1	VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
2	COUNTY OF SUFFOLK : STATE OF NEW YORK
3	x
4	ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
5	REGULAR SESSION
6	x
7	Station One Firehouse
8	3rd & South Streets
9	Greenport, NY, 11944
10	
11	October 21, 2025
12	6:00 p.m.
13	
14	B E F O R E:
15	JOHN SALADINO - CHAIRMAN
16	DINNI GORDON - MEMBER
17	SETH KAUFMAN - MEMBER
18	DAVID NYCE - MEMBER
19	* * * * * * * * *
20	ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
21	MICHAEL NOONE - CLERK TO THE BOARD
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Good evening,
2	folks. That was the approximately 6:00
3	whistle. This is the Village of
4	Greenport Zoning Board of Appeals
5	regular meeting.
6	Item Number 1 on our agenda
7	tonight is a motion to accept the
8	minutes of the September 16, 2025
9	Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. So
10	moved.
11	MEMBER NYCE: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
13	(Aye said in unison.)
14	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
15	aye.
16	Folks, in the interest of for
17	the public and for full disclosure, our
18	attorney is not going to be here
19	tonight, and we have one member missing
20	tonight. So we're going to try to
21	muddle through without the attorney and
22	with four members of the Zoning Board.
23	Item Number 2 is a motion to
24	schedule the next Zoning Board of
25	Appeals meeting for November 18, 2025

1	at 6:00 p.m. at Station One Firehouse,
2	Third and South Street, Greenport, New
3	York 11944. So moved.
4	MEMBER GORDON: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
6	(Aye said in unison.)
7	THE COURT: And I'll vote aye.
8	Item Number 3 is 412 West Street.
9	This will be a public hearing regarding
10	the application of Francisco Azama
11	Lopez, am I getting that right?
12	MR. AZAMA LOPEZ: Azama, yes.
13	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Applicant
14	proposes a second story addition and a
15	two-story rear addition. The relief
16	requested is on the agenda. The
17	property is located at the in the
18	R-2 One and Two Family Residential
19	District and is not located in the
20	Historic District. The Suffolk County
21	Tax Map Number is 1001-4-1-26.
22	I'm going to ask the Clerk of the
23	Boards, this was properly noticed?
24	CLERK NOONE: It was properly
25	noticed.

1	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I have the
2	mailings. If anyone from the public
3	wants me to read them, I will. If not,
4	the stenographer has them, she'll enter
5	them into the official record.
6	(Mailings: Charles/Earline
7	Hepburn, 331 Fourth Avenue, Greenport,
8	New York 11944; Paul/Gabrielle
9	Mysliborski, 408 West Street,
10	Greenport, New York 11944; Stacy
11	Crocker, 415 West Street, Greenport,
12	New York 11944; Greenport 412 Kaplan
13	Ave LLC, P.O. Box 591, Shelter Island
14	Heights, New York 11965; Cheryl Vogel,
15	416 West Street, Greenport, New York
16	11944; Ralph Mims, P.O. Box 6,
17	Greenport, New York 11944.)
18	Is the applicant here? Name and
19	address for the stenographer.
20	MR. MURRAY: I want to introduce
21	myself, I'm Dave Murray with at 332
22	Fifth Avenue. I'm neighbors of the
23	applicant. I'm not here as a
24	contractor or anything, I'm just here
25	as a neighbor helping any questions

1	that you might have, to help explain
2	the questions to them and those things.
3	But if you would come up and give your
4	name and address.
5	MR. AZAMA LOPEZ: Yeah, my name is
6	Francisco Azama Lopez, and I live at
7	412 West Street, Greenport.
8	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. Do you
9	want to we understand that there
10	might be a small communication problem.
11	Does anybody want to just give us
12	what's going on?
13	MR. MURRAY: I'll do it. So the
14	applicant is asking for an extension on
15	the back of their house. And they're
16	asking for relief of a side yard
17	setback with this. And as the as
18	everybody saw, he staked it out to
19	where the back extension is coming,
20	it's really just going off both the
21	right side and left side lines of the
22	house going out, I think, a total of 14
23	feet. He's adding a second story. I
24	think they're continuing with three
25	bedrooms on the house, just adding more

