

June 25, 2020

The Planning Board of the Incorporated Village of Westhampton Beach held its regular meeting on June 25, 2020, at 5:00 P.M. in the Municipal Building, 165 Mill Road, Westhampton Beach.

PRESENT: Ralph Neubauer, Acting Chairman
 Jack Lawrence Jones
 Rocco Logozzo
 Michael Schermeyer

 Maeghan Mackie, Board Secretary

 Brad Hammond, Building & Zoning Administrator

 Kyle Collins, Village Planner
 Ron Hill, Village Engineer

 Anthony C. Pasca, Esq., Village Attorney

DECISIONS:

1. **Avidor Group LLC, 133 Montauk Highway (905-5-2-4 and lot 5 and lot 38)** Applicant requests a site Plan Review to construct a new two story 11,000 sq. ft. mixed use building consisting of retail/office use on first floor and office and two apartments on 2nd floor. The property is located in the B-2 Zoning District.

Status: **HELDOVER until July 23, 2020**

ZBA: **Granted**
ARB: **Advisory Report Received**

SEQRA: **Complete**
SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCPC: **Approved;**
SCDPW: **Approved;**

HOLDOVERS:

2. **160 Montauk Highway, 160 Montauk Highway, (905-6-1-19) Westhampton Beach**
Applicant requests a Site Plan review to construct an addition to an existing Permitted Retail Beverage Store. The property is located in the B-2 Zoning District.

Status: **HELDOVER until July 23, 2020**

ZBA: **Granted**
ARB: **Received**

SEQRA: **Conditional Neg. Dec. Issued**
SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCPC: **Approved, Matter of Local Jurisdiction;**
SCDPW: **Approved with no comment;**

3. **Anthony J. Cassano, Jr., and Louis Commisso, (905-5-1-21) 30 Lilac Road** Applicant Requests a minor subdivision review to create two (2) lots on a parcel of land located in the R-2 Zoning District.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 23, 2020**
 Applicant is awaiting a determination from the Suffolk County Dept. of Health Services Board of Review.

ZBA: **N/A**
ARB: **N/A**

SEQRA: **COORDINATED REVIEW; DETERMINATION ISSUED: 6/25/2015**

June 25, 2020

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *N/A*

SCPC: **NEEDED**

4. Marios Nikolaides, 36 Hazelwood Avenue (905-6-1-11.1) Applicant requests a minor Subdivision review to create a three-lot subdivision on a lot located in the R-4 Zoning district.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL September 24, 2020**

ZBA: **GRANTED, 12/20/2018**

ARB: *N/A*

SEQRA: **UNLISTED ACTION, GRANTED FEBRUARY 28, 2019**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *N/A*

SCPC: **NEEDED**

5. 85 & 105 Montauk LLC, 85, 105 Montauk Hwy & 105 Oak St, (905-005-01-012, -053.01 & -052.02). Applicant requests Site Plan review to construct a two-story restaurant building with associated site improvements including improvements on lots to the West & South, consideration of a change of Zoning District for the Southerly lot with demolition of the dwelling and site build-out for parking with buffer, and site improvements on the Westerly lot including curbing, buffer & access reorientation.

Nicholas A. Vero, Architect said to provide an update, they did close on the property to the South of this and he is waiting for the Deed to come back so they go to the Board of Health and satisfy the covenant requirements. He will be sitting down with his client to go over the plans and particulars with reference to the comments they have received to date.

6. Laurence Verbeke, 167 Oneck Lane, (905-009-01-019). Applicant requests review to subdivide a 207,984 SF (4.77 ac) lot, improved with a single-family dwelling and accessory structures, into two flag lots of 151,621 SF (3.48 ac) and 56,363 SF (1.29 ac). The subject property is located on the west side of and with access to Oneck Lane, in the R-1 Zoning District.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 9, 2020**

ZBA: *N/A*

ARB: **NEEDED**

SEQRA: **Granted; October 10, 2019**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *N/A*

SCPC: *N/A*

7. Rogers Associates LLC, North Side of Rogers Ave (905-003-01-007.01 through 007.07). Applicant seeks site plan approval to construct 52 dwelling units in 13 Buildings (11 townhouse groupings, 2 two-family dwellings) with private community center, pool & tennis court for multifamily development with on-site sewage treatment plant in two development phases

