VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK STATE OF NEW YORK

PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR SESSION/WORK SESSION

Third Street Fire Station
Greenport, New York

September 5, 2019
4:00 p.m.

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

ROBERT CONNOLLY - PLANNING BOARD ATTORNEY
PAUL PALLAS - VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR
(The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Good afternoon. This is the Village of Greenport Planning Board meeting. It's a work and regular session on September 5th, 2019. It's approximately 4 p.m. We'll start off with the work session.

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

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor of the minutes?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Aye.

Motion carries. The minutes are approved and adopted.

Items No. 2 is a motion to schedule the Planning Board regular session, as well as a motion to schedule the Planning Board work session, both at 4 p.m. on October the 3rd, 2019. We'd like to combine them and have it for a single session.

MEMBER HAMMES: I won't be able to make
that meeting, just so you know.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. I think we'll still have -- everybody else is going to be available that day?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Yeah.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: October 3rd, yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So we should still have a quorum. So we're going to -- the proposal, then, is to schedule both of those meetings on the date of October the 3rd at 4 p.m. Do I have a second for that motion?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Aye.

The motion carries.

The next item is concerning 27 Front Street. Actually, this is to accept the findings and determinations, but we're going to postpone this until the next meeting. And that -- this has to do with the application, the approval of the application of the Frisky Oyster at 27 Front
And, also, the application of 110 South Street in Greenport, we're going to postpone that until our next meeting on October the 3rd. Do I need a second and approval on that, or just move on? We're just going to reschedule it.

The next item is concerning 112 South Street. The same thing, motion to accept the findings. That's something that we're going to move as well, right?

MR. CONNOLLY: Yeah, that also.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So that's going to -- the application of 622 Front Street is going to be moved to the next meeting as well.

So the next item is 300 -- concerns 300 Main Street. It's a pre-submission conference regarding a site plan approval for Stirling Square LLC, represented by Architect Robert I. Brown. The applicant is proposing interior and exterior renovations to accommodate the conversion of the first floor from retail to assembly, and the second and third floors from residential apartments to commercial hotel units. The property is located in the Commercial Retail District. The property is also located in the
Historic District. This is at Suffolk County Tax Map #1001-4.-7-29.1. And good afternoon.


The only aspect of the project that is exterior and is being submitted to the Historic Preservation Commission is on the north side of what's now the Doofpot, to build a glass folding wall, similar to the one that is currently at the hotel lobby on the north side of the courtyard.

The object of this proposal is to turn the Doofpot into the hotel lobby, and opening up what is now the hotel lobby into a retail space farther down the road.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: The --

MEMBER HAMMES: The hotel lobby now is also a retail space, right?

MR. BROWN: It's a combination, yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: So is the intention that that -- because it looks like you're also requesting that the space that is being submitted be also retail and assembly, so --

MR. BROWN: Yeah. The idea is that everything that's in what is now the lobby on the north side, it used to be the yoga studio a while
back, all of that would move into what's now the
Doofpot.

MEMBER HAMMES: But that -- then that
particular area would remain, though, coded for
assembly and retail the way it is now?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER HAMMES: So there would be two areas
in that complex --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- that would be for
assembly and retail?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER HAMMES: Do we comments from the
Planner?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yeah. Kristina has
been out. I forgot to bring them, I apologize.
I will send them out first thing tomorrow
morning. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So where the -- I'm a
little confused myself. You made me more
confused. Where the current clothing retail
shop/hotel lobby --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- is on the north side --

MR. BROWN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- it's actually the northeast side, right, of the courtyard?

MR. BROWN: Yeah, it's the middle of the --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Where Alex's store is, right?

MEMBER HAMMES: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's his retail shop?

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. The proposal will have that become what?

MR. BROWN: That's undetermined at this point. My belief is that they would be looking to rent it out as retail space.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. But it's -- but it no longer will be -- it won't be continuing to serve as a hotel lobby?

MR. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: And the new hotel lobby is proposed to be where the Doofpot used to be?

MR. BROWN: Where the Doofpot it now, yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: And where will the entrance to that lobby -- will be in the
courtyard yard or on the street?

MR. BROWN: Both, both.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MEMBER HAMMES: Based on the plans, it looks like they'll keep existing entrance and make it handicapped accessible; is that correct?

MR. BROWN: Yes. Keep the front door on Main Street, and create a folding glass wall on the north side inside the courtyard.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: So the new glass wall is like across from the --

MR. BROWN: Across from the --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: -- the retail.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So it's not --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Current retail.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: There won't be a glass wall along Main Street?

MR. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: No.

MR. BROWN: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: The storefront remains exactly the same.

MEMBER HAMMES: I think it's going to go
right here.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah, facing the courtyard.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: And that's the only exterior --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Facing the courtyard.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- renovation?

MR. BROWN: That's the only exterior change. That and signage, which has yet to be determined. Though, actually, the signage will probably be exactly what's on the current lobby, will be moved to Main Street.

MEMBER HAMMES: And are the upstairs rooms currently apartments, or are they currently hotel rooms?