1	space for his family.
2	The applicants have been residents
3	of the area for 19, 20 years and
4	MR. AZAMA LOPEZ: From 2006.
5	MR. MURRAY: 2006, so 19 years.
6	So they're looking for relief on the
7	side yard setback.
8	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. Last
9	month we kind of asked about some stuff
10	we thought that was anything
11	CLERK NOONE: Well, the
12	environmental assessment form, the
13	Village Attorney we decided that the
14	environmental assessment form wasn't
15	going to be used anymore for any
16	further applicants, so that was
17	dismissed.
18	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We decided
19	that going forward.
20	CLERK NOONE: You decided that
21	going forward, yes.
22	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So we don't
23	care about that.
24	CLERK NOONE: We don't care about
25	that.

1	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And again, for
2	whoever is listening in the public, if
3	an applicant doesn't have to supply a
4	short EAF, me, personally, I'm fine
5	with that. For a Type II action, you
6	don't have to supply it. But if you do
7	supply it, I read it. So if it's here,
8	and we read it, we're going to ask
9	questions about it. So I thought going
10	forward we just wouldn't see this
11	anymore, but I kind of have this.
12	CLERK NOONE: You have it because
13	it was part of the original
14	application. So I wasn't going to take
15	it away from you.
16	MEMBER NYCE: To that part of what
17	was on there, I think we discussed
18	because the back half of the house now
19	is going to have pitched roofs going to
20	two side yards, that's going to be
21	guttered, down spouted, and going to a
22	dry well to catch that runoff; is that
23	correct?
24	MR. MURRAY: I don't think that's
25	on the plan for the dry wells.

1	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I don't see a
2	dry well on the plan. That was the
3	reason I asked. I mean, there was two
4	questions about a local permit. We
5	don't really care about that. And
6	these two things are, honestly,
7	Building Department issues, but since
8	we have it in front of us, we'll make a
9	note to the Clerk that he can bring it
10	to the Building Department.
11	One of the questions, does the
12	proposed action meet or exceed state
13	energy code requirements, they answered
14	no. I don't even know if that's legal,
15	you know, to not build to state energy
16	requirements.
17	MR. MURRAY: Well, when you do an
18	addition, I think I'm actually
19	curious about that too, John, but I
20	think an addition because they're not
21	touching the front side of their house,
22	I think it's just the addition. So I
23	think overall you won't need that, but
24	on the new part you would. Does that
25	make sense?

1	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Yeah, it does.
2	And we're only addressing the new part,
3	we don't care about the old part.
4	MR. MURRAY: So that I think
5	that's
6	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: You don't have
7	to answer now. We thought maybe they
8	would bring their builder or their
9	architect, but they didn't. So we're
10	going to make a note for the building
11	inspector
12	CLERK NOONE: Well, I'm not sure
13	if the building inspector is going to
14	actually require that. He's only going
15	to care about what he requires.
16	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We're only
17	inquiring about what's on here and
18	if we're only pointing it out to
19	him. That's all we're doing. It's not
20	going to effect the application.
21	And the other thing is about the
22	storm water discharge, that we are kind
23	of interested in.
24	MEMBER NYCE: I would suggest that
25	it be directed away from the neighbor's

1	property particularly on the side where
2	they're looking for relief. You know,
3	a smaller amount of space on the west
4	side of the property.
5	MEMBER GORDON: West side.
6	MEMBER NYCE: So if those down
7	spouts come down, if you have some sort
8	of leader that leads back to your
9	property and not to the neighbor's
10	property.
11	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We have a
12	portion of our code excuse me, a
13	portion of our code says you have to
14	contain your storm water. It can't
15	migrate to other people's properties
16	and stuff. Normally the way the
17	builders handle it is they put a dry
18	well, and it goes into the dry well.
19	This is a Building Department
20	building inspector issue. In the past,
21	we addressed it because we had the
22	short EAF. All we're saying is we're
23	going to give the building inspector a
24	heads up to this. What he does after
25	that is up to him.

