VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK  STATE OF NEW YORK

PLANNING BOARD
WORK SESSION/REGULAR SESSION

Third Street Fire Station
Greenport, New York

December 5, 2019
4:00 p.m.

BEFORE:
WALTER FOOTE - CHAIRMAN
JOHN COTUGNO - MEMBER
LILY DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON - MEMBER
PATRICIA HAMMES - MEMBER
REED KYRK - MEMBER

ROBERT CONNOLLY - PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY
PAUL PALLAS - VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR
AMANDA AURICHIO - CLERK TO THE BOARD

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service
(631) 727-1107
(The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Good afternoon. This is the Village of Greenport Planning Board meeting. It's a work session and regular meeting. It's Thursday, December 5th, a little after 4 p.m. And we're going to start off on our work session.

Item No. 1 is a motion to accept and approve the minutes of the November 7, 2019 Planning Board meeting. May I have a second on that motion?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Aye.

The motion carries.

Item No. 2 is a motion to accept and approve the minutes of the November 14th, 2019 Special Planning Board meeting. May I have a second on the motion?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.
MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.
MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: The motion carries.

Item No. 3 is a motion to schedule the combined Planning Board Work Session and Regular Meeting for 4 p.m. on January 9th, 2019. May I have a second?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?
MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.
MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.
MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Aye.
The motion carries
MEMBER COTUGNO: For the record, I won't be here.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. We'll miss you.
MEMBER COTUGNO: I'll be someplace warm.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: We'll be jealous.

Item No. 4, motion to schedule the combined Planning Board Work Session/Regular Session meeting for 4 p.m. on February 6, 2019. May I have a second?
WORK SESSION/REGULAR SESSION 12/5/19

1 MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?

3 MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

4 MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

5 MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

6 MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

7 CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Aye.

8 And that motion carries.

9 Item No. 5 is for 471 Main Street. This is a continued Pre-Submission Conference with possible motion to schedule a Public Hearing for January 9th regarding the application of Emily Demarchelier, represented by Architect Robert Brown. The applicant proposes interior renovations to accommodate the new use of a café and bar for the property located at 471 Main Street. This Property is located in the Commercial Retail District. This property is also located in the Historic District. It's located at Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-4.-7-21.

10 My understanding is we had recently received a Planning review for this application, which I think was shared with the applicant. And do you have a copy of that?

Received a copy of that report yesterday.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: So I haven't had a great deal of time to respond to it. I think the -- the only issue -- well, there were just some, to my mind, bookkeeping and Building Department issues that were raised, which we'll certainly take care of by the time, hopefully, for the hearing, which, hopefully, will be scheduled.

The only other issue is bathrooms, number of bathrooms.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: And we've prepared a plan with a second bathroom. Unfortunately, the report did not cite the code section that he was referring to in terms of the requirement for bathrooms in a restaurant, which I was hoping to review before making that full submission.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So you're saying that subject to you receiving the citation, you would revise the plans, provide for the second bathroom?

MR. BROWN: Yes, the plans would be revised. If I could just, you know, see the citation and at least understand the point that
he's making.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Is that something we can provide him with?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: We certainly can provide that in time for -- well in advance of the hearing.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: If you choose to schedule it.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: But we have already provided -- prepared a plan, should that be the case.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. And can you just -- would you mind just specifically responding to each -- do you have the report in front of you? I'd like you to just specifically respond to those items. We can provide you with a copy.

MR. BROWN: One second. I thought I had it with me, but I --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Does anybody have an extra copy?

MR. BROWN: -- can't seem to --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: We'll provide you with an extra copy.

MR. BROWN: Okay. We -- the first item is
parking, as it always is. And my answer, of course, is that the building, the property was improved prior to the code mandated date, and, technically speaking, no parking is required. There is some onsite parking in the back of the building, and it's on the corner, so there are two streets from which people could park and get to the property.

ADA egress and bathroom are clearly shown on the plan. I think there's some -- might have been some miscommunication with the consultant, because there is a comment about not having the floor plan, which was on the drawing. There is ADA egress and an ADA bathroom, and a route from the building to the street that is ADA compliant, and that will be clearly spelled out, again, on the plan.

The next issue is the bathroom issue.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.

MR. BROWN: And we'll address that as soon as I know what his reference is.

The occupant load has been calculated. There -- the exits from the building, the egress from the building is clearly compliant, and I will elucidate that on the plans for the hearing.
The building is fire sprinklered currently. There is nothing on the plan that would require modification of that.

And I'm not quite sure why he wants to see the reflected ceiling plan. That's generally something that we do for the Building Department.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I'm sorry. It's something you don't normally do?

MR. BROWN: We normally only do for the Building Department, not for -- I've never done a reflected ceiling plan for a Planning Board application. If you require it, I can easily do it.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Is it something that would -- it was filed with the Building Department already?

MR. BROWN: No, no.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, so you're going to do it?

MR. BROWN: We're not going to go to the Building Department until --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, I see.

MR. BROWN: -- we get your approval. But what I'm saying is he's asking for a reflected ceiling plan, and, normally, that's not something
that's done until we're making the building permit application.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: What does the reflected ceiling plan show?

MR. BROWN: It's the lighting layout.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, the lighting, I see.

MEMBER COTUGNO: I don't think it's important for this.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: No, I don't.

MEMBER COTUGNO: But I just can't figure out why you're waiting for something from the Village about two bathrooms. Isn't that something you can look up in the code and determine to yourself if you need two bathrooms?

MR. BROWN: I have, but I cannot find anything that stipulates a special number for the bathrooms for a restaurant. As I said, I've already prepared a plan showing two bathrooms. I would just like some clarification.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Yeah. I believe you definitely need two, especially when you're selling alcohol, because you need men and women when you're selling alcohol. That's not even the Building Code, that's the Board of Health.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, as I said, we
would happily comply. I would just like some
documentation of where the code comes from,
because I could not find it. That's my
shortcoming, but I'm asking for help.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.
MEMBER COTUGNO: No problem.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Does anybody else have any
questions or comments at this time?
(No Response)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Are we ready to -- okay.
I think we're ready to schedule a public hearing
for this. When's the next available date for a
public hearing? And how does --

MS. AURICHIO: January 9th.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: How does our docket look
on January 9th? Is it --

MS. AURICHIO: Like how big is the
schedule?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MS. AURICHIO: It's open right now.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's pretty open? Okay.

We'll schedule it for January 9th. That gives
enough time for notice?

MR. CONNOLLY: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So we'll schedule
the public hearing for January 9th.

MR. BROWN: Very good.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay?

MR. BROWN: If I might ask, obviously, there's a possibility that these drawings will be amended. What is -- what is the deadline for amended drawings?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: We would need them at least, I would say, two weeks before the hearing, so two weeks from now. Yeah, two weeks from now, 2 1/2 weeks about.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: I'll just wait here.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All right. So this is Item No. 6, 111 Main Street. Continued Pre-Submission Conference with possible motion to schedule a Public Hearing for January 9th for the applicant -- application of PWIB Claudio's Management, represented by Architect Robert Brown. The applicant proposes interior and exterior renovations for the property located at
111 Main Street. This Property is located in the Waterfront Commercial District. This property is also located in the Historic District. It's at Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-5.-4-25 and Lots 38.1 and 39.

MR. BROWN: Robert Brown, Architect for the project. And, also, Mr. Loffredo.

MR. LOFFREDO: Stephen.

MR. BROWN: And Stephen and Tora are here on behalf of the ownership to give you a little bit of a refresher presentation and answer any other questions that I can't. If you want to go through the report, I do have the report for this one.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, good, yeah. You want to start off by doing that? Let's go through the report.