Status: **THERE WILL BE A JOINT WORK SESSION HELD ON JUNE 25, 2020 WITH THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES; PUBLIC COMMENT WILL NOT BE ALLOWED, BUT THE PUBLIC IS PERMITTED TO WATCH THE MEETING. Details for logging on will be posted after June 22, 2020.**

DRAFT Scoping Documents Received on March 3, 2020

The Planning Board will discuss the scoping process at its March 12, 2020 meeting. All are welcome to attend, but please note that the discussion will be about the scoping process only -- no substantive comments on the Draft Scope will be entertained at March 12th meeting. Subsequent to March 12th meeting, a schedule will be published that includes a time frame and opportunity for public participation and substantive comment on the Draft Scope prior to the adoption of a Final Scope.

ZBA: *Undetermined*

ARB: **NEEDED**

SEQRA: **POSITIVE DECLARATION ISSUED, 1/9/2020; PLANNING BOARD LEAD AGENT**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: **N/A**

SCPC: **NEEDED**

OTHER: **Special Exception Permit required from Board of Trustees**

8. Westhampton Inn LLC., 43 Main Street (905-11-1-15) Applicant requests a Site Plan approval to construct a two-story ten-room hotel building with a covered front entry, rear porte-cochere and associated site improvements upon a 0.93 acre parcel located at the South West corner of Main Street and Mitchell Road in the B-1 Zoning District.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 9, 2020**

ZBA: **NEEDED**

ARB: **Referred to ARB at January 23, 2020 Meeting;**

SEQRA: **Planning Board Deemed Lead Agent;**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: **N/A**

SCPC: **Received SCPC, 2/14/2020 – No objection;**

9. Prime Storage, 98 Depot Road (905-002-01-019.10). Applicant requests a site plan review to construct a two-story mini-/self-storage building (10,428 SF) on slab with accessory office as an expansion of an existing storage facility operation. The 3.657-acre property is located on the east side of Depot Road, in the I-1 zoning district.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 9, 2020**

ZBA: **NEEDED**

ARB: **Referred to ARB at January 23, 2020 Meeting;**

SEQRA: **Coordinated Review Commenced 1/27/2020;
Accept Lead Agency Status**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: **N/A**

SCPC: **Received SCPC No objection;**

10. James Traynor, 91 Old Riverhead Rd (905-002-01-007.02) Applicant requests site plan approval to construct a one-story General & Special Trade (G/ST) Contractors' Office building (9,744 sf) on slab, a two-story G/ST Contractors' Administrative Office building (1,776 sf) over unfinished basement, & convert dwelling to G/ST Contractors' Administrative Office (1,888 sf), with associated site improvements, upon a 63,770 square-foot parcel located in the HD zoning district.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 9, 2020**

ZBA: **Granted; Received, May 21, 2020**

ARB: **Referred to ARB at January 9, 2020 Meeting;**

SEQRA: **Negative Declaration Issued, February 27, 2020**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: **N/A**

SCPC: **Received SCPC No objection;**

11. HCMC, 51 Old Riverhead Rd (905-004-01-010). Applicant requests site plan approval to construct two-story additions to the converted dwelling for a G/ST Contractors' Office building (3,796 SF) over unfinished basement & crawlspace, with associated site improvements, upon a 22,886 square-foot parcel located in the HD zoning district.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 9, 2020**

ZBA: **Granted; Received, April 16, 2020**

ARB: *Referred to ARB at June 11, 2020;*

SEQRA: *Type II Action*
SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *N/A*
SCPC: **NEEDED**

12. Kevin Butler, 104 Main Street (905-012-04-032). Applicant requests subdivision review to subdivide a 10,606 SF lot into two parcels of 2,877 SF & 7,729 SF. The subject property is improved with three mixed-use commercial buildings and located on the northwest corner of Glovers Lane & Main Street, in the B-1 zoning district. This is a re-opening of a public hearing held-over from by request of the applicant dated June 9, 2016.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 23, 2020**

ZBA: **NEEDED**
ARB: *N/A*

SEQRA: *Type II Action*
SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *N/A*
SCPC: *N/A*