1	Does any member have a question
2	for the applicant?
3	MEMBER GORDON: I don't have any
4	questions. I do think that you just
5	need to fill in for the record the
6	it says here is basement or lowest
7	floor being constructed? And the
8	answer neither yes nor no, at least
9	in my copy, is checked.
10	MR. MURRAY: What part of that
11	application, I'm sorry?
12	MEMBER GORDON: It's the section
13	on new construction areas, and it asks
14	is basement or lowest floor area be
15	constructed? And in my copy, neither
16	yes nor no is checked, so.
17	MEMBER NYCE: So there will be
18	MEMBER GORDON: I guess, I would
19	like to know the answer.
20	MEMBER NYCE: It's asking if the
21	basement or lowest floor is being
22	constructed. So are you putting a
23	foundation underneath the new section?
24	The answer is yes, so.
25	MR. MURRAY: That's going to be a

1	crawl space on the new section.
2	MEMBER GORDON: It's very clear on
3	the site plan.
4	MEMBER NYCE: If you're putting in
5	foundation, you need to just have
6	MEMBER GORDON: Yes.
7	MR. AZAMA LOPEZ: Yes.
8	MEMBER GORDON: And my arithmetic
9	suggests that it's the coverage,
10	percentage of coverage is 15.3 percent
11	rather than 14. It's not important, I
12	realize, but because you have lots of
13	room on the lot coverage. Other than
14	that, I have no questions.
15	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dave?
16	MEMBER NYCE: No.
17	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth,
18	anything?
19	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Nope.
20	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Thank you.
21	I'm going to ask the public, if there's
22	anybody from the public that would like
23	to speak? No. Okay.
24	What's the pleasure of the Board?
25	Are we going to close this public

1	hearing?
2	MEMBER NYCE: I'm fine with that.
3	MEMBER GORDON: Yes.
4	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Yes. Aye.
5	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm going to
6	make a motion that we close the public
7	hearing. So moved.
8	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Second.
9	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
10	(Aye said in unison.)
11	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
12	aye.
13	Item Number 4, oh, look at this,
14	412 West Street. Item Number 4 on our
15	agenda is 412 West Street. This is a
16	discussion and possible motion on the
17	area variances applied for by Francisco
18	Azama Lopez for the property located at
19	412 West Street, Greenport, New York
20	11944. The Suffolk County Tax Map
21	Number remains the same at 1001-4-1-26.
22	What are we thinking here, folks?
23	We're talking about just for the
24	record, we're talking about a side yard
25	setback from a two story rear addition

1	of 7.7 feet where a minimum of 10 feet
2	is required. And to permit an
3	aggregate side yard setback of 19.7
4	feet where the minimum of 25 feet is
5	required. 150-21 says to permit an
6	enlargement of a nonconforming building
7	in a manner that increases the degree
8	of nonconformity. So the applicant is
9	looking for three phases of relief.
10	None of them seem overwhelming. What
11	are we anybody have any comments
12	about this?
13	MEMBER NYCE: No.
14	MEMBER GORDON: Well, the west
15	side yard setback is going to be the
16	same as it has been always for the
17	house, the 7.7 feet. I mean, it is
18	increasing the degree of nonconformity
19	just for those, whatever it is, 14 and
20	a half feet.
21	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: For the
22	addition, whatever the addition is.
23	MEMBER GORDON: For the addition,
24	yeah, 14 and a half feet. And I
25	sometimes have doubts about this

1	standard for not increasing the degree
2	of nonconformity because as people
3	become more settled and more affluent,
4	they want bigger houses, and I don't
5	think we should have huge houses, but I
6	understand people want bigger kitchens
7	because our lives have changed about
8	cooking and people have more guests.
9	So it seems to me sometimes that
LO	adhering to that standard is sort of
L1	unreasonable, and I would say this is
L2	one of those cases. And that the
L3	increase in the degree of nonconformity
L 4	is really not very great. It makes the
L5	downstairs area a little bigger and it
L 6	adds a bedroom.
L7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. Okay.
L8	MEMBER GORDON: But surely, it is
L 9	the third this third element of
20	increasing the degree of nonconformity.
21	I mean, if Arthur Tasker were here, he
22	would say no, no, no.
23	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: If Arthur
24	Tasker was here, he would have to
25	recuse himself because the original

interpretation was for Arthur Tasker's house on Sandy Beach. So he would have to recuse himself.

But as an explanation to what my colleague said, the Zoning Board of Appeals had made an interpretation in -- Dinni and I were both on the Zoning Board at the time, that a house on Sandy Beach without increasing the footprint decided to go up, and the Zoning Board at that time decided that it was permitted. It was -- it didn't increase the nonconformity.