MR. BROWN: The second floor of that building in the front, the west side, is currently a two-room apartment.

MEMBER HAMMES: It's Airbnb though, I think, right?

MR. BROWN: That I couldn't -- in terms of operation, I couldn't tell you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Are we talking about the Doofpot --

MEMBER HAMMES: Yes.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- building?
MEMBER HAMMES: Yes.
MR. BROWN: Upstairs of the Doofpot.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.
MEMBER HAMMES: So the request is to convert that into a two-room hotel room?
MR. BROWN: Yeah, the idea is to convert that into two hotel rooms, and take over the attic as a third hotel room.
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: So it would just be three new rooms?
MR. BROWN: Three new rooms. Where there's one apartment, there would be three hotel rooms.
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Is there an idea about parking? Are there any parking requirements?
MEMBER HAMMES: Well, I think it's grandfathered.
MR. BROWN: No. That's something that was discussed going way back to the origin of the project. And because the property had been developed prior to the code, it's exempt from parking requirements.
MEMBER HAMMES: But the drawing that you submitted doesn't -- it shows -- okay, never
mind. I didn't see it. Paul, on the -- on the parking issue, is the whole complex treated as one building?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: It's a single parcel. The complex is a single parcel. The buildings are existing, were existing. So it would almost be irrelevant how we treated it, because even if I took individual buildings for requirements, they would have all existed anyway.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Has this application had a requirement to go before Zoning for anything?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: No, not for this application. It does have a requirement, I think, as the applicant noted, to go to HPC, Historic Preservation Commission, for their signoff.

MR. BROWN: We've already made that application.

MEMBER HAMMES: Has that been scheduled?

MR. BROWN: I would just like -- I'm sorry?

MEMBER HAMMES: Has the hearing been scheduled for that?

MR. BROWN: Yes, yes. I also just feel compelled to point out, I was notified this afternoon by Greg Morris that there's some
confusion about --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I wouldn't -- there was an issue with the address. It's really only a legal notice matter, it wouldn't concern -- it's only for the --

MR. BROWN: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: That's an administerial -- administrative issue, not --

MR. BROWN: That's fine with me.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Not a concern for this Board, it's fine.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So with these three additional hotel rooms, how many hotel units will there be in the entire complex; do you know?

MR. BROWN: I believe 12.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Twelve?

MR. BROWN: I believe it would go from 9 to 12. Well, 10 to 12, technically.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: There are 10 above the restaurant?

MEMBER HAMMES: No. The other building where Brix and Rye is has 12.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Oh, that's --

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's two different
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I did not know that.

MR. BROWN: The entire second floor --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. BROWN: -- of the complex is hotel rooms right now.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I thought those were apartments.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Ten to 12. You said there's three new units, so there would be 10 --

MR. BROWN: Yeah, but there is one apartment, so --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right, but I mean hotel units, so --

MR. BROWN: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MEMBER COTUGNO: So I have a couple of things. One is like more -- more or less housekeeping. It's a nice site plan, but I think everything should be labeled. I happen to be familiar with all the uses of the space, as I know this is a separate building and a separate application, but it is by the same owner.

MR. BROWN: Right.
MEMBER COTUGNO: So we should relate to everything else. And, for instance, I don't know what the "X" means above the subject building. Does an "X", does that mean landscaped area? There's an "X", but I don't know what that means.

MEMBER HAMMES: By the stone patio.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Right above the word "renovations", yeah, just to the right of proposed stone patio.

MEMBER DOHERTY: I was referring to the glass wall.

MEMBER HAMMES: I think that's the glass door.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: That door?

MEMBER HAMMES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: He's talking about that "X".

MEMBER HAMMES: It's the glass door.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Oh, the vestibule. It's a vestibule. The vestibule. Is that the vestibule?

MR. BROWN: No. That's actually a raised platform area. I'll --

MEMBER COTUGNO: How would I know that?

How would I know that?
MR. BROWN: Yeah. I will label everything.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Well, is it on the elevations?
MEMBER HAMMES: Are there any apartments?
I mean, are there any hotel rooms on the third floor --
MR. BROWN: No.
MEMBER HAMMES: -- in any of those buildings now?
MR. BROWN: No.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Why do we just have an elevation that looks like of Main Street? Shouldn't we be having an elevation from the courtyard?
MR. BROWN: That is First Street, I believe. I mean, that is --
MEMBER COTUGNO: The courtyard.
MR. BROWN: This is the courtyard.
MEMBER COTUGNO: The other elevations --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.
MR. BROWN: This is the side of the Doofpot. These are the new doors.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So this is Main Street here?
MR. BROWN: This is Main Street here, yes.
MEMBER COTUGNO: The other elevations aren't shown because there's no change, I assume.

MR. BROWN: That's correct.

MEMBER COTUGNO: So this is a total change of use for the entire three-story building from retail --

MR. BROWN: Well, it's going from retail to retail and assembly on the ground floor.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Right.

MR. BROWN: Upstairs, the --

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's an apartment.

MEMBER HAMMES: It's residential.

