

1 VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
2 COUNTY OF SUFFOLK STATE OF NEW YORK
3 -----x

4 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
5 REGULAR MEETING
6 -----x

7
8 Third Street Firehouse
9 Greenport, New York

10 January 20, 2016
11 5:00 P.M.

12
13 B E F O R E :

- 14
15
16 ELLEN NEFF - MEMBER
17 DAVID CORWIN - MEMBER
18 JOHN SALADINO - MEMBER
19 DINNI GORDON - MEMBER
20 DOUG MOORE - MEMBER (EXCUSED)

- 21
22
23 EILEEN WINGATE - VILLAGE BUILDING INSPECTOR
24 JOSEPH PROKOP - VILLAGE ATTORNEY

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INDEX OF DISCUSSIONS

* There were no Public Hearings for this Meeting.

NAME	PAGE
Holy Trinity Church	3-5 (2)
Scott Gonzalez	6-10 (4)
SAKD Holdings, LLC	11-43 (32)

1 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: This is the
2 January meeting of the Village of
3 Greenport Zoning Board of Appeals. I am
4 Ellen Neff. The agenda is available if
5 anyone wants one. And our chairman is
6 present. So I am ask your considerations
7 since this is -- I am not highly
8 experienced in doing this.

9 The first item of business is to
10 create a motion to approve the Findings
11 and Determination decision document for
12 the variance requested by the warden of
13 Holy Trinity Church, Lydia Wells, at 718
14 Main Street. The property is in the
15 Historic District, R-1. The variance was
16 voted on our December 16, 2015 meeting.
17 Property is at Section 1001-2-3-5. I am
18 going to ask if I need to read the
19 findings and determination.

20 MR. PROKOP: No, you don't.
21 There is one thing that I would like to
22 bring to your attention. There is a
23 January 20th version. And the January
24 20th version, the only change was to take
25 out the word instant, if I am not

1 mistaken.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: What page
3 would you be talking about? I am looking
4 at the January 18th version. I
5 apologize.

6 MR. PROKOP: That's okay. That
7 is what was circulated. On the top of
8 Page 2, on January 18th version contains
9 the word, "Instant." It was suggested
10 that I take that out, which I did do.
11 And sent it back, and that is now a
12 January 20th version.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: The draft that
14 is corrected is Zoning Board of Appeals
15 accepted the application at a public
16 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals
17 that was held on July 15, 2015. Okay.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. PROKOP: This is now the
20 version without the word instant in it.
21 It says January 20th on top.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. So
23 could I have a motion for us to approve
24 the findings and determination?

25 MEMBER GORDON: So moved.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: A vote -- a
2 second, please?

3 MEMBER SALADINO: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. I will
5 record the votes.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Corwin?

7 MEMBER CORWIN: No.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

9 MEMBER SALADINO: I disagree with
10 the decision, but I certainly agree that
11 this is what happened. So I am going to
12 vote, yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay.
14 Ms. Moore?

15 MEMBER GORDON: Gordon.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Sorry.
17 Ms. Gordon?

18 MEMBER GORDON: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: And I, Ellen
20 Neff, will vote yes.

21 So the motion carries, 3-1 and we
22 have adopted these findings and
23 determinations.

24 MR. PROKOP: I would like to say
25 that some of these decisions, I go back

1 and I print out every agenda and every
2 minute -- page minute that the
3 application was discussed. So I did this
4 for this decision and what I want to do
5 is turn it over to the Board. So you can
6 have this for your record.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Thank you. I
8 am assuming we will file it?

9 MS. WINGATE: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Thanks,
11 Mr. Prokop.

12 Okay. The second item on our
13 agenda is, discussion on the notice of
14 coordinated review that was circulated by
15 the Board of Trustees regarding a
16 Wetlands Permit application for Scott
17 Gonzalez, applicant, on behalf of the
18 Townsend Manor. Located at 714 Main
19 Street. The Board of Trustees adopted
20 Lead Agency status and initiated a
21 coordinated review for purposes of SEQRA.
22 Determining that this action is a Type I.
23 The property is located within the
24 Historic District and is in the
25 commercial retain zone. Comments

1 regarding this application should be
2 received by the Village Board of Trustees
3 by February 5th. Any discussion? We
4 have -- Members of the Board? I will
5 just read a little bit more. The
6 applicant wants to remove and replace
7 some areas of the bulkhead with vinyl
8 sheet pile and hauled in place, and with
9 10 feet area in front of the new wall
10 restored to the -- I am not -- can you
11 explain to me --

12 MEMBER SALADINO: Four feet below
13 average --

14 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. And 65
15 to 70 feet of cubic yards of soil will be
16 used to backfill behind the new wall.
17 And all surrounding surfaces will be
18 replaced in kind. And there will be no
19 seaward extension of the existing
20 bulkhead. So we're --as you can see on
21 this notice, it looks like 8 or 9
22 organizations or boards have been asked
23 to weigh in.

24 MEMBER SALADINO: Question for
25 the attorney. Joe, are we an involved

1 agency or interested agency?

2 MR. PROKOP: If there is no
3 variance or interpretation that we're
4 involved in, then we're not involved.
5 We're an interested agency.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: In which is
7 why we received notice and we don't have
8 to respond? In other words, saying
9 nothing, we don't want to weigh in.
10 Does any of the members want to make
11 comment?

12 MEMBER CORWIN: The conservation
13 advisory committee is going to meet
14 there at 2:30 tomorrow and look at the
15 project. As a member of the Zoning
16 Board of Appeals, I have no comments.
17 So I don't think I will make any for any
18 future date. I said, committee. It's
19 council. They're going to meet. They
20 will make a recombination and it's not
21 binding with the Village Board.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. All
23 right. Thank you. And so do I need a
24 motion to say that we chose not to
25 respond officially or we can just not

1 respond?

