VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK STATE OF NEW YORK

PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR SESSION

June 2, 2016
5:00 P.M.
Third Street Fire Station
Greenport, New York

BEFORE:
MARY GIVEN
PETER JAUQUET
DEVIN MCMAHON
BRADLEY BURNS
JOHN COTUGNO
GLYNIS BERRY
PAUL PALLAS
JOSEPH W. PROKOP
(Whereupon the meeting was called to
order at 5:08 p.m.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: We're going to be begin
the meeting; this is the Village of
Greenport planning board, June 2, 2016.

Item No. 1 Front Street: Motion to
accept and for action on the use
evaluation application from Crazy Four
Inc, represented by Callie Brennan,
President. The application proposes to
reopen 2 Front Street (formerly the
Coronet), under the name Crazy Beans.
The proposed restaurant use is a
permitted use in the CR (Commercial
Retail) Zone. The property is located
within the Historic District and is a
Type II Action, which is not subject to
coordinated review. Suffolk County Tax
Map No. 1001-4.-10-17.

Do we have any comments or
discussions on this? We discussed it at
the last meeting. We're reopening this
space. Did we receive the FHL.

PAUL PALLAS: I didn't see any in the
file.

JOSEPH W. PROKOP: It was submitted today.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So, if that's going to be included in the file, I think that was the only --

MARY GIVEN: And the sign and the historic preservation.

DEVIN MCMAHON: They'll be separate from us.

Any motion that we approve the application as it was submitted?

MARY GIVEN: Second.

DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor?

(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: Item No. 2: Motion to accept and for action on the use evaluation application from Juniper Spirit Merchants, represented by Robert Place. Item application proposes to reopen 219 Main Street (Claudio's Liquor Store) under the name Spirited Wine and Liquor. The proposed use is permitted use in the CR (Commercial Retail) Zone.
This property is located within the Historic District and is a Type II Action. Suffolk County Tax Map No. 1001-4.-10-22.2.

Do we have any discussion, questions, comments on this. We discussed it at the last meeting. At first it was simply a continuation of the previous use, garbage.

JOSEPH W. PROKOP: That's correct.
DEVIN MCMAHON: Minimalist use is not the same as a restaurant use. Any comments or questions?
GLYNIS BERRY: We should also make a resolution about the SEQR funding.
DEVIN MCMAHON: Yeah. So, the first motion will be to for purposes of the Type II Action, and we'll have no significant impact on the environment.
Second that motion?
PETER JAQUET: Second.
DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor?
(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)
DEVIN MCMAHON: So, that motion carries.
The second will be motion to accept and approve the application as submitted. Do I have a second for that motion.

BRADLEY BURNS: Second.

DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor?

(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: Going back to Item NO. 1, as we should have, I'm going to make a motion that the document make a determination of a Type II Action, no significant adverse impact on the environment. Second for that motion?

PETER JAQUET: Second.

DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor all say I. (Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: Item No. 3, Row off Front Street: Motion to accept and for action on the use evaluation application from William F. Claudio Inc., represented Janice Claudio. The application from proposes to use the east side of the applicant's dock to offer boats for sale. The proposed use
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is a permitted use in the CR (Commercial Retail) Zone. This property is not located in the Historic District.

Suffolk County Tax Map No. 1001-5.4-25.

I believe they didn't make a determination on that. I don't believe that would be a Type II Action, it would be an unlisted action.

PAUL PALLAS: It's Type II.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Is it?

GLYNIS BERRY: Yeah, because it's permitted use.

DEVIN MCMAHON: I think it's totally property for the space.

GLYNIS BERRY: We'll let Joe decide.

PETER JAQUET: It's not a specially named use?

GLYNIS BERRY: The issue is for number three shouldn't be Type II or unlisted.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Well, I think that in this case, we the Board has determined previously a use evaluation is a Type II Action. So, as long as you agree -- as long as the Board -- this went on the
agenda as a use of evaluation. So as long as that's all it was, then it would be a Type II Action. If there's anything else involved, a site plan or anything else required with this, then it wouldn't be a Type II.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Okay. The permitted use I don't have any questions or issues with regard to the site plan.

