VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK : STATE OF NEW YORK

PLANNING BOARD
WORK SESSION

Via Video Conferencing
May 20, 2020
4:00 p.m.

BEFORE:
WALTER FOOTE - CHAIRMAN
JOHN COTUGNO - MEMBER
PATRICIA HAMMES - MEMBER
REED KYRK - MEMBER
LILY DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON - MEMBER (Absent)
ROBERT CONNOLLY - PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY
PAUL PALLAS - VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR
(The meeting was called to order at 4:16 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: This is the Village of
Greenport Planning Board Work Session meeting.
It's Wednesday, May the 20th, 2020. It is
4:16 p.m. We're conducting this meeting by the
GoToMeeting.com app. And the comments regarding
the agenda have been accepted by email at about
3 o'clock today, or during the meeting by using
the chat function on the GoToMeeting app.

"Please join the meeting from your
computer, tablet or smart phone." There's a --
it's the website link, is on the website of the
Village website.

We are -- Item No. 1 is a motion to accept
and approve the minutes of the March 5th, 2020
Planning Board Meeting. May I have a second?

MEMBER HAMMES: I second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Is there a second?

MEMBER HAMMES: I second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Okay. All those in
favor? If -- Planning Board members, when I ask
for a vote, just raise your hand, so I cannot
only hear you, but see you, if you want -- if you
approve it.

MEMBER KYRK: ( Raised hand)
MEMBER HAMMES: (Raised hand)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: (Raised hand)

Okay. So approved.

Item No. 2, motion to schedule the Planning Board Regular Meeting for 4 p.m. on June 25th, 2020.

May I have a second?

MEMBER HAMMES: Second.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor, say aye.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Aye. Motion carries.

Item No. 3, 214 Front Street. This is a Pre-Submission Conference with possible motion to schedule a Public Hearing for June 25th, regarding the site plan review application of 214 Front Street, LLC., represented by Charles Squire and Gail Barlow. The applicant proposes a change of occupancy from Group M (Retail) to Group B (Business). This property is located in the Retail Commercial District and is not located in the Historic District. Its location is Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-4.-9-21.

At this time, I welcome the applicant to
give us a brief introduction on this application. And before you do, just please announce your name and address.

MS. BARLOW: Oh, address of the space or home address?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Your home address.

MS. BARLOW: Oh, sure. Hi. This is Gail Barlow and Charles Squire. We are at 3480 Orchard Street in Orient. Nice to meet everybody.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Nice to meet you.

MEMBER HAMMES: Nice to meet you.

MS. BARLOW: Hi. So, yeah, we live in Orient, and we have a branding company called Mutiny. We have been running it out of our home since 2012, and had been looking for office spaces in the Village to house our business as it -- as we were looking to grow, and found that -- looked around a lot and found that spot and bought that. It was a beautiful space that would be really conducive to what we -- we have a creative agency and a creative business, and liked that it was sort of in the heart of -- the heart of Greenport near the school where our daughter will be going. And, yeah, and so that's
sort of our intro.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Does anybody on the Board have any questions to ask the applicant?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Again --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Hello.

MEMBER COTUGNO: This is John.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Hey, John, speak.

MEMBER COTUGNO: So I have no concern of the use or the change of use, but in the change of use, I'm -- I have concerns about the amount of occupants and the number of exits.

Now exit doors have to swing out, and both those doors, although there's two exit areas, both doors swing in. And I'm also concerned about handicapped accessibility, being that there's a step up to the front, and any change of use that is required be fully handicapped accessible. I know that putting in a handicapped toilet, which is nice, but the people have to get in there.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Is this a space which is primarily for your office use, as opposed to inviting the public in?

MS. BARLOW: That's correct, it's not -- it would be primarily for our office use. And then
we had thought about making our conference room
available to businesses who didn't have a space
to take a meeting, but it wouldn't -- our
intention is that it's our private office.

MEMBER KYRK: Yes. I had seen the comments
about freelancers and such. I was wondering
whether this would be freelancers that are
associated with the business that you're doing,
or would this be just generally office, in
essence.

And I've also seen that you plan to have
some gatherings for seminars, I think it would
be. I can't read it here right now. And I was
wondering how many folks you thought might be at
those seminars. What -- you know, what were your
intentions?

MS. BARLOW: Well, that's a good question.
I think that, obviously, COVID and sort of the
new world has changed some of our business
planning. But I'll tell you about the vision as
it was at the beginning of the year, when we
thought about offering workshops or sort of
educational seminars. You know, that would be
around brand -- how to brand your business, how
to build your business, marketing, sort of things
that were in our specialty zone, and sort of the idea being, you know, that we're excited about connecting with the business community and being a resource to small businesses.

I think as we move forward with, you know, sort of the new world that we're in, I think that this is kind of a non-answer, because I don't really have a vision for that anymore. I think that we're sort of more thinking about, you know, how the space would first be used just to support our business. So, obviously, if we were to do any kind of workshop or, you know, making some of those resources available to people (background noise in video) thought about how many people would even be there.

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah, yeah. Just curiosity how many people will be there.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Mr. Chairman, if I can ask those that are not speaking to mute their phones, please.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So, Paul, I have a question for you. The change -- you know, John just mentioned that with a change of use, there's a requirement under the code to make it handicapped compliant in terms of a ramp and the
swing doors. Is that the Village Code's requirement or a State Code requirement?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: It's a -- it's a State Code. It's actually, I think, rooted in Federal Law, and there's a provision for infeasibility. We have not gotten to the point where we would be reviewing that yet.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: We certainly would review that before any ultimate approvals would be given.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. But who makes that decision? Is that -- is that the Building Department or is that the Planning Board?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Typically, it's the Building Department that makes that determination.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Okay. I would just like to make a qualitative comment on this change of use in the business. And I can just say, as a -- you know, a resident of Greenport for a while now, I think, you know, putting everything else aside, it's a very welcomed development to see a business of this nature integrate into the community, because, you know, quite frankly, so far everything seems to be either a restaurant,
or a furniture, or a clothing store. So I think, you know, from that perspective, this is a welcomed -- you would be a welcomed addition. So I just want to get that out there so you understood at least my point of view.

MS. BARLOW: Thanks, yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: I agree, I agree. It's nice not to have a restaurant or bar on our agenda for that space.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MS. BARLOW: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: And it's a beautiful space, too. I really -- my wife and I used to go in there to pick up old items, and the architectural integrity of it is quite special.

MS. BARLOW: Yeah, we were really attracted to that as well in the best way.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Does anybody else have any further comment on this application at this time?

(No Response)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: If not, then I'd like to suggest that we schedule a public hearing on this application. And according to the agenda, we were proposing for June 25th; is that right, Paul?
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: That is correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Do I need a second on that, or we just go ahead and schedule it? I forgot the protocol.

MR. CONNOLLY: You need a second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. May I have a second on scheduling the public hearing for this application on June 25th?

MEMBER HAMMES: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. All those in favor? Aye.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MS. BARLOW: Thank you.

MR. SQUIRE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: You're welcome.

Okay. Item No. 4, 621 Main Street. This is a discussion regarding the covenant and restrictions on the property. A Pre-Submission Conference regarding the site plan review application of Community Action Southold Town, acronym CAST, represented by Martin Finnegan,
their Attorney.

The applicant proposes the conversion of the former church to CAST headquarters. And a number of people have pointed out that stop calling it a former church, it's currently a residence, a single residence. So let's -- you know, just for the record, let's get that out there.

This property is located in the R-2 (One and Two-Family) District and is located in the Historic District. This property also requires an area variance and HPC approval. It's located at Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-2.-6-49.4.

At this time, I invite the representative of the applicant to give us a presentation. Is there anybody who would like to speak on behalf of cast?

MR. FINNEGAN: Yes. Good afternoon. Martin Finnegan here on behalf of CAST. I am -- thank you for having us. I'm joined this afternoon by Kathy Demeroto, who's the Executive Director of CAST, and the Architects from Studio A/B as well. I believe -- is Marc on the line as well?

MR. SOKOL: Yes, I'm here as well.
MR. FINNEGAN: And Marc Sokol, who's the
president of CAST.

So as stated, this is an application to
convert what is -- what was a church and was
previously converted into a residential dwelling
into CAST headquarters, pursuant to Section
150-7(B) of the code.

Obviously, CAST is, I assume, well known to
this Board as a philanthropic organization in the
Village which does amazing work within the
Village and within the Town of Southold for so
many of our residents. And under the current
predicament that we're all living in, their work
has been outstanding.