MR. BROWN: It's your call.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, let's do that.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Yeah. The first item is the pizza shop.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Just let me just interrupt you for a second. Is there a need to read the report into the record, or is it something that can just be incorporated by reference?
MR. CONNOLLY: I mean, it's part of the record, just because it had --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. CONNOLLY: It's been submitted to the Village.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Should I just make a formal acknowledgement that it's part of the record or --

MR. CONNOLLY: Yeah. I mean, if there's points you want to read from it, that's --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. No, that's okay. Continue. I'm sorry.

MR. BROWN: Okay. The first paragraph references the pizza shop, and his first comment is the shop needs to be reviewed by the Building Department to make sure it ensures -- it meets Building Department requirements. Again, that's self-stating, that's for the Building Department.

There's a change of use that requires the space to be brought to code regarding egress, accessibility, fire, etcetera. It is a historic building. It's an existing building with minor modification. So, in terms of ADA compliance, aside from the fact that it could be accessed from the Claudio's building, because there is a
direct connection, I just want to state for the record that the code in such a situation states access shall be provided where feasible, and no other access is feasible that I can see, except through the building.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So the ADA access is going to be through the main building, through the main restaurant?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. MATSUOKA: Well, just to clarify, because that comes up a lot, it's one building, it's not a separate building. It's the same building, so you're coming in one door and you'll go into the pizza shop. So it's not --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: And there's full like access between the two areas?

MR. MATSUOKA: It's just another room.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. On the same level?

MR. MATSUOKA: On the same level.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. I defer to legal on -- that that's compliant with the ADA requirements. I don't know for sure if it is.

MR. BROWN: It does comply --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: -- because of access from the
restaurant, which does comply. The issue is bringing that part of the building up to code is not feasible. For example, the separate entrance, accessible entrance from the sidewalk is not --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: That part, meaning the pizza area?

MR. BROWN: The pizza place.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: So there won't be a separate entrance, or you're saying people will --

MR. BROWN: There will be.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: There will --

people will be able --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: -- to go in separately?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Or go in through the restaurant.

MR. BROWN: You don't have to go through the restaurant. Going through the restaurant would only be in cases where accessibility is required.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: And would they
be open the same hours, does that I mean?

   MR. BROWN: Yeah.

   MR. LOFFREDO: Yes.

   CHAIRMAN FOOTE: That's a good question.

   MR. BROWN: The next part, again, and this always comes up and I always have the same answer, in terms of parking, the buildings predate the requirement for new off-street parking, so --

   CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, I understand that. I know it's come a bunch of times already for me in my brief tenure here on the Planning Board. But still, in all, we have a vested interest in representing the impact it's going to have on the community at large anyway, even though technically you're right.

   MR. BROWN: I don't disagree, but --

   CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So, I mean, to address this particular comment, it's that the change of use suggests that there's going to be a greater need for parking as a result. Is that not logical?

   MR. BROWN: Well, if you have a higher occupancy --

   CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.
MR. BROWN: -- then, obviously, the amount of parking necessary changes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: But --

MR. MATSUOKA: Possibly changes.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, but a great deal --

MR. MATSUOKA: More seats doesn't necessarily mean more customers, it just means you can seat more people at the same time. It's another way of looking at it.

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah. But if your business plan is to fill those seats, I'm assuming your --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Hey, Reed.

MEMBER KYRK: -- your business plan is to be successful, so --

MR. MATSUOKA: Right.

MEMBER KYRK: That's what we have to deal with.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. The wait times can exceed three hours. So the number of people are already there, they just have to wait an exorbitant amount of time to sit. So that's kind of the idea.

MEMBER KYRK: Okay.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: What do you do
now when your parking lot is full?

MR. MATSUOKA: We apologize to people.

MR. BROWN: I would imagine, also, that for this specific location, a lot of people have parked elsewhere in the Village and are walking to Claudio's.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. I'd also say 25% or more of our guests arrive by boat, too, so not everyone arrives by vehicle, or at least vehicle with wheels.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, that's probably true of your other restaurants, but I don't think that's going to be true of a pizza place, necessarily.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yes, good point.

MEMBER KYRK: And you're going to be -- you're going to be serving pizza that will be picked up and --

MR. MATSUOKA: Yes.

MEMBER KYRK: Okay.

MR. LOFFREDO: By the slice and whole pies, and probably eat there as well.

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah. So that brings in a lot of casual traffic, I would think.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: You want to continue reviewing the comments?
MR. BROWN: Sure.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thanks.
MR. BROWN: Next is the restaurant specifically. And I just want to make a general comment here about the consultant's calculation on the number of seats that are being added, and the impact on the buildings in terms of --
MR. LOFFREDO: Egress.
MR. BROWN: Occupancy and egress. And the point is -- the point -- the fact of the matter is all of the seats that are being added in this application are outdoor seating that have no impact on the occupancy or egress requirements in the restaurant.
MR. MATSUOKA: They're also, I think, combining all the numbers for the whole property into one number.
MR. BROWN: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: What are the total number of parking spaces that Claudio's --
MR. BROWN: Ninety-nine.
MR. MATSUOKA: Ninety-nine.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Ninety-nine?
MR. MATSUOKA: (Nodded yes).

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So I'm just curious how -- if it was required to comply with the code and based on all the seating, how many extra spaces would be required? Does anybody know how to do the math on that?

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's going to be 100 more.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, okay.

MEMBER HAMMES: Well, I mean, they would be in compliance with their current occupancy.

MR. MATSUOKA: Does -- Rob, does outside seating trigger --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I don't believe --

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

MR. MATSUOKA: -- parking?

MR. BROWN: Yes, technically. Bear with me one second, I might have that information. Total seating, existing and proposed, is 823.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Eight-twenty-three, that's the total, including the new amount --

MR. BROWN: All, all locations on the property.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Including the new proposed?

MR. BROWN: Including the proposed.
MEMBER HAMMES: So you're adding -- you're adding about 200 seats, as I recall.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, it's 190 --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Six.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Four, four, 194, I think.

MEMBER HAMMES: So that's about 20%.

MEMBER COTUGNO: That's a lot.

MEMBER HAMMES: So that's about a 20% increase. And I understand what you're going to say again about those people are there, but they may or may not be there. They may be there at certain periods of time, but not other periods of time. By increasing the availability, you may be driving the numbers up even more. So I don't really totally buy your argument, I give it some credence. But I do think that the intensification of use, from my perspective, is a real concern, and I think you guys need to give some thoughts about what you would propose to do to help mitigate that.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. Oh, we have a lot of ideas for parking.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Such as what?

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Yeah.

MR. MATSUOKA: Oh. Well, the new Urgent
Care Center that's going on Main Street, I believe they're only going to be open on -- during the week. We could rent that space to provide alternative parking. They do make, maybe not the prettiest, but double-decker parking structures that we could hide in the back of our property, that would double the number of cars that we could potentially hold. Again, not so pretty, but --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: In the back? Where do you mean in the back?

MR. MATSUOKA: So --

MR. LOFFREDO: Oh, so add a building in behind the restaurant.

MR. MATSUOKA: Between the side and the restaurant, where we predominantly try and -- I mean, there's 99 spots, but we definitely hold way more cars than that. We try and aggregate all of employees and those that are working double shifts to the back of the property, so that we can double-park everybody in, because we know that they're going to be there the whole day. That area is not quite visible from the water. It's definitely not visible from the --

MEMBER KYRK: Could you just indicate on
the --

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah, this.
MR. LOFFREDO: In the back.
MR. MATSUOKA: This area here.
MEMBER KYRK: All right. Oh, yeah, where the coolers were going to go.
MR. MATSUOKA: Yes.
MR. LOFFREDO: Yeah.
MEMBER KYRK: Okay.
MR. MATSUOKA: Where -- yes, some of the coolers already are. They're not visible from Main Street or Front Street, and they're not really visible from the water, unless you're actually parked at the property. But we could put up, you know, some double-decker parking structures there that would help increase.
MEMBER HAMMES: But then would you be adding valet parking at that point?
MR. MATSUOKA: No. I mean, when you say valet, you mean paid, paid for?
MEMBER HAMMES: Well, I just think if it's a double --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.
MEMBER HAMMES: If it was a double structure, I'm not sure --
MR. LOFFREDO: Right, people can't drive up.

