

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

VILLAGE OF GREENPORT.
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK : STATE OF NEW YORK
-----x
PLANNING BOARD
WORK SESSION & REGULAR MEETING
-----x

May 4, 2023
5:00 p.m.

Station One Firehouse
236 3rd Street
Greenport, New York 11944

In The Matter of Item No. 1, 111 Main Street,
Greenport, New York, pre-submission conference regarding
The Application of Brian C. Doyle, Esq., on behalf of
PWIB CLAUDIO REAL ESTATE LLC,
SCTM# 1001-5-.4-25,38.1,39

BEFORE:

PATRICIA HAMMES - Chairwoman
DANIEL CREEDON - Member
ELIZABETH TALERMAN - Member
FRANCIS WALTON - Member
SHAWN BUCHANAN - Member

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL NOONE - Clerk of the Board
JOSEPH PROKOP - Village Attorney

1 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Good afternoon. Welcome
2 to the scheduled worksession and regular meeting of
3 the Village of Greenport's Planning Board for
4 Thursday, May 4th, 2023.

5 This meeting is a public meeting and includes
6 a pre-submission hearing in respect to the property
7 located at 111 Main Street, commonly referred to as
8 Claudio's and/or Crabby Jerry's.

9 As a reminder to the applicant and the
10 public, if you are speaking today, please start by
11 slowly and clearly stating your full name and
12 address for the record. In addition, please
13 remember that all comments should be addressed
14 solely to the Planning Board and not to any
15 applicant or person in the audience. Thank you.

16 The first order of business today is a
17 continuation of a pre-submission conference
18 regarding the application of Brian C. Doyle, Esq.,
19 on behalf of PWIB Claudio Real Estate LLC.

20 The application requests site plan review in
21 respect to a proposed extension of an existing
22 canopy over the "waterfront" wharf on the property.

23 The property is located in the W-C Waterfront
24 Commercial District and is also in the Historic
25 District.

1 The property is located at SCTM No.
2 1001-5.-4-25,38.1,39.

3 While there currently is a moratorium in
4 effect in respect to site plan approvals for
5 properties located in the W-C District, it has been
6 determined that this application may proceed
7 pursuant to that certain order and conditions of
8 conditional discharge entered into by the Justice
9 Court of the Town of Southold in respect to certain
10 claims brought by the Village of Greenport against
11 PWIB Claudio Real Estate LLC, the owner of the
12 relevant property, which was entered into on
13 November 30th, 2022.

14 For reference, in granting a discharge of the
15 claims of the Village, the Court imposed certain
16 conditions on Claudio's, including the following:

17 Claudio's agreed to make application for
18 building permit, site plan approvals, variances,
19 and/or historic preservation approvals, if required,
20 for the site within 60 days of the date of the
21 conditional discharge; and to diligently pursue such
22 applications, including providing documents or other
23 materials reasonably requested in connection
24 therewith.

25 Claudio's also specifically agreed to file

1 for site plan approval for an awning on the
2 extension being currently erected over a wharf area
3 on part of the property.

4 In addition, Claudio's agreed to obtain
5 professional design for a sound buffering structure
6 along the bar area facing the marina so as to buffer
7 and protect the marina area from noise from the bar
8 to the satisfaction of and obtaining approval from
9 the Planning Board.

10 Claudio's further agreed to develop and
11 submit for approval, in conjunction with the site
12 plan approval required above, a plan to provide
13 parking for customers of the business and to
14 mitigate the impacts of the business on parking in
15 the Village, and obtain approval of said parking
16 plan.

17 I note that Claudio's first came before the
18 Planning Board in respect to the proposed canopy
19 extension in June of 2022.

20 I further note that the current applicable
21 site plan for this property is the site plan which
22 was approved by this Planning Board in findings and
23 determinations entered into in July of 2020.

24 Applicant has specifically acknowledged that
25 the current conditions on the property do not

1 conform in all respects with the existing site plan
2 approval, including in respect to landscaping,
3 lighting and certain other areas that are described
4 on the existing approved site plan.