2 MEMBER CORWIN: It would be
3 better to have a motion.

4 MR. PROKOP: A motion that we
5 communicate that there is no response
6 from the Zoning Board of Appeals. No
7 comment from the Zoning Board of
8 Appeals.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: May I have a
10 motion?

11 MEMBER SALADINO: So moved.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Second?

13 MEMBER CORWIN: I second it.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: To call the
15 roll, Mr. Corwin?

16 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

18 MEMBER SALADINO: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Gordon?

20 MEMBER GORDON: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Neff?

22 Yes. Okay.

23 So the vote is 4 in favor and
24 non opposed.

25 So we will not respond to this

1 request. Moving on to the third item on
2 our agenda.

3 I am going to do another item
4 before we get to 3. 2A, is going to be
5 -- we were going to schedule a public
6 hearing -- we did schedule it however it
7 was not properly noticed to have a public
8 hearing about the property on Fifth
9 Street. And since it wasn't properly
10 noticed, we're unable to do that. It
11 will become part of our agenda for next
12 -- our next meeting. Is anybody here to
13 have something to say about that?

14 MR. SWISKEY: I just have one
15 question. Are you scheduling a public
16 hearing tonight?

17 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: We expected to
18 have it because we did our site visit.
19 However, when we reviewed, the date was
20 wrong. It was correct in three places
21 and it was wrong in one place. So we're
22 going to put it off till our next
23 meeting.

24 MR. SWISKEY: Thank you.

25 MEMBER CORWIN: We should have a

1 motion tonight to schedule a new public
2 hearing for February for whatever that
3 date is.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I would like
5 to wait till the point of when we get to
6 our next meeting to do that because
7 whether or not we have sufficient members
8 here, the third Wednesday in February is
9 the question. But I hear you, we will
10 schedule a public hearing at that time.

11 MEMBER SALADINO: I have a
12 question. Has the new public hearing
13 been noticed?

14 MS. WINGATE: No. I have plenty
15 of time. We're at the 17th.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: So I would
17 like to put that off until we handle
18 No. 3. No. 3,

19 Motion to accept an appeal for
20 area variance. And to public notice and
21 schedule a public hearing and a site
22 visit for (prospective owner) Daniel
23 Pennessi, president of SAKD Holdings,
24 LLC. The applicant proposes to construct
25 a new mixed use commercial building on

1 the vacant lot at the southeast corner of
2 Third and and Front Street. Section, Lot
3 and Block No. 1001-5-4-5. The property
4 is not in the Historic District and it is
5 located in the waterfront Commercial
6 District. The proposed building is to
7 contain a 16-room hotel, 80 seat
8 restaurant and 570 square feet of retail
9 space. The numbers about the lot
10 coverage and percentages of area
11 construction are as follows.

12 Lot coverage of 4,123 square feet
13 representing 46% of the site,
14 requiring an area variance of 590 square
15 feet or 6% of the total area of the lot.
16 Which is 8,834.2. Section 150-12A of the
17 Village Code requires maximum lot
18 coverage of 40% or 3,533 square feet in
19 the Waterfront Commercial or the WC
20 District.

21 The proposed overhead wood
22 trellises, front steps and raised outdoor
23 dining area are within the front yard
24 setback in the Waterfront Commercial
25 District, requiring an area variance of 6

1 feet. In the Section 150-12(B),
2 requirers 6 feet front yard setbacks on
3 both Front and Third Street.

4 The mixed use building prosed 12
5 parking spaced. Section 150-16A (1)
6 requires 36 parking spaces based on
7 square footage calculations and
8 requirements for hotel occupancy
9 requiring a variance of 24 parking
10 spaces.

11 The proposed building does not
12 provide for an off-street loading berth.
13 Section 150-16B(e) requires one berth for
14 each 25,000 square feet of floor area.

15 The proposed building height is
16 47'0", based on the height of the
17 elevated bulkhead located on the roof,
18 requiring a height variance 12'0".
19 Section 150-12B limits the height of the
20 building to 2 stories or 35 feet.

21 Discussion or is there a
22 presentation?

23 MEMBER CORWIN: I am not sure we
24 need a discussion.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Right. We're

1 accepting this application and there is
2 also -- it has to go before the Planning
3 Board.

4 MEMBER CORWIN: It has been
5 before the Planning Board.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I think they
7 deferred --

8 MEMBER CORWIN: The applicant
9 made an application to the Building
10 Inspector. That was denied. That led
11 them to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Now
12 we're trying to schedule the hearing. I
13 think before we even schedule a hearing
14 they ask in the application, I counted
15 three interpretations.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Excuse me, can
17 you go back about ten words? I missed
18 what you said.

19 MEMBER CORWIN: I said, they in
20 their application they ask for three
21 interpretations of the Village Code,
22 which is part of our duties. Before we
23 accept an application for variances, I
24 would contend that we have to settle
25 those three interpretation questions.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: And the three
2 interpretation questions are about
3 parking?

4 MEMBER CORWIN: I would have to
5 go through here and tell you what they
6 are. Before I do that, let's make sure
7 that is the proper way to proceed. Maybe
8 the attorney can help us. I say we have
9 to settle those interpretation questions
10 first with a public hearing and then we
11 have a public hearing for the variance
12 request. So in other words it's a
13 couple of months worth of hearings.
14 It's about after the second yellow page,
15 you go one more page. Title page and
16 letter. Next page is the lot coverage.
17 Then it says applicant respectively
18 request or an interpretation of Section
19 150-12B of the Village Code to determine
20 the project requires a variance from the
21 bulk regulations set forth.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Could you stop
23 just for a second and help us find the
24 rest of that section of the
25 application.

1 MEMBER SALADINO: I have a
2 suggestion while I am showing the
3 chairperson. Perhaps the applicant
4 would chose instead to reword the
5 application as opposed to asking for an
6 interpretation, I kind of agree with
7 David that it would require a public
8 hearing for interpretation. And this way
9 to move things along.