After that, a couple or three years after that, there was a house on Main Street, 506 or 508, I don't remember, and the same issue came up. And at that time, our attorney at that time, different attorney at that time, it was for a second floor deck over a first floor kitchen. And the Zoning Board reaffirmed -- at that time it reaffirmed its interpretation of 150-21.

Apparently now, without somebody

1	asking for a new interpretation, the
2	Village has decided that this, in fact,
3	requires relief. If in this
4	particular instance, it's really a
5	nonissue. I mean, it's not something
6	that's going to make a big difference
7	in how this Board votes tonight, I'm
8	guessing, how it affects the property
9	or the property owner, but in the
10	future, it could make a difference. So
11	the Zoning Board has we all know
12	that interpretations have carried the
13	weight of precedence. The Zoning Board
14	has an interpretation on this. Like it
15	or not, it is the law of the land. But
16	now, someone else is interpreting this
17	and they decide that relief is
18	required. Again, I don't think it's
19	going to make a difference tonight, but
20	down the road, it very well may.
21	So in response to what my
22	colleague said, that's kind of, like,
23	my response to that.
24	MEMBER GORDON: Which is, I think,
25	in a way an argument for revisiting

1	this standard and making it more
2	nuanced for situations, and then you
3	wouldn't have to be dealing with this
4	kind of trivial matter.
5	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, unlike
6	other municipalities, and you know
7	this, unlike other municipalities, an
8	outside Board is required to ask for an
9	interpretation from the Zoning Board.
10	In this municipality, in their infinite
11	wisdom, which I totally agree with, we
12	can ask ourselves for an
13	interpretation.
14	So me personally, I'm okay with
15	the interpretation that the Zoning
16	Board made in 2015 and 2018, that they
17	reaffirmed it in 2018. If someone here
18	tonight or in the future wants to
19	request an interpretation, I don't have
20	a problem with it.
21	MEMBER GORDON: I'm not talking
22	about a different interpretation, I'm
23	talking about thinking about changing
24	that section, but we're not going to do

it now obviously.

25

1	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm not sure I
2	understand. Change what section?
3	Change that portion of the code?
4	MEMBER GORDON: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We already did
6	with our interpretation. The
7	interpretation becomes the law, not
8	that portion of the code.
9	MEMBER GORDON: All right. I'm
10	thinking about a future text, but let's
11	not. I meant just to say that I think
12	we can move easily with this, me, we
13	can move easily on this question
14	because we're comfortable with allowing
15	this applicant to increase the degree
16	of nonconformity.
17	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. There's
18	so much more I could say, but I don't
19	want to belabor it, so we're just going
20	to move on, if that's okay with the
21	folks here.
22	I lost my place. Where were we
23	with this?
24	MEMBER KAUFMAN: You were asking
25	the other Board Members how they felt

1	about it. I think we might have done
2	that.
3	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: How do we feel
4	about it?
5	MEMBER KAUFMAN: I think it's a
6	reasonable request and it's a minor
7	impact.
8	MEMBER NYCE: I concur.
9	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I agree.
10	MEMBER KAUFMAN: How do you feel?
11	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I agree also.
12	That was an elaborate solution to
13	a nonexistent problem. I apologize.
14	Sometimes the less said, the better.
15	I know we have to do SEQRA.
16	I'm going to make a motion that
17	the Zoning Board of Appeals declares
18	itself lead agency for the purposes of
19	SEQRA. So moved.
20	MEMBER NYCE: Second.
21	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
22	(Aye said in unison.)
23	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
24	aye. This is a Type II action, so no
25	further there's no impact on the

1	environment.
2	We can read these five questions
3	or we can just discuss them a little
4	bit.
5	MEMBER KAUFMAN: We don't need the
6	five questions.
7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We don't read
8	the five questions if we discuss them
9	in our discussion.
10	MEMBER NYCE: Which I think we
11	have.
12	MEMBER KAUFMAN: We have.
13	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think we
14	have.
15	So the next thing would be I'll
16	make a motion that the Zoning Board of
17	Appeals approves the listed the
18	three listed requests for relief, so
19	basically approve the application. So
20	moved.
21	MEMBER NYCE: Second.
22	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
23	(Aye said in unison.)
24	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Should we take
25	a roll call? We're all in agreement.