The proposal -- the presentation we'd like
to make, I'm going to basically turn it over to
Glynis and Hideaki in a minute to kind of review
the renovations. But in -- it is primarily a --
an interior renovation of the existing space,
with a relatively small addition for access, for
handicapped access to the premises. And,
especially, it is intended to house all of
CAST's operations, which Kathy will explain in
more detail, but are primarily the office
operations of the organization, and the
educational programs and food pantry that run there periodically.

So you mentioned the covenant. I've had a discussion with the Village Attorney about that. It's my understanding that we are in agreement, that the covenant that requires any residence on the property to be a single-family residence is not applicable here, because we are seeking, in fact, to change the use to a philanthropic use, which is not a residential operation.

So, you know, essentially, we are looking to have the building renovated, and also to add parking as much as possible on the premises to primarily be for the staff members of CAST, and occasionally for people accessing services there.

With respect to the renovation -- Glynis, are you there?

MS. BERRY: Yes. Can you hear me?

MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. Yes, I can hear you well. I hope the Board can hear you.

MS. BERRY: Okay.

MR. FINNEGAN: I'm going to ask you and Hideaki at this point to just, if you could, just give a brief overview of the renovations that are contemplated, and maybe just briefly explain the
site plan.

I should note, if I can real quickly before I turn it over, that I did submit through -- a revised plan that is different than what was submitted with the original application. I'm hoping that that got into the Board's hands.

We did have a meeting with some of the neighboring homeowners, and in consideration of some of their concerns, there were some modifications made to the original plan, which were intended to enhance screening and to mitigate some of the impacts that they were concerned about. So, the fact -- did you -- did the Board get that revised plan?

MEMBER KYRK: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.
MR. FINNEGAN: You did, great, great.
MEMBER HAMMES: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Marty, could you just kind of save us a little time, explain what the changes were? I don't know if it was evident in the -- in the new plan.

MR. FINNEGAN: Yeah, sure. They were -- and Glynis could -- but, essentially, the garage was to be moved, but that is going to stay where
it is. And the dumpster was moved to the north, so that it's not, not on the, you know, the neighboring property line. And the buffer between the -- this property, 621 Main, and the properties to the rear has been enhanced, increased to about 9 feet. And, also, there was a shed that is eliminated. And that's really essentially it, I believe. Glynis could correct me if I'm wrong.

   MS. BERRY: No, you were perfect.

   MR. FINNEGAN: Okay. So why don't you just, then, explain a little bit to the -- to the Planning Board about the other changes that are contemplated.

   MS. BERRY: Okay. Basically, almost all the changes are focused on accessibility, because the layout fits their needs almost perfectly. So we wanted to have a ramp, and the back has less of an elevation change. And, also, you know, the front setbacks are an issue for making that accessible. So it just made sense to put in a new entry at the rear and reconfigure that.

   And we also added what's called an accessible stair that goes down to the basement, because some of the rooms, like the sharing room
and food storage, is downstairs. So it just made
the whole connection to the basement and the main
function more efficient and accessible.

It -- the addition is like a tail, and that
was because we were trying to have the least
impact on the existing building. So we
maintained the windows at the back, so it's
configured so that we keep the windows as much as
possible on the existing structure.

The parking, we needed to increase the
amount of parking and provide a loading zone. So
we have the driveway going to the rear and the
parking along the back line, and this does two
things. It maximizes the parking, and also has
the least visual impact on -- because there's
already a really good buffer zone. So people's
views of the property are going to be more the
building and the grass. So we tried to minimize
impacts as much as possible.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So I think it would be
really useful for somebody to give us a brief
overview of the intended use of this site for
CAST in terms of what CAST is going to be doing
with it. And included in that would probably be
just an idea of how many people are expected to
be in there at any given time, who will be there.

I must tell you that there's been a significant early community reaction that both, you know, praises what CAST is doing, we all, I think, are very grateful for it, but, at the same time, raising concerns, given the location. This is really a residential area. And I think it would be really helpful to just get a good overview of the substance of what CAST will be doing at this new site.

MR. FINNEGAN: Sure. I'm going to ask Kathy Demeroto, who's CAST's Executive Director, to review that with the Board. We anticipated that that would be one of your questions.

And I think that it will be clear that, you know, while CAST does many different things, most of the activities are very periodic in nature. And so I don't think that there's the intensity that people may fear. So -- but, Kathy would you mind kind of reviewing just the activities that we discussed, so that the Board is aware of them?

MS. DEMEROTO: Sure. Can everybody hear me?

MEMBER KYRK: Yes.

MS. DEMEROTO: Okay. I'm Kathy Demeroto,
the Executive Director of CAST. And thank you
for the opportunity to share more of what we do.

As you probably all know, CAST has been
serving the community since 1965, and has been
located in Greenport Village for almost 55 years.
And as far as our operations, it's a combination
of safety net programs and education programs.

So we have a food pantry which has limited
hours. It's Monday, from 9 a.m. to noon, it's
Tuesday from 3 p.m. to 6, and Friday, 9 a.m. to
noon. And we anticipate, with moving the
location, that our -- we will have the same hours
for our sharing room. So that's when people come
in to look in our sharing room for clothes and
household items. So those would be limited
hours. It's nine hours a week during the week.

We would also have the office open for
general paperwork. It could be an application,
it could be use of a fax machine. And that's,
you know, our regular work -- open-door-hours are
9 a.m. to 5 p.m. So we -- I looked back at the
data last year. On average, we had about 80
people per month come in for those types of
requests. So about 20 per week, and that would
be some time between the hours of 9 and 5.
Usually, they would come in for those requests during food pantry hours or sharing room hours, as they were there anyway.

As far as the education piece, we currently don't have room for that kind of space to have our classes at CAST. So that's part of the reason why we're looking for space, so we can have a real community organization serving the community, and people could come to our center for our classes.

So we're not having any classes now, they've been suspended. But prior to the pandemic, we were meeting on Wednesdays, from 7 to 8:30 p.m. for ESL classes, but they only ran from October through December, and again from January through April.

We had citizenship classes on Thursday evenings from 6 to 7:45. That just runs from January through March. But, again, those were not at CAST, they were at the Libraries. And I am thinking it will continue in the Libraries as a great partnership, and the Libraries would like us to continue hosting those classes at the Library.

We occasionally have six-week computer
sessions in the Fall and Winter one time a week, and that's sporadic, but it's just in the Fall and the Winter, and we usually get anywhere from two to six attendees to those classes. And the ESL classes, we generally get between five and 15 attendees.

    We do a monthly workshop, Engage, Educate and Empower Workshop series, so those are various topics. It could be financial planning, it could be nutrition, pediatric health. And we do those once a month, and it's an hour-and-a-half, and they are sometimes during the day and sometimes in the evening. And they only run from October through May, and we get anywhere from two to 12 attendees, generally, for those.

    In the -- this year, January, we did a culinary pilot program at Holy Trinity Church, and we -- it was a 10-week program from January through March, and it met twice a week from 3:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., and the range is six to 12 students, as well as three to four volunteer teachers. And we hope to have that program, if we get funded again, next January through March, so that could potentially be at this building.

    CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's a program for what?
I don't understand.

MS. DEMEROTO: It's a culinary program for high school students --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Culinary, okay.

MS. DEMEROTO: -- that are going to college. Yeah. We don't hold any classes from June through mid September, so there's no evening or afternoon educational programs at CAST during the summer months.

We occasionally have tutoring for students, school-age students. We don't do that at CAST, because we don't have the space, so that generally happens at the Library. But that's something we would hope to do at CAST, and that's one-on-one tutoring. Generally, we serve one in four kids a year, so that's not a very popular program bringing many people in.

And then we do some seasonal programs. So we have a school supply drive once a year, where families come in and we distribute school supplies. They have slots and times for pickups scheduled, and that's during the day.

We do a holiday toy drive, which we've done at different locations in the community, because we don't have space. It's a two-day event,
again, during the week, during working hours. Families get a time slot where they come in. So it's only two slots at a time. So you're only having two parents or guardians coming in at a time for that.

And then we do a hot Thanksgiving dinner meal. We generally do that at Clinton Memorial AME Zion Church. And since that's a great partnership, we may continue to do it there, as opposed to having it at a new location.

And then the other programs we have, we have a mobile foot pantry, which delivers food from CAST twice a month, and it's a van. I don't know if you've seen our van around town. So the van packs food out and delivers on Wednesdays in the community. As far as some other things that were raised --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Where would the mobile foot pantry be? I'm sorry.