5 Moreover, upon a review of the findings and
6 determinations applicable to the July 2020 site plan
7 approval, this Board's Planning Consultant LKMA has
8 indicated that the site plan and drawings submitted
9 in connection with the current application continue
10 to omit certain details required under the General
11 Conditions section of those findings and
12 determinations.

13 I also note that pursuant to the findings and
14 determinations approving the July 2020 site plan,
15 applicant was obligated to inform this Planning
16 Board and re-appear before this Board in the event
17 at any time that the parking agreement it had
18 entered into in 2020 with the Greenport School
19 District terminated or was not renewed.

20 At this time could I please ask the applicant
21 to approach the podium and state his name and
22 address for the record.

23 MR. DOYLE: Good afternoon, my name is Brian
24 Doyle, I'm an attorney with Greenberg Traurig in
25 Bridgehampton, New York. I appear tonight for PWIB

1 Claudio's.

2 Congratulations, Chairwoman and new members
3 of the Board.

4 We have submitted to you today, to your
5 attorney, and I recognize the late submission, of
6 the SoundSense memorandum dated May 3rd.

7 At our last pre-submission meeting the
8 applicant heard the views of the Board and of the
9 public that despite what we believe to be a
10 compliant sound buffering system that we have
11 installed over the pier, that there was still noise
12 complaints coming in, though not formally charged,
13 that it was a challenge for the Village to address.

14 We have had our consultant go out to the
15 property and we have prepared a statement to you
16 where we are prepared to install additional
17 measurements to mitigate the sound, and recognizing,
18 you know, the late submission, I would ask that
19 before our next pre-submission meeting, I don't know
20 who the Village would like to go out and meet on
21 site with our consultant, if it's Mr. Pallas or L.K.
22 McLean, to take a look at what we propose to do, but
23 we are happy to work in conjunction with the Village
24 to do that.

25 So I would ask that you review that and

1 please let us know, you know, when and if you would
2 like to do that.

3 But the inclusion of that report, and
4 Mr. Harkin is here from SoundSense, is that what is
5 installed there now is sufficient. There will be
6 additional material that will be provided to the
7 pier and that material he believes will enhance the
8 system significantly. The canopy itself that we
9 propose is going to enhance the system
10 significantly, in his opinion. So I would ask that
11 you take that into consideration.

12 The last time we were here also there was
13 some mention that extending the canopy may affect
14 navigability around the Claudio's pier. I don't
15 think there has been any evidence submitted by your
16 engineering firm that that is the case. I think
17 that was an issue raised by the Chairwoman.

18 I just offer for your review an aerial of the
19 Claudio's dock and the neighboring, I think it's the
20 Village pier.

21 (Handing).

22 The Village pier extends far out into the
23 bay, around the Claudio's dock. It's difficult for
24 me to understand how extending a clear canopy, that
25 is also retractable. There are times when it's

1 retracted. But even if it were opaque, I don't
2 understand how extending that canopy could affect
3 navigability when the pier that the Village owns
4 extends way beyond our pier.

5 So if that's a complaint, I would just ask
6 for clarification on that from the Board or your
7 engineer so we can attempt to address it.

8 The other item that was raised by the
9 Chairwoman at our last hearing was, and I have not
10 received any clarification on that from the Village,
11 is whether or not we require a variance to obtain
12 this relief.

13 My review of the statute in its Section
14 150-11C(c)[1][d] indicates that we do not require a
15 variance. The language of the statute says that the
16 use is not permitted or shall not cover more than
17 50% of the over-water deck, dock, pier or wharf.

18 The extension of this canopy won't extend the
19 use. It won't intensify the use. It won't make the
20 use any larger.

21 We have a CO'd restaurant and bar use on this
22 pier dating back to at least 1991. This particular
23 use was approved by this Board in July of 2020, and
24 all we seek to do is cover the use and keep the use
25 free from the elements.

1 I hear tonight for the first time that there
2 continue to be problems with Mr. Brown's plans. I
3 have not received anything in writing from the
4 Village. I understand that some of the Board
5 members have raised that with us, that there are
6 indicia and marginalia on the plans that you would
7 like to see removed. I asked your engineer tonight
8 if I could have a list of those. We are happy to
9 remedy that right away.

