

1 VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
2 COUNTY OF SUFFOLK : STATE OF NEW YORK
3 -----x
4 PLANNING BOARD
5 WORK SESSION, PUBLIC HEARINGS & REGULAR MEETING
6 -----x
7 July 28, 2025
8 4:00 p.m.
9 Station One Firehouse
10 236 3rd Street
11 Greenport, New York 11944
12
13 Before:
14
15 PATRICIA HAMMES - Chairwoman
16 DANIEL CREEDON - Member
17 FRANCES WALTON - Member
18 ELIZABETH TALERMAN - Member
19 SHAWN BUCHANAN - Member
20
21 ALSO PRESENT:
22
23 MICHAEL NOONE - Clerk to the Board
24 IAN R. CONNETT, ESQ. - Board Counsel
25

FLYNN COURT REPORTING SERVICES
(631) 721-1107

1 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Good afternoon, and
2 welcome to the scheduled work session and regular
3 meeting of the Village of Greenport's Planning Board
4 for Monday, July 28th, 2025. It is currently 4:01
5 PM, and I hereby call this meeting to order.

6 This meeting is a public meeting. The
7 principal topic for discussion today is going to be
8 an overview of the results of the Planning Board
9 survey which was conducted during June, and a start
10 on a discussion on housing with the Village's
11 Housing Committee chaired by Dinni Gordon. The
12 Housing Committee members that come will be joining
13 us up here in the front.

14 We're going to start with a couple of
15 administrative items. The first order of business
16 today is a motion to accept and approve the Minutes
17 of the April 28th, 2025 Planning Board work session,
18 public hearing and regular meeting.

19 Do I have a second?

20 MEMBER WALTON: Second.

21 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those in favor?

22 (ALL AYES) .

23 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Opposed.

24 (No response) .

25 The motion carries.

1 The next order of business is a motion to
2 accept and approve the Minutes of the May 9th, 2025,
3 Planning Board, work session, public hearings and
4 regular meeting.

5 Do I have a second?

6 MEMBER WALTON: Second.

7 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those in favor?

8 (ALL AYES) .

9 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Opposed?

10 (No response) .

11 Motion carries.

12 The next order of business relates to an
13 open public hearing in respect of an application for
14 construction at 140 Main Street.

15 This project is located at Suffolk County
16 tax map 1001-5-3-18, and is located in the C-R
17 Retail Commercial District and is also located in
18 the Historic District.

19 The Planning Board accepted the site plan
20 application for this meeting at our April 28th, 2025
21 meeting. There are still some administrative issues
22 being addressed in connection with the notice of
23 denial issued for this project and related
24 variances.

25 We are thus going to continue to put a pin

1 in this public hearing and continue to hold it open,
2 but we are not going to discuss the application at
3 this time.

4 Given the most likely timeline for this
5 application being ready for Planning Board review,
6 I'm going to move to keep this open until our late
7 October meeting, however, to the extent that certain
8 predicate steps are completed sooner and we can meet
9 any required notice periods, including postings on
10 the Village website, publication in the official
11 paper and any required notice to neighboring
12 property owners, we'll revisit this as soon as we
13 can.

14 For now, however, I'm going to make the
15 following motion.

16 Whereas the public hearing on the
17 Application of Robert I. Brown, RA, on behalf of
18 Mark and Patty Carlos for a proposed new apartment
19 dwelling units at 140 Main Street was continued to
20 today, pending administrative actions to be taken by
21 the Village, now therefore the public hearing is
22 again continued to October 27th, 2025.

23 Do I have a second?

24 MEMBER BUCHANAN: Second.

25 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those in favor?

1 (ALL AYES) .

2 MEMBER CREEDON: Can I ask a question about
3 this. Not about this one specifically, but
4 generically about these types of applications, given
5 what the status of the -- it's an administrative
6 question.

7 I've always assumed that when these came
8 before us they were approved by the Building
9 Inspector, or, and up to code and things like points
10 of egress and other things.

11 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: That's not true.

12 MEMBER CREEDON: It was not true.

13 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: It's not necessarily
14 true. I mean, as to development pointed and any
15 relevant documents and memos that we get from our
16 consultant.

17 MEMBER CREEDON: I'm sorry, what was the
18 last part?

19 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: His consultant is
20 supposed to be identifying concerns for us, and we
21 have to accept it before it can go to the ZBA,
22 because we have to establish lead agency
23 jurisdiction. So it's never going to have gone to
24 the ZBA before it comes to us. But we won't make a
25 determination on it until after the ZBA.

1 MEMBER CREEDON: Right, but at the point
2 that we are going to approve something, it will have
3 gone through the process.

4 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Correct, but we have to
5 accept it first.

6 MEMBER CREEDON: Okay, is it still doing
7 it?

8 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: It is. There is also a
9 pending potential code change to address it, which
10 we'll be discussing at our August 15th meeting.

11 MEMBER CREEDON: Okay, thank you.

12 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those in favor?

13 (ALL AYES) .

14 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All those opposed?

15 (No response) .

16 Motion carries.

17 All right, in the original agenda for
18 today's meeting we had scheduled a public hearing on
19 the site plan application for 208 Main Street. That
20 application proposed a 22-seat pizza restaurant in
21 part of the property at that address.

22 At the time the hearing was scheduled to
23 meet notice requirements in case site plan review
24 was required, the application was still under review
25 by the Village's Building Department and counsel.

1 It has since been determined that that
2 project does not require site plan approval or
3 parking review, only a standard building permit.

4 We therefore will not be holding a hearing
5 on that, and that will progress in the ordinary
6 course through the Building Department.

7 I want to highlight this, though, because
8 it contrasts sharply with recent comments made by
9 members of the public and business community at last
10 week's Board of Trustees meeting, suggesting it has
11 become overly difficult to open a small business,
12 like a pizza place, in Greenport.

13 In reality, under the current code,
14 projects like this move forward without Planning
15 Board involvement or parking requirements, something
16 that was not always the case under the old code.

17 In fact, over the past six months, more
18 than six business, I think it's closer to eight or
19 nine, have submitted applications to open or expand
20 in the Village, and have either opened, received
21 permits, or are in the process of obtaining building
22 permits.

23 Many of these would have required Planning
24 Board approval in the past, but given the code
25 changes two years ago, they do not today.

1 Several residents and business owners
2 spoke passionately about this topic at last week's
3 Village Board meeting. Their concerns are
4 understandable, particularly from a development
5 standpoint.

6 While some statements were not made
7 entirely accurately, for example, several of the
8 larger projects that were referred to that have gone
9 through pre-submission process with this Board,
10 would have required traffic analysis and parking
11 review, even under prior code.

12 That does not diminish the sincerity or
13 legitimacy of their perspective.

14 That said, those views represent just one
15 perspective. In reality, our community encompasses a
16 wide spectrum of opinions on development, traffic,
17 parking, preserving village character and shaping
18 our future.

19 The village is home to residents with a
20 wide range of backgrounds. Some of these families
21 have lived here for generations, others who have
22 moved here more recently, and business owners, who
23 are vital to our local economy.

24 Naturally, priorities differ. Long-term
25 residents often focus on affordability, housing and

1 maintaining the businesses and services that are
2 essential for year-round living.

3 Newer residents, many of whom are
4 part-time or are weekend homeowners, may place
5 greater value on a more urban, cosmopolitan
6 experience, with enhanced esthetics, cultural
7 offerings and lifestyle amenities.

8 And business owners, they face a
9 significant challenge of sustaining operations in a
10 tourism-driven economy where they must cover 12
11 months of costs in just a few peak months.

12 Our population is also diverse in terms of
13 the life stage and priorities. For example, some
14 younger adults may be focused on employment
15 opportunities, affordable housing and social or
16 cultural activities.

17 Families often emphasize education, access
18 to recreational spaces and housing stability, while
19 many older residents value a quieter environment and
20 community safety.

21 In addition, some community members
22 prioritize environmental protection, water quality
23 and preserving the historic working waterfront,
24 while others are more interested in promoting
25 seasonal tourism and attracting new residents and

1 investors.