MEMBER HAMMES: People would be just randomly driving into the double structure?

MR. MATSUOKA: Well, yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MR. MATSUOKA: Would someone have to manage that? Yes, yeah, yeah. And then, you know, the third option that we've been talking about for a long time, which is connected to, you know, other potential ideas that could be beneficial to the Village, but potentially, you know, buying property that's further away outside of the Village and doing some kind of trolley service for, again, guests, or our staff, so they could all park farther away --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MR. MATSUOKA: -- and bring them in to help at that. One of the big challenges is Claudio's employs well over 200 people. There is in excess of 100 people per day that work at the property. You know, we pay our security staff to stay late at night to escort our staff, especially women, to their cars at night, even on the property. When the property is full, if you arrive for a dinner shift and you're working, you might have
to park far away in the Village. So I would say at times up to half of our parking is filled with employees that are there all day. So it not only, you know, diminishes our income ability, but it also limits the number of spaces available to Greenport people.

MEMBER KYRK: So you're saying roughly 50 of the cars that are there are your employees, and, presumably, they arrive early, so --

MR. MATSUOKA: They're there all day.

MEMBER KYRK: They're there all day.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. I mean, there could be up to 25 security staff on the property at night. You know, they don't carpool, you know, they come from all different places, so.

MEMBER KYRK: I mean, wouldn't it -- I mean, wouldn't it be within your means to say employee parking is elsewhere?

MR. MATSUOKA: The problem with that, and in our other experiences with large properties like this, you know, the elsewhere takes another spot of a potential customer or guest for someone else in the Village, so --

MR. LOFFREDO: But you also add -- and it makes it a less desirable place for our staff to
work, because if they have to struggle to get to work, park, walk to where they're working, walk --

   MEMBER KYRK: I'm sorry. I'm tempted to say, oh, well.

   MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah, and it's true, but we all -- we all struggle to find staff in the season, so.

   MEMBER KYRK: Yeah, yeah, I'm hearing you.

   MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. I mean, you know, one parking space could be utilized by three guests throughout the day. You know, that income is significant to us. You know, the income from parking goes to maintain the property, keeping it clean, fixing the boardwalks, fixing the streets, you know, painting, lighting. It's expensive to upkeep that. So when you give a free spot all day to an employee, who you're also paying to be there --

   MEMBER KYRK: Understood, yeah, yeah.

   MR. MATSUOKA: But, you know, the idea of having some kind of offsite location, maybe there is property that the Village owned and wanted to rent to us at a friendly price. You know, we could open that and manage it on behalf of the
Village, you know, maybe share income with the Village.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Do you happen -- are you thinking about a particular property, because I'm drawing blanks.

MR. MATSUOKA: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: The only one I -- we've had a discussion about this in another context when we were talking about Moores Lane as a potential offsite parking area. Is -- who owns that property?

MEMBER HAMMES: The Village.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It does.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: The Village owns the entire area, yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Would the Village ever consider using it for parking and like renting it out?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I'm not going to presume to speak for the Board.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: But I -- you know, there are a significant number of events that take place in those fields.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: So I wouldn't --
again, I --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. That's something
that we'd have to address to the Board.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I would think, well,
the applicant would.

MEMBER KYRK: Okay.

MR. MATSUOKA: But then, again, you know,
we would be more than happy to help and support,
manage it, manage the income that could come from
it, share it with the Village, if that was
helpful. And we would always, as we do with our
current property now, we would share that
opportunity with every business in the Village,
you know, every employee, as long as there is
space, could utilize that space. We could manage
a trolley that would bring them in and out, you
know, to the Village and to the property.

Parking is an issue in every village we
have restaurants in, and it's a constant
conversation, because the vast majority of
parking spots are held by employees, and it
inhibits economic turnover, makes it hard for
guests and restaurant customers, other businesses
to find spaces.
MR. BROWN: May I make a suggestion?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Sure.

MR. BROWN: I don't think this is going to be resolved tonight, but if we can get on the agenda for a hearing next month, perhaps we could provide some concrete suggestions.

I would, again, argue that though the Claudio's organization is, I think, being generous in suggesting alternatives, that the code clearly does not require additional parking.

MEMBER HAMMES: I understand that, but I think that we, as a Board, in considering, you know, site plan approval, have to consider the impact of the increased traffic. It's not even just a parking question, it's a question of people driving down that little stub of a road, and hitting the end and there not being anywhere for them to go, except turn around and go back on out.

MEMBER KYRK: To turn in and all the other stuff, yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: The more traffic you put in there, the worse it's going to get. And so I don't, I don't think to say, you know, it's not required is necessarily the answer in terms of
what is on this Board.

MR. BROWN: As I said, as I said, they are working on various alternatives.

MEMBER HAMMES: Understood.

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: And it's good to hear that. Walter, I mean, the one thing we might want to consider as a Board, related not just to this, but, I mean, this, as you mentioned, has come up as a recurring issue --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- is whether we should be drafting some sort of letter to the Board of Trustees --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- you know, suggesting whether it's a combined meeting with them and the ZBA, or whoever, to start. There needs to be some brainstorming done, and, you know, people keep talking about it in the Village. And I know the Trustees are focused on it, but it just doesn't seem like -- this conversation has been going on for as long as I can remember.

And I'm looking at, you know, 200 more spots on an eight, 900-person property, which is
a 20% increase, never mind all the other things going on, and I think it's really time, whether -- I mean, again, you know, I don't know what the Village's view on your suggestion would be about Moores Lane, but I, personally, coming from a project finance background find kind of public-private partnerships an interesting idea, and I think it's great to hear that you guys are saying that's something you'd be interested in. And I'd really like to see the Village considering that and giving some due thought to it. And I -- you know, again, I guess you guys need to take that to the Trustees. But I don't think it would hurt us as a Board, since this is an issue that we're repeatedly having to grapple with, to kind of tell the Trustees that we'd really like to have even a joint session just to discuss it.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: That's a great idea.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Yeah, I think it's a great idea.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Because this always puts us, as the Planning Board, in a hard spot.

MR. MATSUOKA: And, again, I've seen the
growth of villages over decades similar to Greenport, and the lack of forward-thinking always bites us in the end. You know, Greenport is only going to get busier, so we would love to help out in any way we can.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you. You want to get back to the record here?

MR. BROWN: Yeah. The next issue is pedestrian access and egress in case of a disaster. Excuse me. And I would say Main Street provides a pretty wide path of egress, as simple as that. I mean, I can show arrows on the plan showing egress down Main Street, but I think it's pretty self-evident.

MR. MATSUOKA: Well, and just again, to add all of the additional seatings in an area that doesn't have walls.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, all the additional seating is outside.

The next item, outdoor lighting design, and I will take responsibility for that not being on the plans that were submitted last time. They will be on the plans that are submitted in two weeks.

MR. LOFFREDO: And, aesthetically, they'll
be keeping with existing light that's there right now.

MR. BROWN: They will be Dark Sky, and aesthetically in keeping with what's there.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: At our prior meeting with you guys, we brought up a concern about noise and noise mitigation. Has there been any effort on your part to consider that further?

MR. MATSUOKA: Yes. So the new canopy that we put up, the walls failed on there, and throughout the season we tried different solutions, which were also unsuccessful. So we've gone back to the manufacturer and they've taken the walls back, and they are refabricating them in a more rigid format, both across. There will be beams across, so that they don't come out, and noise doesn't escape. And there'll also have latches into the floor, so it doesn't come up when it's windy. You know, there's a constant 10-mile-an-hour wind there, and it pushes those fabric PVC walls a little bit and noise escapes. So they will take a couple of months to remake, and then they'll be sending them back and putting them up, but that should help significantly.