GLYNIS BERRY: I would just advise signage they need to come back with a signing permit, and also there was an issue with litter. So, if they have some kind of contained if they're going to have a fire, so there's not an issue.

DEVIN MCMAHON: I think it's certainly appropriate to mention, but I don't think we need to add an additional -- that's a do what you're supposed to do. That's required anyway. If they're littering, they're littering. That would be a separate problem.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Did anything come in with this application? Any kind of a
plan.

DEVIN McMAHON: There was. I indicated where the sales would be. Where that would be used for.

JOSEPH PROKOP: I think they just need to -- what they did on their diagram between one and their bulkhead, they crosshatched it. But if they're only going do it along their bulkhead, they should indicate on their plan.

DEVIN McMAHON: Okay.

JOSEPH PROKOP: If they're going to fill in the whole area, just so we have something in the file.

We can still go ahead. They just need to correct that.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Okay. So, the plan as it is does not indicate that?

PAUL PALLAS: The wording could be a little clearer. We can just have them reword that, to indicate that that where the boats would be limited to.

DEVIN McMAHON: Okay.

PAUL PALLAS: The wording is not one
hundred percent clear.

PETER JAUQUET: What are we looking at, where the sign is going to be?

PAUL PALLAS: No. Where the boats are going to be.

PETER JAUQUET: I know. I think they should write it out where the boats are going to be.

PAUL PALLAS: Correct.

PETER JAUQUET: And the slip on the other side of that dock are not indicated up until now.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Okay. So --

PETER JAUQUET: And where the TV sign goes, and if there's going to be a kiosk with papers.

JOHN COTUGNO: Is there going to be an office?

DEVIN MCMAHON: No. Essentially they did it last year too. It was just advertising the boats, showing the boats, and I think they had a little sandwich board on the boat advertising stocks, marina. Most of the sales there
back at on the, it's just a matter of
having the boats there.

So we have as it's indicated, it
looks as if the boats will be on the
west side of that dock -- on the east
side.

PETER JAUQUET: This is a permanent
wooden dock at water level with stairs
coming down. They've had boats on the
west side for sale.

PAUL PALLAS: I think this is more
formalizing what's happened. So, by
this drawing they're showing they're
going to limit it to that side. So, my
suggestion just we will have to limit
them. That's your choice.

PETER JAUQUET: I was thinking since
this is such a sketchy design here, they
might still be interested in both the
west side and east side of the dock. It
doesn't matter to me, they should tell
us.

GLYNIS BERRY: I think there was an
issue with the Village if they were on
the west side if they were attaching the
boats to --

PETER JAUQUET: That's our property.

PAUL PALLAS: That both bulkheads, I
believe, belong to the Village.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So, maybe we can
indicate that it will be for the space
between the dock and the west side of
the property.

PAUL PALLAS: The western bulkhead and
the dock.

DEVIN MCMAHON: And the eastern side of
the dock.

PAUL PALLAS: The western bulkhead is
their property.

DEVIN MCMAHON: If they're going to have
any signage there, they need a sign
permit. If their having things on the
boats, that's not our --

PAUL PALLAS: No.

DEVIN MCMAHON: I think that's how they
did it last year. If they're going to
have any addition flyers, they'll
need --
JOSEPH PROKOP: A written decision. And
I'll list these things, you can just
give them to me in detail.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Okay.

JOSEPH PROKOP: The only thing that
concerns me with the signage is, the
electronic sign in nature as opposed to
a board because the electronic could be
a problem.

DEVIN MCMAHON: I think that would
qualify for signage that would require a
permit before they install the TV. If
they're going to install the TV, they
need to show what's going to be
displayed and how it's going to be
displayed.

PETER JAUQUET: In case anyone wants to
start putting TVs on.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Okay. So, does anyone
have an issue with the actual use?

PETER JAUQUET: No.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So, perhaps we'll do a
written decision but specify bullet
point that need to be addressed.
One, the boat sales would be limited between the western bulkhead of Claudio's parking and the east side of the dock in question. If they choose to put a TV up, they will need to submit a sign permit application.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Did they actually say TV?