2 These differing realities create tension
3 points. But all perspectives are valid and deserve
4 to be heard.

5 Our responsibility as a Planning Board is
6 to listen with respect and to work toward a balanced
7 approach that serves the best interest of the entire
8 community, both now and in the years ahead.

9 This is an important point. There is no
10 single right answer or singular vision for
11 Greenport. It's critical to acknowledge and respect
12 this diversity of perspectives. No one viewpoint
13 should dominate.

14 The roll of this Board is to listen to all
15 voices and balance short term needs with long term
16 impacts in the best interest of the entire Village.

17 Every time I consider a matter before the
18 Planning Board, I set aside my personal preferences
19 and biases, which, for the record, include a high
20 degree of scepticism about the idea that more
21 parking is always necessary. And I focus on the
22 potential impact the proposed development may have
23 on different constituencies within the village as
24 well as the community as a whole. That is our job as
25 a Planning Board.

1 The code amendments adopted two years ago
2 were the result of significant community input and
3 extensive work by the Board of Trustees and our
4 volunteer boards. Are they perfect? No, absolutely
5 not. I've identified a number of things that need
6 to be changed, and after two years of implementation
7 we do see areas that need fine tuning and change,
8 and the Planning Board is going to be working over
9 the next coming months to come up with
10 recommendations on that.

11 This survey that we're going to be talking
12 about in a little bit is a part of that. But
13 overall, those changes have made it easier for small
14 business opening in existing buildings that don't
15 involve major construction by removing unnecessary
16 layers of review that were in the old code.

17 Large scale projects, on the other hand,
18 that involve significant construction, still require
19 sit plan review, and in some cases conditional use
20 approval. This is for good reason.

21 Such projects can have far-reaching
22 impacts on safety, infrastructure, traffic and
23 community character. Taking time for a thorough
24 review is not obstruction, it is responsible
25 planning.

1 It is also worth noting that approvals run
2 with a property, not the owner. Once a project is
3 approved, it stays approved even if the business
4 changes hands to someone with very different
5 priorities. That is why these decisions require a
6 long-term perspective, not just consideration of a
7 particular applicant's current intentions or
8 popularity within the community.

9 Finally, while the Building Department has
10 most certainly faced its challenges this past year,
11 and I have been outspoken about that at numerous
12 Board of Trustees meetings, and those challenges
13 have caused delay and sometimes inconsistent
14 guidance, I believe the Village is working hard to
15 address those issues and streamline the process.

16 The Planning Board shares this goal. We
17 want the system to work fairly and efficiently for
18 everyone.

19 Our mission on this Board is not to
20 re-invent Greenport for one group, for one vision.
21 It is to maintain the Village's economic and
22 community vibrancy while protecting its character,
23 ensuring it remains livable for both year-round and
24 seasonal residents; for those that have lived here
25 their whole life, for those that are moving here,

1 and for those that will come in the future.

2 We do welcome all perspectives, but I want
3 to say, and actually applies across our country
4 right now, constructive dialogue requires
5 recognizing that no single viewpoint represents the
6 whole picture.

7 That's all I have to say on that topic for
8 today.

9 Moving on. We're now going to move on to
10 our presentation and discussion on the results of
11 the Planning Board survey conducted in June. I'm
12 going to turn it over to Elizabeth to run everyone
13 through the survey results, but before doing that, I
14 again have some general comments I would like to
15 make.

16 I had not intended to make the prior
17 comments, but felt the need to this evening.

18 First off, I want to thank Board members
19 Elizabeth Talerman and Frances Walton, in
20 particular, for all of their hard work on the
21 survey. They really took the lead on this and got
22 it out into the community, and worked on putting it
23 together and processing the results.

24 I also want to thank all the members of
25 the public that participated in the survey. This

1 would not be valuable without your input.

2 The survey was designed to gather a clear
3 and more data-driven understanding of how Greenport
4 residents feel about some of the reoccurring and
5 divisive topics that come up in discussions about
6 the Village, rather than relying on hearsay or on
7 the loudest voices in the room. We hope that the
8 survey would give us and the Board of Trustees the
9 opportunity to get some real insight into the
10 community's priorities and concerns.

11 What is clear from the results, as you'll
12 see, is that housing availability and the concerns
13 about vacancies, both residential and commercial,
14 are front of mind for a strong majority of
15 respondents. There is a shared urgency around
16 increasing the availability of year-round affordable
17 housing in the Village, particularly for local
18 workers, long-time residents and families.

19 Respondents expressed frustration about
20 vacant or poorly maintained homes, as well as a
21 broader sense of erosion in the residential fabric
22 caused by a plethora of second homeowners,
23 investment and investor-owned properties used for
24 short-time rentals.

25 In parallel, many respondents expressed

1 dissatisfaction with long-term commercial vacancies,
2 especially in prominent buildings in the downtown
3 core area. These highly visible empty storefronts
4 and commercial properties resided not just as a sign
5 of economic stagnation, but as a drag on the overall
6 character and vitality of the Village.

7 The clear message is that residents want
8 to see buildings, whether residential or commercial,
9 activated and contributing to the life of the
10 community.

11 Housing and vacancy issues were not
12 discussed in a vacuum. The comments made clear that
13 support for new housing, whether through mixed-use
14 development or accessory dwelling units, otherwise
15 known as ADUs, often comes with specific conditions.

16 Residents expressed a strong desire to
17 ensure that any new units are truly affordable and
18 not simply additional inventory for the short-term
19 rental market.

20 Many emphasize the need for regulations
21 that prioritize full-time residents, and prevent
22 further displacement of the local work force.

23 Other recurring themes included concerns
24 about the balance of property rights versus
25 community standards, the impact of tourism, and the

1 need to preserve the character and livability of
2 Greenport for year-round residents.

3 Parking, while somewhat more polarizing,
4 remains a relevant issue.

5 While a few respondents dismissed it as
6 tired or not worth revisiting, many others emphasize
7 the continued need for accessible parking for
8 residents, especially in the downtown area during
9 high-tourism season.

10 While ranking questions demonstrated
11 general support for options like metering or
12 reducing minimum parking requirements, the written
13 comments often reveal the desire for more
14 context-specific careful implementation.

15 The takeaway here isn't that the one side
16 is right and the other is wrong. It's that parking
17 remains a live quality of life issue in the Village,
18 and deserves thoughtful attention, not dismissal.

19 The survey results clearly show that there
20 is a significant competing viewpoint within the
21 community regarding property.

22 One, it defers from some of the
23 perspectives expressed at last week's meeting, which
24 I previously mentioned. Importantly, the feedback
25 also highlights that many residents support

1 addressing parking concerns through a variety of
2 solutions that do not rely on having wholesale new
3 parking lots.

4 Developing qualities that encourage
5 walking, biking and other forms of sustainable
6 mobility will appropriately be using timed parking,
7 meter parking, and current parking lot space
8 availability, can play a key role in maintaining the
9 Village's character while also helping to
10 effectively manage parking needs.

11 In some cases, the open-ended feedback
12 contradicted or complicated the results of the
13 ranking questions. By the ranking questions I'm
14 referring to the ones where you are required to rank
15 one through five. And then there were other
16 questions where you could put text in submitting
17 your answer, underscoring the importance of
18 listening closely and not relying solely on
19 numerical results.

20 This reinforces the idea that planning in
21 a small, dynamic community like Greenport requires
22 nuance and flexibility. There are no
23 one-size-fits-all solution.

24 Ultimately the survey doesn't offer simple
25 answers, but it does provide a much-needed snapshot

1 of where the community stands and where real points
2 of tension lie. It gives us foundation for a deeper,
3 more informed discussion about how to balance the
4 Village's economic future with its identity, values
5 and quality of life.

6 And with that I'll shut up for a while and
7 turn it over to Elizabeth to give us a more detailed
8 overview of the survey results.

9 There are copies of this presentation on
10 the chair, so if you care to grab one.

11 Mike, I would ask you after this meeting,
12 tomorrow morning, if you could post this under the
13 Planning Board agenda.

14 MR. NOONE: Sure.

15 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Okay, Elizabeth,
16 it's all yours.

17 MEMBER TALERMAN: Thank you, very much.
18 Can everyone hear me?

19 (Affirmative response).

