffic flow on Carpenter Street between Center and Main Street, the different types of parking, overnight parking as opposed to, I guess we would call it transient parking or short-term parking, delivery needs, evaluating delivery needs, appropriateness of time and day for particular deliveries, understanding how pedestrian thoroughfare and crosswalks are affected or would be affected by any changes, considering the need of tractor-trailers and large vehicles to get down to the end of Carpenter Street as well as to make deliveries throughout the village, also understanding that is a thoroughfare for the State, the effect of seasonal needs of parking, we want to encourage that discussion begin with the examination of the 2009 traffic study and also operations for additional enforcement of existing regulations, possible increase in the enforcement.

MS. MUNDUS: And there was one more thing that someone mentioned, not at one of these public meetings, but in other
community forums, Ruth and the Edelsteins both said that people park, they try to make the effort to get off Carpenter Street and they overcompensate by parking too far on the grass, and Ruth was unable to even get in her gate because a car was parked so close to her fence, she couldn't even open the gate to get on the property.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Which I don't believe --

MS. MUNDUS: Because there's no curb there.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: But I don't believe that parking is even allowed there, I think they're illegally parking.

MS. MUNDUS: That's very true, and they have signs. I mean, the homeowners put their own signs out there.

MR. PROKOP: Is that right, there is no parking on Carpenter Street?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: In between Central and Bay Avenue, there is no parking on one side and it's restricted parking on the other side.
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I'm going to also add possible means of, and we are, as I think Mr. Brown pointed out last time, and I think it was noted in the 2009 traffic study, we are largely a pedestrian village, so encouraging pedestrian thoroughfares and means of making it more reasonable for people to safety travel through the village.

I'll also add that there are a large number of bicyclists in the village and they need to be considered in this as well.

MR. PELTON: Devin, that's just exactly what I -- I installed two bike racks -- Brent Pelton.

I installed two bike racks at Stirling Square, and it's amazing how they get filled up.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Do they?

MR. PELTON: Yeah. And additional bike racks throughout the village.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. I think many people would be happy to see increased biking, but we do need to also understand
how that's going to affect traffic patterns
and we need to make sure it is safe for the
bicyclists as well as the motorists and
pedestrians because if you have people
riding their bikes on the sidewalks, it can
then become very dangerous for everyone.

MS. BERRY: If it's slow enough, they
can ride in the traffic.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. Yes, it needs
to be --

MS. MUNDUS: But yes, it needs to be
thought where it's safe and where it's not.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Are there any other
items?

MR. SALIDINO: John Salidino.

I wasn't going to speak this
evening, but listening to -- just as a
clarification, lower Main Street is a State
road from Front Bridge is considered a
Village byway, I believe.

So what happens on that portion of
Main Street is strictly up to the Village.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Where was that from,
that was between --
MR. SALIDINO: From lower Main Street is still considered a State from Front to the Claudio's to the traffic signal.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. SALIDINO: From Front Street to Bridge is considered a Village byway by the State from Bridge to 48th is in Southold, so I don't know what they consider it.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: We have the State, Southold town, the Village.

MR. SALIDINO: Well, you're not planning on anything on -- you weren't taking suggestions for lower Main Street.

MS. MUNDUS: No.

MR. SALIDINO: As far as deliveries, a lot of municipalities limit the size of the truck. Manhattan, in midtown between certain hours is limited size, can't be over thirty-three feet, so tractor-trailers -- it would be easy to address, you know, you let the merchant know that a sixty-five-foot or forty-five-foot tractor-trailer just can't come, and I'm sure the vendors would be glad to accommodate them, I mean, you know, it's
to their advantage.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: When the village is congested, it affects everyone in the village, you know, their customers can't get to them and they can't in and out easily.

MR. SALIDINO: As far as making Main Street a one-way, I'm sure it's a great suggestion, I have no clue how that would work. Where would the cars going in some direction, whether it's north or south, they're going to have to go somewhere, First Street or wherever and you know you're going to hear from those people.