PAUL PALLAS: They did. I thought they said a television.

MARY GIVEN: On the pile.

PAUL PALLAS: On the pile.

MARY GIVEN: Correct.

DEVIN MCMAHON: If a TV be installed, whatever is displayed on the TV needs a sign permit.

PETER JAUQUET: Does the TV have sound?

MARY GIVEN: I don't know.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Also, if there are going to be any flyers distributed.

PETER JAUQUET: A flyer kiosk.

DEVIN MCMAHON: If that's going to be included, anything that's going to be on land would need to be self contained.
Anything else?

PETER JAUQUET: When they come up to get those signs, they don't want to walk over the edge into the water.

DEVIN MCMAHON: No, they don't want that.

PETER JAUQUET: I'm just curious about the kiosks and the water's edge and whether that's a safety factor there as they approach all that activities.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Right now we have -- well, my proposed motion would be to approve the application with the following three conditions: That the boats for sale are parked between -- docked between the western bulkhead of Claudio's property and the eastside is in question. If the TV is going to be installed on the piling and it's going to be advertising the boat sales, that would be considered signage and would require a sign permit. And if there are any flyers they'll need to be self-contained. Again, if they're going
to have a kiosk with advertising on it, that would be part of the signage as well. Do I have a second for that motion?
PETER JAQUET: I'll second that.
DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor say I.
(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)
DEVIN MCMAHON: Motion carries. We also need to for purposes of SEQR make a determination that it's a Type II Action. Second for that?
BRADLEY BURNS: Second.
DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor say I.
(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)
DEVIN MCMAHON: Item No. 4, 211 Carpenter Street: This was originally motion to table the discussion on the application for site plan review pending receipt of requested information and extend the 60 day time period for action. I'd like to add that David Kapell, representing Old Shipyard LLC, located at 211 Carpenter Street, has proposed to convert an existing
two-story building into a first-floor
tasting room and one second-floor
apartment. The property is in the CR
(Commercial Retail) District. Both uses
are permitted in the CR zone. The
property has been vacant for some time.
All mixed-use buildings are required to
have a fire suppression system by the
New York State Fire Prevention and
Building Code. The property is located
in the Village Historic District, and is
subject to coordinate review. Changes
are to items prior use there. Suffolk
County Tax Map No. 1001-4.-10-11.

The one change I want to make to
the property is make the motion to
initiate a coordinate review this SEQR
map even, HBC building permit.

Do we have any questions or
comments on this?

JOSEPH PROKOP: So, we're going to
preliminary adopt the status and
initiate and coordinate a review?

DEVIN MCMAHON: Yeah, I know they do
need it before HBC, but it's going to be a while because they're not on Monday's agenda. I don't believe so. We did not yet receive the most recent plans that addressed the HPC and the potential destruction of the handicap access; is that correct?

GLYNIS BERRY: No.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Did you want to speak on this?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. We are going to submit that with we will eliminate the conflict between the HPC valve and the down spout leader. We will relocate the driveway apron to the south edge of the property, and we will reverse the outward door swing that's apparently in the conflict with the stairs on the front porch.

GLYNIS BERRY: And shift the --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. The driveway apron. Can we make those conditions of approval?

DEVIN MCMAHON: I think we have to
complete the SEQR review before we can
vote on approval. So, either way
something's going to go before HPC
building permit.

Tonight we can initiate the
coordinated review and then the process
can be completed. But I don't think we
can vote on approval of application
tonight.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you accept it and
it will be on the agenda for approval in
July maybe?

DEVIN MCMAHON: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you very much.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Well, as soon as HPC is
done.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Does the planning
board require HPC approval before they
act?

DEVIN MCMAHON: No.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Just complete your
coordinated review. Which is --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It depends what the
subject is, but I don't want to speak about this application specifically but there might be something that's subject to HPC detail things but.

DEVIN MCMANON: We're not making major changes.

DEVIN MCMANON: Okay.