20 Okay, great.

21 So I'm going to go through an overview
22 of how we designed the research and what the
23 findings show, and then I'm going to go into each
24 specific section of the survey: Mixed use
25 development, accessory dwelling units, vacant

1 property, administrative approval, new
2 construction, and parking.

3 So, the goal of the survey was, as
4 Tricia said, to really get an evidence-based or
5 data-driven perspective. What does our community
6 think, and the issues that were important to
7 survey had to do with commercial and residential
8 vibrancy.

9 We want to make sure as a Planning
10 Board we are making decisions, not based on our
11 own feelings or attitudes or beliefs, but as
12 representatives of the constituents who live here
13 and work here.

14 So, a little bit about methodology. My
15 professional career was as a market researcher.
16 So the methodology here was a really important
17 thing to me. We kept the survey open from June
18 10th to June 30th. It was available for
19 completion online and in printed form.

20 We printed five-hundred postcards and
21 flyers and distributed them throughout the Village
22 to encourage people. And we noticed the survey in
23 the Village newsletter, the Village website, in
24 Planning Board and Board of Trustees meetings. And
25 there were 177 completed surveys. And for a

1 community of just over a thousand households, that
2 number of responses gives us a 95% confidence
3 level that our results are projectable, with a 2%
4 margin of error. So wherever I was looking at
5 results, I knew we could be plus or minus 2%.

6 The topics included affordable housing;
7 mixed-use zoning in the downtown commercial
8 district, meaning a commercial ground-floor with
9 residential upper floors; Accessory Dwelling Units
10 or ADUs, administrative approval of new
11 construction, commercial and residential property
12 vacancies, and parking in the downtown commercial
13 district.

14 You'll see the survey results, or
15 you'll hear me talk about residence versus
16 commercial and other.

17 It was very important to all of us on
18 the Planning Board to understand people who own
19 homes here, who live here full-time and use this
20 as their tax basis, or who are full-time renters,
21 versus other folks: Short-term renters, employees
22 of Village businesses, business owners, commercial
23 property owners, and people in the hamlet, in
24 Southold or further afield who are just fond of
25 Greenport.

1 The way we constructed the survey, we
2 were able to ask people where they wound up in
3 these definitions, and then we were able to look
4 at the results based on these different
5 definitions.

6 So a quick snapshot across the entire
7 survey at once. What we see here is that the
8 survey primarily reflects views of residents who
9 live and/or own homes in the Village, who live
10 here full-time.

11 So we had far more homeowners,
12 full-time residents and full-time renters
13 responding, versus all others.

14 And in terms of how everything ranked
15 overall, the greatest support in order of
16 preference was for affordable housing, quite
17 frankly, whether that was second-floor
18 construction, accessory dwelling units, or
19 third-floor construction. There is a lot of
20 emphasis around how to create housing
21 opportunities.

22 There was also a great deal of concern
23 about vacant property, both commercial and
24 residential. You can see that over two-thirds of
25 surveyed respondents were in support of somehow

1 understanding the amount they could seek.

2 More than two-thirds, or just about
3 two-thirds of all survey participants do favor an
4 administrative approval process for new
5 residential construction.

6 Parking is a really big deal. 68%,
7 nearly 70% of people support a residential parking
8 sticker program. Following that, about half of the
9 people favor metered parking on Front and Main,
10 and one in three people favor metered parking in
11 the Adams and South Street lots.

12 But when you look at the metered
13 parking favorability, it falls, it seems,
14 underneath the idea that there would be a sticker
15 program for residents. Residential exemption.

16 So we're going to go into each one of
17 those things in more detail.

18 I also wanted to give you a view of how
19 residents feel about these issues versus
20 commercial folks, short-term rentals folks, and
21 people that may be in the hamlet or further
22 afield.

23 And you have can see is it's pretty
24 close. There weren't big differences that we saw.
25 Other than people who aren't full-time residents

1 being even more adamant about vacancies, and
2 feeling more strongly that vacancies should be
3 part of some kind of registry.

4 So, the first question we asked was,
5 rank order, from one to five, which of these
6 issues is most important to you. And what we see
7 is affordable housing was the number-one most
8 important issue, and was above, in the 90% area in
9 terms of responses.

10 Just after that, it was commercial and
11 residential vacancies followed by mixed use
12 zoning, then ADUs, and then we see it drop off
13 when it comes to parking. But when I say
14 drop-off, it's still significant that one in three
15 folks in this Village are concerned about parking
16 and favor some kind of solution.

17 So, I'm going to go into the details of
18 each one of these areas, to give you even more
19 color.

20 Most people are in favor of mixed-use
21 development, and what that means is allowing in
22 the downtown commercial district, second and
23 third-floor residences above first-floor
24 commercial space. You'll see almost no opposition
25 on this issue.

1 And there is a bit of a difference,
2 while most people favor second-floor construction,
3 there is more than half of people favor
4 third-floor construction, but we got a lot of
5 comments. It was qualified. Not -- it's
6 third-floor construction, judiciously. Not sort of
7 a blanket statement. And to give you a sense of
8 that, I wanted to read some of the comments, very
9 few of the comments that came in.

10 We should be encouraging creative
11 development that aids more affordable housing
12 options, while also providing enhanced
13 opportunities for mixed use development, greatly
14 increases the vibrancy of the neighborhood. And
15 long-term goal should be to make Greenport
16 affordable for people to live and work here,
17 without long commutes.

18 So either affordable housing or some
19 ratio of affordable to market rate.

20 What we learned from the comments, in
21 addition to the rankings, was that mixed-use
22 development is about supporting affordable
23 housing, maintaining community character and
24 architectural character.

25 In making available apartments, there

1 was a lot of support for full-time residential,
2 versus anything part-time or short term.

3 There is a need to consider parking,
4 when it comes to adding housing. And there was a
5 support for third-floor construction, but with
6 some limitations to avoid massing or density. So
7 that's the mixed-use findings.

8 If I'm going too fast or anybody needs
9 me to slow down, just let me know.

10 In terms of accessory dwelling units,
11 what we see both from residents and commercial and
12 other, is very strong support, over 80% of people
13 favor permitting ADUs. That said, there was a lot
14 of feedback again here, that either the principal
15 building or the ADU should be owner occupied. And
16 it was a preference for owners occupying the
17 principal building.

18 There is strong preference for
19 affordability limitations. There was very strong
20 preference for no short-term rentals of ADUs,
21 either use for the family themselves or for
22 12-month full-time rentals.

23 There were comments that were
24 supporting no more than a total of two units on
25 any property. So if a property was already

1 two-family, then no ADU.

2 There were requests to consider setback
3 requirement, height restrictions and code
4 compliance with all of the Village's zoning codes
5 so far.

6 And some of the comments, I'll read
7 these. Some of us are desperate to live, and would
8 quite literally take anything, so I think the more
9 options you give us, the more we can thrive and
10 exist in our own town. As long as it's affordable
11 and maybe offered to the younger generation first,
12 because we require less than a family or
13 ill-bodied person. We also have lower standards
14 of where we live because we are just grateful to
15 have a roof over our head.

16 In another comment, in favor for family
17 use, not in favor for use to rent out. Our housing
18 issue should be solved by increasing density
19 downtown, not in our residential areas.

20 A separate comment, focus program on
21 repurposing existing accessory structures, rather
22 than new construction, and grandfather size and
23 siting on the property.

24 And finally, the building should stay
25 within the character of the neighborhood with one

1 dedicated parking spot.

2 So that's just a favor of some of the
3 comments we received.

4 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: We have more on the
5 next page.

6 MEMBER TALERMAN: Yes. Allowing and
7 thoughtfully regulating ADUs in Greenport is a
8 smart, community-beneficial policy. ADUs can
9 increase long-term rental inventory, without
10 requiring large-scale development, and fit within
11 existing neighborhood scale and esthetics of the
12 community.

13 ADUs should require a permit process
14 and require owner to reside onsite, in either the
15 main home or the ADU. All setbacks and height
16 requirements should be in line with the current
17 Village zoning. ADU should be in line with the
18 style of the primary residence.