1	I'll take a roll call. David?
2	MEMBER NYCE: Aye.
3	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
4	MEMBER GORDON: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
6	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Yes.
7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
8	yes. Easy peasy. Thank you. The
9	I'm not entirely sure of the process.
10	The decision will be with the Clerk
11	within five days. The Building
12	Department will get that decision
13	and
14	CLERK NOONE: I'll let the
15	Building Department know that the
16	variances have been granted.
17	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And then a
18	building permit will be when he gets
19	a chance, he'll issue a building
20	permit. Thank you.
21	MEMBER GORDON: And I'll be
22	interested as I walk by your house to
23	watch it change.
24	MR. MURRAY: Me too.
25	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: David has the

1	best view.
2	Moving on. Item Number 5 is 518
3	First Street. This is a continued
4	discussion and possible motion on the
5	area variance applied for David Murray
6	on behalf of Donald Wiss for the
7	property located at 518 First Street,
8	Greenport, New York 11944. The Suffolk
9	County Tax Map Number is 1001-4-3-6.
10	Members, we've had a month to
11	ponder this. David, I have to
12	apologize to you, we thought we were
13	going to have
14	MR. MURRAY: I understand. John,
15	I get it.
16	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We thought we
17	would have five members.
18	MR. MURRAY: Proceed, right.
19	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I kind of have
20	some stuff to say that may or may not
21	be okay with you, but the Members, if
22	you want, I'll go. If not, somebody
23	else have no.
24	Again, I took notes because
25	because I'm getting old and I got to

1 take notes.

2	I went through the five questions,
3	which I used to decide which all
4	Zoning Board Members use to decide if
5	the detriment to the Village is greater
6	than the benefit to the applicant. So
7	by law, we are required to ponder these
8	five questions and use the results that
9	you come to to control your vote. So
10	you know, one of the questions, whether
11	an undesirable change would be produced
12	in the character of the neighborhood.
13	From my experience on the Zoning Board,
14	first of all, the Zoning Board's
15	mandate, you know, Article 2 of the
16	Zoning Board mandate is the elimination
17	of nonconforming uses. So to pay a
18	nonconforming use forward, to me, is
19	contrary to what our mandate is. We
20	all understand about preexisting
21	nonconforming. Nobody is going to
22	change that, nobody is going to make
23	you move a house that's been there a
24	hundred years. But once that house is
25	not there anymore, then it has to abide

1	by the rules.
2	So in this case, a neighbor was
3	kind of okay with the detriment to her
4	property. But we know that the
5	variance runs with the land, so the
6	next neighbor might not be okay.
7	Whether the benefit sought by the
8	applicant can be achieved by some
9	method, other than an area variance.
10	Obviously yes, they just move the
11	building over. The elephant in the
12	room is that there's a foundation. I'm
13	kind of willing to compromise about
14	this foundation, but can we move the
15	building over three and a half feet or
16	five feet? Yes.
17	Is the requested area variance
18	substantial? In relation to what's
19	required and what's provided, I believe
20	it is. It's three times the amount
21	needed for the required setback.
22	Whether proposed variance will
23	have an adverse impact on the physical
24	environment, conditions in neighborhood

or district. This Board has -- I

25

1	believe this, this Board many, many
2	times has heard about fire safety,
3	about the reason for setbacks. We take
4	into consideration that and also the
5	neighbor's right to open space and to
6	the perception of light and stuff. So
7	to build something on a neighbor's
8	property line, in my mind, deprives the
9	neighbor of that.
10	The last question we're asked to
11	consider is is the difficulty
12	self-created. I mean, obviously.
13	And having in reference to
14	that, I kind of reject the mindset that
15	the municipality might bear some fault
16	in this. I don't subscribe to that. I
17	don't think the municipality should be
18	held responsible for this overt act. I
19	mean, sometimes we have to wait. Right
20	now there's is the government still
21	shut down right now? I think the
22	government is still shut down. So
23	people are waiting, I mean, people are
24	waiting for paychecks, and thank God

not Social Security checks. But you

25

1	can't just decide that I'm tired of
2	waiting. I heard last month that this
3	is not a big deal because the scope is
4	smaller from a previous application
5	that we had for this same thing. I
6	disagree with that too. I don't have a
7	square footage that I have in my mind
8	that makes it okay. One project is 600
9	feet, this is 300 feet. I don't have
10	that. I think the act is what we have
11	to I don't think we should pay bad
12	behavior forward. I don't think I
13	think the builder and the applicant
14	both admitted that they knew that they
15	were doing this without a permit. I
16	don't subscribe to the old Greenport
17	paradigm that just ask for forgiveness
18	as opposed to permission.
19	So unless my colleagues say
20	something that is radically different
21	than what I just said, that opinion is
22	going to be expressed in my vote.
23	That's all I have.
24	Anyone? Or not. We'll just take
25	a vote.