10 I know that there were some items that Mr.
11 Brennan raised last time that there were indicators,
12 that they were on there, that confused him or didn't
13 need to be there. If I can just get an e-mail or
14 writing on what things you would like to see
15 removed, we'll accommodate that. But for the
16 purposes of this application, we are only talking
17 about the extended canopy.

18 So I would hope that to the extent we can, we
19 can narrow our focus just on that extended canopy
20 area.

21 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Okay. I guess a couple of
22 things. First of all, going back to the last point
23 that I raised in my opening remarks. Do you happen
24 to know whether or not the parking agreement that
25 was entered into in 2020 had stayed in effect since

1 then?

2 MR. DOYLE: My understanding is, I have always
3 been told by my client that is fully operational.

4 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Could you please submit
5 copies of those?

6 MR. DOYLE: Sure.

7 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Because the original
8 agreement on its face terminated that year.

9 MR. DOYLE: Sure.

10 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So I think this Board
11 would like to see evidence of that.

12 I think this Board would also like to
13 understand in the future, and at the next meeting
14 that we have, how exactly Claudio's is working to
15 make sure that that parking is actually being used.
16 Because it's one thing to sign a piece of paper and
17 it's another thing to actually make sure that it's
18 being implemented.

19 MR. DOYLE: You raised that at a prior
20 hearing, I think. And I believe -- and Mr. Pascano
21 is here -- I believe Claudio's shuttles people to
22 and from. But I will clarify that. If there are --
23 our employees are directed to park there. So if
24 that is going to continue to be an issue, we'll
25 address it.

1 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Okay.

2 So I think the bigger point that I have for
3 discussion, I guess both for yourself and among the
4 Board members for this evening, goes to almost the
5 last point you made about the application being
6 solely with respect to the existing canopy.

7 It is my reading of the court order, and I
8 discussed this with both the Village Attorney and
9 with the Planning Board attorney to a lesser extent,
10 that that order is not just in respect of the
11 canopy. There is a specific provision relating to
12 that, but it requires Claudio's, to the extent it is
13 not compliant with its current site plan, to make
14 such filings as are necessary to ensure it has a
15 valid, fully approved site plan. And I don't think
16 you or your client disagrees that there are certain
17 things from the 2020 site plan that have not been
18 done, some of which, I understand, may be intended
19 to be done, and some of which I believe you changed
20 your mind about, for instance the elimination of
21 certain bathrooms.

22 And based on further discussions that I have
23 had with the Village and the Planning Consultant and
24 the Village Attorney, I think that really there are
25 certain things that this Board needs to be able to

1 move forward with this application.

2 And in particular, to the extent that the
3 property's current conditions don't match the
4 existing 2020 site plan approval, I really think you
5 are going to need to amend the site plan application
6 to address those issues.

7 So in kind of specifics of documents that I
8 think either have been submitted but have not been
9 submitted in adequate form, or have not been
10 submitted at all, is first off, my understanding is
11 that the Village has previously requested, and I
12 think this is, you can consider this an official
13 request, to the extent this message has not been
14 received previously, for an existing conditions plan
15 in respect to the property that satisfies
16 generally-accepted engineering and planning
17 practices or requirements in order to enable the
18 Village and Planning Consultant to review the
19 existing site plan conditions against the existing
20 site plan approval and proposed site plan --

21 (These proceedings momentarily interrupted by
22 the Fire Station alarm sounding).

23 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: (Continuing) My
24 understanding is that this is commonly accepted in
25 Planning and that this Board has previously, both

1 last year and this year, raised the issue that
2 considering the site plan it wants to ensure it is
3 not inadvertently approving a site plan that has
4 things on it that it is not fully aware of, and in
5 order to do that, it has requested that the Village
6 and the Planning Consultant confirm that what
7 exactly is not in compliance at Claudio's with
8 respect to its existing site plan approvals, so we
9 are not inadvertently approving something that we
10 don't intend to approve. In order to do that, we
11 are requesting an existing conditions plan.