19 We should prohibit ADUs as short-term
20 rentals, in order to prioritize affordable
21 long-term housing.

22 These are the kinds of comments that
23 made this survey so valuable to us.

24 Okay. Moving on to vacant property.
25 Unquestionably, there is strong support for some

1 kind of registration of vacant property.

2 Commercial and residential.

3 And in terms of community feedback, the
4 feedback helped us understand that empty,
5 unoccupied and closed for more than extend, but
6 12-month period, should be subjected to a vacancy
7 registry. Housing or property not used, not
8 maintained, or abandoned, should be on the
9 registry. And there's some questions about what
10 is the purpose of the registry. What would it help
11 us do.

12 So verbatim comments, businesses that
13 are obviously not only open, even if they do so
14 for only one day a year, should be on the
15 registry. If a property is not maintained, is
16 vacant or not contributing to the health and
17 vibrancy of the town, it should be registered, and
18 taxed.

19 And there is an alarming amount of
20 vacant commercial space in the village, and it's
21 clear they are making zero effort to fill the
22 space. The arcade building and ice house come into
23 mind.

24 Now, in terms of an administrative
25 approval process for new residential construction.

1 There is favor for it. There is more favor for it
2 by those who answered commercial short-term
3 renters or other, than residents, but you see
4 residents favor some kind of administrative
5 approval process at about a 62% rate.

6 So this administrative approval
7 process is a design or Planning Board review for
8 new residential construction, or a project that
9 substantially replaces an existing home. It
10 excludes minor changes such as additions,
11 renovations or new models that retain the existing
12 structure.

13 And the community feedback included
14 concern about new build, conformity to rigid
15 historic standards, that are considered by some
16 onerous or overreaching. And there was some
17 concern about establishing the entire Village as
18 an historic district, which may undermine the
19 actual properties that are historic in the
20 Village.

21 And, finally, parking. So there was a
22 tremendous amount of support among residents, 73%,
23 and among commercial occupants and others, 63%,
24 almost two out of three people, for some kind of
25 residential sticker program.

1 There is favor from for metered
2 parking. It's a little bit of a polarity in terms
3 of commercial and others. It's about half and
4 half. But in terms of residents, we are just about
5 50% in favor. About 36% opposed.

6 And what was very clear is that
7 metered parking and a residential sticker program
8 have to go together. One without the other doesn't
9 seem as supported.

10 So what we are seeing is that, and let
11 me break it down. The metered parking on this
12 page is about Front and Main Street. There is more
13 favorability for that than the Adams Street and
14 the South Street parking lots.

15 There is less favorability for any
16 metering in those lots.

17 So the community feedback in terms of
18 meters was really about enforcement. It doesn't
19 work if we're not enforcing it. There was a desire
20 to limit meters to summer months only. Others have
21 great desire for exceptions for residents, first
22 responders, persons with limited mobility or
23 disability, and employees of businesses in the
24 Village. And there is a desire for some limited
25 time meters in particular places.

1 And in terms of the verbatim
2 responses, Greenport residents should receive
3 parking permits for public parking on streets and
4 in the lots on Adams and South streets, especially
5 in the train station. All others should have to
6 use meters.

7 Summer daytime hours should be metered
8 in commercial districts and metered parking during
9 summer months, and then allow residents free or
10 discounted fees for short stays. For instance, one
11 to two hours, particularly as it relates to the
12 IGA, the laundromat and the pharmacy areas.

13 When it came to the question about
14 should there be onsite parking requirements, most
15 are in favor of requiring hotels to provide onsite
16 parking. So people that need to park for more than
17 several hours.

18 Following that, short-term rentals,
19 affordable housing, commercial marinas and
20 market-rate apartments came up at about the 40%
21 favorability. And after that, onsite parking
22 requirements fell away. Specifically, there is
23 much less favor for requiring parking for taverns,
24 for restaurants, for take-out eateries, or just
25 for indiscriminate new construction.

1 And the community feedback, there
2 should be a required fee for properties that have
3 no room for parking, to be used for
4 transportation, such as a local jitney. The
5 Village is an urban-style grid. Parking lots and
6 spaces are the lowest and worse use of our limited
7 land space. And in terms of parking requirements,
8 keep it a walking village. The Village should
9 build for more public parking.

10 So what you are seeing here is all over
11 the place because parking is polarizing. No matter
12 what, there is no one way to look at parking other
13 than those who reside here full-time should have a
14 sticker and should be exempt from having to pay
15 for parking in the village where they live.

16 And that is the result of the survey.
17 And we would love to hear any comments. There are
18 printed copies of what I just shared on this chair
19 here. We are going to have it posted tomorrow to
20 the Planning Board, and we invite you to e-mail
21 Mike any comments you have and he'll share it with
22 the Planning Board.

23 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So I think the priority
24 from this, and we have done this overview. We are
25 not really going to open up a big public discussion

1 on this tonight. I think if people have, as
2 Elizabeth said, additional questions or comments on
3 the presentation, we would ask you to send them to
4 Mike and he'll get them to all the Planning Board,
5 and we hope to take this up at our August 15th
6 meeting, and at that time we would like the public
7 to ask questions or make comments depending on what
8 else is on our agenda, because we are generally
9 going to prioritize regular business, and we may
10 have one or two applications at that time.

11 But because we are lucky and fortunate
12 enough to have some members of the relatively new
13 housing committee for the Village, and since so of
14 much of this really does focus on housing, I think
15 our hope for kind of the next hour or so was to talk
16 about housing and kind of what we should do and what
17 kind of things we should be working on and thinking
18 up, sketching up some concepts and constructs we
19 might want to be taking to the Village Board of
20 Trustees.

21 I do want to make it clear, and there were
22 one or two comments in the survey that this relates
23 to, is that the Planning Board itself cannot change
24 the code. The housing committee can't change the
25 code. Only the Board of Trustees can change our

1 code. But the Board of Trustees has a lot on their
2 plate, a lot to do, so I think we have thought,
3 earlier this year, that it made sense to try to
4 assist by looking at some of these issues, and
5 probably in the first instance coming up with
6 high-level suggestions of topics that we think are
7 right for change in the code, and taking those to
8 get some kind of feedback from the Board of Trustees
9 and then doing kind of more work as we go along.

10 So housing again really came out strongly
11 from this survey as something that everybody is
12 focused on. There are nuances around it. And, but
13 one thing I think, and Elizabeth and I have talked
14 about this bit about surveys is you can't put all
15 the words on the paper when you are doing the
16 survey. You can't say, okay, do you support this
17 type of housing if you have all 20 of these things.
18 Do you support all these ten things. So sometimes
19 you get comments and you try to get just how you
20 kind of circle that up with what people seem to be
21 supporting. But then parking in particular, we know
22 that we are a resource-constrained community on
23 parking. There's not a lot more places we can put
24 parking in the residential areas. Most lots are
25 built out and they either have a parking driveway or

1 they don't. And if they don't, there is nowhere to
2 put one. So that is something that I think you have
3 to balance.

4 But in any event, I thought, again, that
5 we could maybe have a discussion on housing. And I
6 know, Dinni, that you've met with your committee a
7 bit, and I don't know if you want to give us a quick
8 overview of what you guys have been discussing or
9 where you are, and we can maybe have a dialogue.

10 MS. GORDON: Sure. Well we are very new to
11 our committee responsibilities, but we have begun to
12 talk about the general issue of affordability, which
13 is paramount, I think, for everybody. And I'm
14 interested that it was so strongly here. But
15 certainly it's true for everybody on the committee.
16 And I think the first sort of substantial area where
17 we have done some recent work has to do with ADUs.
18 And that is because we had the opportunity to hear
19 from Liz Hanley, who lives in Shelter Island, who
20 has spearheaded a very substantial program for
21 developing ADUs. She got three-and-a-half million
22 dollars from the State of New York to do this, and
23 she has had a good relationship with the Long Island
24 Housing Partnership that administers the program.
25 She has 16 ADUs already developed and with people

1 living in them, and twelve more in process.

2 So it's a very different picture from the
3 picture in Southold. I've spent a little time, in
4 fact, telephone call this morning talking to Gwen
5 Schroeder about the Southold Town experience. And
6 one of the things that is very clear is that as
7 little regulation as possible is more likely to get
8 you some real results.