To eliminate parking on Main Street as we have all from public hearings before, they will certainly have something to say about that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Absolutely.

MR. SALIDINO: So as far as a solution --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I think we are a long way off from a solution, but these are some of the beginning points, you know, as a jumping off points for discussion.
MR. SALIDINO: I would have no problem, you know, eliminating parking. I thought when you guys, Mr. Burns, when you eliminated parking on the south side of Front Street, I thought it was the greatest thing.

MR. BURNS: You were one to approve, but there were a whole bunch who said --

MR. SALIDINO: Oh, no. You're going to hear from those same people, you know, and the new merchants now also that are --

I mean it just relieved such a problem and people seemed to have survived, you know, so as -- and then once you -- if you eliminated parking on one side, obviously, you can move the line over and everybody would have a little more room.

The only other spot I would suggest is in front of Pete Clark's.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Where is that?

MR. SALIDINO: Clark's Garden.

It seems extremely tight there. To me it's the tightest place.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: The same issue,
there was actually -- I can recall an emergency vehicle being stuck in there not too long ago and they had to get a number of officers in to back everyone out, so they could get the ambulance out of there.

MR. SALIDINO: You's have a tough row to hoe.

Thank you.

MS. BERRY: Since we're talking -- it's outside the Village limits but does the Village care about what happens at that intersection of 25 and 28?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. That is outside the Village. I absolutely think that needs to be addressed but for now we'll -- I think that does need -- that's a separate lobbying issue that needs involvement from the State.

So just to move along, I'm going to, if these items are okay, I will draft a letter to the Board of Trustees asking them to comment on this and to get this process going.

We do need to pass a resolution to
that effect though, so I'm going to make a motion that, I will draft said letter to the Board of Trustees and we can move from there.

Do I have a second on that?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Item number two, continued discussion of current sign regulations. The Village Board passed a resolution requesting that the Planning Board submit comments to the Code Committee regarding current signage regulations.

Do either of you have comments with regards to the current application?

MR. BURNS: No.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Glynis?

MS. BERRY: I'm sorry, I didn't have time to do a write-up, but when we were looking at the sign for some of the
projects, there were a couple of issues that weren't fair because we interpreted the language differently.

One is clarification of the number of signs a building can have because one part looks like it's limiting it and another part doesn't; so that needs clarification.

And maybe a little more clarification on the types of signs and if there are any, you know, like we had that issue of what is a hanging sign and how signs are affixed so maybe a little clarity on that.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: I think that the overhead signs should not be -- a door overhead sign should be distinguished differently.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay. We had that recessed versus --

MR. PROKOP: Yes, it shouldn't be swinging or --

MS. BERRY: I think it's how it's attached because that is where the danger comes, you know, so --
MR. PROKOP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

Clarification on overhead signs, what is allowed, what is not; clarification on the number of signs that each business is permitted.

MS. MUNDUS: And also the means of attachment.

MS. BERRY: And also each facade, you know -- you're right, each business, each facade because there was different kinds of language, and in one place it looked like each business could only have one sign, but then there was another interpretation that they could have more than one sign, so it wasn't clear.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

And you said the means of attachment.

MS. MUNDUS: Right.

MR. PROKOP: What about, are we clear about the number of signs you can have in your window, like if you have one outside sign, you can do whatever you want in the
window; is that clear?

MS. BERRY: No, it isn't clear.

MR. PROKOP: That's what we're talking --

MS. BERRY: That's one of the things too because it's counted as a sign and yet -- it's not clear.

MR. SALIDINO: Do you know if this next Code Committee meeting if they're planning to take action on the sign regulations?

MR. PROKOP: No, but they would appreciate comments, they would really appreciate comments.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

MR. PROKOP: That's on Monday, that's in four days.

MS. MUNDUS: I think the main sign question that we had over and over again is, what is a sign hanging over the sidewalk, you know, remember we spent a lot of time on that?

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: So recessed overhead on the sidewalk --

MS. BERRY: Maybe enumerate the
different sign configurations and any limitations like that.