12 In addition, as I previously just mentioned,
13 we believe that the application for site plan review
14 needs to be fully updated to specifically lay out a
15 detailed list of the changes from the existing site
16 plan approval from 2020, that the applicant does not
17 propose to comply with, and we would request that
18 anything that the applicant does propose to comply
19 with in the future but is currently unable to, that
20 it give a detailed description of what its plan is
21 for working to, um, satisfy those requirements, and
22 a timeline for satisfying those requirements.

23 With respect to lighting, I specifically note
24 that it's the sole obligation of the applicant to
25 address this electric service layout and ensure

1 compliance with the site plan.

2 To the extent you need assistance from any
3 applicable utility services, including the Village
4 in its capacity as a utility provider, you should
5 include that information in the application along
6 with the proposed timeline of how you are going to
7 work with the Village in that respect.

8 MR. DOYLE: We have done that. We have
9 provided electrical upgrade plans to Mr. Pallas in
10 that regard in January.

11 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I understand. But what
12 I'm asking for on this Board is that you provide a
13 timeline from where you think, how you are going to
14 work with the Village to get through that electrical
15 upgrade services plan.

16 MR. DOYLE: I understand that. We have not
17 heard anything from Mr. Pallas in months on that, so
18 if you would kindly just ask Mr. Pallas to
19 communicate with us on that, we would happily do
20 that. I just --

21 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: You can pass that on to
22 him, but that's really between you and the Village
23 and the capacity of the Village Building Department
24 and his utility provider.

25 MR. DOYLE: I'm just telling you so that you

1 understand.

2 MR. PROKOP: So I could tell you -- excuse me.
3 I'm sorry. Can I speak?

4 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Sure. Can you just say who
5 you --

6 MR. PROKOP: Village Attorney Joseph Prokop
7 sitting in for Mr. Connelly tonight, at his request.

8 Just to make it clear to you, we did speak
9 with Mr. Pallas today, specifically on that point.
10 He actually asked that this be clarified, assuming
11 that you were going to raise that, and he wants it
12 made clear on the record on his behalf that we have
13 not, although we'll have received material regarding
14 a potential electric upgrade, we have not received
15 plans -- neither he nor the Village has received
16 plans for an electrical upgrade. So if you have a
17 problem with that, you should --

18 MR. DOYLE: I'll state on the record, Joe --

19 MR. PROKOP: (Continuing) It's not really a
20 matter before the Planning Board. Please direct
21 that to Mr. Pallas.

22 MR. DOYLE: Well, I just want to make it clear
23 for the Board, we delivered those plans to Mr.
24 Pallas in writing, in the presence of Mr. Prokop, on
25 January 27th, 2023, and Mr. Pallas, and I have a

1 confirmatory writing, says he'll review them. And I
2 have not heard from him in two months.

3 So I'm not trying to be difficult with Joe,
4 but, you know, I'm the applicant, I deliver plans to
5 the Building Department, please tell us what's wrong
6 with them, and I hear nothing back.

7 So I'll correspond with him. We can bring an
8 action against him to review them. I don't know
9 what else to do. We are trying to comply. But,
10 that's fine, I can deal with it in other ways. I'm
11 sorry, Chairman.

12 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: No, that's all right.
13 Your comment is noted, as is Attorney Prokop's.

14 In any event, the site plan application that
15 goes with this, I just want to make sure, because we
16 have been having this problem with some other site
17 plans, so this is a more general point that I'm
18 making to applicants, is that site plans need to be
19 double-checked and triple-checked that they comply
20 with all the requirements of Section 150-30, and
21 that includes details as to, you know, any
22 utilities, amendments, rights-of-way, any changes
23 that you might be needing to make to the site plan
24 for the utility upgrade or the like.

25 So that may be on there, I don't know. That

1 is something I'll need confirmation from the
2 Planning consultant on.

3 MR. DOYLE: It is on there.

4 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: The next point I have goes
5 to the memo you already mentioned that we received
6 today, we, because of the time that we received it
7 in, we have not had an opportunity to review it. We
8 will. I would note that going forward, not just
9 with respect to your application, but all
10 applications, we are not going to take into account
11 materials we have not received in a week in advance
12 of any hearing.