9 Also, I think it's important, and this
10 didn't come out one way or the other in the survey,
11 but I have to spend more time with the survey to be
12 sure about this. But, the emphasis in Shelter Island
13 was on preserving the opportunity for people to stay
14 in their houses who were threatened by, you know,
15 age and lack of funds and disability and so forth,
16 to have, to enable people to remain in a smaller
17 circumstance in Greenport, I mean in Shelter Island.

18 And, but as a result, it didn't exclude
19 other people. And so the Shelter Island, a couple of
20 the Shelter Island success stories are, in one case
21 a teacher and in another case a young family,
22 husband, wife and small child.

23 So I found it very interesting because at
24 this point what has impeded the shelter of the
25 Southold development of ADUs is really the

1 complexity of regulations, which still exist even
2 though they have eliminated a big one, which was
3 that the principal, that the ADU had to have had a
4 CO for three years before it could apply.

5 So anyway, that has been, sort of the
6 first programmatic discussion we've had, and it
7 interested me to see that ADUs were so important.

8 We've also had sort of preliminary
9 discussions of something that was not included in
10 the survey, and that is the development of small,
11 residential, multi-family housing. Quite separate
12 from the mixed use, I mean, the mixed use, I think
13 we, everybody in the committee was in favor of
14 mixed-use development downtown, but we also were
15 talking about the building of small, residential,
16 multi-family developments. And that didn't come
17 into the survey. And I, you know, I would like to
18 know why, but I also sort of understand why.

19 I think people are moving slowly toward
20 the whole idea of greater density, more, a broader
21 range of housing opportunities and so forth.

22 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: The survey questions
23 were really designed around topics that had been
24 recurring in the community over the last couple of
25 years. And I would not say that multi-family hasn't

1 been but I feel like it's been more off to the side.
2 And so trying even to move ADUs and more
3 understanding of the criteria around in particular
4 the third floor development in downtown, I think we
5 thought was kind of more, you know, you've got to
6 take your baby steps, and rather than distracting
7 people with another shiny new thing, and talk about
8 -- and maybe we also kind of feel, and this is
9 interesting that you brought this up, because my
10 sense is the Village is pretty built out. So I'm not
11 sure, within the Village proper, putting aside
12 Village-owned properties, where exactly those kind
13 of things would be built

14 MS. GORDON: Well, we have an opportunity
15 to find out about that from the state, which with
16 its Long Island Forward Housing program provide us
17 with technical assistance, not only to do things
18 like traffic studies and environmental impact
19 reviews and environmental studies, but also simply
20 be the determination of what are appropriate sites
21 for the technical assistance, the piece of it before
22 you are really talking about construction.

23 But I would like to know, I would like to
24 get some comments from my two colleagues here. I
25 think we're going to have one more member of our

1 Board, but she's a hardworking person and this will
2 get a little late.

3 But Nicky and Yan, would you like to
4 comment on what we've done so far, and not done?

5 MR. ALBALADEJO: I just had another word
6 about the ADUs. I did a lot of research on the
7 topic. And the number one thing with ADUs is of
8 course getting them funded. There is always state
9 funding that's available, but when that's not, you
10 have to turn to banks, of course, or reverse
11 mortgages, but mostly banks. And that is where
12 regulation is really the death knell, even in places
13 out west like California, Oregon and Washington,
14 that are very much pushing ADUs, they never really
15 top out at more than 6% of the housing supply. The
16 moment you include things like owner occupied in the
17 main house, or things like that, all banks hear is
18 we don't want to fund this. We don't know what we
19 will be able to do if it falls into our hands after
20 a foreclosure, if we can't rent out both pieces.

21 And a lot of people talk about ADUs as
22 kind of a one size fits all. But as far as I'm
23 concerned, if your approach to ADU also includes
24 very onerous regulations, especially in places as
25 small as Greenport, they are basically going to fall

1 stillborn. You might only get eight or 20 out of the
2 whole Village and then, you know, you kind of
3 bungled this opportunity.

4 Another thing, for example, is focusing
5 specifically on pre-existing ADUs. We have a couple
6 of those in the Village, but I feel like we really
7 wouldn't get anywhere with that as far as housing
8 goes. Of course on the committee we are extremely
9 supportive of things like the mixed-use development
10 and we hope to hear more about that going forward.

11 MS. GOHOREL: First I would like to say,
12 amazingly you got as many people to respond as you
13 did.

14 I think a lot of what we deal with is a
15 mix of fear of the new and slightly-missed
16 education, because when I think about housing and
17 affordable housing, I don't think of new people who
18 will be coming here. I think of this is the people
19 who are already here and will be great for them to
20 have a safe, secure place to live.

21 So when we are not necessarily, when we
22 say density, in my brain, I think, oh, gosh, where
23 are these people coming from. I fell like all of us
24 can use slight changes of vocabulary that are not so
25 daunting, for right now.

1 I completely agree with focusing, not
2 focusing but mentioning the ADUs first as staying
3 multi-usage, which I'm fully in support of, but I
4 don't think we are there yet as a community,
5 necessarily.

6 So as a group, our whole goal is to find
7 ways that we can support the Planning Board, that we
8 can support the Trustees and lead them into
9 directions that would hopefully, our goal is to
10 create more housing and safe places for people to
11 live instead of, I don't know, 15 people per house
12 with two bathrooms.

13 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Can I ask a question,
14 because I, the Long Island Housing Partnership, can
15 you explain what it is they do to us? Not what they
16 do to us, but like what they are, I guess. Because
17 you mentioned them in the context of Shelter Island,
18 and I know they are relevant in Southold, too, but
19 I'm not --

20 MS. GORDON: There is also the Community
21 Development Corporation of Long Island. Both of
22 these are non-profit agencies that manage,
23 administer these, the ADU Plus-One state program.

24 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So this is funding.

25 MS. GORDON: Pardon me?

1 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Is it funding?

2 MS. GORDON: No, it's administration of, if
3 you get your two-million dollars from the state,
4 which is apparently the sort of standard award for a
5 town, they take a, I think it's \$10,000 per unit,
6 off the top, and administer, so that the, you know,
7 the staff of the Village or Shelter Island doesn't
8 have to do it.

9 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: When you say administer
10 it, do you mean administer the construction of the
11 units or do you mean administer who is living in
12 them, making sure that they check any boxes that
13 might apply.

14 MS. GORDON: I think it's primarily the
15 latter --

16 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Check the box.

17 MS. GORDON: But I think it also includes
18 making sure that a contractor is insured, things
19 like that, but not --

20 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So if you have
21 affordability standards, they would be the people
22 around, for example, the Village's Housing Authority
23 that would do that.

24 MS. GORDON: I think that's right.

25 MR. ALBALADEJO: They don't set any like

1 affordability mandates or anything like that.

2 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: No, but if the Village
3 incorporated them, but obviously once you
4 incorporate them then they have to be enforced, for
5 lack of a better word, so when somebody is going to
6 apply for that housing, they have to show income
7 levels and all of that has to fit.

8 There is a tremendous, having spent a lot
9 of time a year-and-a-half ago, looking at a wide
10 range of ADU legislation across the country, and
11 affordable, more generally including mixed-use
12 development, one of my concerns being in a small
13 village that has very limited government
14 administrative resources, which is not likely to
15 change any time soon, is how does this get
16 administered. It's kind of like what we went through
17 with Sterling 123. Who is checking those boxes to
18 make sure if we have affordability requirements,
19 right? If we just say, if all you say is somebody
20 has to, it has to be a full-time resident, for
21 instance, which actually we don't even say full-time
22 resident right now in our code for downtown
23 apartments. What we say is there has to be a
24 twelve-month lease. And that means that I could go
25 get a twelve-month lease, and keep the place empty,

1 or I could use it as a pied-a-terre.

2 So, but, if it said, you know, you had to
3 meet resident, like you basically have to be a
4 full-time resident, so you have to show that you
5 have your driver's license, you are registered to
6 vote there, you pay your taxes there, that you
7 actually are living there, except when you go off on
8 your vacation and/or maybe you go away for two
9 months because you've got job somewhere else.
10 Somebody has to administer that, right, somebody has
11 to check all that paperwork. So that's what I'm
12 asking. Is there somebody that does that kind of
13 thing?