MS. DEMEROTO: -- I think there was some inaccurate information out in the public about delivery. So I pulled the data from last year, 2019, on truck deliveries. And we only -- for the whole year, we had 15 deliveries by Peapod, and we had 18 deliveries by Long Island Cares for
the year. So those are the only trucks that came
in, other than the trash pickup, which happens on
Fridays.

And as far as the food pantry numbers from
last year, just to have a sense, on average, we
did 120 to 130 distributions per month, so that's
about 30 households coming in per week.

MR. SOKOL: Kathy, someone asked, someone
asked about --

MS. DEMEROTO: A majority of our -- a
majority of our clients are walkers and do not
come by vehicle.

MR. SOKOL: Kathy, someone asked where the
van would be parked.

MS. DEMEROTO: Well, right now, we keep it
parked at my home, and I think that's to be
determined whether it would stay at my home or it
would be parked in the church lot.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: But the mobile food
pantry, when it's available, it would be -- it
would be available -- it would be parked in the
church lot, is that the idea when people come
there?

MS. DEMEROTO: No, no, no, no, no. It just
comes to the CAST location to get the boxes and
bags of food for --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, I see.

MS. DEMEROTO: That takes about 30 minutes to load, and then it drives to people's homes. So the mobile pantry is for homebound --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, okay.

MS. DEMEROTO: -- clients or clients with transportation barriers who can't come to CAST. We do not serve out of the van at CAST.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I understand. Okay.

Thank you for clarifying that.

MR. FINNEGAN: So, if I could just kind of wrap that up, it's pretty clear that the CAST operations are pretty much, you know, a 9-to-5 operation in terms of their office operations. And the services they provide are mostly off-season in terms of the busy season in the Village, but, clearly, only during business hours and very, very periodic. So it's our, you know, position, that, you know, the impacts to the surrounding area will be minimal, if they're even discerned by anybody.

I really feel that the way they operate, that it's very well organized and well run. And, you know, particularly along Main Street there,
there are, you know, all different kinds of uses. So I believe that, you know, CAST can do the great things they do and have no problem being a good neighbor.

So that is, you know, pretty much our presentation. If the Board has any other questions regarding the proposed renovations. We do acknowledge that we need to go to the ZBA and get some dimensional relief for the use, and, you know, we're prepared to do so as soon as we get a Notice of Disapproval.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Is there any contemplation of using the space as a contingency or otherwise emergency shelter? Because right -- currently, as it was being used previously, there was some residential rooms. Was there any plan or discussion to make the space available for that purpose?

MS. DEMEROTO: Absolutely not.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. FINNEGAN: Yeah, no.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: And are the -- the food pantry concept, it's basically there for pickup, but is there any contemplation to have it like serve as a community gathering for actual
cafeteria-style servicing of food --

MS. DEMEROTO: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- and eating on the premises?

MS. DEMEROTO: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Thank you. That was a very comprehensive description. I'm a bit overwhelmed by just how much you do, and it's quite commendable. Would it be possible, if you haven't done this already, and I apologize if you already submitted it and I just didn't notice it, if you could submit a written description of the different functions and the time frames for when these things occur?

MS. DEMEROTO: Yes, I have it written, and Martin has it as well, so we can get it to you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. FINNEGAN: Yeah, I will, I will submit that. I thought we did, but we'll certainly submit it immediately.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I think you might have, too, Marty. I just -- it's been a while, and I just -- if you could kind of --

MR. FINNEGAN: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- circulate that, it
would be good.

MR. CONNOLLY: Walter, this is Rob Connolly. Just that two housekeeping matters. Solely because it's located in the Historic District and it's a site plan application, you need to declare it as a Type I Action pursuant to SEQRA by resolution, okay? So you could make a motion to declare it a Type I Action pursuant to SEQRA. And then you're going to have to make another motion to declare the Planning Board's intent to be the Lead Agency.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. CONNOLLY: Okay?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Sure. Thanks, Rob. So, at this time, I propose that we declare this a Type I Action pursuant to SEQRA, and that we're -- Planning Board should be designated as the Lead Agency. May I have a second on that motion?

MEMBER HAMMES: Second.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor? Aye.

MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Those motions carry.
Does anybody else have --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Mr. Chair --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- have any questions?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: -- this is Paul.
Mr. Chair, this is Paul. The -- there were a
number of questions from the public. Do you want
to take those now?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I --

MR. CONNOLLY: This isn't a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah. I would have
thought that would be more -- these are --
they're automatically entered into the record by
virtue of being submitted, as I understand it,
correct? We don't need to read them out as part
of the record. So --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I believe -- I'm not
going to say that that's 100% true. I've not
used the -- not had people comment in prior
meetings, so I didn't have to read them. I
can't -- I will not say with 100% certainty.
But, again, you are correct, that there will be a
public hearing as a followup to this at some
point, at which time any concerns from the public
would be heard.
MEMBER HAMMES: Paul, are you talking about the comments that were submitted in writing prior to the meeting, or are you talking about the comments and questions that have been raised in the chat function?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: No, not -- the ones that have been raised in the chat function that have been coming.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. I -- let me -- I'll scroll through it, then. Let me just quickly. Hello. One thing --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: It begins with the comments timed stamped 4:36.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. "I heard about a buffer to the rear, but not about a buffer to the south, as per code, for this very busy driveway. I'd like that addressed." So could somebody respond to that?

MS. BERRY: Sure, I can do that. There is already a line of trees buffering the property to the south that's actually wider than your code, except right where there's the building. So we haven't changed that, it's the way it is now, because that's where the driveway entry is. So we didn't change that. So there's a buffer for
about half of it, but not the roadside half.

MR. FINNEGAN: The neighboring building essentially has a zero setback, so it is, you know, as it is now on the plan.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So the next comment is, "It does not show a buffer in front of the house, wall and windows, just the existing fence and plantings to the rear."

MR. SOKOL: Well, again, we have a -- you know, there's a minimal setback. There are -- there's some vegetation surrounding the building. We have it all around the perimeter of the property, a little bit in the front, but I don't know what buffer they would be referring to in the front, generally.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Well, this is a comment from Gwendolen Groocock, and I'll just -- she had a followup comment. "I would like that addressed," meaning the buffer comment. "Please, perhaps you can circle back at some point. It is a safety and privacy issue for my tenants." I forget which she's -- I think there's a four-tenant building just to the left. If you're looking at the church site on Main Street, it's the one to the left, I believe.
She goes on to say, "It is a safety and privacy issue for my tenants. Plus, for so many vehicles pulling in and out, I am concerned about someone striking the house. It's a wood frame historic house, as you all know, and a vehicle like a dump truck striking it could literally compromise the structural integrity. I do not have the code in front of me, but a buffer will be required."

So I don't know if anybody wants to comment on that at this moment, or shall I just go on to the other comments?

MR. FINNEGAN: Well, it is something that can be discussed. It's up to the Planning Board, and we'll take whatever feedback you offer and consider it, but, as of now, the plan as written, it isn't.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Marcia Kebbon asked, "What about garbage, heating oil, food deliveries?"

MR. FINNEGAN: Kathy, you said the garbage delivery was once a week?

MS. DEMEROTO: We get garbage pickup once a week. And then, as I discussed earlier, as I mentioned, in 2019, we had 15 Peapod deliveries for the year, and 18 Long Island Cares deliveries
for the year.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. What's the fuel source, is it oil for this structure, do we know?

MS. BERRY: Yes, there -- wait a minute.

They were oil tanks, right?

MR. ARIIZUMI: Yeah, oil tank in the basement.

MS. BERRY: Yes, there are oil tanks in the basement.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Another comment from Gwendolen Groocock. "I believe the impacts are considerably larger than being represented. We have seen the long food lines, and this sounds like a lot of trucks."

She has another comment that says, "This is about the site plan now, so they will save time if the buffer situation is addressed, addressed before formal submission."

MS. DEMEROTO: I just want to comment. Obviously, we're in an unusual time during this health and economic crisis, and we're seeing many people that we've never seen before because of unemployment. And so yes, our regular pantry numbers for the last month have increased, but I anticipate, as this resolves, that we'll go back,
and people are unemployed, we'll go back to our
normal numbers that we served in 2019.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Someone else asked, maybe Mr. Brennan or Ms. Brennan, "To the Board, please confirm, is the applicant submittal materials, do they represent the current proposal? Please clarify the date of the current site plan."