13 MR. DOYLE: I understand that.

14 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I'm going to repeat this
15 later in the meeting so it's on the record for all
16 applicants going forward. But, just to note that.

17 So we reserve all rights with respect to
18 reviewing that report and commenting on it at this
19 time.

20 And then I guess we discussed somewhat the
21 2020 parking agreement, we'd asked, again, for an
22 update on that, as well as a written description of
23 how Claudio's intends to encourage and implement the
24 use of that agreement.

25 I also would like to note that in the cover

1 letter that you sent accompanying the January 27th,
2 2023 application, you expressed the view that SEQRA
3 review is not required for the proposed site plan
4 amendment. I'm not sure that -- we are not in a
5 position to fully say this at this point, but we've
6 previously, with site plans for Claudio's,
7 determined that they are a Type I SEQRA action, and
8 I suspect we'll come out in the same fashion for
9 this one.

10 So again, when you go back and you look at
11 that application, to update it, to reflect any
12 changes that you think need to be made for things
13 that you don't intend to do that are in the current
14 site plan and/or address any outstanding things --

15 MR. DOYLE: Understood.

16 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: (Continuing) we would ask
17 that you make sure that you put it in a form such
18 that it would satisfy Type I SEQRA action
19 requirements.

20 On your point on 150-11(c)[1][c], obviously
21 this Board will need to discuss this at some point,
22 but my, one of the things that I was going to bring
23 up for this Board's consideration today, is that at
24 next meeting where we discuss this, I think we
25 should consider a referral from this Board to the

1 ZBA on this point for their interpretation of
2 whether those provisions apply or not, because there
3 is lot of, there has been a lot said on those
4 things, and at this point I think to some extent
5 it's a ZBA question in the first instance of their
6 interpretation of that, their sections of the code,
7 which would include both the 50% rule as well as in
8 150-11(e), there is a provision that says there is
9 no outdoor public address or music system audible
10 beyond the limits of the site.

11 So that's something this Board will take up
12 at some point and consider referring.

13 I don't know, my intention right now,
14 frankly, is, one, I'll see if any of my colleagues
15 have any comments, but otherwise I think that this
16 Board is in a position where I would like to make a
17 motion that we table this hearing until such time as
18 we do receive that existing conditions plan and the
19 revised application that I've mentioned, and that
20 they've been signed off on by our Planning
21 Consultant. Because I don't know, putting aside
22 some of the substantive points that have come up
23 about the canopy extension, I don't think that we
24 have all the materials or information that we need
25 at this time to have a full and comprehensive

1 discussion with you and your client about any
2 concerns that we may have until we have that
3 existing site plan, I mean that existing conditions
4 plan, it's been reviewed by the consultant, they've
5 provided input to us, and we receive your revised
6 application.

7 You are welcome to comment on that before I
8 make an official motion, but it's my intention to
9 make that motion.

10 MR. DOYLE: You can make that motion.

11 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Okay. Well then at this
12 time I would like to make a motion that this
13 Board -- well, first of all, before I do that, do
14 any of my colleagues have anything they would like
15 to add? I know I just have been talking a lot. I
16 spent most of the day on this, so.

17 MEMBER WALTON: Francis Walton, newer member
18 of the Planning Board.

19 So I definitely appreciate having some time
20 to review the materials before us, and in
21 particular, you know, I think I would appreciate
22 greater understanding of the 50% rule and the
23 eight-foot clearance requirements. I can't yet cite
24 the exact section of the code. But, um, so I think
25 that that would be very helpful, you know, in terms

1 of getting ZBA feedback on that.

2 Also, I'm not sure, it's a much better aerial
3 view of the one I was able to print out, but I'm not
4 sure that this is conclusive, from my perspective,
5 that it doesn't present greater coverage of height
6 on the pier. It doesn't present, you know, a
7 visibility issue. But that, you know, is for
8 further consideration.

9 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Thank you. Shawn?
10 Anything?