MR. BROWN: The rear -- yeah. But the rear of the building, the east side of the building is already hotel rooms.

MEMBER HAMMES: Right. But that particular space that you're asking is currently zoned residential, right?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER HAMMES: Or --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Well, this is a separate building, it's a separate building.

MR. BROWN: No, it's all -- that's all one building. There's a north building, a south building, and the main restaurant building on the
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So there's an east
extension to the Doofpot building that was
also -- is already hotels?

MR. BROWN: The back of the Doofpot --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MR. BROWN: -- is --

MEMBER HAMMES: What we --

MR. BROWN: -- the space we were here
for --

MEMBER HAMMES: Right.

MR. BROWN: -- the last time, which is that
assembly space.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, right, right. That's
made into event space.

MR. BROWN: And that's all -- it's all
connected.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's only event space.

MR. BROWN: It's all one building.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MR. BROWN: It's just --

MEMBER HAMMES: But that doesn't have --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: And that's continued to be
even -- you're not changing the use.

MEMBER HAMMES: It just looks like another
building from the outside.

MR. BROWN: We're not changing any of that. This is -- this is all just the Doofpot and directly above it.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: And that currently doesn't have hotel rooms above it.

MR. BROWN: It's got the --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: It's the Monkey Room space and the new bar.

MR. BROWN: Yes, that has hotels above it, hotel rooms above it.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: That has a hotel room, too, huh? Okay.

MEMBER COTUGNO: I know you attempted to make the front entrance handicapped accessible, but it's really not practical.

MR. BROWN: No.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Because you can't have a ramp go right up to a door.

MR. BROWN: Yeah, it's --

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's actually worse than having a step. It's more unsafe for a handicapped person to approach a door and on -- while he's on an angle.

MR. BROWN: Yes. And it's one of those
situations where, as I believe the code puts it, conversion is not feasible.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: So where do we have handicapped access?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Well, this is an attempt to make handicapped access. And like he's saying, there's no really way to do it unless you go onto the sidewalk.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.

MEMBER COTUGNO: But, to be honest, I'd rather have the step --

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

MEMBER COTUGNO: -- than have a ramp going up to a door, because if you're -- even nonhandicapped people, it's not practical to be on an angle and try and open up a door.

MR. BROWN: No, of course, of course.

MEMBER COTUGNO: And I believe the door should open out anyway. All exits should open out, especially now that we're changing the use.

MR. BROWN: We could easily switch that door, yeah.

MEMBER COTUGNO: I think even you should consult with a code expert about changing a residential apartment to a hotel use, because
that's a change of use, which may trigger handicapped accessibility to the second and third floor.

MR. BROWN: We have an accessible unit on the ground floor on grade.

MEMBER COTUGNO: But it's not part of this building.

MR. BROWN: But it's part of the --

MEMBER HAMMES: The complex.

MR. BROWN: -- that complex.

MEMBER COTUGNO: I don't know if that works. I'm not the expert, but I think an expert should be involved.

MR. BROWN: In our -- in our prior discussions, when we got the original approval, we had apartments -- I'm sorry -- hotel rooms above the restaurant, and above the north building, and above half the south building, and it was determined at the time that an accessible unit on the ground floor in one of the buildings was sufficient to satisfy the code.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Is it a percentage of the number of rooms that you have to have?

MR. BROWN: No, it's --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Why?
MR. BROWN: -- providing equal service on
the -- in an accessible situation.
MEMBER COTUGNO: Is this building owned by
the same company?
MR. BROWN: Yes, it's all -- it's part of
American Beech.
MEMBER HAMMES: I have a -- I have a
question on the usage. If it gets changed to
assembly -- and this is related to what was done
earlier this year when the part behind it was
changed from assembly to alleviate overflow from
the restaurant, would that de facto allow them to
also use that space for overflow from the
restaurant?
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: No. No, because it
would --
MR. BROWN: No.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: You would be
approving a site plan that designates the area as
a hotel lobby --
MEMBER HAMMES: And retail.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: -- which is what is
on the -- and retail.
MEMBER HAMMES: And could that be
conditioned on the approval for the existing
lobby and retail being changed to just retail?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yeah, I --

MR. CONNOLLY: Yes.

MEMBER HAMMES: I just -- my concern is if
you end up with a lot of things that are assembly
in there, that what the -- what the actual use
is.

MR. BROWN: In the code, there are
different designations of assembly, and assembly
for a restaurant is different than assembly for a
hotel. I think it's A(2) and A(3). I don't
remember the numbers exactly.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: But did you say that the
proposal for this new hotel lobby would also have
a retail component to it?

MR. BROWN: Yes, yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: I think they're planning on
moving the whole thing over --

MR. BROWN: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- is my understanding.

MR. BROWN: What's in that --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay, move it --

MR. BROWN: -- north building would all
move to the --

MEMBER COTUGNO: That's why I think it is
important to know what the existing retail lobby
is going to be used for. Before you said you
don't know, but I think that should be part of
our approval.

MEMBER HAMMES: Well, or they may not know,
and we may just say then they can only use it for
retail.