13. 55 Old Riverhead Road LLC, 55 & 59 Old Riverhead Rd (905-004-01-007, -009.02 & -009.03) Applicant requests site plan approval to construct a multifamily development consisting of 16 (sixteen) senior dwelling units in four two-story townhouse buildings with attached garages, pickleball court, and associated site improvements, upon an assemblage of three parcels totaling 122,001 square feet on the west side of Old Riverhead Road in the HD zoning district. ****THIS APPLICATION WILL NOT BE DISCUSSED UNTIL THE “NYS PAUSE ORDER” HAS BEEN LIFTED.**

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL July 9, 2020**

ZBA: **N/A**
ARB: **NEEDED**

SEQRA: *Unlisted Action; Coordinated Review Commenced on February 14, 2020*
SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: **NEEDED**
SCPC: **NEEDED**

REFERRAL FROM THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

14. Build Coastal, LLC., 26 Old Riverhead Road (905-4-2-9) Special Exception Application for “Change of Use” from Administrative Contractors Office to Propane Contractor and Administrative Contractors Office.

Thomas Downing appeared on behalf of the application together with Chris Brody, Propane Depot, and Mr. Reilly said he thought they were looking for more updated landscaping on the North side of the property.

Mr. Downing said they did not discuss it because they did not get a chance to review the plans submitted.

Mr. Neubauer said the general consensus is that we would like an uptick and the plan was submitted late, you were going to increase the diameters on the South side and add to the North side.

Mr. Collins said we did not have a conversation regulating to the North side and they did submit for the May meeting a revised plan showing on the East side of the site in the tank storage area larger trees in terms of height, and showed the proposed planting between that area and Old Riverhead Road along the Southern property line. My indication was that was adequate and the North side we did not get to discuss with the applicant.

Mr. Neubauer asked if they are opposed to adding anything to the Northern border?

Mr. Downing said he did the lighting plan, and he's up to \$40,000.00 in plantings and lighting so there will be a tipping point, but you're looking through a parking lot and that site is mostly filled with vehicles that are being serviced. Anyone looking from the road is looking at cars, they are not looking in to my site because there are almost always vehicles there, but I could put something there, but maybe something smaller that can grow in. The cost of the Leyland Cypress and the lighting is the cost is my aversion.

Mr. Brody said it's very narrow on that North side, there's not much space between the fence and the parking lot.

Mr. Reilly said we don't want something that will be root bound.

Mr. Brody said it's only 2' or 3' of space.

Mr. Downing said the Angelo's property goes right to the property line to the fence and I don't think that site plan could accommodate a 10' buffer, but you're looking at vehicles and when you are traveling down that road it is a minimal amount of time you can see in to his yard. He's happy to put the hedge it screening on the fence, and would do so on either side; the gate that runs North and South along Angelo's property, and I am doing a lot to screen the site.

Mr. Logozzo said it's not their intent to impose hardship for screening of the property line, but it's the only property driving South on Old Riverhead Road that looks like there's storage behind the building, and something small 5' to 6' spaced out would solve the problem and give it time to grow.

Mr. Downing said okay.

Mr. Logozzo said they are not trying to create a hardship but it's the only property that looks like outside storage behind the building.

Mr. Downing said it looks bad because there's a construction site to the South that's completely cleared, and I didn't want to install the trees and fence until I have an approval, and I am fine doing it on the South side and I can try to line up with the North building, but its vehicles. If they were doing a new site plan you wouldn't have parking there.

Mr. Logozzo said you may get the screening from the East to West, maybe we can limit it to 100' off of the street to give a blockage not to see the storage.

Mr. Downing said there's a 6' chain link fence on the North side, and it's not being modified. You don't have to go along the property line to solve it, but it's the only property where you can see the storage.

Mr. Collins said I think doing a distance, because there are Evergreens on the side of the building if you start there and head East, the neighboring property is an "L" shaped building, it's a one story East to West section, and two story for the auto repair, when you get past the second story you can't see. That is approximately 75' from the fence on the North South and that ties in to the back of the subject building, you will go along way with screening the stie from Old Riverhead Road with 75'.

Mr. Downing said he's okay with that, if they can do 5' trees.

Mr. Neubauer said he would like to see them move forward.

Mr. Reilly said that's fine with them and it's not unreasonable.

Mr. Collins said if you look at the striping on the site, that kind of is in line with the building.

Mr. Downing asked if he can adjust the plan and return it back to the Board?