11 MEMBER BUCHANAN: Yes. Again, I think it's
12 important for to us to have a full picture of
13 everything that is going on on this site. It's
14 really difficult, because as I mentioned before, it
15 does feel like things, some of the things that have
16 come in and things that are, even some of the things
17 on the plans submitted today about moving the
18 speakers and the dock houses at the other end of the
19 project area, and it's really getting everything
20 sort of all the same so that we are looking at the
21 same things on every document. So it's like this is
22 2020 and this is 2023. So that we just know what we
23 are looking at. And I think that would make this
24 much easier to get where we need to go.

25 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Anything?

1 MEMBER TALERMAN: No. I agree, I would like a
2 site -- the site plan and existing conditions, um,
3 to be existing and not, without verbal explanations
4 of what will or has shifted.

5 MR. DOYLE: Understood.

6 MEMBER CREEDON: And something that, um, I
7 think Francis just mentioned it, I was looking at it
8 earlier, on the eight-foot for the designated
9 access, the eight-foot width, I didn't measure it,
10 but it looks like the east and west side is clearly
11 much less than eight feet, whereas the south side
12 looks like it may very well be eight feet. Maybe
13 more than enough. But that looks much narrower, at
14 least in my sight.

15 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So at this time I would
16 like to make a motion that this Board table further
17 discussions or consideration after today's meeting
18 of any site plan application, or this site plan
19 application by Claudio's, until such time as we have
20 received an existing conditions plan that has been
21 reviewed and deemed satisfactory to the Village
22 Board, Building Department and our Planning
23 Consultant for purposes of considering a new site
24 plan application, and also a revised application
25 requesting the site plan approval that satisfies the

1 requirements of a Type I SEQRA action meets all the
2 requirements of Section 150-30 of the Village Code
3 and details the following: A request for site plan
4 approval in respect of any deviations from the 2020
5 site plan application and conditions set forth in
6 the related findings and determinations applicable
7 to the approval of said site plan which the
8 applicant does not propose to address in order to
9 conform to the 2020 site plan approval.

10 And two, a detailed timeline and proposal for
11 how applicant proposes to address any remaining
12 deviations from the 2020 site plan application and
13 conditions set forth in the related findings and
14 determinations.

15 As part of this motion I would propose that
16 no further hearings be held before this Board or be
17 scheduled before this Board in respect to this
18 property until the foregoing have been received by
19 this Board in satisfactory form at least ten days in
20 advance of the regularly scheduled meeting of this
21 Board, and we would want such plans to have been
22 signed off on by both the Village and the Planning
23 Board.

24 Do I have a second on this motion?

25 MEMBER TALERMAN: Second.

1 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those in favor?

2 (ALL AYES).

3 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those opposed?

4 (No response).

5 Motion carries.

6 I would ask that you and your client work
7 closely with the Village and LKMA to pull those
8 materials together. And I understand you are not
9 that Planning Board and you can only do so much in
10 this respect. I understand your point.

11 MR. DOYLE: I would love it, candidly, and I
12 understand. I would love it if someone from the
13 Planning Board would stay involved because --

14 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I'm always available, so.

15 MR. DOYLE: And that would be very helpful.
16 I'm going to bug you then, because it's become very
17 frustrating. But I appreciate it.

18 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I think LKMA, I would
19 request, I think some of the stuff that we've
20 discussed in terms of the general conditions that
21 were in the 2020 determination as a starting point,
22 we can send that over to them for sure.

23 So maybe if you can try to work together with
24 Laura to put a list of things that you think we need
25 to get and share that with me and Rob and the

1 Village, and we'll endeavor to get that to you as
2 quickly as possible.

3 You know, we are not trying to delay this
4 process but we really do need to make sure that we
5 have a holistic view of everything that is going on
6 on the property, and, you know, there is concern
7 that we kind of get the incrementalism on the edges
8 sometimes on some of these proposals.

9 MR. DOYLE: I understand that.

10 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So I thank you for your
11 speaking.

12 MR. DOYLE: Thank you, as well.

13 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I assume nobody has
14 anything further on this application at this time.

15 (Negative response).

16 Okay, thank you.

17 Moving on to Item No. 2 on our agenda for
18 today. This time is allotted for a discussion
19 regarding Planning Board policies, procedures and
20 relevant current issues.