MR. BROWN: Well, in any case, whatever
they intend to finally use it for, I'm sure we
would be back here to get approval.

MEMBER HAMMES: Well, I mean, if it's zoned
assembly retail now, would they have to come back
if they were putting another store in there, or
if they decided to leave the hotel lobby in
there?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I would have to see
what the -- what was exactly approved, if the
whole space was just, you know, used for both, or
an area of the space was designated and they
changed that around.

MEMBER HAMMES: I mean, my --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I don't know. I'd
have to think about it.

MEMBER HAMMES: My gut instinct is I don't
know that I'm comfortable leaving it assembly
right now without knowing what it is. I would probably be a little bit more comfortable --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- with retail. Retail seems the obvious use for it.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Well, I think it's really kind of also getting a better feel for what the goal is. I don't think when this is all done he wants to have two different hotel lobbies.

MR. BROWN: No, no, it would not be used as a hotel lobby.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER COTUGNO: It could be two assembly areas for the overflow of parties or whatever.

MEMBER HAMMES: Because eventually 1943 Pizza is going to move out of there as well.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.

MEMBER HAMMES: Right?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: Within the next five years.

MEMBER COTUGNO: I thought one year.

MEMBER HAMMES: Okay, whatever. I mean, soon.

MR. BROWN: Yeah. I mean, the reason for this is to create a larger space for the lobby,
really. And, honestly, I don't know that they've
given tremendous consideration to what they would
do with that other space.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: And did the -- the
Building Department is going to require
sprinklers for the second and third floors?

MR. BROWN: There are -- there are
sprinklers throughout the entire building right
now.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Including the third floor?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MEMBER HAMMES: What's on the third floor
right now?

MR. BROWN: Right now, it's just storage
space.

MEMBER COTUGNO: It's storage? So you're
converting storage to a hotel unit?

MR. BROWN: On the third floor, yes. It's
a sizable attic.

MEMBER COTUGNO: It has the proper ceiling
height?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MEMBER COTUGNO: And egress window? Egress
window?
MR. BROWN: I would have to double-check that.

MEMBER COTUGNO: I think that's important.

MR. BROWN: Well, as it -- as it being sprinklered, I don't know that it would need to be an egress window. The travel distance is --

MEMBER HAMMES: It seems to me we need the input from --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Definitely, definitely.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- from the Planner on it.

MEMBER COTUGNO: As far as I know, third floors that are storage cannot in New York State be converted to habitable space.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I would say even if the code didn't require it, we probably should. It's a third floor unit, so it's kind of important.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Just I apologize. The size of the window, whether it needs to be egress or not, those are permit level issues. I'm not suggesting you shouldn't comment on it, just to be aware that if it -- whatever is required by the code would be dealt with when we got construction level plans.

And I just -- I do have the Planner's comments I can read there brief. If you'd like
me to just paraphrase them, I could do that, if that's your pleasure.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Sure.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: All right. He's asking that it be noted on the application what the -- what the change of use is, and I think you've already commented on that.

Talks about signage for egress, and details on egress and egress signage within the space. Again, it would be permit issues, but certainly should be shown. He mentions about parking, which you already talked about.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: What did he say about parking?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Just that you should think about parking. You know, he doesn't -- he understands that it's not a code requirement, that's all, and you've already sort of talked about that a little bit. He's just making sure that you note that.

The SEQRA determination is Type II.

Yeah, that's pretty much his whole comments.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Is there anybody else prepared to comment at this time?
MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: (Shook head no).

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. I think we're --

MEMBER HAMMES: I think -- I mean, my two biggest things that I would want to think about are, one, the third floor being a hotel room, whether that's appropriate, and two, whether there should be some -- you know, the space that's currently the lobby should be changed so it's just retail, unless they come back for something else. And then, obviously, the glass door, I think I'd be interested to hear what HPC says about that, although I do note that there's one there already.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right. Okay.

MEMBER HAMMES: Those are my thoughts, for what it's worth.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you. Anybody else?

Shall we --

MEMBER COTUGNO: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I think at this time we've gotten some good information from you, and thank you for your time to explain it.

MEMBER HAMMES: So I guess the next step is schedule a public hearing?

MR. BROWN: Thank you for the --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: My recommendation on the hearing would be to not schedule it at this time until HPC has weighed in, as there may be significant comments that may change, alter this plan.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: So my recommendation would be to wait for the October meeting, right? Yeah. To schedule the hearing, assuming that HPC has concluded by then. The hearing, then, you would take the opportunity to schedule it on October 3rd for the November meeting.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: That would be my recommendation.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All right.

MEMBER COTUGNO: That's it.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: We're all set. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: The next item is -- this is -- we're now on our regular session, and this is 604 First Street. It's a public hearing for
the application of Beachy Blonde LLC, represented
by Architect Frank Uellendahl, who is I know away
in Germany. And we're -- we have a
representative from the applicant.