JOSEPH PROKOP: The main thing is because it's in a historic district with SEQR.

DEVIN MCMANON: More application changing, I believe, was the only issues that this board had.

Is there any other comments or questions.

PETER JAUQUET: No.

MARY GIVEN: Drainage, did he address that?

DEVIN MCMANON: The thing is we ask applicants to provide preexisting on performance and.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We would consider it if we had a ability to, but we don't have a space and it's preexisting.
DEVIN McMAHON: Any other questions or comments with this?

JOSEPH PROKOP: I make a motion to move ahead for the board to preliminary adopt the agency status, determine preliminary that it's a Type I Action because it's in a historic district and coordinate a review.

DEVIN McMAHON: Anyone have any objections or questions about that?

PETER JAQUET: No.

DEVIN McMAHON: I make a motion to adopt for purposes of SEQR that it's a Type I Action due to its location and change in use. And we will begin the coordinated review. The HPC will be notified and it be will be on the next meeting's agenda. Do I have a second to that motion?

PETER JAQUET: Second.

DEVIN McMAHON: All in favor say I.

(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN McMAHON: Motion carried.

Item No. 5, 300-308 Main Street:

Continued discussion on the application
for site plan review pending completion
of coordinated review. An amendment to
the previous site plan has been
received. The previous site plan was
approved on November 4, 2015. The
applicant, Robert I. Brown, Architect is
representing Stirling Square LLC- Brent
Pelton. The applicant has proposed to
remodel four existing apartment units
into an additional five temporary
residential (inn) units, and one
handicap accessible unit on the ground
floor, bringing the total of rental
rooms for American beech Inn to 11
rooms.

The proposal includes a renovation
of Suite 308C (a ground floor space),
into a lobby for the Inn, incorporating
a new glass facade with interior and new
exterior seating and a water feature in
the courtyard. The proposal includes
additional bluestone hardscape for
easier handicap accessibility and
several ramps providing accessibility to
each of the commercial units. The proposal has specified a retractable awning over the existing cedar trellis which covers the dining patio at the American Beech Restaurant. The plan also calls for an extension of the wood pergola to the north. The property is located in the Village of Greenport Historic District and is subject to coordinated review.

The Historic preservation Commission reviewed the proposal at the April 4, 2016 HPC meeting and approved the change in facade, but asked the applicant to explore other options for the dining patio. The Historic preservation Commission has asked that the project remain on the agenda pending an alternative to the retractable awning. All additional changes to the site plan will be reviewed at a future HPC meeting. Suffolk County Tax Map No. 1001-4.-7-29.1. Sir, Mr. Brown.

ROBERT BROWN: Robert Brown. Just
DEVIN MCMAHON: Have you decided what you're doing with the awning?

ROBERT BROWN: We believe we have a solution that's been discussed on officially with members of the historic preservation. We have the go back to them to finalize.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So, we need to finalize that. Any other questions or comments?

GLYNIS BERRY: Two questions. I noticed that there wasn't a change in the paving at the head of the stairway, so do you want the keep did gravel there where people --

ROBERT BROWN: That was changed.

GLYNIS BERRY: Not on this set.

ROBERT BROWN: The paving now comes to the top of the stairs.

GLYNIS BERRY: Right. But the gravel also comes to the top of the stairs, so you have a change of texture right where somebody is grabbing the railing -- I'm sorry I'm misreading it.
You're okay. You changed it.

Thank you. I appreciate it.

And I guess the only other question is with the extension of awning: Is there any kind of fire hazard with the fire place.

ROBERT BROWN: The awning will not be going over the fireplace. The plan shows the awning essentially stopping where the pergola stops extending with that awning over the fireplace.

GLYNIS BERRY: Is there any --

ROBERT BROWN: No. It sufficiently covers the fire box.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So there's possibly questions whether or not a between the fireplace and the extension of the pergola?

PAUL PALLAS: Yes.

ROBERT BROWN: Generally speaking, the code specifies the distance between the firebox and any combustible material.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Well, that will be a building permit issue. Obviously we
can't.