14 MS. GORDON: Yes, but I think, again, a
15 difference between Southold and Shelter Island. I
16 mean these are the only local examples I know
17 anything about, and I think they are the only small
18 communities in Long Island, or at least in Suffolk
19 County.

20 In Shelter Island there is no
21 affordability requirements, which of course
22 eliminates a lot of what you are talking about.

23 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Is there a residency
24 requirement? Or something similar? Can they be used
25 for short-term rentals?

1 MS. GORDON: No, they can't be used for
2 short-term rentals, but I don't know whether it's
3 year long or, I don't know about that. But
4 short-term rentals are excluded. But I think the
5 fact that there were affordability, I mean we just
6 have to face this, the fact that there are
7 affordability requirements for Southold created a
8 limit, a very clear limit. So that is obviously a
9 policy question that would have to be addressed.

10 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Yeah, I mean, it's
11 interesting, because I think the survey results are
12 pretty clear that while there is a lot of support
13 for this, it's very, I think pretty qualified on
14 them being affordable, full-time, year-round
15 housing.

16 Now, there is an argument to be made that
17 if you set the full-time, year-round housing
18 language properly, that it will somehow drive
19 affordability, because it's market factors, and --
20 I'm not saying I agree with this or not, I'm just
21 saying what the arguments are, right. Like, if you
22 are saying this to somebody, okay, you can have this
23 but it has to have a full-time resident in there,
24 then the question becomes what is the market for
25 that. And it can't be a pied-a-terre. It can't be

1 somebody that's just there on weekends. It has to be
2 somebody that is making them this residence, that
3 should have somewhere, somewhat of a pressure on
4 what the rent can be, just based on the fact that it
5 has to be somebody who is working out here.

6 But, you know, one of the points that was
7 made by people that spoke at last week's Board of
8 Trustees meeting, is that we should be trying to
9 attract more people that can work remotely from the
10 city to be out here full-time. So, you
11 know, if you took that approach, that obviously is a
12 different dynamic, too.

13 MEMBER BUCHANAN: Well, I think it's tricky
14 because I look at it this way. And I think, you
15 know, as somebody who is able to buy my first home
16 by borrowing every cent that I had for it, it
17 changed my life being able to do that, and pay
18 people back to do that, to have that opportunity.
19 And it was a rental first, then it became a condo,
20 and I would hate to think that somebody who would
21 maybe be starting out or working a job and then all
22 of a sudden started making more money, that we would
23 say, even if they were still working here or living
24 here, I would hope, that always makes me a little
25 bit concerned, that --

1 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: It's usually a runway
2 on the affordability that if you have it to begin
3 with, you have for some period before you actually
4 lose the status.

5 MEMBER BUCHANAN: But I think it's sort
6 of one of those things that if you are still, like
7 we have people that are very active in the
8 community and who are good citizens that, I don't
9 know how you incorporate something like that. But
10 it would just be, it would feel really --

11 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Well, that's the whole
12 Fair Housing Act, so. I mean, I'm not touching that
13 one with a ten-foot pole.

14 MEMBER BUCHANAN: This is one of those
15 things for me where I think, you know, I've hear
16 people in this community who have not taken raises
17 so that they can stay in certain housing situations.
18 And I would hate to think we are keeping people down
19 when we should be using this to build people up. And
20 that's, I don't know how we solve this.

21 MEMBER TALERMAN: I believe it's in the
22 survey results that the primary requirement of an
23 ADU is not short-term rental. That was the primary.
24 And affordability was the issue of most concern. So
25 we can conflate those two or I think perhaps

1 something really interesting, you are bringing up
2 facts that many people may not know. And since we
3 started this, that the more requirements, the more
4 complexity you add to housing, the less likely we
5 are to achieve a goal of 12-month resident,
6 increasing the pool of 12-month residential housing,
7 at our market rate.

8 And the reason that our market rate is
9 high now, is inflated, is because of short-term
10 rentals, right? It takes a lot of long-term rental
11 off the table. So to create an adjustment, we would
12 need I think the most important requirement that we
13 have to consider is the 12-month rental requirement.
14 And after that, maybe we have to take more off of
15 the complexity and requirements on, and see how we
16 do.

17 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I mean, that's a
18 gaining question, too, right, that's come a lot in
19 the past about do you try to get to the perfect, or
20 do you start with what you think you can get passed,
21 right, which to go to your point, I understand about
22 the existing. But the easiest thing is the existing,
23 right, in some respects. Because those buildings
24 are already there, and you don't have to have the
25 argument about whether we are going to give them

1 bulk standard relief or not.

2 You know, I don't know. I mean, everybody
3 has a different view on this. But I agree with you
4 that if you just say, well, what is existing is all
5 we're going to do, that's only going to get you "x"
6 number. You can go out for new construction, but the
7 question is do you take that kind of incremental
8 approach on the view that maybe it also helps to
9 educate people to go to your point, Nikki, that they
10 start to see it and then they are less afraid, and
11 so the first round is, okay, existing structures
12 that we X-Y-Z criteria can be ADUs, maybe not new
13 construction yet, and we get through that, and the
14 next is, okay, we've seen that that works, now what.

15 I don't know. I'm not saying I think that
16 or I don't think that. I mean my tendency always
17 tends to wanting to go to the light, just fix it,
18 get it right. Get it right. But that's, that is also
19 I can tell you, having been on last year's code
20 committee -- and Dinni can say whether she agrees or
21 does not agree -- the more you try to fix
22 everything, the less likely you are going to get it
23 through the Board of Trustees any time soon.

24 To go to your point, simpler is better.

25 MS. GORDON: I wanted to say one thing that

1 has occurred to me, and I have not heard a
2 discussion about this about ADUs. That is that the
3 emphasis I think in both places that, locally, that
4 we have been talking about, has been in preserving
5 the ability for people to stay in their housing or
6 in the Village or in their communities. And what I
7 think this has meant for Shelter Island, is that a
8 very large percentage of ADUs that have been built,
9 have been improved, have been for older people or
10 infirm people who can't manage the stairs anymore.
11 And I'm a little bit concerned about the situation,
12 which I can imagine would prevail here, where you
13 have fairly substantial houses, quite sizeable
14 houses, which now have an ADU, and the house is now
15 available. We hope it's going to be available for
16 an affordable rental, but it may be that it is
17 simply the opportunity for another resident from New
18 York or somewhere else, to come and not live up to
19 our ideal of keeping people here.

20 And I think keeping people here should be
21 also defined as keeping working people here. Because
22 a lot of what we know is needed, is how to afford
23 those who are now commuting to Islip.

24 It used to be to Riverhead. Now Riverhead
25 is too crowded, and too expensive, so they're coming

1 from Islip. But they are people who are here, and
2 how do we work that interest a picture of the
3 possible development of ADUs and the use of the
4 buildings that, the principal buildings that are now
5 on the market, or on the rental market.

6 MEMBER CREEDON: Do we have any data at all
7 on how many places are available in the Village for
8 rent on a short-term basis?

9 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: A lot. We have a lot.

10 MR. ALBALADEJO: We have, in greater
11 Greenport, the entire hamlet, is about 280.

12 MEMBER CREEDON: Whereabouts in the
13 Incorporated Village.

14 MR. ALBALADEJO: I have a map on my
15 desk, which I could count though, but I'd need a
16 day or two for that.

17 MEMBER CREEDON: Day or two?

18 MR. ALBALADEJO: Yes.

19 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I would say around 60.

20 MR. ALBALADEJO: Yeah, it's leaning toward
21 60% mostly concentrated around Seventh Street or
22 downtown.

23 MEMBER CREEDON: Okay, thank you.

24 MR. ALBALADEJO: No problem.

25 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I mean this is getting,

1 you know, again, the Code Committee, I chaired the
2 Code Committee last year, spent a lot of time on
3 this, on ADUs and affordable housing, needs a lot of
4 work, on any site.