The applicant proposes new construction of
a residential dwelling for the property located
at 604 First Street. This property is located in
the Historic District, and was granted a
Certificate of Appropriateness by the Historic
Preservation Commission of the Village of
Greenport on August 22nd, 2019. The property's
location is Suffolk County Tax Map
#1001-2.-6-45.2.

MS. POLEWAC: Hi.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Good afternoon.
MS. POLEWAC: Samantha Polewac here.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Nice to meet you again.
MS. POLEWAC: Likewise.
MS. BRAATEN: Can you spell that?
MS. POLEWAC: P, as in Peter, O-L-E-W-A-C.
MS. BRAATEN: Thank you.
MS. POLEWAC: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Do you wish to add
anything further about the application at this
time?
MS. POLEWAC: I don't think so.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Well, this is a public hearing. So, at this time, you don't need to -- unless anybody wants to have any questions addressed.
MEMBER COTUGNO: Yes. Well, the last time Frank was here, I mentioned that he should leave more of a buffer space between the neighbor's driveway and his driveway and plant shrubs there, and he said, "Yes, I'll show that," but I don't see it.
MS. POLEWAC: Oh, he didn't update it?
MEMBER COTUGNO: It's not -- it wasn't done.
MS. POLEWAC: Okay. All right. When he gets back from Germany, I'll speak to him about that then.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I think we also talked about the idea of having a little bit of landscaping in the front, in front of the porch --
MEMBER COTUGNO: Right.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- area as well --
MEMBER COTUGNO: And I don't see that either.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- facing First Street.
But, otherwise, I don't think we had any other substantive comments.
MEMBER HAMMES: I'm recused on this one, so.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So thank you. And we'll let the public -- anybody from the public who wants to speak at this time on this application is --
MS. POLEWAC: Okay.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- free to come up and announce yourself.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Mr. Chair, before you move, I just want it noted for the record that we did receive the mail receipts, that the mailings were done.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.
ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: -- for the -- for the notice for the hearing.
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you, Paul.
MR. NULAND: Which I didn't receive.
MS. ROWLAND: Yeah, nor did I. October -- August 22nd doesn't exist on the website. We got no notice of any kind.
MEMBER HAMMES: I did receive mine.
MS. ROWLAND: And we live across the street.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: You did or did not?

MEMBER HAMMES: I did receive mine. And I would note that they actually went out of their way. Frank noted that the wrong address was on the tax rolls for me, so they did make sure it got to me.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: What is your address, please?

MS. ROWLAND: 621 First Street.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I'm sorry?

MS. ROWLAND: 621 First Street.

MS. BRAATEN: Can I have your name?

MS. ROWLAND: Jada.

MR. NULAND: 603 First Street.

MS. ROWLAND: Jada Rowland, R-O-W-L-A-N-D.

MEMBER HAMMES: It may have gone -- if your tax -- if your address for your tax bill is different, it would have gone to that address.

MR. NULAND: I didn't get it at either place.

MS. ROWLAND: I've always gotten my notices before, and this is the first time I didn't get any notice, and it was only by happenstance. I
passed by the little white notice when I was walking my dog, and went, "Oh, I didn't hear about that."

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I don't see those addresses, but I can speak with them after the meeting to see what happened.

MR. NULAND: Okay.

MS. ROWLAND: And there was nothing on the website, because I usually check the website to see and there's nothing listed even for today. This meeting, 22nd, wasn't listed.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: The agenda is on the website.

MS. ROWLAND: Huh?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: The agenda is on the website.

MS. ROWLAND: Yeah, I look for everything. The agenda might be, but the meeting dates are not. And so I look and see, and I see no meeting, and so I go, "Oh, no meeting."

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: The agenda has the date.

MS. ROWLAND: And, in fact, the last Historic meeting was supposedly August 17th, or something like that, it was a while ago, or maybe
that's the last meeting, period. So that is a problem.

This is always awkward if you're a neighbor. And I know we're the people that are usually called and we're the most concerned, but it always makes for awkwardness, because, obviously, you want to get along with your neighbors and you don't want to cause and complaints or problems. But we got a previous building built on our block and we got kind of blindsided by that one. I was there at the meeting, and the only thing under discussion at that point was they wanted to move a little closer to the sidewalk.

I've been told by the developer that it would be in accord with all the buildings on our block. Well, it is if you compare it to the big, biggest building on our block, but that biggest building has two lots. This building, the one across the street from me, has only one lot, and we are once again dealing with a small lot.

My house is on what I think is the smallest lot on the street, it's 45 feet. My house is 20 feet, the rest of it is driveway. This driveway space listed here is only 10 on one side and 15
on the other, and the 10 is really close to the
building next door. There doesn't appear to be a
driveway in that building next door.

So I'm frustrated both by the fact that I
wasn't able to talk at the Historic thing about
the nature of the neighborhood and how the
neighborhood feel has been changed by the
building across the street from me. It is not
only hugely tall compared to the houses next to
it, but it is also very wide for the size of the
lot, it barely fits. And then they were given
permission, also, to put another little adjacent
outbuilding in the rear. And I don't care about
the swimming pool, that's perfectly okay. What
they want to do with their backyard is not my
concern. But what we all see is nothing now but
building. We don't see -- there is no land left
at all and they're very close.