PAUL PALLAS: We'll review that certainly, but I think as part of the planing process is to improve the pergola. We'll have to let you know that if it is in fact okay.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Okay. Are there any questions on any other aspects of the plan.

GLYNIS BERRY: I would just like to comment: Thank you for being so responsive to all the comments and incorporating a lot.

ROBERT BROWN: I thank you for your assistance. It was greatly appreciated.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Any other questions or comments?

PETER JAUQUET: I don't have any comments.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Anyone, questions comments. So, the next step is going to be HPC then --

ROBERT BROWN: Yes.

DEVIN MCMAHON: -- with your plan with
the awning, and then going coming back to us.

ROBERT BROWN: Yes. Can I ask with that the status of the application is at this point and the coordinated review?

DEVIN MCMAHON: I believe because we don't have a completed plan, it's still a -- I don't think we've accepted the final plan.

ROBERT BROWN: Can I ask what specifically you're looking for?

DEVIN MCMAHON: One, indication of what you're planning to do with the awning and you just need to confirm that there's no issue with the pergola extension. As far as I'm concerned, those are the only two things now that I think the questions in the air.

JOSEPH PROKOP: I noticed in the application that there's currently four units that are being converted to five

ROBERT BROWN: Yes.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Does that meet the code?

GLYNIS BERRY: He's making --
JOSEPH PROKOP: It has to be subject to the building department not this board. Is there anything else we need to look at with regard to that with making four into five?

GLYNIS BERRY: I believe it's compliant; I can double check. If he turns it into a hotel.

JOHN COTUGNO: It doesn't affect the parking requirements?

GLYNIS BERRY: There were no parking requirements.

PAUL PALLAS: We'll review that as well.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Can we communicate that to the applicant then?

PAUL PALLAS: Yes.

DEVIN MCMAHON: We'll communicate that if there's a problem with the building department; otherwise, I don't have any other questions or comments at this time. Anyone else?

GLYNIS BERRY: I don't.

ROBERT BROWN: Thank you.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So, we do need your
answer to your question. To move forward we need a finalized plan before we can accept the application and coordinated review.

ROBERT BROWN: You mean accepted by HPC?

DEVIN MCMAHON: Just needs to be your final plan that's indicating the awning and everything completed, that's it.

ROBERT BROWN: Because we do have a plan that shows what we're submitting to HPC for that awning.

PAUL PALLAS: They'll have to look at that and decide, right.

JOSEPH W. PROKOP: That's what I'm saying, are you waiting for HPC to respond.

PAUL PALLAS: The site plan indicates a retractable awning, but HPC has not approved that. So, in theory, HPC could reject it, which means there will be a site plan again. So, this board is not in the position to accept it.

JOSEPH W. PROKOP: I'm just trying to work my way through this. It's my
understanding that HPC approved the
retractable awning, but was not
satisfied with this specific design at
the time.

PAUL PALLAS: I understand your point,
but there's no HPC approval at this
point. But that's the issue that's
being communicated right now that
there's no HPC approval, which
ultimately means it could be rejected,
which could change your site plan.

GLYNIS BERRY: Where is the door for
Unit D?

ROBERT BROWN: Unit D?

GLYNIS BERRY: Yeah.

ROBERT BROWN: Sorry, I don't have that
with me.

The unit is on the first floor at
the bottom of the stairs.

GLYNIS BERRY: At the bottom?

ROBERT BROWN: Yeah. It's not indicated
on the plan.

GLYNIS BERRY: And Unit D is directly
going up the side.
ROBERT BROWN: Yes. At the bottom of the stairs.

GLYNIS BERRY: How is Unit C and Unit E separated?

ROBERT BROWN: Unit C and B?

GLYNIS BERRY: Right. Sorry, I'm messing up, sorry.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Are there going to be six rooms?

ROBERT BROWN: There will be six additional hotel units.

JOSEPH PROKOP: The access to the handicap one on the first floor, is that --

JOSEPH W. PROKOP: Directly outside.