1	MEMBER KAUFMAN: I have nothing to
2	add. I agree with what you said.
3	MEMBER GORDON: My position is
4	pretty much the same as last month.
5	I'm I wish the applicant had gotten
6	the I mean, I feel, as Seth does,
7	that it's very important, that just to
8	get the building permit to apply for
9	a building permit is sort of
10	MR. MURRAY: It was applied for,
11	Dinni. It was all Historic approved
12	everything.
13	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: David, you
14	can't
15	MR. MURRAY: You said
16	(Whereupon, there was simultaneous
17	crosstalk.)
18	MEMBER GORDON: I misspoke.
19	MR. MURRAY: Let's get this
20	straight.
21	MEMBER GORDON: I should have
22	said, I'm sorry it was not acquired.
23	I'm sorry it didn't happen, the
24	building permit.
25	MR. MURRAY: Okay. But applied

1	for is something
2	MEMBER GORDON: Okay. You're not
3	we're the ones who are supposed to
4	be talking now.
5	MR. MURRAY: I know. Well
6	MEMBER GORDON: I also think that
7	the variance is not so substantial. I
8	think it would be kind of awkward to
9	move the building, it will not align
LO	with the driveway. I think the
11	building size is not likely to have an
12	effect on the neighborhood to use part
L3	of the questions we ask. And the
L 4	neighbor was not just okay with it, she
L5	was she saw the problems and I think
L 6	she of course, there might be
L7	another neighbor, but I doubt very much
L8	that another neighbor is going to be
L 9	concerned.
20	So although I'm hesitant about
21	the about the relationship with the
22	Building Department, I guess, I have
23	put that aside and I'm comfortable with
24	this variance request.
25	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: David?

1	MEMBER NYCE: Yeah, I expressed my
2	opinions last month. I still I
3	agree with Dinni in this instance that
4	I don't see I don't necessarily have
5	a problem with granting the variance in
6	this case.
7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. Just
8	because we heard something from someone
9	in the audience in the back there. We
10	don't care what happened at HPC, HPC
11	has nothing to do with us. And HPC
12	doesn't have the right to grant
13	variances or grant relief. So whatever
14	happened at HPC doesn't effect anything
15	that happens here.
16	Dinni had mentioned about the
17	driveway. I had planned on saying
18	something like that. I think the fact
19	that the building the applicant
20	would like the building to line up with
21	his perception of where the driveway
22	should be, I kind of think that's
23	hokum, I think, you know, to move it
24	over three feet, the building is going

to be a hundred feet from the front of

25

1	the property. I don't know anybody
2	that's going to notice that. But that
3	was an argument that the applicant made
4	in favor of us granting this relief.
5	I'm not sure if did we do
6	SEQRA, did we do SEQRA?
7	CLERK NOONE: I don't believe we
8	did yet.
9	MEMBER KAUFMAN: We haven't. I'll
LO	just add, I think that, you know I
11	don't if they want if they feel
12	it lines up better, and I guess you do
L3	too, that's one thing. My problem is
L 4	really that we were never given the
L5	opportunity to actually comment on that
L 6	positioning and that variance because
L7	it was just built without a permit.
L8	That's the problem I have with this
L 9	entire affair is that the process
20	wasn't followed, and we never had an
21	opportunity to actually have input into
22	that. It was just put into the ground
23	and now here it is. And that's the
24	real conundrum for me. It's not a
25	matter of is it a major variance or is

1	it going to be a detriment to the
2	neighborhood. I don't think it is. I
3	don't think moving it over a few feet
4	is going to ruin the neighborhood or
5	anything. But it's just that we don't
6	have a choice. It's there and how do
7	we legitimize that? That's the problem
8	I have.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Let me ask, and maybe David will respond after I say this. I'm willing to kind of compromise half way. We know in our code the definition of a building is the same as a structure and a foundation is a building. It is a structure. And it carries the weight of being a building.