MS. BERRY: The date of our latest one was March 10th, 2020.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So that is your current application; is that correct?

MS. BERRY: Yeah. And, actually, if you look at the actual date with -- in the right corner, it's actually 3/11/2020.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MS. BERRY: But we'll take a look at that comment. So, you know, whether we have another version or not, we'll see what we can do to address any issues.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Marcia Kebbon wrote, "I am very concerned about the ability for large trucks to make the turn into and out of the driveway. I have seen trucks block both directions of traffic on Main Street coming out of the current
driveway. They are not able to turn around, so
we're often blindly backing into Main Street with
cars, vans and bicycles traveling around the
corner of Sterling and Main. Is a traffic safety
study being made?"

MR. FINNEGAN: Well, we have not done a
traffic study. It was not a requirement of the
submission of the site plan application. But,
you know, I think those are issues that can be
dealt with through the process, if need be. I'm
not -- I'm not sure that the level of traffic in
and out of this property that has been described
would warrant that.

MS. BERRY: I'd like to add a comment. In
one version we moved the shed, and if we had done
that, there could have been more room for
maneuvering at the intersection corner. So if
that is a priority at the expense of parking
places, and/or an option of relocating the shed,
we could look at that. So I guess it's a matter
of priorities for the Village. Is the number of
parking places or the ability of the truck to
turn onsite a priority?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Both. One -- another
comment was, I think there -- I think the
confusion is the drawing in the current
application. Drawing A-01 is dated January 21.
So I take it that the -- there's -- you have this
more recent updated drawing. I'm not sure
that -- that's not -- has that been shared with
the public? I mean, is that something that's
available for the public to see? Paul, I guess
that's a question of you.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yes. Mr. Chairman,
I just verified on the website. When we received
the plan, we did update on the agenda and on --
so on the -- on our Village website, under
Planning Board, the current plan dated 3/10 is,
in fact, available there.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Another comment,
Gwendolen Groocock, "I am adding for the record
that the downstairs rooms on that side of the
hour are children's bedrooms, and the house does
not have AC, so they need ventilation. They
can't keep their windows and curtains shut all
year long so people don't look or break in." I
guess it's more of a comment. I'm not sure how
you want to respond to that. Then --

MS. BERRY: She's talking about her house?

MEMBER HAMMES: Yes, she's talking about
the houses on the south --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- by -- that borders the driveway.

MS. BERRY: Okay. So if we were able to provide a buffer, then that would handle that, right?

MEMBER HAMMES: Correct. I think her position is that a buffer is required.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MS. BERRY: Okay.

MEMBER HAMMES: Under the code.

MS. BERRY: Right.

MEMBER HAMMES: I haven't checked it, but that seems to be the position.

MS. BERRY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: A question to the Board. "Do we have a Consulting Planner in this meeting?" Paul, I don't think we do, right?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: No, we do not. I'm just trying to check if we had sent this to our Planner. I'm just not sure. We certainly will get comments back to the Board well in advance of any hearing that may take place.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Another comment
from Marcia Kebbon. "I had a young woman land
her car in my driveway after hitting three trees,
a telephone pole and my hedge just shy of my
house. Gratefully, she was okay, but this is not
the first time this sort of accident has occurred
on this corner." I mean, this kind of reiterates
that there's definitely a concern about -- here
about the traffic issue, and we may -- we may, in
fact, as a Board want to recommend a traffic
study for this project.

MS. BERRY: Could I interject here, because
the use is relatively low. So could this be a
kind of start as an internal evaluation, like
observing how many people come in per day and
that type of thing, what percentage come by car
and the number of deliveries? Would that be a
good way to start?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Are you -- I'm not sure
what you're asking. Are you saying if and when
the application --

MS. BERRY: Because a traffic study,
basically, it's usually at intersections, and,
also, usually the usage is rather intense
compared to what's here. So what I'm suggesting
is maybe starting with an internal evaluation of
the traffic and the method of travel, the frequency, the timing of when things usually happen, so people get a real sense of the activity.

Because I'm sure the -- I spent 11 years working for the Department of Transportation and have done a lot of work with transportation studies, and I -- basically, there's not going to be enough usage to have an impact. But analyzing it and having the clear numbers for people, so that they understand what's going on. And, frankly, I think the issue of being able to turn around is probably more critical than the number in terms of traffic impact.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: That seems reasonable to me, if we can -- if we get enough -- like it goes back to the request for a written layout of what is being done there and the timing of everything. I think that's certainly -- that will help go a long way maybe to address that concern about traffic. So I'm -- I think I'm -- I'm fine with that. I don't know how the other Board members feel, but I think that's fine.

MEMBER HAMMES: I agree.

MEMBER KYRK: Yeah, I agree. The numbers
are lower than I would have expected them, 
frankly. I'd like to see them, and it would be 
useful to let everybody else that's commenting 
see them.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. We continue to get 
some other comments about that, about traffic, 
and I think it -- you know, we don't need to 
repeat them here.

One other person has asked, Mr. Brennan has 
asked about confirming that we received his 
letter. Just to answer you, Mr. Brennan, yes, we 
have. It's part of -- the letter that you 
submitted is just part of the public record. So, 
you know, we appreciate your writing it.

I just want to kind of -- at this point, I 
don't want this -- to turn this into a public 
hearing. It's not a public hearing, and I think 
if we keep going this route, it kind of has a 
risk of becoming that, and that's really not what 
we're here for today. So there'll be plenty of 
opportunity for the public to speak at the public 
hearing. So, at this point, I'm going to cut off 
any further reading of these comments. 

Does anybody else have anything else they 
want to add at this point?
MS. BERRY: I'm --
MR. FINNEGAN: I would just -- go ahead.
Go ahead, Glynis.
MS. BERRY: I would request that you
forward the comments to me, so that -- you know,
we're going to look at the site plan to see how
we can best address issues that are raised. So
if you could forward the comments to us, so that
we can --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So the comments I've been
reading are from the chat line on this particular
call. I -- Paul, I assume everybody has access
to this chat.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I don't --
MR. FINNEGAN: We don't. None of us do, so
if there's any ability to --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I don't know, I don't know
how to forward them, but somebody --
MEMBER HAMMES: I don't know. They may
disappear once the call is cut off.
MR. FINNEGAN: Okay.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I will --
MR. FINNEGAN: I think we have -- I think
we have an idea of what they -- what they are in
general. If there's -- I assume people
will follow up in writing, and at the appropriate time at a public hearing submit them.

But I think that it's worth mentioning a couple of things, that, you know, we did reach out and we have been sensitive to the concerns of neighbors, and anticipated some of them and are trying to address.

The CAST Board has spent two or three years now trying to find a suitable location for this operation, and this property seems to be perfect for what they do for the Village and the Town. So we're hoping that we can make this happen, and obviously, will do our best to mitigate any concerns that are raised. But with that, that kind of concludes our comments.

MEMBER HAMMES: Paul. Paul just to confirm, the letters that we've received have all been provided to the CAST group?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I don't -- I don't believe we've done that. We certainly can. A lot of them came in within the last day or two, but we can forward them out to the CAST representatives.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, that's a good idea.

MEMBER HAMMES: Also, just so you know, you
can -- you can highlight all the chat, Paul, I
don't know if you want to do this or not, and
copy it into a Word document.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yeah, I'm attempting
to do something like that as we speak.
MS. BERRY: And my other question is will
you be like moving on a denial so that we can go
to ZBA today?
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: The -- it really
depends on ultimately what this Board's decision
is now. If the Board wants to continue the
pre-submission, then no. But if the
pre-submission is considered concluded, then we
would -- and they -- and they refer it to ZBA, we
would then submit the Notice of Disapproval to
you as the applicant.
MS. BERRY: We'd appreciate it if you would
do that, that would be great.
MR. FINNEGAN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I --
MR. FINNEGAN: Well, I guess it's the
Board's --
MEMBER HAMMES: Is there any reason not to
close the pre-submission hearing at this point?
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I don't think so. I mean,
personally, I think that we -- there's been so much time lost with the shutdown, it's in everybody's interest to get this thing moving forward to the next step and procedurally, and if that's to refer it over to the Zoning Board at this time, I would be in favor that.

And the only thing that I'd want to see if we can do on the same track is to the extent that any changes that you guys have already acknowledged, like additional buffering, for example, would -- somehow could be incorporated pretty quickly, so that that can kind of be reviewed as we go along?