10 MEMBER CORWIN: This is the
11 application that we have before us.

12 MEMBER SALADINO: I understand
13 that, David, but we didn't accept it.

14 MEMBER CORWIN: Then we go
15 another month and get a new application.

16 MEMBER SALADINO: Joe?

17 MR. PROKOP: So I think that --
18 there is no rule that would require that
19 interpretation be determine before a
20 variance however it does amend the
21 application -- in consideration of the
22 application -- the interpretation is
23 basically -- what the applicant is asking
24 you to do is to determine that the
25 Building Inspector was incorrect in the

1 decision that was made. The decision
2 that a variance was necessary. I
3 think they could be considered at the
4 same hearing. They would have to be
5 considered -- as I said, to say it
6 another way. The interpretations are
7 requesting an interpretation that the
8 Building Inspector was incorrect and that
9 no variance is required. So you would
10 have to make those decisions before you
11 rule on variances because you
12 determination might in fact be a variance
13 was required. I think that could move
14 ahead as part of the same consideration.
15 As far as accepting the application, if
16 there is going to be any changes, we
17 can't accept it. I don't know if
18 there are going to be changes or not.
19 We should accept it in its formal
20 format.

21 MEMBER CORWIN: Well my
22 position is that we do the
23 interpretations first with a public
24 hearing and then we settle them and then
25 we have a public hearing on the

1 variances. If we try and do everything
2 at one meeting, I think we're going to
3 have a very long meeting and we're just
4 run around.

5 MEMBER SALADINO: David, you
6 understand this is never going to happen
7 in one meeting.

8 MEMBER CORWIN: Well, if the
9 applicant accepts that and acknowledges
10 that it will be more than 62 days from
11 when the hearing is closed --

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: We can leave
13 the hearing open.

14 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes, we can.
15 You're correct.

16 MEMBER SALADINO: Let the
17 applicant state -- this right is just to
18 accept this application. If the
19 applicant is content with the application
20 after what the attorney said, then let
21 him make his statement and we will vote
22 yes or no to accept it.

23 MR. PROKOP: When we do accept --
24 if we accept it and move ahead, the next
25 agenda and public notice has to reflect

1 what is applied for. So we do --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Pardon? What
3 you just said?

4 MR. PROKOP: The public notice
5 and agenda should reflect what is
6 requested in this December 31, 2015
7 letter. So in our records we have this
8 letter which does not have page numbers.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: We can remedy
10 that and number them 1 through 6 at the
11 bottom. I just did that so I could find
12 something. It's a six page letter.

13 MR. PROKOP: I was just saying
14 that when somebody looks back at the
15 minutes they know what we're talking
16 about and looking at. It's a combination
17 of variances and determinations.

18 MEMBER SALADINO: So the public
19 notice would be written and the agenda
20 would be created and that wouldn't happen
21 tonight. That would happen somewhere
22 down the road. Would that prevent us --
23 if we will agree to what we just said,
24 Joe, that wouldn't prevent us from
25 approving or denying tonight, would it?

1 MR. PROKOP: Excuse me, I didn't
2 mean to interrupt.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Accepting or
4 requesting some other action. And if I
5 understand you correctly, Joe, you said
6 we could create a public hearing in which
7 we notice specifying the interpretations
8 requested as well as the variance
9 requested?

10 MR. PROKOP: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: What is the
12 pleasure of the Board?

13 MEMBER SALADINO: I think we
14 should hear the applicant and have him
15 decide on what he wants to do.

16 MEMBER GORDON: I have a
17 question. The standard that we apply to
18 the application as it's presented to us
19 for acceptance -- I am not sure which
20 page it is. The application form itself,
21 the second page. There is a section of
22 area variance reasons says, please see
23 cover letter for those questions that we
24 always ask. And many of these issues are
25 discussed by sort of implication in the

1 letter but there is no direct response.
2 I am not sure whether that matters or
3 seems to matter, but seems worth talking
4 about. If the point is that we're
5 judging -- not the merits of the
6 application but whether it's complete
7 enough to be accepted for our review.

8 MEMBER SALADINO: I have a few
9 problems with this application myself. I
10 think we should let the application say
11 his piece and then it's up for
12 discussion. He should be able to tell us
13 what he thinks. That's part of the
14 discussion that we have, I think. Then
15 we can address the application itself.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I just want to
17 respond to what Ms. Gordon had said.
18 We're talking about the second page of
19 the application where we talked about the
20 five reasons, which we use when we vote
21 after the public hearing. And I think
22 that one thing we might ask if
23 specifically to tie -- first of all, I
24 would like to say please see the cover
25 letter of December 15th. So we don't

1 lose track of what letter we're talking
2 about. A couple of lines drawn out of
3 that letter, the stated as the area
4 variance reasons. Certainly, we're not
5 saying that we're not reading the letter.
6 It's tied to it. Anyone else on the
7 Board?

8 MEMBER SALADINO: I don't want to
9 sound like an advocate for this guy but I
10 just see that those questions are just
11 responded to in a different area. I am
12 not sure if there is a point of law or
13 procedure that says that can't be done.
14 And everything in front of me is still
15 open for discussion and either acceptance
16 or denial. I don't think we're giving up
17 anything on what people have to say about
18 it. Let the guy -- let the applicant
19 make his story and tell his story.
20 Perhaps there is questions that we could
21 ask after we recognize them.

22 MEMBER CORWIN: Let's ask the
23 questions first. You have some questions
24 and I brought up some questions.

25 MEMBER GORDON: I have no

1 problems with putting these reasons in
2 the area variant list if that is the
3 way that we want -- the basis of which
4 we want to review accepting the
5 application.

6 MR. PROKOP: The problem is and I
7 would like to ask Eileen Wingate if she
8 agrees with me or disagrees with me but
9 it looks like the letter from December
10 31st doesn't just disagree with some of
11 your interpretations but it also
12 references some different sections.
13 In some cases like the lot
14 coverage --

15 MS. WINGATE: I do know how I
16 determined the lot coverage and how the
17 applicant determined the lot coverage.
18 It's obvious and clear-cut.