So right now, there's an in ground foundation there, and because of that foundation, this building has to -- the building that's proposed to go on top of that foundation needs this relief.

I don't know if it's possible. I know it might be expensive, but I don't know if it's possible to just ignore, like,

1	three and a half feet of that
2	foundation and build the building over
3	with a five foot setback that it's
4	supposed to have without having to
5	MR. MURRAY: Destroy the
6	foundation.
7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Just let me
8	finish. If the relief is not
9	granted if the relief is not
10	granted, the building and the
11	foundation would have to be code
12	compliant. If we compromise, we can
13	make the building code compliant and
14	the foundation remain in place. I
15	don't know if that's I'm not.
16	MEMBER NYCE: You're talking about
17	adding foundation to the west side?
18	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: It would be
19	the north side.
20	MEMBER NYCE: Sorry, the north
21	side, right, and abandoning the equal
22	number of feet on the south side, and
23	move the building over. So add to the
24	foundation, move the building over.
25	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Or not. I

1	don't believe the building is on a
2	foundation to begin with.
3	MR. MURRAY: I was just trying to
4	show to Dave that the footings are on
5	the edge. I'm just pondering.
6	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Or we could
7	just vote. I mean, you know, we're
8	allowed to offer compromises. I don't
9	know I don't even know if this is a
LO	reasonable in my mind it is, but I'm
L1	kind of, like, a dope. In my mind,
12	this a reasonable compromise.
13	MR. MURRAY: We thought of that at
L 4	one time, we did.
L5	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Why wouldn't that
L 6	be a reasonable compromise?
L7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I don't have a
L8	problem saying I don't know.
L 9	MEMBER KAUFMAN: The lawyer is not
20	here tonight, but I don't see why that
21	would be an issue and at least then
22	you're not wasting an entire foundation
23	and all of the effort and
24	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Expense.
25	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Expense and

1	carbon emissions and everything else
2	that goes with that.
3	MEMBER NYCE: It may come down to
4	the fact that the fix causes as much
5	work as the tearing it out and redoing.
6	MEMBER KAUFMAN: But this is not a
7	deep foundation, it's not piles I don't
8	think.
9	MR. MURRAY: No, it's not. It's a
10	monolithic pour, which is not you
11	know, should I come up?
12	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The public
13	hearing is closed, but the lawyer is
14	not here, sure, come up. Name and
15	address for the stenographer.
16	MR. MURRAY: I could move over one
17	foot easier than three.
18	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Now we're,
19	like, negotiating.
20	MR. MURRAY: I'm not negotiating,
21	I'm just, like, seeing where the
22	footing is. My footings are on the
23	ends of this. I'm just trying to
24	like, I could cut off a certain point
25	and add new footings to make it a

1 little --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: David, we have a small amount of latitude. Listen, you kind of know about what goes on here. We have a small amount of latitude here. And allowing the --that three and a half feet of foundation to remain, I think, is within our authority here. I'm not entirely sure. But I think it's within our authority.

The other side of that coin is, if the relief is not granted, it's got to come out. The building inspector I don't think has the option to say, the heck with it, leave it. I think his responsibility would be to say make it code compliant. It's a building, the foundation is a building. If we condition it that -- and again, I'm not sure -- I told our attorney to stay home, relax tonight, there would be no heady topics to be discussed, but I think it is well within our authority to allow that foundation to remain and

1	have the building itself be code
2	compliant. Move it over the three and
3	a half feet, the five feet from where
4	you want it. I'm not prepared to give
5	you both. I'm not prepared to give you
6	that building. Two of my colleagues
7	already expressed their opinion. I'm
8	not prepared to give you that building
9	on that property line. So we can take
10	a vote and cast our fate to the wind
11	and let the building inspector decide
12	what happens. Or maybe we can take
13	a vote is what we can do.
14	MEMBER KAUFMAN: On what, though,
15	exactly? On a compromise?
16	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, on this.
17	MEMBER GORDON: What's before us.
18	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: On granting
19	the 3.4 feet on a side yard.
20	MR. MURRAY: I'm sorry, does it
21	mean anything about the other buildings
22	being on the property line around the
23	area?
24	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Again, I kind
25	of addressed that in my narrative.