MS. BERRY: Yes. Yes, we'll definitely do that.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So, yeah, I mean, at this time, whatever I need to do formally to refer it over to the Zoning Board, I propose that that's what we do at this time. Do we have a second on that motion?


CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor? Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So moved.
MR. CONNOLLY: And, Paul, we just need to make sure the Suffolk County Planning Commission gets a copy of the application.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Paul's on mute.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Sorry. I will make sure that happens on Friday.

MR. CONNOLLY: Okay, great.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Very good. Well, thank you, everyone, for participating on this application today. At this time, I move on --

MS. BERRY: Thank you

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I move on to Item No. 5, a motion to adjourn. May I have a second?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor? Aye.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

MEMBER KYRK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So moved. Thank you, everybody. Have a good day.

MS. DEMEROTO: Thank you.

MR. FINNEGAN: Bye-bye. Thank you.

(The meeting was concluded at 5:10 p.m.)
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEW YORK )
) SS:
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK )

I, LUCIA BRAATEN, a Court Reporter and Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do hereby certify:

THAT, the above and foregoing contains a true and correct transcription of the videoconference proceedings taken on May 20, 2020.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 7th day of June, 2020.

Lucia Braaten

Lucia Braaten

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service
(631) 727-1107
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Dimensions: 612.0x792.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>timed</strong> [1] - 29:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>timing</strong> [2] - 38:2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>today</strong> [4] - 2:8, 39:20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:8, 44:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>toilet</strong> [1] - 5:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>topics</strong> [1] - 20:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town</strong> [3] - 10:24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:11, 41:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>town</strong> [1] - 22:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>toy</strong> [1] - 21:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>track</strong> [1] - 43:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>traffic</strong> [11] - 33:24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:4, 34:7, 34:11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:8, 37:9, 37:21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:1, 38:14, 38:21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>transcription</strong> [1] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong> [1] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>transportation</strong> [2] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:8, 38:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>trash</strong> [1] - 23:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>travel</strong> [1] - 38:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>traveling</strong> [1] - 34:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>trees</strong> [2] - 29:20, 37:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tried</strong> [1] - 16:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trinity</strong> [1] - 20:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>trucks</strong> [4] - 23:1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:14, 33:22, 33:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>true</strong> [3] - 28:18, 45:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>trying</strong> [4] - 16:5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:21, 41:7, 41:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong> [1] - 18:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>turn</strong> [7] - 12:16, 14:3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:23, 34:1, 34:23,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:12, 39:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tutoring</strong> [2] - 21:10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>twice</strong> [2] - 20:19,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>two</strong> [10] - 5:13, 16:13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:4, 20:14, 21:25,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:3, 22:4, 27:3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:8, 41:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two</strong> [1] - 11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>two-day</strong> [1] - 21:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-Family</strong> [1] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>type</strong> [1] - 37:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong> [3] - 27:6, 27:8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>types</strong> [1] - 18:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>typically</strong> [1] - 8:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ultimate</strong> [1] - 8:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ultimately</strong> [1] - 42:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>under</strong> [4] - 7:24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:12, 35:12, 36:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>understood</strong> [1] - 9:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unemployed</strong> [1] - 33:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unemployment</strong> [1] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unusual</strong> [1] - 32:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>up</strong> [5] - 5:16, 9:14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:13, 31:14, 41:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>update</strong> [1] - 35:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>updated</strong> [1] - 35:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>useful</strong> [2] - 16:21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>uses</strong> [1] - 25:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>van</strong> [8] - 22:13, 22:14,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:15, 23:14, 24:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vans</strong> [1] - 34:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>variance</strong> [1] - 11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>various</strong> [1] - 20:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vegetation</strong> [1] - 30:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vehicle</strong> [2] - 23:12,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vehicles</strong> [1] - 31:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ventilation</strong> [1] - 35:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>verified</strong> [1] - 35:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>version</strong> [2] - 33:19,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Via</strong> [1] - 1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>video</strong> [1] - 7:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video</strong> [1] - 1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>videoconference</strong> [1] -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>view</strong> [1] - 9:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>views</strong> [1] - 16:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VILLAGE</strong> [2] - 1:1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village</strong> [12] - 2:2, 2:13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17, 8:1, 12:10, 12:11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:4, 18:5, 24:18, 34:21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:12,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**41:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>virtue</strong> [1] - 28:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vision</strong> [2] - 6:20, 7:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>visual</strong> [1] - 16:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>volunteer</strong> [1] - 20:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vote</strong> [1] - 2:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>written</strong> [4] - 26:12,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:15, 31:16, 38:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wrote</strong> [1] - 33:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>year</strong> [12] - 6:21, 18:22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:16, 21:16, 21:19,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:22, 22:24, 23:1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:5, 31:25, 32:1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>years</strong> [3] - 18:5, 38:5, 41:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>York</strong> [1] - 45:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YORK</strong> [2] - 1:2, 45:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>young</strong> [1] - 37:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZBA</strong> [3] - 25:6, 42:8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zero</strong> [1] - 30:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zion</strong> [1] - 22:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zone</strong> [3] - 7:1, 16:11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service

(631) 727-1107
observer1 (to Everyone): 4:06 PM: Hello
observer1 (to Everyone): 4:07 PM: One thing you could try is low definition camera so less bandwidth
observer1 (to Everyone): 4:23 PM: Can I ask what building this is? Google Earth shows "Front Street Station".
observer1 (to Everyone): 4:24 PM: Is it possible for someone to hold the site plan up to a camera for a few seconds?
Pamela Hammes (to Everyone): 4:25 PM: It is the building that used to be an antique store
observer1 (to Everyone): 4:25 PM: Ty
Gwendolen Grocock (to Everyone): 4:36 PM: I heard about a buffer to the rear but not about a buffer to the south as per code for this very busy driveway. I'd like that addressed.
Pamela Hammes (to Everyone): 4:36 PM: I believe the drawings show a buffer on the south side
Gwendolen Grocock (to Everyone): 4:38 PM: It does not show a buffer in front of the house wall and windows. Just the existing fence and plantings to the rear.
Gwendolen Grocock (to Everyone): 4:45 PM: I would like that addressed, please. Perhaps you can circle back at some point. It is a safety and privacy issue for my tenants. Plus with so many vehicles pulling in and out, I am concerned about someone striking the house. It's a wood frame historic house as you all know, and a vehicle like a dump truck striking it could literally compromise the structural integrity. I do not have the code in front of me, but a buffer will be required.
Marcia Kebbon (to Everyone): 4:45 PM: What about garbage, heating oil, food deliveries?
Gwendolen Grocock (to Everyone): 4:46 PM: I believe the impacts are considerably larger than being represented. We have seen the long food lines. And this sounds like a lot of trucks.
Gwendolen Grocock (to Everyone): 4:51 PM: This is about the site plan now so they will save time if the buffer situation is addressed before formal submission
Gwendolen Grocock (to Everyone): 4:52 PM:
Exactly. It needs to be changed.

Gwendolen Groocock (to Everyone): 4:53 PM: 615 main

brenn (to Everyone): 4:54 PM: Board - Please confirm is applicant's submittal materials represent the 'current' proposal.
brenn (to Everyone): 4:56 PM: Applicant - please clarify the date of the current site plan.
Marcia Kebbon (to Everyone): 4:57 PM: I am very concerned about the ability for large trucks to make the turn into and out of the driveway. I have seen trucks block both directions of traffic on Main Street coming out of the current driveway. They are not able to turn around so are often blindly backing into Main Street Street with cars, vans and bicycles traveling around the corner of Stirling/Main. Is a traffic safety study being made?
brenn (to Everyone): 4:58 PM: Drawing A-01 is dated 1/21/2020. A

Gwendolen Groocock (to Everyone): 4:58 PM: I am adding for the record that the downstairs rooms on that side of the house are children's bedrooms, and the house does not have ac so they need ventilation. They cant keep their windows and curtains shut all year long. So people don't look or break in.
brenn (to Everyone): 4:59 PM: Board- Do you have a consulting Planner in this meeting?
Marcia Kebbon (to Everyone): 4:59 PM: I had a young woman land her car in my driveway after knocking out 3 trees, a telephone pole and my hedge just shy of my house. Gratefully she was ok, but this is not the first time this sort of accident has occurred on this corner.
Gwendolen Groocock (to Everyone): 5:01 PM: 615 mainstreet

Gwendolen Groocock (to Everyone): 5:01 PM: Required by code with a setback.
Gwendolen Groocock (to Everyone): 5:02 PM: Light, ventilation, vehicle safety and privacy are my concerns.
Marcia Kebbon (to Everyone): 5:03 PM: It's more a study of the current traffic on Main Street during business hours and expected hours of operations.
brenn (to Everyone): 5:03 PM: Board - I summarized my concerns about this proposal in a letter dated May 18, 2020.
brenn (to Everyone): 5:04 PM: Board- Please confirm that you have received my letter.
February 4, 2020

Dear Mr. Pallas,

I understand that the Village of Greenport Planning Board will be holding a work session on February 6th, 2020 at 4:00PM. I have specific concerns about Item No. 8 – 621 Main Street SCTM# 1001-2.6-49.4. Unfortunately, I will be traveling on the 6th and will not able to attend the meeting. While I expect the Board will schedule a public hearing on the matter, please consider the following in the interim;

- Based on my understanding of the proposal, I believe the proposed activity is a substantially intensive use that is incompatible with the R-2 District in general, and the historic residential neighborhood bounded by Broad, Main, North, and First Streets, specifically.