MEMBER KYRK: So, just to be clear, we're
going to try it again with what we've learned about the failures of the panels this last year?

MR. MATSUOKA: Exactly. We'll try it again with the learnings, yes.

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah, yeah.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: But you don't typically always have the walls down when you have music, do you?

MR. MATSUOKA: When we do -- most of the noise complaints that I've read about -- no one actually comes to speak with us at the property. We hear about it days later when we receive something in the mail. So the things that I've read also don't have a lot of detail, it just says "noisy". You know, it's like one or two words, like "lots of noise". But most of the time stamps on there are at night. So at night, what we try and do is enclose the space to keep all of that inside.

MR. LOFFREDO: So as the summer, as the summer progressed and this became a pattern, we made a point at nighttime on Fridays and Saturdays of having those walls down, unless it's too windy that they start to deflect and we have to raise them, because, again, the tracks and
mechanism --

MEMBER KYRK: You know, I find it interesting that the people will basically give an anecdotal thing when there's free applications that do a pretty good approximation.

I'm a motorcycle rider, so I am concerned about what amount of noise my BMWs are putting out. So I got an application and I read the rules and it's real easy to do. I put on the Village of Greenport that people want to measure it, go measure it, you know.

MR. MATSUOKA: I appreciate you saying that. So there is no one on the Board who is trained or licensed to record that. So we --

MEMBER KYRK: I get that it has to be somebody much, much more knowledgeable than myself.

MR. MATSUOKA: And I'm not pointing fingers. I just want to state for the record there is no code that states a noise level. There is no one who is trained to use a sound meter to record or check that level. And even if there was, there is no meter owned by the Village. So we hired our own person to do that, and we recorded it at multiple times per day and
night on multiple days, and never did it exceed
an average noise level. But we --

MEMBER KYRK: I don't understand that. It
didn't exceed an average noise level of what?

MR. MATSUOKA: In other villages. We used
other villages' noise --

MR. BROWN: Ordinances?

MR. MATSUOKA: Ordinances, yeah, as the
guide.

MEMBER KYRK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Are you saying -- wait.

Are you saying Greenport doesn't have it's own
ordinance for noise levels?

MR. MATSUOKA: The tickets we receive don't
state anything other than --

MR. LOFFREDO: There's a noise complaint.

MR. MATSUOKA: -- it's noisy, yeah.

MR. LOFFREDO: It wasn't specific to
targeted, a targeted level.

MEMBER HAMMES: I think, but I could be
wrong, the code -- I'm not sure whether the code
as a decibel number in it, but it also has --
even if it does have that, it has a public
nuisance standard. But that's like, you know,
pornography, I'll know it when I see it, I'll
know it when I hear it. And so I think that
that's what Village has been applying --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Correct.
MEMBER HAMMES: -- but you could probably
speak to that.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: If I can clarify
that, and second, clarify a question from what he
was saying. There are decibel levels in the
code, there definitely are. And the noise or the
nuisance ordinance does -- that there is a point
in there where it just talks about that -- just
that point, if it's disturbing someone, it can't
cross property lines, things of that nature, so
it is in the code.

Second thing, with regard to these panels
that you're talking about, are these still --
they sounded like a permanent wall, as opposed to
a temporary.

MR. LOFFREDO: It's a retractable component
of the awning, the sides of the awning. It can
be raised or lowered.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: As you said, it's
made of cross beams and the like?

MR. LOFFREDO: Yeah. So they're putting a
stabilizing brace --
1          MR. BROWN:  Slats.
2          MR. LOFFREDO:  -- through them.
3          MR. BROWN:  Slats.
4          MR. LOFFREDO:  So they won't deflect.
5          MR. MATSUOKA:  They're rigid, they'll be
6                         more rigid.
7          ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS:  But they're still
8                         retractable?
9          MR. LOFFREDO:  Yes.
10         MR. MATSUOKA:  Fully.  The exact same
11          concept, just that they're not as flexible, the
12          fabric itself won't be as flexible.
13          The point about noise, we're going to be
14          here for a very, very, very long time, so we want
15          to be good neighbors, and we want to find a
16          healthy balance in that.  So the walls that we
17          thought that were going to work last year didn't.
18          So we are paying for new walls, and we think that
19          it's going to make a significant difference next
20          year.  But it's something that we will continue
21          to control to the best of our ability.
22         CHAIRMAN FOOTE:  Thank you.  Does anybody
23          else have anything else that they want to talk
24          about right now?
25         MEMBER KYRK:  Should we be looking at the
MEMBER COTUGNO: You think these new walls need Building Department approval?

MR. MATSUOKA: The same -- it's the exact same thing.

MEMBER COTUGNO: I heard you say they're more permanent and --

MR. MATSUOKA: Not more permanent.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Does it affect egress?

MR. MATSUOKA: They're literally the exact -- they're the exact same material. The only difference is what happens, you know, similarly to something like this, if this was the wall that comes down, when there's wind on it, they flex a little bit back and forth, and when they flex, they come out of the --

MR. LOFFREDO: Guides.

MR. BROWN: Track.

MR. MATSUOKA: The guides.

MR. LOFFREDO: The tracks.

MR. MATSUOKA: And they kind of flap in the wind. So the new ones that they're manufacturing now have rods through the material, so that even if they flex a little bit, they don't -- they won't come out of the guide. So, hopefully, it
will keep --

MEMBER KYRK: And they're also anchored at the bottom as well.

MR. LOFFREDO: Yeah.

MR. MATSUOKA: And there'll hooks at the bottom. So once they flex a little bit -- I know way more about canopy walls than anyone really needs to know.

(Laughter)

MR. MATSUOKA: When they flex a little bit, they also pull up. And so all of this space in the side allows noise to escape, so --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Which we don't want to do.

MR. MATSUOKA: Exactly. So the idea is these rods that are going through it should stop it from flexing, so that they stay in, and the idea of the clips at the bottom stop it from being able to pull up.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: You know, there's also a knob on the amplifier of the musical instruments. If you turn it down a little bit, it's not as noisy. Check it out.

MR. MATSUOKA: I'll have to look into that.

(Laughter)

MR. LOFFREDO: I can attest to that. My
apartment is right across the street from Lucharitos. So when I'm living in town, I feel your pain, because, you know, we go through the same thing as a resident when we go across on Friday and Saturday night, yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Are these walls fire retardant?

MR. MATSUOKA: Yes. Exact same material that was approved for the canopy. They're -- literally, they're remanufacturing the exact same walls and putting in the -- a rod in the middle of them.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: If I may just -- I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. To -- just concerning this point, I recognize that they're the same material, and it's not a Planning Board issue, but you still would need a new -- the name of the manufacturer and the certifications.

MR. MATSUOKA: No problem.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Just so you're aware of it.

MR. MATSUOKA: No problem.

MR. BROWN: Just to quickly go through the rest of the items --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Sure.

MR. BROWN: -- in the report. SEQRA determination is, of course, at the Board's discretion. A full Environmental Assessment Form was submitted with the application.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All right.

MR. BROWN: The New York State Municipal Law, again, that is, I believe, the Board's responsibility, the Village's responsibility to notify various agencies.

The Corps of Engineers and the DEC, I don't understand why they would be involved.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I don't think you have to -- I apologize. I don't think you have the updated on this.

MR. BROWN: It came in as I was leaving this afternoon.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yeah. There's no -- that was stricken --

MR. BROWN: Okay. Then never mind.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: -- the DEC and Army Corps.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Just to offer for the Board's clarification, unless, unless it's in
a separate file in our office, and if it is, I apologize, we have the short form, we don't have the long form.

MR. BROWN: I'm pretty sure I submitted a long form for this.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I don't have that, I can tell you that.

MR. BROWN: I will make another copy. It's this.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I can't see that from here.