PAUL PALLAS: I think what the question is: It's not clear how each of these rooms is accessed. We see the stairs but then what happens? It's not clear what happens at the bottom of the stairs.

ROBERT BROWN: It's just a matter of the doors were not shown on the ground-floor plan.
PAUL PALLAS: So, they open up out in the courtyard at the bottom of the stairs?

ROBERT BROWN: Yes.

PAUL PALLAS: The elevation --

JOSEPH W. PROKOP: This is the existing door that leads to Unit C.

PAUL PALLAS: Okay.

ROBERT BROWN: Unit D has a door here on the ground floor which isn't shown on the plan, but it should be here (indicating).

PAUL PALLAS: Maybe just the detail.

JOSEPH W. PROKOP: Sure. Unit E as well the same idea, there's a door here I believe (indicating).

PAUL PALLAS: Just not on the drawing. Maybe the door swinging so we know.

ROBERT BROWN: I can show you there's doors.

PAUL PALLAS: I know but then everyone gets to see how people are entering and exiting the rooms.

ROBERT BROWN: Sure.
JOSEPH PROKOP: The application is going to be building ramps to the commercial units in the courtyard.

ROBERT BROWN: Yes.

JOSEPH PROKOP: So, there's no ramps to the room?

ROBERT BROWN: There will be a ramp to the new accessible hotel room on the ground floor.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Okay. Several ramps providing accessibility to each of the commercial units?

GLYNIS BERRY: He's been very responsive and that he's added ramps to all the commercial areas, off the central court has ramps.

ROBERT BROWN: All commercial spaces will be accessible and one hotel room will be accessible.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Is all handicap access?

ROBERT BROWN: The code only requires one is added.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Then just extended the solid blue stone throughout so the lobby
JOSEPH W. PROKOP: Yes.

GLYNIS BERRY: They've been very good at this. In fact, they've added the accessible unit, so thank you.

BRADLEY BURNS: So, we're holding them up at this point because of the awning?

DEVIN MCMAHON: Essentially. I think the question HPC had indicated, they wanted to review that, I think that's it. Unless I'm missing something.

ROBERT BROWN: The continuation would seem to apply in principal that accepting the retractable awning is work outside the detail, so I guess it would be up the you if it's a detail.

MARY GIVEN: Has it changed since I sat on the HPC?

ROBERT BROWN: Yes.

MARY GIVEN: How?

ROBERT BROWN: We're talking about a removable solid cover up against the building to make up the difference of the 16 feet, and the sixteen foot
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2   retractable awning is starting at the end of that.
3   JOSEPH PROKOP: There's no plan to enclose the sides of the pergola?
4   ROBERT BROWN: I haven't had a conversation about that; I couldn't answer.
5   JOSEPH PROKOP: The aluminum ventilation system that's hanging outside the building on Carpenter Street, is there going to be anything like that?
6   ROBERT BROWN: No. That was a surprise to me too by the way.
7   JOSEPH PROKOP: Do you know if that was approved by the HPC.
8   ROBERT BROWN: No, I couldn't answer that. I don't know. I wasn't involved with that.
9   PAUL PALLAS: On the awning you're talking about this panel, if you will, from the building, is that permanent?
10  ROBERT BROWN: No. It will be removable. It's solid but removable; it doesn't necessarily have to be there
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when the courtyard is not used. It
would be something put on at the
beginning of the season and taken off at
the end.

DEVIN McMAHON: What are you referring
to?

PAUL PALLAS: As I understand, the
applicant is putting in a solid panel
and the retractable awning would start
from that point out. So, you're going
to have a relatively permanent awning
for some distance and then a mechanical
retractable awning six feet off the
building into the parking lot.

PETER JAUQUET: Does it go from east the
west or from north to south, the
direction of those awning?

ROBERT BROWN: The retractable awning
will be moving east to west, west to
east.

JOSEPH PROKOP: So a part of the roof is
going to be a permanent awning and part
of it will be retractable?

MARY GIVEN: It's not actually an
ROBERT BROWN: The first six feet off the building will be a removable plastic seating.

MARY GIVEN: You never found a company that could accommodate?