1	Maybe I wasn't clear enough. We're not
2	going to make a preexisting building, a
3	preexisting nonconforming building
4	move. The code was written in 1971.
5	That's what we address. What happened
6	back when Greenport was on a prairie,
7	you know, and people were building
8	wherever they wanted to build, we have
9	no control over that.
10	Also, part of our mandate, 150-2
11	tells us it's our responsibility to
12	eliminate nonconforming uses. So when
13	somebody knocks down a preexisting
14	nonconforming building and wants to
15	build a new building on the exact same
16	footprint, I'm not inclined to say
17	that's okay. Especially when you're
18	not restrained on the other side.
19	You're not you could put the
20	building wherever you want on the
21	property. Again, the property is the
22	elephant in the room. There's a
23	foundation that was poured without
24	permission or permit. I think if
25	that and I'm speculating, and I'm

1	just guessing now, if that foundation
2	wasn't there, this building would be
3	code compliant without any doubt in my
4	mind. Without any doubt in my mind.
5	The applicant would come in front of
6	us, we would express our opinion, he
7	would give us the reasoning that he
8	thinks the building should be 1.5 feet
9	from the property line, he would tell
LO	us about his driveway, and I don't
L1	think again, if that foundation
12	wasn't there, I don't think this Board
L3	would grant that relief. I don't think
L 4	it would have came in front of the
L5	Zoning Board. I think this would have
L 6	been squared away at the Building
L 7	Department. Move the building over
L8	five feet, you don't have to go to the
L 9	done Zoning Board. 99.9 percent of the
20	applicants that make application to the
21	Zoning Board would take that deal, I
22	think. But that's my opinion.
23	I'm going to make a motion that
24	the Zoning Board of Appeals declares
25	itself lead agency for the purpose of

1	SEQRA. So moved.
2	MEMBER NYCE: Second.
3	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
4	(Aye said in unison.)
5	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
6	aye.
7	Are we prepared to vote on the
8	notice of disapproval on the request,
9	or do we want to discuss any options?
LO	I'm prepared to vote either way.
11	MEMBER GORDON: I am too.
L2	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Me too.
L3	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All right.
L 4	I'll make a motion that if our
L5	attorney was here, he likes me to
L 6	phrase these in the negative. I don't
L7	like doing that. We can make two
L8	motions, but I'll make a motion that
L 9	the Zoning Board of Appeals grants the
20	variance for the requested relief.
21	MEMBER GORDON: Second.
22	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So moved.
23	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Second.
24	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: David?
25	MEMBER NYCE: So your motion is to

1	grant the variance as requested?
2	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Right. We
3	know that Brian likes us to phrase it
4	in the negative to say deny, but I
5	think it works either way.
6	MEMBER NYCE: It does.
7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So I made the
8	motion, Dinni seconded. We'll take a
9	roll call vote. David?
10	MEMBER NYCE: Aye.
11	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
12	MEMBER GORDON: Aye.
13	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
14	MEMBER KAUFMAN: Aye.
15	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
16	no. All that for nothing.
17	MR. MURRAY: You guys are killing
18	me. Thank you.
19	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: You'll get the
20	notice. You'll have the decision
21	within five days in the Clerk's Office
22	and you know the deal. They'll do the
23	building permit.
24	Moving on, Item Number 6, any
25	other Zoning Board of Appeals business

1	that might properly come before this
2	Board. Anybody, anybody in the back?
3	No? No questions.
4	Item Number 7 is a motion to
5	adjourn. So moved.
6	MEMBER NYCE: Second.
7	CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
8	(Aye said in unison.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, AMY THOMAS, a Court Reporter and Notary
4	Public, for and within the State of New York,
5	do hereby certify:
6	THAT the above and foregoing contains a
7	true and correct transcription of the
8	proceedings held on October 21, 2025, and
9	were reported by me.
10	I further certify that I am not related to
11	any of the parties to this action by blood or
12	by marriage and that I am in no way
13	interested in the outcome of this matter
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
15	hand this 31st day of OCTOBER, 2025.
16	
17	
18	AMY THOMAS
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	