Mr. Hill said he looked at the lighting and it will work.

Mr. Neubauer asked if they are anticipating a decision on July 9.

June 25, 2020

Mr. Reilly said they'd like to see a plan.

Mr. Neubauer said if the plan is submitted a week before the meeting and KC and RH have an opportunity to be certain it's contained on it.

Mr. Reilly said as long as Mr. Pasca can get it prepared.

Mr. Pasca said they just need to make sure the plans are a final set.

Mr. Hammond said they were concerned about tank storage above the fence, and they would be 8' in height over a 6' fence going forward it is easier to enforce and police it if the fence is 8' then we can condition it, but if the fence is 6' we don't want to stack over it.

Mr. Collins asked the maximum height of the fence in the B-2 Zone?

Mr. Hammond said the commercial site does not have a limit to his knowledge, only the residential site.

Mr. Downing said he is doing the 10' screening, the fence is to keep out intruders and as far as enforcement you were going to see the previous site plan and that limitations.

Mr. Logozzo asked what the intended stack height is?

Mr. Brody said approximately 10' and we thought that was a clean line.

Mr. Hammond said the code allows 10' in the rear yard in nonresidential districts.

Mr. Neubauer asked if the fence is where it's supposed to be at the height?

Mr. Collins said its in the right location.

Mr. Brody said sometimes a large fence does not look good, versus screening. He is thinking more about the Southerly neighbors view.

Mr. Reilly asked what type of fence it would be?

Mr. Downing said it would be a chain link fence. They are doing the hedge it along the front property line and there's a breakdown of the material. There will be trees there too and they'll grow together like they did in the rear of the property and you cannot see through that.

Mr. Reilly asked the color of the chain link?

Mr. Downing said galvanized. The site to the South there is the same screening on the opposite side so you will just see the Leyland Cypress barrier on both sides, to then have a fence sticking up higher.

Mr. Hammond said the higher the trees are the less dense the buffer is, the intention is to block the tanks, and the 8' fence we can hold the storage to that height. He would like a condition on the height of the stacking of the tanks.

Mr. Brody said it's 10' the vertical tanks are 30" each, and it comes to 9' but we said it would remain under 10'.

Mr. Hammond said if the tanks are 4' above the top of the fence you're going to see it, even with the trees.

Mr. Downing said a 10' chain link fence you can see through it. He thought the fence was security and the screening was for visual impact. If he plants the trees now at 10' next year they will grow to be 10' to 12' I don't understand what a 10' fence will do for the visual aspect. If we put hedge it you will still see the 10' high poles and I think it will look bad, with the poles and fencing sticking up it will draw more attention to it.

Mr. Reilly asked if there's any fencing that size along Old Riverhead Road?

June 25, 2020

Mr. Collins said no.

Mr. Reilly said it has to blend.

Mr. Schermeyer said if you go up to Liberty Gas further North there is a big fence that facility and that's an example of what that will look like.

Mr. Downing said they have propane storage.

Mr. Schermeyer said it's not a nice-looking fence.

Mr. Reilly said if the trees are going to be 12' and there's no security issues, I understand what Mr. Hammond is saying, I'm hesitating to install a 10' fence on that side of the road it will not blend.

Mr. Downing said they don't take any issue on the height of the tanks; I agree with the Board about that. We agree with that, and the height of that, and putting measurements on there on the size of the tank storage yard.

Mr. Schermeyer said to stack them two (2) high instead of three (3) high.

Mr. Reilly said I don't know if we should put a limit on the number of tanks or the area.

Mr. Downing said it changes on the market, there might be more 100 gallon tanks than 1,000 gallon tanks, the area is defined and fenced in and if we want to expand we have to come back to this board.

Mr. Reilly said you've committed to a lot of work and screening, and if there's no security or safety issue that requires more than a 6' high and there will be a condition that they have to be healthy and kept alive.

Mr. Neubauer said I'm not inclined to put a 10' fence there either, if it's not screening anything.

Mr. Schermeyer said 8' Leyland Cypress grow fast.

Mr. Jones said he does not have a problem with an 8' fence.

Mr. Reilly said it sounds like they are all in agreement that they do not want to see a 10' fence, and they are okay with a 6' fence.

Mr. Hammond said he just needs a condition regarding the stacking of the tanks not to exceed 10'.