MR. BROWN: This is the long form filled out, and I know I sent in a copy. I will send another copy.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I have a question. You gave us new plans. Are they different? And if you could just -- how are they different?

MR. BROWN: New plans?

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Well, as far as this is the same.

MR. BROWN: Those are the same plans.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Okay. Then I just have two copies.

MEMBER KYRK: The date was different on it.
MR. BROWN: Sorry?

MEMBER KYRK: The date was different. The date was different on it.

MR. LOFFREDO: I think because they asked for more detail. I think in the last meeting you asked for elevations --

MEMBER KYRK: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. LOFFREDO: -- to be added. So just added --

MR. BROWN: Yeah. Oh, I'm sorry.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. BROWN: You're right.

MR. LOFFREDO: We have the Board -- we have the detail that you requested at the last meeting.

MR. BROWN: You had requested elevations of all the buildings, that's included now, additional information.

MR. LOFFREDO: Seat counts, a few other things.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, nothing of any significance in terms of your --

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah. Just I --

MR. BROWN: -- consideration, yeah.
MEMBER KYRK: -- recognize that it is sort of a challenge to do version control --

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

MEMBER KYRK: -- on this stuff.

MR. BROWN: It's now a 10-sheet, 10-sheet set, so --

MEMBER KYRK: Okay.

MR. BROWN: And most of that is building elevations.

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah. And you'll be submitting another set?

MR. BROWN: Another set that will include the lighting.

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: And, well, we need to discuss if any parking or anything like that --

MEMBER KYRK: If any -- yeah.

MR. BROWN: -- is going to be included.

MEMBER KYRK: Right.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Anything else for this now?

MEMBER HAMMES: I just --

MR. BROWN: Any other questions?

MEMBER HAMMES: This is -- I mean, I'm just -- I'm going back to the parking and the
traffic, because it's not just a parking issue, and I'm just concerned about the amount of traffic that goes down Main Street. I mean, have you guys found like if you've had accidents down there in the circle or anything like that with more congestion coming down?

MR. MATSUOKA: No. And, actually, this year -- again, we're learning a lot as each season goes by. You know, it's a little bit tough, because we've only been open for, I think it's like four or five months per season, so we only have like 10 months of operating experience there. But we've brought on professional parking attendants. Previously, we had less professional parking attendants. So --

MR. LOFFREDO: We also have a security person that's staged at the circle full-time when we're open on the weekends. So there's a security person at the entrance to the property, and that's where the parking attendants are for both parking lots. So we're managing it in a much tighter fashion, and we direct them where to go. And there's also an identification exchange, we assign them a space. And so it's definitely a more organized process. We haven't had any
accidents. There might have been like one --

MEMBER HAMMES: I just -- I just wonder if there's any way --

MR. LOFFREDO: -- nick over the entire summer. I'm sorry?

MEMBER HAMMES: If there's any way to mitigate things by having some sign for people to even turn down there when the parking is all full, or any thought has been given to something along those -- like some prenotification.

Because, again, even if we --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Where could we put, at Front, at Front Street?

MEMBER HAMMES: You know, we are going to have to deal with the parking thing anyway. But I'm just saying, like I -- this is one more topic.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I know, but where would you put the sign, on Front Street?

MEMBER HAMMES: I'm not -- that's what I'm saying, I don't know why -- the sign's the wrong way.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: But, I mean --

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. I mean, we're open to
ideas.

MR. LOFFREDO: Yes.

MEMBER KYRK: Not just a sign that says "Claudio's Parking Full"?

MR. LOFFREDO: We do.

MEMBER KYRK: Oh, you do that.

MR. LOFFREDO: And we do, and Lara just brought that up. And, also, what tends to happen at times is it's kind of like when you're trying to park at a busy parking lot, all of a sudden, somebody gets in their car and pulls out and a spot becomes available, so --

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah, yeah, so it's not --

MR. LOFFREDO: We do, we do try to manage the process as carefully as we can. What we find that happens, though, is it's always in flux. There might be a group of people leaving. It could be two or three parties that came together, so there's all of a sudden three cars that pull out, and we're telling three people come on in and park your car.

So it is, it is a process, but over the two years we've been -- we've had oversight on the property, we can certainly try to manage the process in a much more proactive manner, both
with our staff, because they have identification
tags they have put in the cars, and we give them
very specific areas where they park, and time
restraints as to when they can or can't bring
their car onto the property. I think what Tora
said before is also really valid as well. We're
trying to maintain a much tighter grip on the
parking on the property

MR. MATSUOKA: One of the elements that was
really successful this past summer, too, was we
segregated the motorcycle parking and the car
parking. That cross between them, as a
motorcyclist, you know, I feel like I'm
constantly in danger by pedestrians and cars.
But by segregating them, it really helped kind of
organize traffic in and out, flow in and out.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Are you losing any parking
spaces by this new proposed layout?

MR. MATSUOKA: No.

MR. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: No?

MR. BROWN: It's the same number as
previous.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. There is potential
for us to eliminate additional structures on the
property that could potentially give us more parking spaces.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. MATSUOKA: You know, not ideal for us, but it's a potential.

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's still just a needle in a haystack, because you're short so many.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's so ineffective. So your best bet is the rental of the Village-owned property. To be honest, that's the only way I would even consider this project.

MR. MATSUOKA: We've already --

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's just too far gone.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yep. We've already spoken to trolley companies to see, you know, what it would cost to rent or acquire them, what it would cost to manage that. We've talked to some electric vehicle companies, you know, since these vehicles would be moving a lot throughout the day. And maybe something smaller is better than a trolley, especially because there are some tight turns down Front Street from Main Street, and vice versa, you know, no gas, no emissions, smaller, more agile. So we're -- you know, we're
looking into it. If you got a spot, we'll figure it out.

MEMBER KYRK: What about The Shady Lady?

MR. MATSUOKA: Who's that?

MEMBER KYRK: Oh, they have a huge parking lot.

MR. BROWN: It's called the Lin now.

MR. MATSUOKA: What it called?

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: They are -- I mean, they're an open business.

MR. BROWN: I think it's called the Lin.

MEMBER HAMMES: The Lin Beach House.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: The Lin Beach House.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Lin.

MEMBER HAMMES: The Lin Beach House.

MR. MATSUOKA: Oh, it's not a person.

(Laughter)

MEMBER KYRK: Oh, no. I'm sorry. It was a --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: It used to be called Shady Lady.

MEMBER KYRK: I don't know the current name of the establishment.

MR. BROWN: It's at the corner of Main
Street and the North Road, big white building
with a red roof.

MR. MATSUOKA: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's not that much parking.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Is it?

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. I mean, anything, anything helps.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER COTUGNO: In the past, you allowed people to park in there, even if they're not, you know, a guest of your restaurant, right?

MR. MATSUOKA: That's the whole idea. You know, we really feel a responsibility to be, you know, a solution and partner to the Village. You know, there was definitely consideration to limit the parking only to those people who were spending money on our property, but we said, you know, we'd rather allow anybody who's here in Greenport a spot if we got it. So it's open to everybody. It's also available all day long. So, if you chose to hang out in Greenport all day, that parking spot is available to you all day, unlike the parking in the rest of the
Village, which I think is limited to three hours.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Two.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: No, not all of it, just on the main streets.

MR. MATSUOKA: On the main streets.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Right.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Most of it's two. Some of it's only half an hour.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. So --

MR. LOFFREDO: So we get people who come in and park and they'll stay there the whole day.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: But you're charging them, correct?

MR. LOFFREDO: It's not by the hour. We don't benefit if they stay the whole day or not.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Did you speak with Northwell about the possibility of renting their lot during the weekends.

MR. MATSUOKA: No. You wouldn't happen to have their phone number, would you?

(Laughter)

MEMBER COTUGNO: Wait a minute. When they were here for the Planning Board, they said they would keep it open, the parking lot.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's the same Architect.