ROBERT BROWN: No. There were a few manufacturers.

JOSEPH PROKOP: So, why do we have an application for a retractable awning; why don't we have an application for what you just described.

ROBERT BROWN: It's been in development because originally we were told that manufactures would provide a full retractable awning, then we're told the 16 feet was the maximum they could do.

PAUL PALLAS: It's indicated as retractable. As I understand, what's he's saying is a portion of it will be retractable, but a portion will be semi permanent covering, which may or may not be removed at the end of the season.

JOSEPH PROKOP: We sit through these
meetings and first off when he approved
the pergola, the representation was that
it wasn't going to be covered. So, now
the applicant's here and now they want
it covered and they told us it's not
going to be too bad because it's a
retractable covering. But now it's not
a retractable covering. I guess there
was a change because you realized it
couldn't go.

ROBERT BROWN: Yes.

JOSEPH PROKOP: There should be an
amended application that indicates that.

JOHN COTUGNO: The first six feet is
considered a canopy and you take it off,
but anything is removable.

PAUL PALLAS: Semipermanent.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Maybe submit a new
application that informs of your new
plans please, just so we can review it.

PETER JAUQUET: Sounds like a possible
conditional approval.

PAUL PALLAS: Not at this stage.

DEVIN McMAHON: I mean that's up for.
JOSEPH PROKOP: My recommendation is that why couldn't you at least get on the turnstile to keep it going so it's moving. I think I would definitely issue at this point a review plan it in order for someone to review the plans.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Right. I think I can make that amendment to the description of the awning very quickly.

Once we accept an application, at that time if we need more time, you have a get approval from you as well or deny the application and start over.

ROBERT BROWN: Understood.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So, that's the only -- we have the option of denying the application after 60 days if we're not satisfied.

What would you like to do.

PETER JAUQUET: I'd like a keep it going to get the ball rolling if the awning is the only thing holding us up.

DEVIN MCMAHON: So, we'll make a motion to accept the application and a separate
motion to begin the coordinating review
and a Type I Action because it's in the
historic district.

PETER JAUQUET: That's my opinion. I
don't know about anything else.

MARY GIVEN: But Joe said they need to
amend the application.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Yeah. There's still a
lot moving parts in the application.

DEVIN MCMAHON: We have a lot of the
applications where we accept but changes
are made in large. Part of the
application is complete, so there's a
question of whether or not there's a
covering over the pergola and the
fireplace.

PETER JAUQUET: And the HPC acceptance
of solutions.

DEVIN MCMAHON: I don't have a problem
with a coordinated review because that
does have a mandatory timeframe. I make
a motion that we accept the application
as submitted with the understanding
there will be a change to what's shown
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2   to the awning. And this will be
3   reviewed by the HPC, and they'll offer
4   comments.
5
6   We're going to make a continued
7   look into the issues that were raised
8   with the pergola over the fireplace to
9   confirm whether or not --
10  ROBERT BROWN: That's would be okay.
11  DEVIN MCMAHON: Do I have a second for
12   that motion?
13  MARY GIVEN: Second.
14  DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor all say I.
15  (Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)
16  DEVIN MCMAHON: Motion carries. Make
17   another motion to adopt an agency status
18   for purposes of SEQR specifying this as
19   a Type I Action. Do I have a second for
20   that?
21  BRADLEY BURNS: Second.
22  DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor all say I.
23  (Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)
24  DEVIN MCMAHON: Motion carries.
25  Item No. 6, 131 Third Street:
26
27   Continued discussion and possible action
on the application for site plan review
at 131 Third Street (formerly Meson Ole). Applicant 131 Third Street Greenport Inc., represented by James Olinkiewicz, proposes to reconstruct and create new uses for the existing building located at 131 Third Street, in the CR (Commercial/Retail) District. The proposed renovation includes the division of the first floor into two restaurants and the addition of three residential units on the second and third floors. All proposed uses are permitted within the CR (Commercial/Retail) District. The property is not located in the Village of Greenport Historic District. Suffolk County Tax Map No. 1001-6.-2-23.2.
As per our regular session, changes need to be made with regards to being compliant. Increasing the landing from 3 by 3 to 5 by 5. Indicating on the plans the lighting for the outdoor
light, I believe the plans dated May 12th indicate those changes.