- The Planning Board agenda describes a conversion of a “former church” to the applicant’s headquarters. However, this is inaccurate in that the proposed conversion is actually from a “one-family dwelling” to an eleemosynary or philanthropic use.

- The Planning Board agenda incorrectly indicates that a “Use Variance” is required, where “Conditional Use” approval is required. “Conditional Use” is subject to both Planning approval and compliance with Zoning Chapters 150-7, 150-8, 150-29, and 150-30. Because the subject property does not comply with the code, with respect to minimum lot size and setback requirements, Zoning Board of Appeals variances will also be required. Furthermore, I understand that Chapter 150-29 requires the Planning Board to hold a public hearing on the matter.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my concerns.

Best regards,

Patrick Brennan
May 13th, 2020

Ms. Sylvia Pirillo, RMC
The Village of Greenport

Ms. Pirillo,

This letter is in reference to the meeting and application being presented by Mr. James Olinkiewicz regarding his home at 621 Main Street, Greenport, NY on May 14th, 2020.

I would like to petition the Planning Board and the Zoning Board on behalf of the neighbors to please consider and respond to our safety, traffic and environmental concerns regarding the appropriateness of this location for a (or any) proposed intensive, high-traffic use within our historic and residential neighborhood.

Please refer to the attached Concerned Neighbors Petition that is currently in circulation. We have 22 signatures and a diagram of the surrounding neighbors on Main Street, Sterling Street, Broad Street, 1st Street and North Street, who have currently either signed their names or have formally given permission to represent their concerns listed in the document.

The above, would allow what is currently a single family residence to be used as an intensive use proposal akin to a highly active commercial operation. This could potentially challenge both Area and Use variances.

Please note that Mr. Olinkiewicz was given approval just over two years ago by the Planning Board to divide the property purely for financial advantage and was given the right to do so as long as he maintained the property as a single family residence. To now reconsider this standing would undermine the determination of the board’s prior rulings.

We look forward to an open discussion and due process in this matter.

Sincerely,

Marcia Kebbon
636 Main Street
Greenport, NY 11944

cc.
Mayor George Hubbard, Jr.
Paul J. Pallas, P.E.
Walter Foote
John Cotugno
Lily Dougherty-Johnson
Patricia Hames
Reed Kirk
John Saladino
David Corwin
Dimi Gordon
Jack Reardon
Arthur Tasker
All properties represented in purple have currently signed the petition.
CONCERNED NEIGHBOR PETITION
RE: 621 MAIN STREET (known as the FORMER Methodist Church)
HISTORIC DISTRICT, GREENPORT, NY
February 25th, 2020
ATTN: GREENPORT VILLAGE TRUSTEES, MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING BOARD, ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS AND
HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

We, the neighbors of 621 Main Street (a single family residence) in the Historic District of Greenport Village, petition the above to consider and respond to our safety, traffic and environmental concerns regarding the appropriateness of this location for a proposed intensive, high-traffic use within our historic and residential neighborhood.

This location is on the west side of a street with heavy traffic, and limited sight lines around a bend immediately to the north. It is a known accident "black spot" and speeding is common. The proposed use will involve pedestrians frequently crossing the street, either arriving/leaving on foot from the east sidewalk, or by parking vehicles on the east side of the street and crossing. These pedestrians, including children and the elderly, will likely be dropping off and picking up items, will be carrying large bags of supplies, and attending proposed community programs. There are a number of environmental impact concerns listed below.

1. Traffic and safety: Regular, south bound traffic traveling around the already dangerous bend of Main Street/Stirling/Broad Streets between 25-49 MPH shown on police traffic studies as well as three notable car crashes within 150 yards of the site.
2. Lack of ample parking in the rear of property and no dedicated street parking. Residents who regularly use the East side on-street parking in front of their nearby homes will be negatively impacted on Main/Broad, North and Stirling Streets.
3. No shoulders for passing vehicles or delivery trucks on either side. Trucks such as UPS, Fedex, Heating oil, postal delivery trucks, which do not customarily enter parking lots, will pull over onto the east and make package deliveries on foot, or illegally park on the west side.
4. The use will involve large delivery and garbage trucks turning in and out, likely at a 45 degree angle and likely in reverse, to access proposed loading area without a safe sightline.
5. As a church, there was NO vehicle access from the Main Road. Once converted to a single-family residence, a driveway onto Main Road was apparently allowed. Now, in converting to an intensive use, that residential driveway is proposed to be the sole access to the parking lot. It has never been subjected to code requirements for such use.
6. Environmental impacts: A. Idling trucks in historic, residential zone as well as directly next to bedroom windows of southern adjacent property. B. Garbage waste with larger amounts of use will be an environmental impact concern. C. The proposed parking lot will cause increased stormwater runoff further impacting adjacent properties already effected by this issue. D. Lack of property line buffering by a "substantial" fence/hedge as required by code.
7. We understand the proposed plan to be in violation of current and historic zoning in an R2 district in regards to Village Code 150-7 R1, B (150-29, 150-30; 1, 2, 3) in that the lot is 1/4 the required 1 acre requirement.
8. This proposed use would be a challenge to the agreement under Declarations of Covenants and Restrictions agreed to by The Planning Board and the developers who subdivided the property in November of 2017, and changed the use to make it a single family residence.
9. Within the code regarding Non-conforming uses (150-20) it states that after 1 year has passed unused the non-conforming use is not allowed to re-establish.
10. This change of status and use seems to necessitate consideration for not only an area variance but also a use variance.

In short, this is an intensive use akin to a commercial operation in the historic, residential district, at a location already known to be a traffic accident "black spot".

We look forward to an open discussion and due process in this matter, and request an independent traffic and parking study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email/Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 18, 2020

Dear Mr. Foote,

I understand that the Village of Greenport Planning Board will be holding a work session on May 20th, 2020 at 4:00PM. I have concerns about Item No. 4 – 621 Main Street SCTM# 1001-2-6-49.4. Based on my understanding of the proposal, I believe the proposed activity is a substantially intensive use that is incompatible with the R-2 District in general, and the historic residential neighborhood bounded by Broad, Main, North, and First Streets, specifically.

In conducting the Pre-submission Conference, please consider the following;

AGENDA
The Planning Board agenda describes a conversion of a “former church” to the applicant’s headquarters. However, this is inaccurate in that the proposed conversion is actually from a “one-family dwelling” to an eleemosynary or philanthropic use.

The church stopped being a church when it stopped being used as a church. It is now a One-Family residence. The 2017 Planning Board minutes record property Owner’s assertion and Inspector Wingate’s determination of same, and confirm the building’s status as a residential structure.

APPROVAL PROCESS
I understand that “Conditional Use” approval is required for this project. “Conditional Use” is subject to both Planning approval and compliance with Zoning Chapters 150-7, 150-8, 150-29, and 150-30. Because the subject property does not comply with the code, with respect to minimum lot size and setback requirements, Zoning Board of Appeals variances will also be required. Furthermore, I understand that Chapter 150-29 requires the Planning Board to hold a public hearing on the matter.
COVENANTS & RESTRICTIONS
The subject property was created through subdivision in 2017, and was approved with Covenants & Restrictions (C&R) placed on all three residential lots (621 Main Street, 620 First Street, and 624 First Street). Although in an R-2 district (Two-Family zone), residences on lots created by this subdivision were restricted to One-Family residences.

The C&R is attached to the deed and runs with each property. The C&R document specifically limits the subject property to a One-Family residence, thereby prohibiting all other customary uses.