19 MR. PROKOP: I agree with you.

20 MS. WINGATE: They just
21 calculated it differently and I don't
22 think it's up for an interpretation.

23 MR. PROKOP: That's fine. It
24 could go before the Board then. I just
25 wanted to point out that some of the

1 sections were different.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: May I ask
3 that the sense of the Board is that we
4 accept the application, perhaps listen
5 to a brief presentation by the principal
6 and schedule a public hearing? Is that
7 where we are?

8 MEMBER SALADINO: I think perhaps
9 at that point we're out of order. I
10 think we should first hear what the
11 applicant has to say and there be a short
12 discussion about what he says and what's
13 in front of us and either decide to
14 accept or not. David?

15 MEMBER CORWIN: I have one thing
16 that I want to bring up, before the
17 applicant addresses us. On the short
18 environmental assessment form.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Can you just
20 wait a minute so we can find the short
21 environmental assessment form. Thank
22 you.

23 MEMBER CORWIN: That piece of
24 property had a gas station on it at one
25 piece of time. The applicants are

1 probably aware of that. There is no
2 mention of that in the short
3 assessment form of that. There is no
4 check box or question to mention that but
5 I think there should be an addition onto
6 this short environmental assessment form
7 saying that there was an old gas station
8 on the property. Just in case it turns
9 up when they start digging that there
10 were some tanks that were leaked and
11 everybody knew about it.

12 MR. PROKOP: I think there was an
13 application on this property, we
14 required a long form. My recommendation
15 to the Board would be that we require a
16 long EAF form to be completed by the
17 applicant and submitted to the Board at
18 least 10 days prior to the date of the
19 hearing.

20 MEMBER SALADINO: I agree with
21 the attorney. The property itself, the
22 amount of parking. The fact that
23 there is going to be a restaurant, a
24 retail space, a hotel, parking, loading.
25 It's adjacent to another district. I

1 thought a long form was appropriate.

2 MS. WINGATE: It's going to need
3 coordinated review anyway's. Going back
4 to Planning. Back and forth.

5 MEMBER CORWIN: So they probably
6 should have made a long form a long time
7 ago.

8 MS. WINGATE: It's usually by
9 Board's request.

10 MR. PROKOP: There is two
11 situations where you do a coordinated
12 review. One is where it's a Type I
13 Action and coordinated review is
14 mandatory if there is more than one
15 agency. On the other hand, if it's an
16 unlisted action, it looks like this
17 application is going to be and you
18 believe that there will be and not making
19 any conclusions, but possible that there
20 could be a negative impact on one or more
21 aspects of the environment. With an
22 unlisted action, you should also do a
23 coordinated review. It looks like we're
24 going to do a coordinated review with a
25 Type I application.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Does that
2 preclude us from accepting the
3 application?

4 MR. PROKOP: No, I don't --

5 MS. WINGATE: The Planning Board
6 was intending to take lead agency.

7 MEMBER SALADINO: Unless we
8 decide?

9 MS. WINGATE: Yes.

10 MR. PROKOP: What I would do, I
11 would -- I think the 4,000 square foot
12 criteria -- if it's more, that means that
13 it's unlisted but we would need to check
14 on that.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: So I am not
16 exactly sure where we are.

17 MR. PROKOP: Hold on a second.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay.

19 MR. PROKOP: Any structure
20 exceeding 100 feet above ground level --
21 so I think what you're referring to is
22 that it's not a Type II action. I think
23 that it's less than 4,000 square feet and
24 non-residential, I think it's a Type II
25 action. If it's more than 4,000 it goes

1 to unlisted. We can start the
2 coordinated review process. Either way
3 it's going to need a coordinated review.

4 MS. WINGATE: Do we have to have
5 lead agency?

6 MR. PROKOP: Yes. They can't,
7 because they're not involved at this
8 point.

9 MS. WINGATE: They had had
10 submission process.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Did we ever
12 deal with both Boards at the same time?

13 MR. PROKOP: Yes. In an
14 application like this, it's highly
15 recommended. The recent history, if
16 there was a significant application we
17 had the Board's out together. Either at
18 a joint meeting --

19 MEMBER SALADINO: Or it's
20 possible that this Board can ask the
21 Planning Board that question.

22 MR. PROKOP: You can refer the
23 application to the Planning Board also.

24 MEMBER SALADINO: Not refer the
25 application, just ask them if it's

1 possible -- we could ask them about lead
2 agency status if they're going to take
3 it. Why have a joint session?

4 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Because there
5 are questions that are the purview of the
6 Planning Board and there are questions
7 that aren't. They're both there in the
8 application.

9 MEMBER SALADINO: I understand
10 that. Once it's decided that there is
11 going to be a coordinated review and once
12 somebody takes lead agency status this
13 Board can get on with its work and the
14 Planning Board can get on with their
15 work.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: What I just
17 heard Mr. Prokop talk about is that there
18 have been times in the past and perhaps
19 it's appropriate in this case, for this
20 to be done with rather than one versus
21 the other.

22 MEMBER SALADINO: The Planning
23 Board made their decision about this
24 application.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: No, they

1 haven't.

2 MEMBER SALADINO: They deferred
3 it to us. Now the ZBA is saying,
4 well --

5 MR. PROKOP: My recommendation
6 might be to refer to the Planning Board
7 for the environmental review and lead
8 agency status by the Planning Board. And
9 then we also at the same time set --
10 there was a question as to whether we
11 would set the public hearing. We
12 wouldn't take any action on it until the
13 Planning Board concludes their review.
14 The Planning Board meets next week. So
15 that was a good idea. I agree with
16 that. I think one of the ideas you
17 might consider here is vote as a Board
18 to see if the Planning Board wants to
19 take lead agency. And then they can
20 adopt lead agency and start the SEQRA
21 process.