MR. MATSUOKA: Same Architect.

(Laughter)

MR. BROWN: We'll talk.

MR. MATSUOKA: Okay, great. Yeah. But that's the idea. You know, in other locales, we rent property from other businesses that might not be open, such as banks, when their lots are closed, to provide valet parking services there.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Of course, we already -- we always like to have free parking when the bank closed down after banking hours, so.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. MATSUOKA: I mean, again, we could utilize it for --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Well, that's what Northwell said they were going to do. They were going to allow the general public, when they came before us last month. So if they took it, then they're not going --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Not if they can get money for it.

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's not going to be open to the general public.
MR. BROWN: Are there any --

MEMBER HAMMES: Have you, have you talked
to the school at all?

MR. MATSUOKA: No. That's a great idea.

MEMBER HAMMES: Particularly given where
they are and trying to raise their bond. Any
money they can get may be -- I mean, again, I
don't know, I don't speak for them, but I could
see -- I mean, there's been discussion in the
past, and I guess there's insurance issues and
stuff like that. But it seems to me a similar
idea to what you were talking about on Moores
Lane would work --

MR. MATSUOKA: Great.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- with the school as well.

MR. MATSUOKA: I'll reach out to them.

MEMBER HAMMES: So I'd suggest that you can
probably see if there's any interest there.

MR. MATSUOKA: Yeah. That's a good idea.

Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Are there any questions about
the layouts or renovations?

MR. LOFFREDO: Yeah. Did anyone have any
questions about the plans themselves?
MEMBER HAMMES: For me, the biggest concern is the intensification of use and the impact on the traffic, as well as parking, but it's a -- in my head, it's kind of a traffic/parking issue, and I have some real concerns about it. So I think we have to start those discussions. They're bigger than just the Planning Board, so.

MR. LOFFREDO: Sure, of course.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Anybody else at this time?

(No Response)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: We'd want to schedule a public hearing on this or --

MR. CONNOLLY: We need to -- the consultant doesn't look like -- has seen the full EAF, so the consultant needs to be given the copy of the full EAF.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Before we can schedule?

MR. CONNOLLY: Yeah. And it also needs Historic Preservation Commission approval, so they need to go before them. And the Village needs to refer this to the Suffolk County Planning Commission, too, so those things all have to be done.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Do those happen before a hearing?

MR. CONNOLLY: Yes. The Planning Commission, definitely.

MEMBER HAMMES: What's the process for the Suffolk County Planning Commissioner?

MR. CONNOLLY: They just write a letter to the Planning Commission.

MEMBER HAMMES: Okay. And there's a period of time that you wait?

MR. CONNOLLY: It's 30 days.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: But the HPC is the -- I'm sorry. HPC is the longer term. You need an application, it has to go through the process, the potential for the Historic Preservation Commission to schedule a hearing for this as well, so that is -- yeah.

MR. BROWN: Yeah. I understood that that would happen concurrent with the Planning Board.

MEMBER HAMMES: I think the -- as I recall from past discussions on this point, you can run it concurrently. But if they require you to change it, we would have to pull our --

MR. BROWN: Yeah. You know --
MEMBER HAMMES: We would have to keep our public hearing open anyway. So, to some extent, it's oftentimes more efficient to at least get it in there and get that started.

MR. BROWN: If I may, if we could try to run it concurrently, because the only aspect that Historic -- the Historic Board would have any input on is the addition of three exterior doors to the existing building. I can't think of anything else that would be in their purview.

MEMBER HAMMES: You're not putting any additional awnings out here?

MR. BROWN: It's a -- it's a detachable re --

MR. LOFFREDO: Retractable.

MR. BROWN: Retractable awning.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I would have to talk to the Chair and see if he concurs with that assessment, and the Village Attorney as well, that that's the only aspect. I think that's correct, but I'm not going to say that definitively.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Well, what is it besides having it run by the Historic Board are we subject to? I'm not sure I follow.
MEMBER HAMMES: They have to send a letter to the Suffolk County Planning Board, but they're going to send that tomorrow, and then there's a 30-day period for them to do anything.

MR. CONNOLLY: And, generally, the Planning Commission sends back a letter saying it's a matter of local jurisdiction and they're not, you know --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I don't understand why we'd have to wait for that letter to be returned.

MR. CONNOLLY: Because, if you don't do that and this is approved, and there's an Article 78, however, that challenges the approval, the Village's failure to send that letter to the Suffolk County Planning Commission is reversible error.

MEMBER HAMMES: But could we -- could we schedule the public hearing for January?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Beyond the 30-day period.

MEMBER HAMMES: And then hold it open if we needed to, because --

MR. CONNOLLY: Oh, yeah, you can do that.

MEMBER HAMMES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Well, that's the idea.

MEMBER HAMMES: That's what I would do.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I seriously -- yeah, I doubt that we're going to have --

MR. BROWN: Wouldn't it also be possible to -- if we didn't have a response in time, to approve subject to?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Well --

MEMBER HAMMES: I think we'd probably -- well, we can talk about that. We can cross that bridge when we come to it. My personal view is we could probably hold it open. But I don't see any reason, if the rest of the Board is amenable --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, and I'm --

MEMBER HAMMES: -- to not scheduling it.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah. And I'm skeptical that one hearing is going to be -- if we schedule it for the --

MEMBER HAMMES: January 9th.

MS. AURICHIO: The 9th.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: The 9th? That, you know you, we -- you can clearly indicate -- get the feeling from the Board that we're very concerned about resolving this parking issue and as a condition to our approval. And I'm not saying that it will be a condition of our approval, but,
at the moment, it is a serious concern, and I'm skeptical that that's something that's going to be bureaucratically resolved by January 9th. So I guess what I'm saying is we can schedule the Planning -- the public hearing for January 9th, but with the understanding it's likely to continue on beyond that, in all likelihood. So unless somebody objects, that's what I propose that we do. Okay? Great. All right. Thanks.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

MEMBER HAMMES: You need to make a motion.

MR. MATSUOKA: Thank you.

MR. LOFFREDO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Huh?

MEMBER HAMMES: You need to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I do?

MEMBER HAMMES: Yes. Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. I move to schedule it for -- the public hearing for January 9th. Do I have a second?

MEMBER HAMMES: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.
MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Carried.

Okay. Item No. 7, 230 Main Street.

Schedule a Public Hearing for January 9th regarding the application of Northwell Health Services, represented by Architect Robert Brown. The applicant proposes interior renovations to accommodate the new use of medical offices for the property located at 230 Main Street. This Property is located in the Commercial Retail District. This property is also located in the Historic District. Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-4.-10-10.1. So --

MR. BROWN: Robert Brown, Architect. I'm hoping I can get my name on a chair here.

(Laughter)

MEMBER KYRK: You could bring your own sign.

(Laughter)

MR. BROWN: I do have a copy of the site plan review. And a survey was submitted with the application. Apparently, the consultant did not get that. I will make another available, if that's necessary. I'll keep the load calculations and parking.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I apologize. I think you have the old one as well for that.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: There's no -- yeah, this is slightly different.

MR. BROWN: Yeah. I was wondering what happened all day.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: We apologize.

MR. BROWN: No, no. Thank you. This also states that the applicant -- the consultant did not have a site plan with the existing parking. Again, I will provide another survey, if that's required.

I will tell you that -- I hate to sound like a broken record, but the building predates the code, and, technically, no off-street parking is required. There are 18 existing spaces on the property. Based on the usage for physicians, there would be two physicians onsite at any given time, and the code requires five spaces per, which is 10 spaces. There are 18 spaces on the property, so -- and I will make sure that that is clearly documented for the hearing, but I do not believe that that's an issue.

And the layout proposed is completely ADA
compliant, and meets all egress and code requirements, as it would have had to for the bank originally.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So did you provide the load calculations, egress pathways?