So our concern with this one is that
there's going to be something similar. It is
fairly tight on one side to the other one. I see
it as a lot of depth. I see some of the
projections are up on the second floor, but,
again, it's a visual effect that we'll be seeing.
We won't see that it's skinny on the bottom,
we'll see this thing up on top that looks awfully big to fit into that space.

I don't know that there's anything you can do about it. I don't understand how these things all get approved. I'm not even sure what the purview of the Planning Committee is. I gather you're not the Zoning Board and you're not the Historic, so I don't know how much you can alter what is already planned, but I would like you to kind of look at this.

I was kind of surprised because my driveway is, I think, 19 feet or so, 20 feet, and it doesn't look like very much of a driveway. It looks fairly small, and I have a small, narrow house, and not a terribly tall one. I have one that goes back to the Civil War, pre-Civil War.

So that's one point, and the no notice, and that it's difficult to talk with neighbors. And, as I say, I don't know exactly what your committee is entitled to do, other than just make comments. I don't really know what the Planning Board does. I'm assuming you think about the long-term Village aspect, and I want to speak about that, which is we are increasingly -- I know, because my son has to live in the front
part of my house, because he works here in the Village and he does not make enough money to be able to rent or buy anything at this point. And we keep allowing bigger and bigger buildings that are not going to be affordable to anybody who lives and work here.

So the whole tenor of the neighborhood is going to start changing. I mean, it's people who moved into houses that were big and didn't make them bigger, this is fine. That's what this neighborhood should stay, should have the feeling of the neighborhood, and we're losing it. I really, really feel this.

And the pricing out of working people is really terrible. It's terrible. It's one of the great gifts of this town, was the fact that we had a diversity of occupation, a diversity of the kind of people who lived here.

So -- and I gather that your sister or a relative is supposed to move into the other house. There's no guarantee. That's something I've absolutely learned, is once the permission goes through, you know, there's nothing saying they have to be a relative who lives in that house. So for all we know, it will turn into an
Airbnb and we'll be really stuck, which I certainly hope there is some way to prevent in the Zoning or the Planning, or whatever.

And the height, there's no -- I don't know how to -- I mean, three-sixteenths of an inch is equal to a foot. How tall is this building going to be? How big is it? Is it a lot taller than the house next door? Because that's part of the problem with the building across the street from me, is nobody realized how tall it was going to be, in addition to how wide. So I would like that to be looked at, so that at least it didn't look outsized compared to what's next to it.

And, again, I want you all to start considering. You give approval to these things that are big that no one else -- fine, that very wealthy people who move in can afford it now, but what happens if the market dips and they want to unload their property? Who's going to buy it? The guy who works in the fire -- in this firehouse, the volunteers who work here, the guys who work in the boatyard? I don't think so. The nurses that work at the hospital? I don't think so. I think something -- somebody ought to start looking at this and paying attention at the very
lowest level of committee planning.
And I do complain about the fact that we
were not notified, and it wasn't on the website.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I just confirmed
that it is, in fact, on the website.
MS. ROWLAND: It wasn't just -- when I
walked in here, I showed you. I showed you, it
wasn't there.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I'm looking at the
website agenda. It's the very first item,
Planning work and regular session, 9/5.

MS. ROWLAND: Yeah, look at the -- look at
the calendar listing of meetings. Look at the
meetings.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: It is. It is on
the calendar, I checked.

MS. ROWLAND: That's what I look at. I
didn't look to see what the agenda was. I looked
to see when is the next Historic meeting. It's
not there.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Can I ask a
clarification about the driveway issue, because
I'm not sure I understand.

MS. ROWLAND: Yeah.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: I mean, with --
what would you like to see as a --

MS. ROWLAND: Well, for one thing, it's
very close to the house next door. I mean, I
just don't want another --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Okay.

MS. ROWLAND: -- yet another building that
looks like it's stuffed onto the site, and the
only two ways that it's likely to look stuffed is
by its proximity to the neighbors. So one side,
the driveway is not huge, but it's at least big
enough. It's what, 11 feet or something. That's
not huge. I mean, as I say, mine is like 19, and
my house is 20, so that will give you -- and
there's a driveway on the other side of me. So
that gives you a sense. You don't feel like
everybody's -- you know, even though we are
fairly close together. And for fire reasons, as
if nothing else, you get that close and you got a
second thing that's sticking out next to the
buildings.

You know, I went through this kind of stuff
when I was building the back -- rebuilding the
back end of my house, because it started to cave
in. And when I went through rebuilding the
little -- the little shed that was out back,
where I was told that the little plywood shed
that had been there and falling down had to be
replaced with a cedar -- completely in accord
with the front of my house, because I was in the
Historic District. So the house -- the shed that
was going to cost 2,000 became a $14,000
investment, unnecessary in my opinion, quite
charming looking. But it shows sort of a
difference in the way people were dealing with
the idea of the Historic District and now, which
seems to be, eh, bigger is better. It's not
better. Care about the Town.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you.