21 First off, I note already that we voted at
22 last meeting to schedule our next meeting for May
23 25th at 4:30. While I'm not sure we are going to
24 need it, I think maybe we should go ahead and have a
25 motion this evening to schedule a meeting for

1 Thursday, June 1st, because otherwise I'm afraid we
2 will not have enough time to notice it if we wait
3 until May 25th.

4 MR. NOONE: Well, there is only one item on
5 the agenda, and that's 29 Front Street.

6 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Which is a public hearing,
7 I know. But is it possible an application can come
8 in this week, that we would still be able to hear on
9 the first week of June?

10 MR. NOONE: There would not be time in between
11 the 25th and the 1st to notice something.

12 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: No, I understand that.
13 But is it possible that something could come in for
14 pre-submission and can still be heard on the 1st?

15 MR. NOONE: Well, pre-submission would lead to
16 public hearing, but there isn't time between the
17 25th and the 1st to notice it.

18 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: No, but we might not do
19 the pre-submission on the -- I don't believe we are
20 going to need the 1st but I think, unless people
21 object, it wouldn't hurt for us to schedule it in
22 case we do need it.

23 MR. NOONE: Oh, yes, of course an application
24 can come in.

25 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So at this time I would

1 like to make a motion to schedule a Planning Board
2 regular meeting and worksession for 4:30 PM on
3 Thursday, June 1st, 2023. Do I have a second?

4 MEMBER WALTON: Second.

5 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those in favor?

6 (ALL AYES).

7 Any opposed?

8 (Negative response).

9 Motion carries.

10 MEMBER CREEDON: The motion didn't include a
11 time to begin.

12 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: It will be at 4:30. All
13 of our meetings going forward will be at 4:30.

14 MEMBER CREEDON: Thank you.

15 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So I know we had a general
16 discussion about our schedule going forward, and I
17 don't think we've reached a resolution on that. I
18 think we are going to be, I mean, the only thing
19 that to me might feasibly work, from a notice
20 requirement, and I guess I just throw this out there
21 again, um, would be, one, to have our regularly
22 scheduled meetings going forward at 4:30 on the
23 first Thursday of each month, which I think we've
24 all agreed we'll do, but then to the extent that we
25 need to have a second monthly meeting, which would

1 really just be for pre-submission items, it would
2 not be anything for public hearing, but because of
3 that we would want to do it at a time where we could
4 get it on to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

5 I think the only day that might work for that
6 would be the third Monday of each month at 4:30, and
7 I know that that may make you have to use the Daily
8 News for your notice requirements if we did that?

9 MR. NOONE: It would be New York Newsday.

10 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Whichever one. But I
11 would like to propose, assuming this room is
12 available, that we pencil in the third Monday at
13 4:30 for any second meeting that we need to have,
14 and we would use that only for preliminary
15 submission work.

16 MR. NOONE: It theoretically works.

17 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Well, I'm just talking
18 more generally. We'll deal with it on a specific.
19 So just as a general rule going forward, our regular
20 meeting will be the first Thursday of each month at
21 4:30, and if we think we are going to need it, we'll
22 also schedule a, just a worksession for preliminary
23 submissions which will be held on the third Monday
24 of each month at 4:30, subject to holiday.

25 I don't have anything else on Item No. 2,

1 unless anybody else does.

2 (No response).

3 The next item is any other Planning Board
4 business that might properly come before this Board.

5 Does anyone on the Board or the public have
6 anything that they would like to raise at this time?

7 (No response).

8 All right. Then I'll make a motion to adjourn
9 this meeting. Do I have a second?

10 MEMBER WALTON: Second.

11 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those in favor?

12 (ALL AYES).

13 Any opposed?

14 (No response).

15 Motion carries. Thank you, all.

16 (The time noted is 5:33 p.m.)

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

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

I, WAYNE GALANTE, a Notary Public in and for
the State of New York, do hereby certify:

THAT the within transcript is a true record
of the proceedings taken on May 4, 2023.

I further certify that I am not related
either by blood or marriage, to any of the
parties in this action; and

THAT I am in no way interested in the
outcome of this matter.

Wayne Galante

WAYNE GALANTE