22 MEMBER SALADINO: I didn't
23 suggest that we pass the application to
24 the Planning Board. It's within our
25 right to ask them a question. And my

1 question would be, if they're going to
2 take lead agency status and if yes, then
3 they can start the process. I didn't
4 want to take the entire --

5 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: It's not the
6 entire. It's going to involve the Zoning
7 Board as well.

8 MEMBER SALADINO: I understand
9 that. The Planning Board referred this
10 to the ZBA because what was involved in
11 the application. Now, the ZBA is going to
12 send it back to the Planning Board to
13 have them once again send it back to the
14 ZBA because there is variances involved?

15 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: With the long
16 form and the declaration on their part
17 that there is lead agency. That is one
18 of the possibilities.

19 (Whereupon, the alarm rang at
20 this time.)

21 MEMBER SALADINO: What did I say
22 that was wrong about the process?

23 MS. WINGATE: The Planning Board
24 has every opportunity to accept their
25 application and run simultaneously. The

1 Planning Board has a 60 day threshold to
2 make a decision. If they act too quickly
3 to accept the application before the
4 Zoning Board comes to their decision, we
5 get into a time crunch. So it has to be
6 very careful orchestrated so that no
7 application is accepted prematurely and
8 that everybody gets to weigh in
9 accordingly. And we don't have a time
10 crunch with the --

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: In other
12 words, if we accept the application and
13 schedule a public hearing, much more
14 information becomes assessable to the
15 Board and public and we can keep the
16 public hearing open for a subsequent
17 meeting, which pulls out the timeframe
18 and we don't run into the 60 days.
19 That's one option.

20 MEMBER SALADINO: We can keep the
21 public hearing as long as we want.

22 MS. WINGATE: Whereas the
23 Planning Board doesn't have that option.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I see. Okay.
25 In that case, is there a sense of the

1 Board to accept the application and
2 schedule a public hearing?

3 MEMBER SALADINO: I would like to
4 hear what the guy has to say first.
5 Maybe. Maybe not.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay.

7 MEMBER SALADINO: I defer to the
8 Chair.

9 MEMBER GORDON: I would like to
10 hear from the applicants also. I would
11 like to be sure of what we're talking
12 about, whether we should accept the
13 application. The content of the
14 questions about the variances --

15 MEMBER SALADINO: What?

16 MEMBER GORDON: I don't think we
17 should be talking about the substance of
18 the variances until we have a hearing but
19 I think a little information justifying
20 this particular application -- for
21 instance, my concern about incorporating
22 these area variances reasons and it's
23 with that we need to make a decision
24 whether we should accept this
25 application.

1 MEMBER SALADINO: Dinni, I agree
2 with you. I would just like to stress of
3 letting this guy talk. I don't think
4 that we're under any obligation to either
5 accept or deny. I don't think there is
6 anything that binds us. Right now, all
7 we have in front of us is an application.
8 And regardless of what the applicant says
9 or does, we still have the option -- but
10 I understand your point.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. Would
12 you like to make a preliminary statement
13 to the Board.

14 MR. PENNESSI: That would be
15 great. My name is Dan Pennessi.

16 MEMBER CORWIN: Would you spell
17 that for the recording secretary, please?

18 MR. PENNESSI: Sure.
19 P-E-N-N-E-S-S-I and I am principal of
20 SAKD Holdings, LLC. The contract vending
21 for the property. We have gone ahead and
22 submitted a letter of authorization from
23 the property owner. I have here the
24 architect, Tom Pedrazzi.

25 MR. PEDRAZZI: P-E-D-R-A-Z-Z-I.

1 MR. PENNESSI: Maybe we will
2 start with a summary as what is set
3 forth in the application, if that's all
4 right?

5 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Yes.

6 MR. PENNESSI: We're proposing at
7 the corner of Front and Third Streets a
8 mixed used commercial building. On the
9 ground floor there will be a restaurant,
10 70 seats. Plus 10 seasonal seats.
11 There will also be some retail space on
12 the first floor and two stories of
13 hotel rooms above. There will be 16
14 hotel rooms. And what's currently
15 proposed is a rood deck, currently, for
16 the use of the hotel guests. We had
17 initially presented the pre-submission to
18 the Planning Board in accordance with the
19 Zoning Code to determine if this was an
20 application that the Planning Board would
21 be interested in hearing for this
22 property. As a result of the feedback
23 and based on their work sessions of
24 October, November and December, we went
25 ahead and filed a building permit and

1 received a notice of denial which require
2 us to come before the Zoning Board of
3 Appeals because there was some
4 variances requested. As part of our
5 application, we did note that there were
6 certain conditions that needed to be
7 met and described int the application.
8 Also we had questions on how the bulk
9 was calculated and that the bulk section
10 is for the waterfront commercial district
11 as opposed to the residential, which is
12 subsection A. We believe that this letter
13 does describe why in fact the variances
14 required should be granted. It addresses
15 that there are no other alternatives
16 under the Zoning Code currently to pursue
17 the project that we would like to build
18 there. And also how the proposed project
19 does conform to the character of the
20 downtown and other improvements in that
21 area. We would like the ZBA to accept
22 the application this evening. It would
23 be great to schedule a public hearing for
24 next month. Perhaps I would suggest and
25 maybe ask, I believe what has been done

1 before, the fact that ZBA accepts lead
2 agency status and then passes it to the
3 Planning Board once that formal site
4 plan application is submitted and the
5 public hearing is commenced for the site
6 plan application, perhaps that's a way
7 to bridge the gap between the two
8 boards. And both myself and Tom are
9 here for any questions that you might
10 have.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Thank you.
12 Any questions?

13 MEMBER SALADINO: I have a -- I
14 am going to hold my questions.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I will
16 entertain a motion to accept the
17 proposal?