Mr. Reilly said yes.

MR. Neubauer confirmed the limitation of the stacking is 10'.

Mr. Reilly said yes, and with the Leyland Cypress plantings.

Mr. Downing said they will plant them 5' to the front of Angelo's building.

Mr. Logozzo asked if he can do 6'.

Mr. Downing said he would like to do the 7 gallons, they range around 5'.

Mr. Logozzo said the other are too short, they are always under 5' and if they are 5' to 6' they are above 5' and in a year they will be more once you irrigate them. There are not a lot of trees, you are going back 75' worth of plantings.

Mr. Downing said it's 75' so its another 15 to 16 plants.

Mr. Logozzo said it's approximately 21 and its not a deal killer, and if they are irrigated, they will have grown by 1' to 2'.

Mr. Neubauer asked if irrigation is a condition?

June 25, 2020

Mr. Reilly said yes.

Mr. Downing said irrigation is not an issue. If this is it, they are fine with that.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to close the application of **Build Coastal, 26 Old Riverhead Road, (905-4-2-9)** for a determination; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

15. Krzysztof Zebrowski, Flanders Renovations, Inc., 121 Main Street (905-11-2-24) Special Exception Application for Change of Use from retail to Administrative Contractors office.

16. 804F Realty Corp., Robert Chase 112 Montauk Highway (905-4-2-14.1) Special Exception Application to allow a Convenience Store as Accessory Use to an existing gas station at 112 Montauk Highway, Westhampton Beach

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL June 25, 2020**

NEW APPLICATION:

17. Galway Holdings LLC, 53 Exchange Place (905-015-05-032.01) Applicant requests a site plan review to install fill within the floodplain in conjunction with a sanitary system upgrade for additions/renovations to an existing single-family dwelling upon a 1.87-acre property located in the R-1 zoning district.

JOINT WORK SESSION WITH BOARD OF TRUSTEES: PUBLIC COMMENT WILL NOT BE ALLOWED, BUT THE PUBLIC IS PERMITTED TO WATCH THE MEETING.

18. Rogers Associates LLC, North Side of Rogers Ave (905-003-01-007.01 through 007.07) A joint Work Session of the Board of Trustees and the Planning Board will be held to discuss the application of Rogers Avenue Associates, LLC., starting immediately after the Planning Board's regularly scheduled meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Mackie said that the Members of the Board of Trustees and the Planning Board are here to have a discuss with the applicant, Mr. Collins, Mr. Hill, and Mr. Hammond and Mr. Pasca, but the members of the public are not able to comment but you can take notes and listen, but there is no public comment at this time.

Mr. Reilly said he would like to ask the Village Attorney and Village Planner to go over the process of this and guide the conversation and what we are looking at and what duty we're charged with.

Mr. Pasca said this meeting is to get input from the Trustees so that at the next meeting in two (2) weeks at the July 9 meeting will be a scoping session for the Planning Board to direct Mr. Collins and come up with a final scope which would be adopted at the following meeting. The publics comments have to be in prior to the next meeting, prior to the July 9 meeting. Mr. Collins will discuss the topics to be contained in the comment period.

Mr. Reilly said all public comments should be submitted by the end of business on July 7, 2020.

Ms. Mackie said the comments should not pertain to things you want or do not want, btu they should only pertain to the application.

Mr. Pasca said Mr. Collins will cover the topics that they are focusing on, not whether it should or should not happen.

Mr. Collins said as background in January the Board issued a positive declaration identifying two (2) impacts associated with the project; traffic and impacts to community character. Part of that review, based on their application submission and the Long EAF there were several small to moderate impacts identified and the intent of SEQRA is that the Board takes a hard look at the application and it's appropriate to look at the small to moderate but primary focus is the traffic and community character. Under SEQRA process specific to scoping, the scoping document shall include identifying the significant resources that may effect the relevant environmental impacts on the conditions, the extent and quality of information needed to address the environmental impacts and reasonable alternatives to

avoid impacts that must be included as part of the DEIS. This not about support or objecting the application it is about identifying information what needs to be contained and analyzed within the EIS.

Mr. Reilly said the biggest issue we have heard about is the traffic, and that's probably the single handily issue and the density of the project, and whether it should be smaller and reconfigured and the clubhouse towards the street and maybe pushing that back.