PAUL PALLAS: That's correct, May 12th.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Who did the plans?

PAUL PALLAS: Sherman General Engineering and Consulting.

JOSEPH PROKOP: And the lighten is shown on the elevations.

DEVIN McMAHON: Our earnings and questions are that we had noted before prior to fire, second and third floor noted that it will be checked by the building department. Before the building department's issues as well as seating layouts and capacity will also be reviewed by the building department. That's my understanding. There was a question I believe is to whether or not we received.

JOSEPH PROKOP: We have to send a request to Suffolk County for what's called a local determination letter. We could vote on this, but we can't actually have our determination
considered to be final without that letter.

DEVIN MCMAHON: My understanding is that it was requested.

PAUL PALLAS: We're verifying that it was requested.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Did we complete our SEQR review, we did not I don't think.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Site plan is an unlisted action. So, we will lead status that it's an unlisted action and determine whether or not there's an impact on the environment. Is there a long form or a short form in the file?

PAUL PALLAS: I have the whole file, it's a lot of paperwork. I remember seeing it today.

JOSEPH PROKOP: So, it's a short form (handing). Do you have any comments as to whether it should be a long form or a short form?

GLYNIS BERRY: I don't think a long form is needed.

JOSEPH PROKOP: So, we have a short form
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on file, which is the basic review. And we're not required to have a long form. It's up to the board whether they want to have a long form or not.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Okay.

JOSEPH PROKOP: I don't have a recommendation as to a long form because the exterior of the building is what will be potential impacts on parking and traffic. But those uses were already associated with the building in prior uses, so it's up to the board's discretion.

DEVIN MCMAHON: My personal feeling is that it's not necessary. The largest environment impacts would be of the parking and traffic nature, and I think the Village code was pretty clear that parking existence of last amendment of the code. I don't see it as a significant change prior or an impact on the environment.

So, my personal opinion is that it will be an unlisted action with no
significant negative impact on the
environment.

BRADLEY BURNS: That's my take.

JOSEPH PROKOP: Someone can make a
motion then.

DEVIN McMAHON: I'll make the motion to
adopt with purpose of the SEQR and make
a determination that the project will
not have a significant impact on the
environment. Second?

MARY GIVEN: Second.

DEVIN McMAHON: All in favor?

(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN McMAHON: Motion carries. We'll
make a motion for approval of the
application with the condition that we
confirm the notice of Suffolk County.

JOSEPH PROKOP: It's a local
determination notice of Suffolk County
would be as that the approval is
submitted to the board adopting a
written decision that the approval is
subject to the receipt of the Village of
a local determination letter from
Suffolk County and that because of review that has been provided -- we don't get into the building code and fire code in the board, but I think that we should have a reference just that -- the reference should be that we're not subject to reviewing the building for compliance for fire and building code but that the review take place before the building permit be issue, we review by the Village.

DEVIN MCMAHON: By the Village, you're referring to the building department?

JOSEPH PROKOP: Yes. And the approval would be referenced to May 12, 2016 by Sherman Engineering and Consulting.

DEVIN MCMAHON: I don't have any issue with any of the conditions. Any else?

MARY GIVEN: No.

DEVIN MCMAHON: Second for that?

MARY GIVEN: Second.

DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor?

(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: Motion carries.
Item No. 7: Motion to approve the April 28, 2016 meeting. Do I have a second for that.

BRADLEY BURNS: Second.

DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor?
(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: Motion to adjourn.

MARY GIVEN: Second.

DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor?
(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: I guess we should schedule the next one as well.

I'll make a motion that we schedule the next regular session for July 7, 2014. Second?

BRADLEY BURNS: Second.

DEVIN MCMAHON: All in favor?
(Whereupon all made a motion in favor.)

DEVIN MCMAHON: Motion carries.
(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.)
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