18 MEMBER SALADINO: I am kind of
19 thinking -- I would just ask -- this has
20 nothing to do with your application --
21 well, it does but not really at this
22 particular moment. This is really an
23 ambitious application. And I am just --
24 this is more for personal curiosity as a
25 member of the ZBA and this is strictly

1 for myself. Being such an ambitious
2 application, I would kind of ask -- you
3 know, what. This is not the right time
4 for the questions. I apologize. I
5 apologize. It's a question for the
6 public hearing.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: John, I am
8 afraid you caught my meandering spot,
9 which is unfortunate for the Board and
10 the audience.

11 MEMBER SALADINO: And I
12 apologize.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: May we have a
14 motion to accept the application and when
15 we schedule our next meeting, I am
16 concerned that it may not be February.
17 Normally we have monthly meetings. It
18 will be scheduled for our next meeting
19 and you will know that tonight.

20 (Whereupon, the alarms went off
21 at this time.)

22 MEMBER GORDON: If we accept this
23 application are we requesting the longer
24 form prior to this hearing?

25 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes, we are.

1 MEMBER SALADINO: Well, it was
2 always my understanding that the
3 application had to be complete and
4 correct. For us to accept it, we're
5 saying that it's complete.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: We can also
7 request that the long form be sent ten
8 days prior to the hearing.

9 MEMBER CORWIN: Three weeks. We
10 need time to look at it.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Are we talking
12 about --

13 MEMBER CORWIN: I will make a
14 motion. I move that we accept the
15 application as it is presented this
16 evening with some additions which will
17 include the long environmental assessment
18 form and that we schedule a public
19 hearing at the next available date for
20 quorum meeting of the Zoning Board of
21 Appeals.

22 MEMBER GORDON: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: All those in
24 favor?

25 MEMBER CORWIN: Before we vote on

1 that, questions? I ask the attorney
2 there is a mention of a LLC, Limited
3 Liability Company. But I see no papers
4 on that. Should that be included in the
5 application?

6 MR. PROKOP: If you're talking
7 about Marilyn Shannon, LLC, there is a
8 letter. I will check and see in a
9 second.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I thought we
11 do have SAKD.

12 MEMBER CORWIN: My question is
13 when you file a limited liability company
14 you have to have some principals and you
15 have to have an address to serve papers.
16 The attorney can correct me if I am
17 wrong. I think things like that should
18 be included in the application.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Prokop?

20 MR. PROKOP: What you said about
21 forming an LLC is not accurate. You
22 could get -- you do have to give an
23 address but it could be the attorneys
24 address. We should have the address of
25 Marilyn Shannon also.

1 MEMBER CORWIN: So that's two
2 things, and long form and more
3 information on the limited liability
4 companies that are involved.

5 MR. PROKOP: Also another thing,
6 I really think that on a size of this
7 application, the Board should really get
8 full size plans --

9 MS. WINGATE: I have them. I
10 have them.

11 MR. PROKOP: I think the Board
12 should get a set of plans to review.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Could we make
14 a request that the members consult these
15 complete plans at Village Hall prior to
16 the next -- at least two weeks before the
17 hearing.

18 MEMBER CORWIN: They are for us.
19 They're ours. We can take them home if
20 we want.

21 MR. PENNESSI: If more full size
22 sets are requested, please let me know.
23 I think we delivered four.

24 MEMBER CORWIN: Your willing to
25 submit more if we want?

1 MR. PENNESSI: Yes.

2 MEMBER CORWIN: So then that is
3 not a problem. A couple of more full
4 size plans, long assessment form --

5 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay.

6 MEMBER CORWIN: And that does not
7 preclude that may come up in the course
8 of our discussion.

9 MEMBER SALADINO: Second.

10 MR. PENNESSI: May I add two
11 things?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Yes.

13 MR. PENNESSI: With the
14 certificate of formation for the LLC be
15 sufficient to satisfy that request?

16 MR. PROKOP: Yes.

17 MR. PENNESSI: And I just wanted
18 to note that during -- we had appeared at
19 two Planning Board work sessions. The
20 matter was discussed during the November
21 work session. We were not present. And
22 the plans that have been submitted with
23 the application do incorporate several
24 comments from the Building Department,
25 the Village's Consultant.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: In other words
2 you have made some changes but they are
3 not reflected in the plans?

4 MR. PENNESSI: They are. All
5 Planning Board -- all comments to date
6 have been incorporated into the plans
7 that you have.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: All right.
9 Thank you. Are we ready to vote?

10 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes, we are.
11 Let's have a roll call.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Corwin?

13 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

15 MEMBER SALADINO: Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Gordon?

17 MEMBER GORDON: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: And I vote,
19 yes, as well. So the motion carries.
20 Thank you very much.

21 Item No. 4, I would like a motion
22 to approve the ZBA minutes for
23 November 18, 2015.

24 MEMBER SALADINO: So moved.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Second?

1 MEMBER GORDON: Second.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: All in favor?

3 MEMBER SALADINO: Aye.

4 MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Aye.

6 MEMBER CORWIN: Opposed or
7 abstained?

8 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. Excuse
9 me.

10 Anyone opposed or abstained?

11 MEMBER CORWIN: I abstain.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. That
13 is Mr. Corwin abstaining about the motion
14 of the minutes from the 18th of
15 November.

16 Item No. 5, Motion to accept the
17 ZBA Minutes for December 17, 2015.

18 MEMBER SALADINO: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Corwin?

20 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

22 MEMBER SALADINO: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Gordon?

24 MEMBER GORDON: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: And I vote,

1 yes, as well.

2 Motion to schedule. As discussed
3 in our last meeting because of several
4 absences of members of the Board, being
5 strain on having sufficient members
6 present for us to have a quorum and us to
7 operate, we have made a request of the
8 Town Board that members could
9 participate electronically. Maybe there
10 is a better word.

11 MEMBER CORWIN: Video conference.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Where they
13 are present and they can both participate
14 and note vote. And we understand or I
15 understand from my conversations that
16 that item is on discussion for the Board
17 on Thursday. And I would like to know if
18 it's the sense of our Board whether we
19 all feel that would help us conduct our
20 business on occasions that are necessary.
21 Members that are experience.
22 Particularly, I miss the experience of
23 our chairman who is not here tonight.
24 Anybody else like to weigh in?