MR. BROWN: Again, I will, you know, spell it out more clearly for the -- for the next iteration, but, you know, I felt it was all there and very clear.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: On the site plan or --

MR. BROWN: Well, we did a floor plan and we did a survey -- and we submitted the survey, done by a surveyor, because there are no changes whatsoever to the exterior of the building or the footprint. It's totally an interior renovation.

There are two double doors for egress from the building at opposite ends of the building. That's a very straightforward floor plan. All the hallways are ADA compliant.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I mean, there seem to be a disconnect between what he's apparently provided and what the reviewer commented on, so I don't know what to do.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I mean, I looked through the file myself, and I did discuss it
briefly with the Planner. I -- again, for what it's worth, my opinion, if these things are provided on an updated plan, the parking and egress paths are obviously critically important, however minor items to change on the plan. I think the Architect could provide that well in advance of any hearing date.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: Well in advance.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All right. Thank you.

Are we ready to schedule this? We'll also schedule this for the 9th.

MS. AURICHIO: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Can I have a second to schedule a public hearing on this applicant for the 9th of January?

MEMBER HAMMES: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So scheduled.

Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.
MEMBER KYRK: Are we likely to have -- are we likely to have a --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I can't hear you, Reed.

MEMBER KYRK: Are we likely to have a lot of people here on the 9th?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: We have a couple of hearings. Yes, you've got to --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: You have to talk into the mic.

MEMBER KYRK: Are we likely to have an awful lot of people there on the 9th with Claudio's being on the docket?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, but I think we can manage it.

MEMBER KYRK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I think it's -- I think it will be okay. Okay. The --

MR. MATSUOKA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you. Thanks.

The next item is Item No. 7. No, no, I think we did that one.

So Item No. 8, 420 -- this is the regular session. Item No. 8, 424 Fourth Street. A Public Hearing regarding site plan approval for the application of the Miller Family 2012
Irrevocable Trust, represented by Attorney Patricia Moore. The applicant proposes the addition of two new rooms, for a total of 5 rooms, in the Bed & Breakfast located at 424 Fourth Street. This Property is located in the R-2 (One and Two-Family) District. This property is not located -- is not located in the Historic District. Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-6.6-18.1.

It's been brought to my attention that the sign notices were not properly posted in time, so we cannot have a public hearing on this matter at this time. So we will -- we'll move that to also January 9th. Okay? Thank you. Do I need a second on that? Can I have a second on that rescheduling?

MEMBER HAMMES: Second.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?
MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.
MEMBER KYRK: Aye.
MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So revised.

Thank you.
Item No. 9, 415 Kaplan Avenue. A Public
Hearing regarding a site plan approval for the application of 415 Kaplan Avenue Greenport Inc., represented by Owner James Olinkiewicz. The applicant proposes the construction of a two-family dwelling for the property located at 415 Kaplan Avenue. This property is located in the R-2 (One and Two-Family) District. This property is not located in the Historic District. This property also requires a use variance.

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

Would anybody like -- oh.


CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I'm a contract vendee, I'm not the owner yet. The owner has given me the right to go in front before we would close on the property.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: So the property was the old Peggy Richards property, where a two-family house had burned down. It had been bulldozed by the Village. It's been -- sat and been up for sale for a while. And so we want to build a new two-family back where there was a two-family on
the existing lot. It's been in the Village forever.

So we had -- we had put in the back of the plan parking for six spots. I did not realize that in the Village Code, Section 150-16(C), as I got in the notice, that if there's more than five spots, I have to do some screening. I can either knock it down to five spots, or I could put a fence up to block the neighbor. I own other properties on the other side of the -- of the proposed lot to build a two-family.

So that's pretty much it. So we're --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So if you have those two choices, what do you propose doing?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I would probably put a fence up for privacy for the neighbors, even if there was five spots back there, if we were going to -- you know, we put the extra spots. I'm only required to have three.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I was going to put a couple of extra spots to help alleviate some of the parking --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: -- off of Fifth from
Kaplan, which only has like two spaces in the back, or three spaces in the back, from when we did that original building about seven years ago.

So I would -- I would probably put the fence up just to the neighbor that adjoin -- is adjoining to me, which is another two-family rental house. So you have my Kaplan Avenue, 411, which is a two-family, this that had been a two-family, and the adjoining house next to it, which is an existing two-family. So we're not really changing the demographics of the neighborhood by putting another two-family there and just adding the parking in the back. But a fence would, you know, help alleviate maybe headlights into the -- into the neighbor's property, even though it's way in the back and it's -- the parking lot abuts their three-car garage. So they're only going to pull in and shine the lights on the side of the garage.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So if you were going to -- I thought the idea behind your having extra parking spaces was to help your other property.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Correct.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So would the fence inhibit that, or --
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: No.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: No.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: The fence would be down on the neighbor's --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I see.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Would block the neighbor to the right.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay, I got it.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: My side, it doesn't really matter.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: So just allowed a little bit more parking off the street there. And that's a -- not a narrow, narrow road, but it's a road that if you took a couple of cars off, it would make it a little bit easier for people to drive down.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.
MR. CONNOLLY: Was there a C of O for 415 Kaplan that showed it as a two-family?
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: They're in -- the Village has it under -- if you pull into their original -- I don't remember. It was like 1970 that they had the books that have all the photographs and everything, that it was a
two-family house there. And, in fact, the Richards had a tenant in there of the apartment when the place caught fire.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Does anybody --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: There's an audience member who wants to talk, it looks like.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Any questions from the Board or --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Not at this time. But it's a public hearing, so we'll let the public speak.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Right. No problem, I'll come back.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: But we may have -- something may come up. Yeah, don't leave. Yes, she's going to speak first.

MS. SOLOMON: I can come up?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: You go ahead, sure. And just please announce your name and address.

MS. SOLOMON: Okay. My name is Connie Solomon, and I'm at 422 Kaplan Avenue. Also, speaking on behalf of my Mom. My mother lives
there. We got the property in 1975. And also
Valrose Swann for 18 Kaplan Avenue, that's my
neighbor.

Kaplan Avenue has probably got to be one of
the narrowest, shortest streets in the Village.
Any given time, we've got five, six, seven cars
parked, sometimes a boat. I was told it's okay
for someone to park their boat on the avenue, I
mean, on the street, even if they don't live
there.

So to you, yes, we need much affordable
housing and things like that. I just don't know
where -- where are they going to park? How are
they going to get back to that back spot? How
would they be able to -- where would they park,
and how would they enter their --

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: They would enter --
MS. SOLOMON: How would get to their
parking spaces?

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: They would enter between
Kaplan Market, which I own, and the new building.
We were going to put a 15-foot driveway going all
the way back to the parking area.

MS. SOLOMON: Because that should have been
a parking area that there before -- I mean, the
Kaplan store, the old Kaplan store.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Right.

MS. SOLOMON: I thought, you know, that they had -- they were supposed to park in the back as well.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: There is parking in the back that's already used, but we were only required --

MS. SOLOMON: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: -- three parcels, three spots at that time, because actually, in fact, we're only responsible for three on this application. We're putting more to help facilitate some of the overflow that --

MS. SOLOMON: Right.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: Whether it's my tenants, or whether it's Corwin's tenants, or whoever, it's --

MS. SOLOMON: Exactly. I mean, it's -- you know, like I said, on any given day, and I understand the occupants in the Kaplan store, you know, they got young people and teenagers. But, at any given point, it's about four cars there, so much so, that even today, when I'm trying to back out of my apartment -- I mean, my driveway,
I can't even get out all the way, because, you know, someone's parked right, right across. It's just so narrow.

My mom, she's a senior, and Valrose Swann, they try to -- we try to back their cars in now so that they can drive out, you know, and be able to see, or to get out, to make that little short turn, or something like that.