Mr. Pasca said to follow up on those, when it comes to the review of the alternatives and I'm saying this from a legal standpoint, that's considered most important. What range and what specific alternatives do you want them to review. It is case by case, but a few things you said are typically considered as part of the alternatives. One being the magnitude of the project, it is a common alternative to look at a project with a different magnitude and reduce the density. Another one is design, you brought up that there may be design alternatives to look at and that's a common alternative that might be looked at to analyze different impacts. And a final one is usually a use alternative and in a case like this with a special permit use we typically look at the as of right use as a possible alternative to compare impacts; it's not to say to the applicant that they do or do not have to do it. It's to be able to look at the special permit use impact compared to the as of right impact in the MF District, the only as of right uses are single and two family residences. You may look at an as of right subdivision with single family or two family residences.

Mr. Collins said as it relates to the as of right subdivision the MF 20 does require a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet which could accommodate those two as of right uses and you can have a single family or two family on a 20,000 square foot lot.

Mayor Moore asked how many houses that would be.

Mr. Collins said it's approximately a little over 400,000 square feet, so if you have 20,000 square foot lots it's approximately 20 houses; however you have to provide a road and you lose an acre for the road, and the SCDOH standards when you get in to density so you need onsite Waste Water Treatment, I would believe; but that analysis would be provided by the DEIS, because you won't get 20 units. You can get 18 lots that are 20,000 square feet with the road, the code requires a park, they can pay in to the fund or it can be onsite; with that said 18 lots, with two family house on it, you're talking 36 units. It's a little more than 50% than what they are proposing. I would think it would be appropriate that alternative be analyzed and possible 75% under the MF and see the impacts related to the proposed and see if they are significant or not. Other alternatives are to relocate the recreational amenities to the rear of the site, and you would flip the onsite Waste Water Treatment with the recreation along the train tracks. Some alternatives are to relocate the entrance instead of where its proposed at the North of the Rogers Avenue terminus it could be moved further to the West and the intersection could come off of the East West section of Rogers Avenue.

Mr. Reilly said as a part of that, there was discussion about adjusting the traffic flow on the roadways being changed.

Mr. Collins said that is for Mr. Hill to consider.

Mr. Pasca said that's another topic, the mitigation measures and that's part of the DEIS is to have the applicant analyze the mitigation measures that and if there are traffic impacts what measures can be imposed to mitigate the traffic impacts and they did not identify anything in the draft scope document on what the mitigation measures are and they are saying they will look later, and I'm not sure that's appropriate and with guidance from Mr. Hill as to things they can look at would be helpful. They posed a memo with mitigation measures as possible traffic calming things and they are not in the DEIS and Mr. Hill can help focus on the appropriate mitigation measures to minimize traffic impacts.

Mr. Hill said he will look at that.

Mayor Moore said on behalf of the Trustees one of their main concern is about the potential traffic issues, and a study should be done at the time of the year that represents the maximum usage in the Village, the Summer not the off season and to come up with traffic calming measures to mitigate it. One thing that was discussed was sidewalks on Rogers Avenue at least on one side of the road and that could be something the applicant could include as a mitigation measure.

Mr. Neubauer said we discussed the speed, and speed bumps and in Patchogue Village South of Montauk Highway they have a neighborhood with rather large speed bumps that help with the traffic

speed. The greatest concern of the residents historically has been the speed at which cars short cut Old Riverhead Road on Rogers Avenue.

Mr. Pasca said Mr. Hill can look at traffic and safety as well.

Mr. Hill said yes, he can look at that. Some of the mitigation measures require the Village to approve them. They can throw the ideas out there and they can look at it, but the Village will have to buy in to that so it's a little more complicated. Most of the time we are used to doing mitigation at an intersection, change traffic signals, and we haven't talked about the layout of a road with speed bumps and pinch points and I think that's beyond the Planning Board that will require the Board of Trustees to look at after its proposed and discussed.

Mr. Pasca said we are just at SEQRA, so the question is looking at concern, alternatives and mitigation measures. Whether they are approved or not is beyond this stage and the DEIS. We have to hone in on the document and what has to be in it, and if you don't think it's feasible don't suggest it as possible mitigation and if it may be worth considering its worth suggesting.

Mr. Hill said there's a lot worth considering, there's a traffic calming handbook that FHWA did and there are a lot of techniques I would refer them to.