25 MEMBER CORWIN: I am going to be

1 here in February. So I would like to
2 have the February meeting. I don't want
3 to hold Mr. Moore up anymore. I don't
4 want to hold up these people if we don't
5 have to. I don't -- as long as Chairman
6 Moore or Ms. Gordon is not going to vote,
7 I have no problem with video conferencing
8 as a tool for them to be aware of
9 everything that went on. I do have a
10 problem with people voting in a room
11 that are not at a public hearing
12 because when you see 30 people in a room,
13 it kind of changes your mind about
14 things.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Even though
16 you can hear them and get some of the
17 feeling --

18 MEMBER CORWIN: You don't get the
19 feeling.

20 MS. MACKENTI: Can I just ask a
21 question?

22 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Yes.

23 MS. MACKENTI: This is Joann
24 MacKenti, Fifth Avenue. My question is
25 when they do come back, are they allowed

1 to vote on ones that they were not in
2 attendance to?

3 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: No. Because
4 the vote if taken -- if there are
5 sufficient members a vote will be taken.
6 Now there -- what we're asking the
7 Village Board to approve is having the
8 expertise of the members weigh in. And
9 we're a small Village. To draw the
10 membership of all the Board's of the
11 Village is hard to do that. We're a five
12 member Board, so we need three members to
13 vote.

14 MEMBER SALADINO: I would --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: So no, they
16 would not vote later.

17 MEMBER SALADINO: I don't agree
18 with that. If there is a vote when
19 they're not present and I defer to the
20 attorney but from my experience if
21 they're not at the meeting, they have
22 agreed and we have agreed and I believe
23 the Village Board will agree that they
24 can't vote. But if they come back and
25 the question is in front of the Board,

1 they have every right to vote.

2 MS. MACKENTI: Even if they
3 missed prior meetings?

4 MEMBER SALADINO: Yes.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: If there is a
6 vote taken. The vote is binding. They
7 don't get to come three weeks later and
8 enter another vote.

9 MEMBER SALADINO: No. If the
10 vote is carried over to the next meeting.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: The question
12 is there --

13 MEMBER SALADINO: If I am
14 understanding Joann right, if they miss a
15 meeting and there is no vote taken at
16 that meeting, and there is a vote taken
17 at a meeting where they're present, even
18 though they physically missed the
19 discussion at the last meeting, would
20 they be entitled to vote?

21 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Is that your
22 question, Joann?

23 MS. MACKENTI: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. Because
25 I misunderstood what you said.

1 MS. MACKENTI: Maybe Mr. Prokop
2 can help here?

3 MR. PROKOP: They can
4 participate. They are expecting to
5 educate themselves at what took place at
6 the public hearing.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: And they would
8 have two instances to do that. They can
9 read the minutes which are available on
10 our website and are complete and also
11 from the video conference. So being gone
12 and they knew nothing, I would totally
13 agree with you. In educating themselves
14 is a good way to do it.

15 MEMBER SALADINO: There is going
16 to be two upcoming hearings that most
17 people are going to be concerned about.
18 And I think they will be well attended.
19 There will be a lot of public interest.
20 In my mind, there is no way either one
21 of those public hearings are going to
22 be resolved in the time limit that the
23 members are going to be away. There is
24 no doubt in my mind that these
25 discussions will be going on till at

1 least after the members come back. To
2 see what's going on, I think can only
3 help. So I think the Zoning Board agreed
4 that there wouldn't be a vote. The
5 people that weren't going to be in
6 attendance agreed that they wouldn't
7 vote. I am just not sure what else to
8 say about it. I think we're looking for
9 an elaborate solution to an non-existent
10 problem.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: So what I find
12 back to establishing a date for the
13 February meeting which would normally be
14 the third Wednesday. Mr. Corwin will be
15 here. I will be here. What about you
16 Mr. Saladino?

17 MEMBER SALADINO: God willing.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. Same
19 for me. At this time, we expected both
20 Ms. Gordon and Mr. Moore will not. So we
21 will schedule the February meeting.

22 MEMBER GORDON: I don't know how
23 inconvenient it would be -- but as far as
24 my presence is concerned, I could be here
25 the following week. And we're a very

1 small group. It seems to me like it
2 might make sense to do it --

3 MEMBER CORWIN: I object to
4 that. It has been the third week and I
5 want to stay with the third week.

6 MEMBER GORDON: Okay. Just a
7 suggestion. I feel uncomfortable that if
8 a vote has to be taken, it has to be
9 unanimous with three --

10 MEMBER CORWIN: Don't leave town.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: True.

12 MEMBER SALADINO: Well, a vote
13 that with a quorum that fails, 2 to 1
14 vote, it would just come up at the next
15 meeting or reapply.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: None of us
17 expect that we will get to the point of
18 voting of the matter before us. So I
19 would to suggest that the ZBA meeting of
20 February be held on the 24th because to
21 the best of our knowledge, four members
22 will physically be present. I would like
23 to propose that to the Board.

24 MEMBER CORWIN: Is this space
25 free on the 24th? And I am opposed to

1 that, whether it's free or not. The
2 third week in February. That is when we
3 have our meetings.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: There is no
5 motion on the floor.

6 MEMBER CORWIN: I make a motion
7 that we hold the February meeting on the
8 17th, the third week in February at
9 5:00 o'clock at the firehouse. I note
10 also that at 7:00 the fire wardens come
11 in here and we have to be out. So you
12 got to be brief.

13 MEMBER SALADINO: I take
14 exception to that. There is nothing that
15 says the fire wardens have priority over
16 the Village business.

17 MEMBER CORWIN: Well, it's their
18 building.

19 MEMBER SALADINO: No, it's not.

20 MEMBER CORWIN: Let's hold it at
21 the red schoolhouse.

22 MEMBER SALADINO: I have no
23 problem with that. I don't want them not
24 to be able to have their say because the
25 fire wardens have to have their meeting.