MS. ROWLAND: Sorry.

MS. POLEWAC: It's okay.

MR. NULAND: Hi. My name is Tony Nuland,
and I live at -- well, my wife and I live at 603
First Street.

And I'm not here to complain about any
particular aspect of this site plan review
application. I do have some questions about
procedure, though.

Apparently, there was a meeting of the
Historic Review Board to approve the project. I
mean, that's what it says here, and that's
something that I would have assumed might have
been noticed to the neighboring houses, so they
would -- they would know about it. Now maybe you
don't do that.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: They don't --
there's not routinely, unless it rises to the
level of a hearing, that notices are required,
and it didn't rise to the level of a hearing, so
that's why.

MR. NULAND: I see, okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: But it was on the
posted agenda.

MR. NULAND: Okay. Well that -- but then
another question I have is on this review
application, there's a Part II impact assessment
that hasn't been filled out. Is it not required
to be filled out if it's in an Historic District?

MR. CONNOLLY: No, because it's a
residential. It's not a commercial property,
it's a residential property, so it's a Type II.

MR. NULAND: "Is the property in the
Historic District? If yes, please see Item 8 on
Page 4".

MR. CONNOLLY: It's a residential
residential property, a Type II -- it's a Type II
action pursuant to SEQRA, so there's no
requirement that the -- that part of the EAF be
completed.

MR. NULAND: Okay. So then the only
consideration as to whether the proposed
structure fits in with the Historic District and
the nature of the neighborhood is reflected by 6,
"Is the proposed action consistent with the
predominant character of the existing built or
natural landscape," and that's checked "yes".
The architect for the project checked it "yes".
I'm concerned about that, and my concern
derives from looking at what happened at 620
First Street, which stunned me as something that
we didn't know about either, but that's water
over the dam.

You've got a new project here. My neighbor
raised the question of how high is the building.
I didn't see that anywhere on this application.
Is that not something that gets looked at, the
size of the structure?

MEMBER HAMMES: It would have been in the
elevation plans that were submitted, right?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: I think it would
have been. I'm looking for it now.
MR. NULAND: I mean, I know that the structure is limited to 1600 square feet of ground cover, that's fine. But I would think, in looking at this and approving it, part of what ought to be of concern is how the structure fits into the neighborhood, how -- how it -- how it suits.

Does it have -- is it consistent with the predominant character? Now the thing at 620 is not consistent with the predominant character, and I would hope that this would be consistent with the predominant character. You've got a very good architect working on it, and, you know, I have no reason to suppose it wouldn't be consistent. But I'm just -- I'm just troubled by, again, the fact that the height isn't noticed on -- noted on this.

And then I have a question, too. Looking at the elevations and plans that are provided, it's a little hard to tell whether the projecting porches, and window seats, and different things like that are all taken into account in determining compliance with the 1600 square feet. So when it says total building coverage, 1579, does that, in fact, include all these little
projections? I don't know the answer to that, and I'm not sufficiently versed in architectural
drawings to determine it.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Typically, the
architect would have included that in the -- in
the lot coverage, because it is part of lot
coverage, so --

MR. NULAND: It is?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yes.

MR. NULAND: Oh, okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: So it should be
included, yes.

MR. NULAND: Okay. Well, then, we will
assume that what is -- what should be done was
done.

And this is just another question. It
looks as if this building will have a third
floor, third story, at least this is from the
front elevation projection. Is that occupied?
Is that a bedroom? There's nothing about that in
the description. And, again, that may be totally
irrelevant, but it sort of ties into the height
issue. I don't know.

And you also have two different roof
heights on this on the back, so I would think the
description might include both of them.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Mr. Chair, if I may respond to -- from what I've seen on the plans, there's no occupancy in that -- in the third floor. It's just attic space, from what I can tell.

MR. NULAND: Just an attic or something?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: That's what it appears to me, yes.

MR. NULAND: Okay. Well, that --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Do the elevations give a height?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yeah. Unfortunately, they don't, yeah.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. Well, I think we need to get that, obviously. We've got two people complaining about it already, and it's a legitimate point to know the size and scope of this. So that's something that we should request.

MR. NULAND: Anyway, I -- you know, just my reactions on finding this and looking at it. And we trust that this will go ahead in good form and everyone will be comfortable with it.

MEMBER HAMMES: Paul, did they get Historic
Board approval?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: They did.

MR. NULAND: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All right. Thanks, Tony.

MR. NULAND: Thank you.

MS. ROWLAND: Can I speak?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Go ahead, sure.

MS. ROWLAND: Thank you. It says, "Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places?" And this says no. Are we not listed with the State Historic Register?

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Well, you're in an Historic District.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: The structure, on the existing structure.

MR. NULAND: Huh?

MEMBER HAMMES: The whole reason it's before the Planning Board is that there's no existing structure on that site. Otherwise, it would not be within our purview.

MS. ROWLAND: So the fact that the site doesn't currently contain a structure, it's not listed. So what listing will this house have after its built? Is that --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It won't.