Mr. Collins said that would be the appropriate comment to identify the resources they would use in providing that data and that's a good resource they should utilize when providing the mitigation measures.

Mr. Reilly said the mitigation is visual impact is from Rogers Avenue, Rogers Avenue Ext., and Hazelwood Avenue. We want to make sure there's sufficient screening to reasonably screen it from traffic and the neighborhood and we want to explore that.

Mr. Collins said there is actually a visual survey that will be referenced and we will require a 3D analysis to see the visual impacts to the neighborhood. I would recommend a design and layout to minimize the contrast between condominiums or typical MF and try to look at design alternatives that would fit better in to the surrounding Single-Family Residential neighborhood.

Mr. Jones said he recalls them being concerned about parking on the public road by visitors to this site and that was concern due to the swimming pool location close to the public road, can we deal with that as well. Is there no parking allowed on the public roadway?

Mr. Collins said that's reasonable.

Mr. Hill said they should provide enough parking internally so there should be no need for off site parking, if the pool and recreational center is only accessed by the residents there is no reason for parking off site. We have to clarify that the pool is only available to the residents.

Mr. Reilly said I have been to complexes where they use the area to host functions and we want to avoid that.

Mr. Hill said we need to clarified how they will operate.

Mr. Jones asked if there's a negative aspect to move the sewage treatment from the railroad tracks to closer to the neighborhood.

Mr. Neubauer said the project on Old Riverhead Road has been successful.

Mr. Reilly said it's a chromoglass system and run well, no one really knows it is there.

Mr. Schermeyer asked what the impact is with the railroad passing the sewage plant so close, can it impact it?

Mr. Collins said we can ask them to analyze that and see what the potential impacts are, that's a good question. What the potential impacts of the railroad traffic is.

Mr. Reilly said another issue is environmental issue on site from the air base and the train tracks.

Mr. Collins said in Phase I and Phase II it will be required and given the historic land uses associated with the site that will have to be included and made part of the DEIS.

Mr. Frano said in reference to the onsite, would the noise from the train and planes have to be noticed in the draft EIS.

Mr. Collins said you can take the noise and part of that noise is ambient, existing noise levels that are there. Typically, any development proposed in a residential nature as of right or not one condition is identifying a noise notification covenant that you are in relation to an airport and a train station so when the title report is done they know they are next to those noise generators.

Mr. Hammond said the logistics of combining the comments, do the Board of Trustees give one document should they act together or separate. Do we have obligation to solicit other involved agencies. I know we sent out Lead Agency status, do we notify them of the scoping process.

Mr. Collins said the Trustees can do it separate or combined and direct it to the Planning Board. He asked Ms. Mackie if they received comments?

Ms. Mackie said no, and she will follow up and provide our new time,

Mr. Collins said that's appropriate. It is up to the Trustees to respond how they wish and direct it to the Planning Board.

Mayor Moore the Board of Trustees did issue a letter outlining concerns.

Mr. Pasca said that lead to the Positive Declaration.

Mr. Collins said anything relating to today's meeting, if you want to submit additional stuff you may.

Mr. Frano said the majority of the stuff I would like to see traffic study, the density and alternatives.

Mayor Moore said it seems logical that the traffic would be minimized if the density were reduced.

Mr. Neubauer said ultimately that's where we're going to wind up.

Mr. Schermeyer said it looks like a lot of concrete, it's maxed out. There are single family units on the end, with one bedroom.

Mr. Collins said we are getting in to comments not relating to the scoping document so I would try to not express those comments.

Mr. Reilly asked if that falls in to the alternatives discussion.

Mr. Collins said yes, they were talking about alternatives as it relates to density; the as of right which is less than what's proposed and we were talking about up to the Multi Family having a 75% reduction.

Mr. Reilly said maximizing green space is worth having that discussion.

Mr. Collins said there's existing vegetation on the Southern property line of the site and there are mature trees that could be preserved providing additional buffer from day on from those adjacent residential homes.

Mr. Reilly said the potential to reduce density would allow them to maintain more green space and trees and vegetation itself.