MR. SALIDINO: I'm sorry, what was that?

MS. BERRY: Maybe enumerating the sign configurations, you know, like are they decals, are they attached, are they hanging, are they perpendicular, you know, so that we make sure we cover everything. Like you said recessed, I mean, there are so many different --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

So there needs to be, I think there needs to be additional flushing out of more specifics with regards to types of signs, just more particulars in there and differentiation between what is included.

MS. MUNDUS: I don't remember actually whether it was in there about these plywood sandwich signs which seem to be sprouting like mushrooms all over the village.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes, they're -- directional boards are addressed in the code. I think they are permitted for
Businesses that are not on Front, Main, or Third. I think you can have directional signs, but there's a permit process for that, I think it's a fifty dollar application, maybe less and it lasts for two years or until the business closes, but they need to be reviewed every two years.

MR. SALIDINO: Those aren't the sandwich board signs, those are the -- that doesn't address the sandwich sign, that addresses the signs on the poles. Like you see a sign here that says -- the code doesn't address, the ones you're talking about are the directional signs on the stop signs and stuff, you know, like they'll point to Alice's.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Like the ones for Alice's.

MR. SALIDINO: Exactly. The sandwich board signs, Joe could back me up, from what I have read the code is they're illegal.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: They're just not allowed.

MS. MUNDUS: Yes.
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MR. PROKOP: They're not allowed.

MS. MUNDUS: I mean, because they're everywhere, that fire board has sandwich signs all over the place and you know, they're everywhere.

So sandwich boards.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: I would say, once we have clarification on all of this and again code existing regulation.

MR. PROKOP: I would mention sandwich boards.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Sandwich specifically.

MR. PROKOP: Included.

MS. MUNDUS: Once one store puts a sandwich board then they all do.

MR. PROKOP: It's a free-for-all.

MS. MUNDUS: It's cascading.

MR. BURNS: It wouldn't necessarily be a part of this submission, but they're going to need another code enforcement person.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Yes. I believe that has gotten a lot of discussion at the Village Board meetings, so I think there is,
I think actually, maybe they even -- I'm not sure, I don't want to comment to specifically.

So the next meeting is on the 4th, I don't know if we can really -- how would you guys like to address this? We can -- I'd like to get comments on this sooner rather than later, if we could have something for the next meeting, but that's only four days away. We could ask them to -- I'm on the -- so ask me and others to look at these items specifically, and to, again, I could do similar to what I'll do for the other letter, just sort of take these bullet points and ask that these are some of the items that we feel need further attention, further study.

MR. PROKOP: I would do a letter and just circulate it to the Board quick. I don't think you have to wait for everybody's response because people might be doing different things, but I would just circulate it to the Board --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.
MR. PROKOP: -- and give everybody twenty-four hours to --

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Okay.

So I will try to get that, I guess, today or tomorrow so you guys have a chance to review it before the Monday. It's on Monday, I believe.

MR. PROKOP: Yes, Monday, 4 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Monday at 4 o'clock.

Any other comments, questions?

Okay.

So I'm going to make a motion that I'll generate a letter addressing the bullet points that we discussed and circulate it to the Board members for review prior to the next Code Committee meeting on Monday.

Do I have a second for that?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Item number three, motion to
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approve the Planning Board minutes of the
August 6, 2015 meeting.

Do I have a second?

MS. MUNDUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Item number four, motion to accept Planning Board minutes for August 27, 2015.

Do I have a second?

MS. MUNDUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Item number five, motion to schedule the next Planning Board Work Session for October 29, 2015.

Do I have a second?

MS. MUNDUS: Second.

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

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Item number five, motion to schedule the next Planning Board Work Session for October 29, 2015.

Do I have a second?

MR. BURNS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

MR. BURNS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Item number five, motion to adjourn.

Do I have a second?

MS. MUNDUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: All in favor?

MR. BURNS: Aye.

MS. MUNDUS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN McMAHON: Aye.

Motion carries.

Thank you very much.
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(Time noted: 6:15 p.m.)
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