MS. ROWLAND: -- it's in an Historic District? Does it --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: It will still be in the Historic District.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: But it won't be --

MS. ROWLAND: The house itself will not have --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It's subject --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Maybe in hundreds of years.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: It will be subject to the other structures in the same district, in the -- because it's in the Historic District, it's subject to compliance with review by the Historic Board.

MS. ROWLAND: And the other one is, it says, "Is the project site located in the 100-year flood plan," and it says, "No," and I believe we are, because I am. And so I'm assuming across the street is even more so because they're closer to the water. So I just thought I'd -- I'd like to feel like some of our
comments are actually going to get looked into, that we don't just say, "Yeah, as far as I know," or, "Yeah, he sort of whatever." I'd like to know that we -- at least some due diligence, because we -- you can tell the neighborhood, we're not the only people in the neighborhood who feel really blindsided by what happened with the other property, and so we just don't want it to happen again if possible. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Thank you. Does -- anybody else like to speak at this time?

(No Response)

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. I think that, you know, I'm a little concerned about the confusion over whether or not the notices were mailed out. So is it worth, you know, double-checking that, and when we --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Well, number one, I do intend to double-check it. From what the map that was provided and the addresses that were provided to the applicant, all of them, all of the receipts came back. So I will --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: -- discuss with these two residents whether they are even in the
area that was required. And there is one address that's out of state. That may be part of the issue, so it -- yeah, I will, I will verify that.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay, good. But in any event, I think that we need to keep this hearing open for the time being, until we can have that verified, and, therefore, have it adjourned until the next meeting, which is October 4th, was it, or 5th?

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Third.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Fifth. No, 4th -- 3rd.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Third.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Oh, October 3rd.

And I have nothing else on the docket, so at this --

MEMBER HAMMES: Walter.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER HAMMES: I had just -- I don't know whether the Planning Board is aware of things that came up at the Village work meeting a couple of weeks ago about sunset dates on Planning Board approval, but I, just for the record, wanted to say that I would be supportive of something along those lines.
I had discussed it off the record previously with Paul, but I know it's now been brought up at the Village Board level. So I feel like I should go on the record as saying that I'm supportive of some sort of sunset period for Planning approvals if they're not acted upon within a certain period of time.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. So I think, as a procedural matter, do we all -- we'd like to like discuss that a little further and take a vote on that?

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Sounds reasonable --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Yeah.

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: -- meaning we have to decide on a date, saying -- I mean, isn't there already like --

MEMBER HAMMES: We talked about some of the people get Planning -- they get an approval and they just don't do anything on it, it sits there for five years. I mean, when the --

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Oh, I see what you're saying, okay.

MEMBER HAMMES: -- character of the Village has changed and --
CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay.

MEMBER COTUGNO: That's different. That's related to this?

MEMBER HAMMES: No.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: No.

MEMBER HAMMES: This is just a general --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Okay. It's confusing.

MEMBER HAMMES: This is just a general point, since we're meeting and I'm not going to be at the next meeting. And I know it came up and it's been reported on in the paper. I felt like I should go on the record as a Planning Board member as being in support of the Village Board and the Code Committee considering something along those lines.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: I think it's a reasonable thing to --

MEMBER HAMMES: I mean, it is a Village Board and Code Committee issue, but I just thought the rest -- I wanted the rest of you to be aware of it.

MR. CONNOLLY: I think you can put it in the determinations, facts and the findings that -- you know, that they have to apply for a building permit within "X" number of months, and
get a C of 0 within "X" number of months after
the building permit was issued.

MEMBER HAMMES: I mean, I don't know if
people have a different view than I do, but I
just --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: No, it's -- I think it's a
great idea, and I think we all seem to support --

MEMBER COTUGNO: Sure.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: -- support it. So whether
we are -- I'm not sure we have to take a vote on
it, per se, but I think that we can just going
forward agree in our --

MEMBER HAMMES: I think Paul can just let
the Trustees know that the Planning Board as a
group does support some -- something on that
basis.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yes, I can -- I can
certainly -- at your request, I can send an email
to the Board saying it came up at the meeting and
that they're supportive of putting a time
limitation on Planning Board decisions.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. And just going
forward, do we not have the authority just to do
that anyway, or do we need the --

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: Yeah. It's what
your Counsel was just saying, you can put that as
a matter of routine, just put that as a standard
line in every --

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Right.

ADMINISTRATOR PALLAS: In every finding and
determination.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay, good. Thank you.

Okay. At this time, I'd like to make a
motion to adjourn the meeting. Can I have a
second?

MEMBER COTUGNO: Second.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: All those in favor?

MEMBER DOUGHERTY-JOHNSON: Aye.

MEMBER COTUGNO: Aye.

MEMBER HAMMES: Aye.

CHAIRMAN FOOTE: Okay. We're hereby
adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Time Noted: 4:49 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 proceedings taken on September 5, 2019.

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 11th day of September, 2019.

Lucia Braaten
Lucia Braaten

Flynn Stenography & Transcription Service
(631) 727-1107