Mr. Pasca said that's something that comes out of this. To be fair to the applicant, reviewing reduced density plans may show that the impacts are not materially changed. It's not being done to show its better to have less density, if the data shows that the lower density does not have material impact that may justify the opposite. This is a process and there's a reason why this statement is the center of SEQRA because it's a structure determining environmental impacts and we don't know the results of the impact statement are going to be, we just need to figure out what should be in it.

June 25, 2020

Mr. Reilly said I think we've covered the major points in his eyes. He asked if anyone had anything else to add.

Mr. Collins said I think we covered everything. I will put together my draft comments so you have that to discuss at the next meeting based on today's discussion and some that I've done during my review.

Mr. Reilly told the Public to get the comments in by July 7 by the end of business if you wish to be heard. He asked Ms. Mackie who to submit them to?

Ms. Mackie said they can be emailed directly to her.

Mr. Reilly said they want and welcome the public input and there is a great deal of significance to this Village and the area. If you want to be heard, this is the time.

Mr. Pasca said the same should be said to the applicant now that they've heard the comments, they may have ideas as to feasible alternatives, mitigation measures, etc., so it would be nice for them to make suggestions as well by July 7 to be included in the impact statement.

Mr. Jones asked if speed bumps on Rogers Avenue will be considered?

Mr. Pasca said off site mitigation will be considered and we will get in to at some point, if it's not being proposed by the applicant there's a legality question, and you have a right to study them and whether they will have any effect on the impacts; and for purposes of this document off-site mitigation can be appropriately considered.

Mr. Jones said in lieu of speed bumps, if stop signs were put in would be considered as well?

Mr. Collins said that's an appropriate alternative to analyze.

Mr. Pasca said Mr. Hill will make those suggestions in his document.

Mr. Hill said not stop signs, he has never done a speed bump on a public road but it is done.

Mr. Collins said it is done in downtown areas.

Mr. Schermeyer said speed bumps will not make people happy.

Mr. Hill said it's an issue when it's installed in front of someone's house.

Mr. Schermeyer agreed with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Pasca said we should ask the Trustees if they have any comments or questions.

Ms. Moore thinks it is very helpful and appreciates that this was set up and everything that was said was on their list unless someone else has anything else to add we will wait to hear from Mr. Hill and Mr. Collins.

Mr. Urban said it would make it more straight forward if in all of the studies they had a baseline for existing and a proposed baseline for the as of right impacts how they would change and then what the special exception impact would be and to lay it out succinctly.

Mr. Collins said that's standard procedure particularly to traffic; if you look at the baseline and impacts as it relates to both and the alternatives that are meant to be considered.

Mr. Hill said we usually do the no build and the build, and what Mr. Urban was asking for is also an analysis of the traffic with the as of right, I don't think it's a big ask so I will lay that out. We want to see what the traffic change will be.

Mr. Pasca said one question that came up, because of the season, the applicant wants to get a head start on the data collection, and there's two sides to the analysis and one is data. It might be appropriate because the Scoping won't be complete until the end of July, it may be appropriate to let Mr. Hill communicate with their consultants to get them started on the data collection during the High Season.

Mayor Moore said yes, she'd like that.

Mr. Reilly said if we wait we will not get accurate data.

Mr. Collins said he would like to see the data collected in August, and in a typical time during school October or November.

Mr. Hill asked if they should do it twice?

Mr. Collins said yes, that's his thought.

Mayor Moore said she would like to see that done too.

Mr. Hill said we can do the weekday both times and a Saturday in the Summer.

Mr. Frano said he would like to see that as well.

Mr. Reilly asked if there was anything else to add.

Ms. Moore thanked the Board.

Mr. Urban thanked the Board.

Mr. Reilly said the schedule has been adopted, he asks that everyone stick to it and the topics of discussion are discreet and the public has had a lot of time to think about it and the two week time period is not unreasonable on the scoping document. There will be time to discuss things further with the public.

Mr. Collins said there will be public hearings once the DEIS is determined adequate for public review.

Mr. Reilly said this is just to discuss the topics which are to be discussed in the future. We are not getting in to the application just determining what they should be talking about.

Ms. Mackie said to confirm, July 7 is the date for the public and applicant, and July 9 is the date of the next meeting?

Mr. Reilly said that's correct.

Ms. Mackie reminded the public that there is a tab on the Village website for this application specifically and she urges everyone to follow that on there; it is updated after every meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adjourn the meeting at **5:30 p.m.**; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.