1 MEMBER CORWIN: That's fair
2 enough. I amend my motion to say that we
3 will hold the February meeting on the
4 third Wednesday of February, 2016 at
5 5:00 at the red school house on Front
6 Street in Greenport. So that we might
7 possibly extend the meeting at
8 7:00 o'clock.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Okay. If we
10 were planning to have a public meeting,
11 that location is a rather small
12 building.

13 MEMBER CORWIN: I think that it
14 could accommodate the size of crowd.

15 MEMBER SALADINO: Eileen what is
16 the capacity --

17 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I would say
18 25.

19 MEMBER CORWIN: More than that.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: There aren't
21 that many chairs in the building. I was
22 --

23 MR. PROKOP: You are discussing a
24 motion that doesn't have a second.
25 You need to have a motion seconded to

1 discuss --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Thank you. I
3 am concerned about accepting this
4 proposal and having another applicant to
5 vote on --

6 MEMBER GORDON: You need a
7 second.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: No one has
9 seconded the motion.

10 MR. PROKOP: So then it dies.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Thank you.
12 All right. I am having problems
13 scheduling a meeting with three people.

14 I would like to make a motion
15 that we postpone, not have a meeting in
16 February and schedule our next meeting
17 for the third Wednesday in March.

18 No second. Okay.

19 MEMBER CORWIN: All right. I am
20 making my motion again --

21 MEMBER SALADINO: Before you make
22 the motion so I can ask the attorney a
23 question. Is there a problem with
24 changing the location? Is there
25 something that happened at an

1 orgnzaizational meeting? Is there
2 something that prevents us from having --

3 MR. PROKOP: No.

4 MEMBER CORWIN: I make a motion
5 that the February meeting of the
6 Greenport Zoning Board of Appeals be held
7 on the 17th day of February, third week
8 of February and that rather than the
9 traditional location of the meeting room
10 in the firehouse, that the meeting be
11 held at the red school house on Front
12 Street in Greenport at the south-end of
13 First Street, at 5:00 o'clock.

14 MEMBER SALADINO: Second it. I
15 would like to look at the calendar to
16 see --

17 MS. WINGATE: I am trying to
18 look.

19 MEMBER SALADINO: I second that
20 motion.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: We're also
22 planning to have a public meeting on the
23 applicant on the hotel and --

24 MEMBER CORWIN: Let's square away
25 the date and location of the public

1 hearings.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Let's vote on
3 the motion.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Corwin?

5 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

7 MEMBER SALADINO: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Gordon?

9 MEMBER GORDON: No.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Yes. So we
11 will schedule our meeting -- it will be
12 at the schoolhouse on the 17th. Now we
13 have a public hearing to advertise.

14 MEMBER CORWIN: I make a motion
15 that we advertise the Robert Moore
16 application for fence and deck variance
17 to be published in the Suffolk Times and
18 to have a public hearing at the February
19 17th meeting of the Zoning Board of
20 Appeals of the Village of Greenport.

21 MEMBER SALADINO: Second.

22 MR. PROKOP: There is a question
23 on the motion. What about the site
24 visit?

25 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: We did that

1 site visit today. We did it because we
2 were not aware that it wasn't properly
3 noticed.

4 MR. PROKOP: Okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Are you
6 suggesting that we should revisit the
7 site?

8 MR. PROKOP: No.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Corwin?

10 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

12 MEMBER SALADINO: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Gordon?

14 MEMBER GORDON: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: And Ms. Neff,
16 yes.

17 So the motion carries, we will
18 conduct that meeting on the 17th.

19 MEMBER CORWIN: I will make a
20 motion that we hold a public hearing on
21 the application SAKD Holdings, LLC to be
22 advertised in the Suffolk Times, the
23 official newspaper of the Village of
24 Greenport for the February meeting of the
25 17th and that public hearing will be held

1 at 5:30 at the red schoolhouse on Front
2 Street in Greenport and that we will have
3 an inspection of the site at 4:15. Did I
4 cover everything? An inspection at
5 4:15. Public hearing at 5:30. We will
6 set the Moore public hearing at 5:00
7 o'clock. So we will do another motion
8 for that.

9 MEMBER SALADINO: I second it.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Corwin?

11 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

13 MEMBER SALADINO: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Gordon?

15 MEMBER GORDON: Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I vote yes.

17 I don't think that we need
18 another motion. The first public hearing
19 will be held at 5:00. The site visit for
20 the SAKD will be at 4:15. And the public
21 hearing on that matter will be at 5:30.

22 MEMBER CORWIN: So we're
23 acknowledging that the Moore public
24 hearing will be at 5:00 -- let me make a
25 motion --

1 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: I don't think
2 we need to. That's our regularly
3 scheduled time.

4 MEMBER CORWIN: I have one more
5 motion to make. I make a motion that we
6 appoint John Saladino as the chairman for
7 the February and March meetings of the
8 Village of Greenport Zoning Board of
9 Appeals

10 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Second please?

11 MEMBER GORDON: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Corwin?

13 MEMBER CORWIN: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Mr. Saladino?

15 MEMBER SALADINO: Abstain.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Ms. Gordon?

17 MEMBER GORDON: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: And I will
19 vote, yes.

20 Can I have a motion to adjourn.

21 MEMBER CORWIN: So moved.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Second.

23 All in favor?

24 MEMBER SALADINO: Aye.

25 MEMBER CORWIN: Aye.

1

MEMBER GORDON: Aye.

2

CHAIRPERSON NEFF: Aye.

3

4

(Whereupon, the meeting concluded.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Jessica DiLallo, a Notary Public
for and within the State of New York, do
hereby certify:

THAT, the witness(es) whose
testimony is herein before set forth, was
duly sworn by me, and,

THAT, the within transcript is a
true record of the testimony given by
said witness(es).

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand this day,
December 1, 2015.

Jessica DiLallo
(Jessica DiLallo)

* * *