5 But, honestly, I think the position was
6 generally, that until the short-term rental law was
7 fixed in a way that it was enforceable and was
8 clear, what if any short-term rentals the Village is
9 going to allow, that continuing down this path is
10 just going to invest more people into the whole like
11 we just want to be able to short-term rental our
12 property out.

13 So, again, you know, that has not made
14 significant progress since last year, so, I don't
15 really think we can worry about that anymore, but it
16 is a factor that has to be taken into account,
17 because right now we have a problem with enforceable
18 short-term rentals.

19 MEMBER WALTON: And without it, simply
20 adding additional units, it doesn't address the
21 problem.

22 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Right. Well, if more
23 people are in vested in that are going to say you're
24 taking away my property rights.

25 MR. ALBALADEJO: So the amount of

1 short-term rentals in the Hamlet has not grown in
2 about five years. It stayed stagnant. But with
3 Southold passing their new regulations, it's sure to
4 increase in the Village.

5 MEMBER CREEDON: In the Village or in
6 the area surrounding the Village.

7 MR. ALBALADEJO: In the Village.

8 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: We don't know what the
9 Southold regulations are going to be. I mean, I know
10 what the report says, but I'm not sure what they are
11 actually going to be. They have not been published,
12 to my knowledge.

13 MS. GORDON: I think they are already
14 sending letters. They are already enforcing, and
15 surely --

16 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Yes. I thought you
17 meant new regulations.

18 MEMBER BUCHANAN: Dinni, when you spoke
19 at the Board meeting, I watched it, the last one,
20 whatever, you were talking about maybe it's the
21 first organization, not CDL Live, but the other
22 one, in talking about identifying places within
23 the Village.

24 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: That's Long Island
25 Forward.

1 MEMBER BUCHANAN: And how exactly does
2 that work? And what is that? Just a little bit
3 more, because I thought that was something
4 specific, it was like identifying places within
5 the Village whether it was residential or business
6 or whatever rights that were --

7 MS. GORDON: Yes, I mean the focus is on
8 trying to find places which might be possible
9 long-term, multi-family housing options, and it's
10 \$10 million for technical assistance. It's not grant
11 money. It's, you know, using the expertise of the
12 state, whether it's in economic or traffic control
13 or environmental. It's calling on them to come and
14 look. Even if you don't have a site identified,
15 they can come and say, you know, maybe something we
16 have not thought of.

17 I was interested that you mentioned the
18 parking, how people felt about the parking on Adams
19 Street, those lots. And I'm fascinated. Those used
20 to be multi-family housing, one of those lots. The
21 farther west one, used to be multi-family housing.

22 I have this from a Village Board member,
23 so I believe that it's true. And yet, you know, we
24 are not at the point where we are going to consider
25 that. But maybe the technical assistant who came

1 from the state would say, what do you think, this is
2 close to downtown, it's walking distance. I mean, I
3 don't know, but --

4 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Well, it's also you can
5 build apartments over, I mean, you can have a
6 one-floor parking garage and use the floor above as
7 apartments.

8 MS. GORDON: You could. You could. But my
9 point is just that I think this program has some
10 interesting -- it's interesting because it's
11 providing technical assistance, and not because it's
12 a grant program, for something we've already
13 conceived. It's pushing us to go beyond what we've
14 thought of as possibilities.

15 MEMBER TALERMAN: It's a very innovative
16 point you have. Yes.

17 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Well, the Board of
18 Trustees passed resolutions last week on this.

19 MS. GORDON: Yes, it has passed two
20 resolutions. One to submit a letter of intended
21 application for the program, to get somebody to
22 come. And the other one was to request from Southold
23 that they do the same for the purpose of, for the
24 Greenport West Hamlet. For the other part of greater
25 Greenport, which I'd love to see. Because to look

1 specifically at Clark's Beach area, which we own,
2 the Village owns, but Southold has the zoning
3 authority. And it's the zoning authority that
4 applies for the Long Island Forward grants.

5 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Leueen, did you want to
6 come up?

7 MS. MILLER: Okay, so my name is Leueen
8 Miller, I live at 424 Fourth Street, and I'm just,
9 first I just want to vent a little frustration
10 because I feel that those of us who filled out the
11 survey and who have come to the meeting and to find
12 out the results and to hear the discussion, and then
13 to be told that we really can't say anything, that
14 we can send e-mails our comments to someone, is
15 unsatisfactory.

16 And I think, I think a lot of people,
17 maybe some here, feel equally frustrated. And
18 between that and the Board of Trustees where you can
19 vent and raise your issues and so forth, and then
20 basically get no information in return, I think it's
21 creating or increasing the relationship between the
22 population and the elected officials.

23 Specifically on the housing, I have an
24 issue, there is the North Fork Housing Alliance,
25 which is based on Greenport. It's basically, as far

1 as I can tell, run like a clandestine organization.
2 Once I found a tiny little note at the bottom of the
3 Suffolk Times saying it's not-for-profit. So
4 not-for-profit, you are supposed to have an annual
5 meeting, it's supposed to be open to the public.

6 And one year I went and I was like looked
7 at like I was the elephant in the room. And so I
8 happen to know because right near my, where I live,
9 there is a house that is part of the North Fork
10 Housing Alliance. I can confirm not a coat of paint
11 has been put on that house in 50 years. And God
12 knows before that how long.

13 So I think that none of this comes up, I
14 mean I don't know anything much about the North Fork
15 Housing Alliance, other than there is a number of
16 places in Greenport. I've never heard anybody talk
17 about how it functions, how many units are there.

18 My understanding was a lot of it was for
19 transient people, while they were down on their
20 luck, they could apply for this temporary housing.
21 And then when they got back on their feet, they
22 would move on and then another family or individuals
23 would come in. But that is not the case, because I
24 have seen people in at least the house that I'm
25 familiar with, they have been there for countless

1 years.

2 So in light of this overall discussion,
3 you know, I think it's important to look into that
4 as well. Maybe that can be expanded. I mean, I
5 really don't know much about it because they don't
6 really share information, but I did look up once
7 under New York state, this is a number of years ago,
8 and they are not without money.

9 They have the funds to do minor repairs,
10 or even maybe major repairs, but, I think it's worth
11 looking into. I don't know who needs to look into
12 it.

13 And then finally, this whole discussion
14 about, you know, parking, and accessory dwelling
15 units. It's all fine. I mean, and it's all good,
16 and I think the results of the survey are
17 interesting and worth pursuing. But there is no
18 enforcement. I mean, I have a handicap driving
19 ticket. I can't find a handicap place that is not
20 taken with a regular car.

21 And if I go downtown, the only place is
22 the IGA, they usually, those ones are available. But
23 anywhere else in the Village, I mean, because people
24 take them, and they take them because nobody is
25 going to come and say anything.

1 So you have, I mean, I'm in favor of
2 residents having a ticket, you know, preferential
3 parking, but how to organize that, how to enforce
4 it, how to provide for it, it's like pie in the sky
5 because unless you have someone looking, checking on
6 it, and honestly with the kind of somewhat
7 dysfunctional Village Hall, I don't see that
8 happening for quite a while. Thank you.

9 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: So, just on your first
10 point, Leueen, it's not our intention not to engage
11 with the public on this. It was, the view is that
12 Housing in particular was so important that we
13 needed to focus on discussion with the Housing
14 Committee. And so I think that's one of the reasons
15 why there was not public comments, specifically on
16 this week's agenda.

17 MS. MILLER: I just think that people who
18 make it, give the time to come and listen and not be
19 able to say anything is frustrating.

20 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Normally when we are
21 going to have the public speak, we specifically put
22 on the agenda "public to address the Board."

23 MS. MILLER: Okay.

24 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Okay? And we fully
25 intend to have the public be able to address us on

1 whatever they want on this. But, again, the agenda
2 was specifically set this way this week because of
3 the importance of starting the discussion with the
4 Housing Committee, and the fact that there is only
5 so many hours in the day to do these things. So we
6 wanted to start getting the information out into the
7 public, and we are not saying that the only way to
8 give us feedback is by sending it to Mike. As I
9 said, we are very hopeful that at the August 15th
10 meeting we'll have open public comment and
11 discussion on this, assuming that we don't have huge
12 agenda items that we have to deal with, which really
13 is our priority as a Board.