I've never known the property that you're referring to to ever be a two-family home, and my family has been there since 1975. The Watkins, that was not a two-family dwelling, and neither is the one further down, is not a two-family dwelling. I know that that's recently been zoned as such.

But, again, with the boat and the cars, and the extra parking and stuff, it's just -- you know, the infrastructure is total -- anyway, we've never had new sidewalks or anything. We didn't have sidewalks on the -- you know, on the east side of the whatchacallit, and big old pot hole, and what they just dug and put underground, no one says anything.

But it's just -- we've never -- we're taxpayers and we've never got an answer, never
got any information about, you know, the
lifespan, maybe, of the roads, the structures,
the -- you know, we know it's a dumping ground
down at the bottom there. I don't know if
there'd ever be a SEQRA review, or what have you,
environmental, but it's just -- it's desolate and
it just looks like a -- you know, just from the
old days. You might want to do something on the
infrastructure as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you. Yes, please.

MS. SEMLER: Hi. My name is Vickie Semler,
and I own the property at 516 Madison Avenue. So
the backyard, my backyard shares a common
boundary with the property that you're talking
about.

And I have two concerns. One is when I
moved here in '79, on the right side, which is a
very nice house, but the backyard was a small
garden and was lovely. And the property that is
now under consideration had a large vegetable and
flower garden, and so it was a wonderful space,
and it was part of the community. I mean, my
neighbors on the other side also had a garden and
I planted a garden.

And I understand change happens. But when
the house next door, on my right, which is a lovely house, but there are five -- five parking spaces allocated to that house for a two-family. And it's a small backyard, and so all those cars, they face me, there is no other space, it's as much space as they can get in.

And my concern, also, is that the nature of the whole neighborhood changes when you end up with parking lots in your backyard. And it's just -- it's an added congestion. I understand that it probably makes renting there, if you can have six cars, instead of five, or instead of whatever.

But I do think that the Village really needs to look at the kind of changes that are taking place in that neighborhood, when you end up with houses that have essentially parking lots in the backyard. And that has to do with just the nature of the change, but I would really like that taken into consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: I just would like to address that for one second. So on -- James Olinkiewicz again. On 510 Madison, which is the house adjacent to yours, when I came to build it
with the Village, the Village requested that you're not allowed to park in front of your house in the Village. You can park alongside your house, or you can park behind your house, but we're not allowed to make parking in front of the house. So in front of your porch and everything else, you're not supposed to do that under -- that's what I was told under Village Code, so it was always to design that parking was not in front of house.

So it's much easier for me to leave five spots or four spots. There's a 30-foot setback on the house. We could put spots right in the front, and the whole backyard would be left to nature and everybody would enjoy it. But under the Village Code, you can't park in front of the house.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: You mean on the front yard.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: In the front yard.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MR. OLINKIEWICZ: You can't park in the front.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: You don't mean on the street.
MR. OLINKIEWICZ: You have to park to the side of your house, and have a driveway down the side, or additional parking in the rear. So just as a -- that's how come that was done. I would gladly have put it in the front.

MS. KIEL: Good evening. My name is JoAnn Kiel. I'm the owner of 415 Kaplan Avenue. I am in the process of going into contract with James Olinkiewicz.

In -- I previously -- my husband's a builder, and we actually had plans to put a two-family on there, similar, although our budgets probably are -- probably were a little different and -- but we planned on putting a two-family there as well. I feel that it does fit well within the neighborhood of, you know, what his plan does look like. So I just feel that that was comfortable for us to do the same thing.

As far as the parking, I do go down that street daily. I live on Fifth Avenue, so that Kaplan Avenue is an extension of that street. And when someone said there was a boat there, there was another trailer there, they're allowed to park on the street, as long as they are
registered. So you can't take them off the street, but you can give them parking spaces.

   And I think what Mr. Olinkiewicz is trying to do here is try to give them the best that they can to, you know, take the stress off the street. I honestly feel when he, you know, offered the six parking spots, I don't feel -- and put them in the back of the home, I felt that that was good, it was adequate.

   The -- when I drive past there or try to get to that lot, when they were doing work on that lot itself during the four years that I have owned it, it has -- we weren't even able to drive on the lot, because the cars were parked in front of it. It's 52 feet wide, and the cars just take it over from Kaplan Market. I'm not so sure if one of them might be from the other two-family that is owned there as well. So I do -- I'm fine with the six parking spots, but if you would allow the five, I think that's fantastic.

   The parking in front of -- in front of the house would certainly take away from what our -- you know, our community is supposed to look like, our homes are supposed to look like. It would be beautiful and not commercialized if it didn't
have the parking in front. So I believe the
parking in back is probably the best place
for it.

As far as parking, possibly where it might
have been an obstruction to someone, someone
else, and maybe a fence could go there so she
might not see the parking, although I don't feel
the parking's going to be that far back for you.
But I do feel if fence would be extended down,
maybe that might be another solution. Had lots
of solutions. We've thought about this for years
for our own -- with our own ideas. So those are
a few of them.

I think that's pretty much what I have to
say, but thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So, I'm sorry, you're the
current owner of that property?

MS. KIEL: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So there is a
little bit of a dispute about whether or not it's
a -- it was a two-family before. Was it a
two-family?

MS. KIEL: Do you know, honestly, before --
I don't really know that answer. I do have that
paperwork at home, so I do not know as of right
now, but I certainly can email that to you
tomorrow -- tonight, when I get home. So I don't
have a problem, but I have that paper, I mean,
it's in my folder.

      CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Thank you.
      MS. KIEL: So I can certainly find that
information out.
      MS. SOLOMON: Can I just ask another
question?
      MS. KIEL: But I do know it is an R-2 Zone.
So, I mean, that's --
      CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.
      MS. KIEL: -- always been a given. And it
is a large lot, you know. Most of the lots here
that we've had, they're 50, 227 square feet.
This is over 11,000 square feet. It's doable for
what he's putting on there.
      Mr. Olinkiewicz and I have gone up against
the Boards previously, mostly subdivisions, and
I'm glad to see that that this is not a
subdivision. This is one of the ones that I
actually think that I like of his. That I do
like, I'm not saying I think I like, but I do
like.

      (Laughter)
MS. KIEL: I'm very surprised at myself, so bear with me, because it was definitely a
turnaround for me. So I don't think it's a bad
house for the area. I think it will fit in very
well for what he has.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MS. KIEL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you. Do you want to
come up?

MS. SOLOMON: Just -- oh, okay. Connie
Solomon, Kaplan Avenue, 422.

I had not heard about the -- didn't know
about not being able to park in front of your
home, and that's being Village Code, or what have
you. If so, how is that enforced? Because,
obviously, the Kaplan store, they have -- they
have a lot -- all of that space there in front of
the house.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I think what it means is
you can't park on the yard of your house, but you
can park on the street in front of your house.

MS. SOLOMON: Right.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: But you can't park on the
front yard. That was --

MS. SOLOMON: Front yard.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MS. SOLOMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I think that's what they meant.

MS. SOLOMON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right? Okay, thanks.

Anybody else like to speak from the public on this matter?

(No Response)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. We have to keep this public hearing open, and because of the -- and going in front of the Zoning Board, correct?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yes, it is going in front of the Zoning Board.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So the public hearing is going to remain open until the next hearing date, January 5th -- or January 9th, rather.

MR. CONNOLLY: It would probably have to stay open until the Zoning Board acts on it.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right. Okay.

MR. CONNOLLY: So you might want to put the --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So it's going to stay open until there is an action taken by the
Zoning Board. At that time, we'll decide when to close it. Do I need a second on that, or can I just move on?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: (Shook head no)
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay, good.

Item No. 10, this is my favorite, motion to adjourn. Do I have a second?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.
MEMBER HAMMES: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. All those in favor?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.
MEMBER KYRK: Aye.
MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.


(Time Noted: 5:22 p.m.)
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