IMPACTS
The proposal will necessarily have numerous negative impacts, including: safety, quality of life, and environmental challenges. Insufficient lot size, poor access, and substandard set-backs will prevent successful impact mitigation efforts.

PRECEDENT SETTING
Approval of this project will negatively impact the ‘R’ districts, effectively weakening the protections afforded to our neighborhoods, while simultaneously devaluing the downtown CR District.

Non-Profit businesses are still businesses and as such engage in commercial activity, as defined by our code. The CR district is the most appropriate location for commercial activities.

Allowing commercial activities to migrate into the residential neighborhoods establishes a bad precedent.

CONCLUSION
CAST provides vital services for the entire North Fork community. And this has never been more evident than shown by the current public health crisis.

I would like to see CAST succeed and continue to realize its mission. But 621 Main Street is not the appropriate site for such a purpose. Applicant needs to be in a location where their activities are consistent and compatible with surrounding properties, unfettered by the constraints of operating in a residential neighborhood.

I hope the Board, in its deliberations, will carefully balance the appropriateness of the Applicant’s request against the impact on our Village’s neighborhoods and zoning districts. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Brennan

Cc. P. Pallas
This email is in response to Item #4 on the agenda of the upcoming Planning Board meeting which involves the site plan review application of CAST. This involves the conversion of the former Methodist church at 621 Main Street to CAST headquarters.

We have serious concerns and objections to this proposed sale to a commercial operation. The building in question is an owner-occupied single family residence in an R-2 district located in the historic district. Its conversion to a private residence negates its non-profit status. Its use as CAST's headquarters will have a negative effect on this quiet residential neighborhood.

We are concerned about the constant flow of pedestrian and vehicular traffic that will occur here as we see at CAST's current location. The five off street parking spaces currently on the site are not enough for CAST and clients. Delivery and garbage trucks have no parking and will have to park on the street impeding the flow of traffic on Main Street and hinder neighboring cars from entering and exiting their driveways.

As summer approaches Main Street sees an increased volume of pedestrians and vehicles which will add to the congestion in the area. The Board need to consider these facts in their discussion.

As homeowners we are concerned about our home's security and our own safety. we are also concerned about how our property and resale values will change as a result of having a commercial facility next door.

In summary, we oppose the sale of the former church to CAST or any other commercial operation.

Anthony and Margaret McDonald
629 Main Street
May 18, 2020

Village of Greenport Planning Board
236 3rd Street
Greenport, NY 11944

To be submitted for the pre-submission conference, and read into the record at the Planning Board meeting, May 20th, 2020. Item No 4.

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

This letter is in reference to the site plan application presented by Martin Finnegan, Esq., on behalf of Community Action Southold Town, with the permission of property owner James Olinkiewicz, regarding his owner occupied, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE at 621 Main Street, Greenport, NY for pre-submission meeting on May 20th, 2020.

Please note, the subject property is incorrectly referenced in both the application by Martin Finnegan, Esq. and on the Planning Board agenda, as “the former Methodist Church.” Being referenced in this way incorrectly portrays and misrepresents the legal designation as a single family residence in the R2 district and should furthermore, more correctly, be referred to as 621 Main Street.

In the fall of 2018, at the request of the current owner, Mr. Olinkiewicz, the Planning Board voted to allow the subdivision of the property under the explicit conditions that it remain a single family residence. The property was then subdivided into 3 lots and the church deconsecrated in order to enable the owner to sell each parcel individually for maximum personal profit. To be clear, it is no longer the same property it was prior to the subdivision and sale of the parking lot.

To the points above, the question I pose is this - is the Planning Board interested in overturning your own ruling from just over 2 years ago for Mr. Olinkiewicz’s financial benefit for the second time?

Separately, I am unclear why the agenda states “This property also requires an area variance and HPC approval,” leaving out the possibility that it could potentially require a Use variance, which would be a determination made independently by the ZBA.

In short, the submission is for proposed intensive use akin to a highly active commercial operation in the historic, residential district, at a location already known to be a highly dangerous intersection with drivers regularly reaching speeds of 40-50 mph. This location is currently, and will continue to be, one of the highest traffic intersections in the Village and will be an extremely dangerous area of road for pedestrians walking with children and strollers, cars and truck traffic coming in and out or idling in front of the property because of the inability to make the turn into the proposed lot. CAST is currently, and will continue to be, arguably the most active venture in the village. This property is now under a half acre with planning for only 11 parking spots. CAST currently has parking for 9+ vehicles.

Please understand that I have personally supported CAST, met with Cathy Demerato and believe her to be a valiant and honorable steward. I believe that it is a valuable organization providing much needed services to our community. At the same time, I am very concerned that the proposed location is not the appropriate one for any operation of this magnitude. I understand they have had challenges finding an appropriate and affordable spot and are highly motivated to do so thanks to a grant with time limits ticking. This being said, it doesn’t mean that this location is in the best interest of the neighborhood, the village or even, in the long term, the organization.

I believe, with involvement of the larger community, the village and perhaps other agencies, we could find far more appropriate and accessible location (or multiple locations) serving the diverse communities throughout the Town of Southold without such a large financial commitment for the physical space, substantial property maintenance on a yearly basis and general property upkeep to which I have concerns based on the state of their current premises…and all with limited options for future physical growth.
On a separate note, I understand that Lily Dougherty-Johnson is no longer working for CAST as of the end of April (less than a month ago) to pursue exciting new adventures. I believe that it is reasonable to presume that her previous employment and affiliation continues to put her in a sympathetic position towards CAST and Mr. Olinkiewicz and should therefore continue to be recused from voting on this agenda item moving forward.

See separate petition below with a request for a traffic and parking study to be made.

Sincerely,

Marcia Kebbon
636 Main Street
Greenport, NY 11944

C.c. Mayor George Hubbard, Jr.
Greenport Village Board of Trustees
Zoning Board of Appeals
Historic Preservation Commission
05/20/2020

RE: 621 Main Street, Item #4 on the agenda

Submitted by Marcia Kebbon, 636 Main Street, Greenport, NY

CONCERNED NEIGHBORS PETITION AND MAP FOR PRE-SUBMISSION MEETING:

Attached is a Concerned Neighbors Petition, plus a diagram of the immediate surrounding neighbors who are on this petition, to illustrate the high level of concern surrounding the property at 621 Main Street. This petition is still in circulation and continues to gain signatures.

We petition the Board of Trustees, the Historic Planning Commission, the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals to consider and respond to our safety, privacy, traffic and environmental concerns regarding the inappropriateness of this residence for an intensive, public, high-traffic use within our valuable historic and residential neighborhood.

We look forward to a transparent, open discussion and due process in this matter.

Sincerely, Concerned Neighbors of the Historic Village of Greenport
CONCERNED NEIGHBOR PETITION
RE: 621 MAIN ST
HISTORIC DISTRICT, GREENPORT, NY
February 25th, 2020
ATTN: GREENPORT VILLAGE TRUSTEES, MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING BOARD, ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

We, the neighbors of 621 Main Street (a single family residence) in the Historic District of Greenport Village, petition the above to consider and respond to our safety, traffic and environmental concerns regarding the appropriateness of this location for a proposed intensive, high-traffic use within our historic and residential neighborhood.

This location is on the west side of a street with heavy traffic, and limited sight lines around a bend immediately to the north. It is a known accident "black spot" and speeding is common. The proposed use will involve pedestrians frequently crossing the street, either arriving/leaving on foot from the east sidewalk, or by parking vehicles on the east side of the street and crossing. These pedestrians, including children and the elderly, will likely be dropping off and picking up items, will be carrying large bags of supplies, and attending proposed community programs. There are a number of environmental impact concerns listed below.