14 But, so I'm sorry that you felt that way,
15 that was not our intention, but it is why you will
16 note that normally the Board's agenda does have
17 specific mention of "public to address the Board."
18 This one is not for that reason.

19 MS. MILLER: Okay, but I think my
20 interpretation was that, you know, no public
21 comments on the survey were not welcome, other than
22 e-mailed comments.

23 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: No, that was not the
24 intention. And I'm sorry if that is not clear.

25 MS. MILLER: And on the housing, it didn't

1 seem like, nobody said anything about if you have
2 any ideas or you want to say something, please come
3 up and speak.

4 My interpretation was the discussion on
5 housing was also closed and we would probably be
6 asked to send any comments we have.

7 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: This is just the
8 beginning of a long process.

9 MS. MILLER: Okay, anyway, I just want to
10 let you know.

11 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Thank you. And on your
12 North Fork Housing Authority, that is a thing that I
13 would not even profess the ability to speak to.

14 MS. GORDON: Well, I think it's wonderful
15 that you raised this because, presumably, I mean in
16 future discussions, we could bring the head of the
17 Housing Alliance and the head of our ASHA (sic), who
18 is the head of our Housing Authority here, to talk a
19 little bit about how these --

20 MS. MILLER: That would be a good idea I
21 think.

22 MS. GORDON: There are 12 houses that they
23 control, and they are the administers of the Section
24 8 program, the federal program. I don't know what is
25 going to happen to the federal program, but the

1 voucher program, which enables people, I think it
2 was, you're right, it was originally intended as a
3 temporary thing but it's not any longer. And it used
4 to be, when I first moved to Greenport in 2008,
5 there were not enough vouchers for the places. Now
6 there are not enough places for the vouchers they
7 have. Another sign of the housing problem.

8 MS. MILLER: But they should be required to
9 maintain some sort of maintenance, and not let a
10 place just go to hell. Excuse my French. Because
11 we're talking about, you know, they can see
12 properties being kept to certain standards and
13 maintenance, and they, as a public organization,
14 aren't doing that. Anyway. Thank you.

15 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Do any of the Board
16 members have any comments, questions, things they
17 would like to raise or throw out there for
18 discussion. Housing in particular?

19 MEMBER CREEDON: Not about housing.

20 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Anybody else from the
21 public want to talk about housing, solely housing at
22 this time?

23 MR. MACKEN: Hi, my name is Frank Macken,
24 138 Sterling Avenue. I just want to thank you
25 profoundly. Your Planning Committee, the Housing

1 Committee, it seems to me you've made more progress
2 in the last six months than the last six years in
3 Greenport. And I really hope that some action,
4 actual action will come out of it. It was so
5 encouraging to hear Ms. Hanley's report from Shelter
6 Island last week. It was really amazing what she's
7 done. I mean the 16 units already, it's just
8 incredible. And the money that she's got from the
9 state. The resources are out there.

10 And my concern is like now is the time to
11 strike, you know, while the iron is hot, while you
12 guys have brought in all of this information. And
13 it's clear that people want to do it. Because my
14 concern is that the next administration will not be
15 as favorable, may not be as favorable to this whole
16 issue, and it's, I mean it's already taken six years
17 over two administrations. Just, you know, and like
18 Leueen said, you get up and talk in front of the
19 Trustees and it's just like, you know, it's just
20 like air. Nothing happens.

21 It's just, so I really want to thank you
22 again, and I hope it's something concrete will come
23 out of this. Thank you.

24 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: Anybody else?

25 (No response).

1 Well, maybe we should talk a little bit
2 about next steps. I think, I don't know where you
3 guys are on the Housing Committee, and it sounds
4 like you are still doing a lot of your kind of
5 upfront work.

6 My thoughts were, in terms of the survey,
7 and housing as well, was that, as I said, at our
8 next meeting we would continue discussion of some of
9 the topics, other topics that we didn't get to today
10 in here, and, you know, give the public an
11 opportunity to speak, if they wanted to. And then my
12 hope was to come up, between this meeting and our
13 September 5th meeting, with some high-level proposal
14 ideas for this Board to discuss that we might want
15 to put forth to the Board of Trustees at their
16 September meeting, probably related around some of
17 these topics, like the mixed-use development and the
18 ADUs in particular, where there seems to be a more
19 strong view. Vacancies, also, we have to have a
20 discussion about that as a Board, and try to get to
21 the Board of Trustees probably in the late September
22 meeting with at least some initial ideas on these
23 things.

24 We are also going to offer, we have
25 offered, I don't know whether they want us to do it

1 or not, to do the same presentation at a Board of
2 Trustees meeting in August. We are in the process of
3 separately putting together a more fulsome report to
4 just send them, the Trustees.

5 So those are kind of what our thoughts are
6 in terms of next steps. I don't know what you think
7 about that, how you would want to fit in on that, or
8 if you guys have next steps you are thinking about,
9 in particular, on the ADUs.

10 MS. GORDON: Well, certainly, I think we
11 are going to have the discussion about, the
12 fundamental discussion about how much regulation you
13 would have to have. And, you know, an unpleasant
14 part of that is going to be do we add affordability
15 requirements. Because that is going to, that is
16 going to be very limiting, and yet that's at the
17 heart of what we want to be providing.

18 So I think we are going to be discussing
19 that sort of big question. But I think also we've
20 talked very briefly in the first meeting about the
21 mixed-use issue and the second and third we were
22 talking mostly about third-floor residential
23 possibilities downtown. I'm not quite sure where
24 that's going to go, but I certainly think we need to
25 be talking about that.

1 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: I agree. And in fact
2 that will be something we'll talk about at our
3 August meeting for sure. Because it relates to the
4 proposed code amendment that has been sent to this
5 Board.

6 All right. Just for those in the audience
7 that don't know or care about this point, I'm very
8 happy to let people know that the Village did indeed
9 today put in the grant application for potential
10 grant funding to support our consultant to help with
11 the LWRP. And a lot of heavy lifting went into that
12 from a number of people including Susie Donovan
13 over here and Trustee Brennan and Jane
14 Ratsey-Williams. So a great deal of thanks to them.
15 We'll keep our fingers crossed that the state awards
16 the money to us. I think they've applied for what,
17 over \$200,000 in grants. Which would be great.
18 Because it's hard to figure out how we are going to
19 move the LWRP along efficiently and in a good
20 fashion without any additional outside help. So,
21 call and write your state representatives. I don't
22 think they have anything to do with it, but anyway,
23 keep your fingers crossed.

24 We won't know for several months, but
25 I think it was a great community effort, a lot of

1 people spoke out on this, and I personally
2 appreciate all the support that I was given by the
3 community in pushing on this point, as well as this
4 Board.

5 So, that's my happy announcement for the
6 day. Anybody have anything else?

7 (No response).

8 We are not really going to take up any
9 other topics today, unless you feel a pressing need
10 to. Because it's not printed on the agenda.

11 All right, I appreciate everybody being
12 here, particularly the Housing Committee. We really
13 like to keep the dialogue open, whether it's, you
14 know, in another month or two, having another joint
15 session or, I always think I'm going to make the
16 meetings, and I don't, but we always encourage you
17 to come and speak with us.

18 And same thing for the community. I'm
19 sorry for the crossed wires today about community
20 input. We generally have been trying to, I think,
21 really give the community an opportunity to speak at
22 these meetings and intend to continue to do that.

23 Because this was a special meeting with
24 the Housing Authority, we really wanted to focus on
25 that.

1 So with that, if nobody else has anything
2 else, I'm going to make a motion to adjourn this
3 meeting. Do I have a second?

4 MEMBER WALTON: Second.

5 CHAIRWOMAN HAMMES: All in favor?

6 (ALL AYES) .

7 (The time noted is 5:28 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2

3

4 STATE OF NEW YORK)

5) SS:

6 COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

7

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

10 THAT the within transcript is a true record
11 of the proceedings taken on July 28th, 2025.

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

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

17

18

19

20

21

22

Wayne Galante

23

WAYNE GALANTE

24

25