1. Traffic and safety: Regular, south bound traffic traveling around the already dangerous bend of Main Street/Stirling/Broad Streets between 25-49 MPH shown on police traffic studies as well as three notable car crashes within 150 yards of the site.
2. Lack of ample parking in the rear of property and no dedicated street parking. Residents who regularly use the East side on-street parking in front of their nearby homes will be negatively impacted on Main/Broad, North and Stirling Streets.
3. No shoulders for passing vehicles or delivery trucks on either side. Trucks such as UPS, FedEx, Heating oil, postal delivery trucks, which do not customarily enter parking lots, will pull over onto the east and make package deliveries on foot, or illegally park on the west side.
4. The use will involve large delivery and garbage trucks turning in and out, likely at a 45 degree angle and likely in reverse, to access proposed loading area without a safe sightline.
5. As a church, there was no adequate vehicle access from the Main Road as it was not to code. Once converted to a single-family residence in 2017, a driveway onto Main Road was apparently allowed. Now, in converting to an intensive use, that residential driveway is proposed to be the sole access to the parking lot. It has never been subjected to code requirements for such use.
6. Environmental impacts: A. Idling trucks in historic, residential zone as well as directly next to bedroom windows of southern adjacent property. B. Garbage waste with larger amounts of use will be an environmental impact concern. C. The proposed parking lot will cause increased stormwater runoff further impacting adjacent properties already effected by this issue. D. Lack of property line buffering by a "substantial" fence/hedge as required by code.
7. We understand the proposed plan to be in violation of current and historic zoning in an R2 district in regards to Village Code 150-7 R1, B (150-29, 150-30; 1, 2, 3) in that the lot is 1/4 the required 1 acre requirement.
8. This proposed use would be a challenge to the agreement under Declarations of Covenants and Restrictions agreed to by The Planning Board and the developers who subdivided the property in November of 2017, and changed the use to make it a single family residence.
9. Within the code regarding Non-conforming uses (150-20) it states that after 1 year has passed unused the non-conforming use is not allowed to re-establish.
10. This change of status and use seems to necessitate consideration for not only an area variance but also a use variance.

In short, this is an intensive use akin to a commercial operation in the historic, residential district, at a location already known to be a traffic accident "black spot".

We look forward to an open discussion and due process in this matter, and request an independent traffic and parking study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email/Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Kobben</td>
<td>Marcia Kobben</td>
<td>636 claren st</td>
<td>917 742 4002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Grocock</td>
<td>Glen Grocock</td>
<td>615 main st</td>
<td>631 819 5937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret McDonald</td>
<td>Margaret McDonald</td>
<td>629 main st</td>
<td>631 377 3040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony McDonald</td>
<td>Anthony McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Barbara Ebeling</td>
<td>611 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jebeling@optimum.net">jebeling@optimum.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karolina Peterson</td>
<td>181 Sterling St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nina.karolinap@gmail.com">nina.karolinap@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Catalano</td>
<td>181 Sterling St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vincentcatalano@gmail.com">vincentcatalano@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lamotte</td>
<td>654 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tlamotte@gmail.com">tlamotte@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Lamotte</td>
<td>654 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeanette.lamotte@gmail.com">jeanette.lamotte@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Pollack</td>
<td>620 1st St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kpollack@gmail.com">kpollack@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Neary</td>
<td>111 Broad St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cneary@optimum.net">cneary@optimum.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolene Weber</td>
<td>604 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jweber@optimum.net">jweber@optimum.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Lakeas</td>
<td>610 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gleake@optimum.net">gleake@optimum.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaragdi Naqda Lakeas</td>
<td>546 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smaragdi.naqda@gmail.com">smaragdi.naqda@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Loeb (header)</td>
<td>610 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kloeb@optimum.net">kloeb@optimum.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Evans</td>
<td>629 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lawrence.evans@gmail.com">lawrence.evans@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Brennan</td>
<td>670 First St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cynthia.brennan@gmail.com">cynthia.brennan@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Lederer</td>
<td>115 Broad St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clederer125@yahoo.com">clederer125@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Marris</td>
<td>124 Broad St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:neilmarris@yahoo.com">neilmarris@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Saetle</td>
<td>616 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.saatle@yahoo.com">mary.saatle@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Grossman</td>
<td>630 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sharyngrossman@aol.com">sharyngrossman@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa Elmfors</td>
<td>541 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaselmforse@me.com">aaselmforse@me.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Gareido</td>
<td>615 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:igareido@hotmail.com">igareido@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Gareido</td>
<td>615 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agarei@optimum.net">agarei@optimum.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa Elmfors</td>
<td>604 Main St.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaselmforse@me.com">aaselmforse@me.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John & Barbara Ebeling  
611 Main Street  
jebeling@optimum.net
Dear Mr. Aurichio,

Please let me introduce myself. My name is John Ebeling. My wife, Barbara, and I are members of Stirling Rentals LLC, the owner of the premises at 611 Main Street, Greenport. We have been managing the four rental units at 611 Main for over 25 years, and we have continually maintained, repaired, and improved the premises as finances and time permit. A sorely needed paint job will finally be underway during the summer.

I recently became aware of the proposal to convert the single-family residence at 621 Main Street into the headquarters of Community Action Southold Town (CAST). It is this proposal that prompts me to write to you. Throughout my life I have always been a laissez-faire kind of guy. My philosophy is pretty much “live and let live.” I do not believe in interfering in the lives or affairs of others and, conversely, I appreciate others not imposing their will upon me. But today I must voice my opinion regarding 621 Main Street.

I am confident that there will be attendees at today’s meeting who will be in opposition to the CAST proposal, presenting cogent arguments as to why such a conversion should not take place. I will attempt to keep my “two cents” brief. 621 Main Street is a one-family residence in a residential neighborhood that lies within the historic district of Greenport Village. This is not the proper place to introduce a commercial enterprise. It is a residential neighborhood, and the residents of the area enjoy it as such. A commercial operation will bring noise, vehicular traffic, pedestrian traffic, litter, parking problems, etc., etc. that will serve to disrupt a tranquil neighborhood. While CAST is to be applauded for the admirable work that it does, placing its headquarters in the heart of an historic residential neighborhood is just plain wrong. We should not permit a commercial operation to exist within this residential area.

Thank you for your consideration.

John P. Ebeling
May 18, 2020

Dear Mr. Foote,

I understand that the Village of Greenport Planning Board will be holding a work session on May 20th, 2020 at 4:00PM. I have concerns about Item No. 4 – 621 Main Street SCTM# 1001-2.6.49.4. Based on my understanding of the proposal, I believe the proposed activity is a substantially intensive use that is incompatible with the R-2 District in general, and the historic residential neighborhood bounded by Broad, Main, North, and First Streets, specifically.

In conducting the Pre-submission Conference, please consider the following;

AGENDA
The Planning Board agenda describes a conversion of a “former church” to the applicant’s headquarters. However, this is inaccurate in that the proposed conversion is actually from a “one-family dwelling” to an eleemosynary or philanthropic use.

The church stopped being a church when it stopped being used as a church. It is now a One-Family residence. The 2017 Planning Board minutes record property Owner’s assertion and Inspector Wingate’s determination of same, and confirm the building’s status as a residential structure.

APPROVAL PROCESS
I understand that “Conditional Use” approval is required for this project. “Conditional Use” is subject to both Planning approval and compliance with Zoning Chapters 150-7, 150-8, 150-29, and 150-30. Because the subject property does not comply with the code, with respect to minimum lot size and setback requirements, Zoning Board of Appeals variances will also be required. Furthermore, I understand that Chapter 150-29 requires the Planning Board to hold a public hearing on the matter.
COVENANTS & RESTRICTIONS
The subject property was created through subdivision in 2017, and was approved with Covenants & Restrictions (C&R) placed on all three residential lots (621 Main Street, 620 First Street, and 624 First Street). Although in an R-2 district (Two-Family zone), residences on lots created by this subdivision were restricted to One-Family residences.

The C&R is attached to the deed and runs with each property. The C&R document specifically limits the subject property to a One-Family residence, thereby prohibiting all other customary uses.

IMPACTS
The proposal will necessarily have numerous negative impacts, including; safety, quality of life, and environmental challenges. Insufficient lot size, poor access, and substandard set-backs will prevent successful impact mitigation efforts.

PRECEDENT SETTING
Approval of this project will negatively impact the ‘R’ districts, effectively weakening the protections afforded to our neighborhoods, while simultaneously devaluing the downtown CR District.

Non-Profit businesses are still businesses and as such engage in commercial activity, as defined by our code. The CR district is the most appropriate location for commercial activities.

Allowing commercial activities to migrate into the residential neighborhoods establishes a bad precedent.

CONCLUSION
CAST provides vital services for the entire North Fork community. And this has never been more evident than shown by the current public health crisis.

I would like to see CAST succeed and continue to realize its mission. But 621 Main Street is not the appropriate site for such a purpose. Applicant needs to be in a location where their activities are consistent and compatible with surrounding properties, unfettered by the constraints of operating in a residential neighborhood.

I hope the Board, in its deliberations, will carefully balance the appropriateness of the Applicant’s request against the impact on our Village’s neighborhoods and zoning districts. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Brennan

Cc. P. Pallas