

September 10, 2020

The Planning Board of the Incorporated Village of Westhampton Beach held its regular meeting on September 10, 2020, at 5:00 P.M. in the Municipal Building, 165 Mill Road, Westhampton Beach.

PRESENT: David Reilly, Chairman
Ralph Neubauer
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.

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.

John J. Bennett, Esq., office submitted a request to holdover the application to

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **160 Montauk Highway, 160 Montauk Highway, (905-6-1-19) Westhampton Beach**; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

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 September 10, 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**
SCDHS: **NEEDED**

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

4. **Marios Nikolaidis, 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**

September 10, 2020

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.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL September 10, 2020**

ZBA: **NEEDED**

ARB: **NEEDED**

SEQRA: *1/23/2020 – Deemed Complete; Unlisted Action Coordinated review commenced on 1/27/2020*

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *Received SCDPW – No objection;*

SCPC: *Received SCPC – No objection;*

OTHER: *Zone Change Approved by Board of Trustees*

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 September 10, 2020**

ZBA: *N/A*

ARB: *N/A*

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: **HELDOVER UNTIL October 22, 2020**

DRAFT Scoping Documents Received on March 3, 2020

Draft Scope referred to Suffolk County Planning Commission, Suffolk County Department of Health Services;

Joint Work Session Held, June 25, 2020 with Board of Trustees

ZBA: *Undetermined*

ARB: **NEEDED**

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

Draft DEIS Adopted on July 23, 2020

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *N/A*

SCPC: **NEEDED**

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

September 10, 2020

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 September 24, 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.

Ted Galante, Architect appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Hill asked if there's more interior lighting on the buildings, it looks unlit on the inside.

Mr. Galante said the office space would be.

Mr. Hill asked about the garages, there is perimeter lighting, but there's no lighting around the site?

Mr. Galante said around the perimeter of the building.

Mr. Hill said he is also talking about the old building.

Mr. Galante said they are lit with wall packs, they are not changing.

Mr. Hill asked if they comply with the new lighting code. The lighting plan only shows the lighting on the periphery and that's fine but he noticed around the buildings and back of the building there's not lighting and he's assuming there are wall packs he just needs to confirm that is complies with the lighting code. You can add landscaping to the West of the dumpster, or is that fence slatted where it does not matter.

Mr. Galante said the fence in to the property is not slatted, it's a wrought iron picket but they can shield the dumpster with more landscaping.

MR. Hill said they do not want to see it from Depot Road.

Mr. Reilly said the other question he had was that the poles that the lights are on, what is the height.

Mr. Galante said it was in the spec document.

Mr. Hill said the cut sheet didn't show the units.

Mr. Reilly said because we are on the outskirts of a residential area, he wants to make sure they are low enough but also provide security.

Mr. Hill said there is a requirement about the Code.

Mr. Galante said he will confirm the height and they will comply with the height required in the Code.

Mr. Reilly said Mr. Collins was referencing the light in the parking lot of the Village Hall as an example. There were a lot of issues with the wallpacks at Best Market.

Mr. Hammond said the original submission did not have them, but the landscape architect did add them, the mounting height is 12' and the wall packs are not compliant and in the submission that was corrected. It is compliant with the Code as far as I understand.

Mr. Galante said the poles on the drawings are 12'.

Mr. Logozzo asked if the footprint has changed.

September 10, 2020

Mr. Galante said it changed to match the design approved by this Board.

Mr. LogoZZo said the footprint appears to be different than the rendering.

Mr. Hill said the landscape plan and lighting plan don't match the site plan.

Mr. Galante said they will, the changes are minimal but they are trying to manage the fee and not pay until we are settled and then everything will be compliant.

Mr. Collins said the landscaping plan comments he had was that along the road there is a gap by the middle light pole, and I think there are five (5) BR Trees 3' to 4' and I would add one (1) more there to buffer the parking lot and it won't hide the building, but it will soften the parking lot on the West side of the site.

Mr. Galante said he will add that.

Mr. Collins said to the North of the building there is an existing Leyland Cypress at 14' but he'd like it to be double checked because it looks like it is dead.

Mr. Galante said he will have that looked at by the landscape architect.

Mr. Hammond said they still need Department of Health.

Mr. Reilly said we need a full site plan. We need a complete set of plans.

Mr. Hammond said to revise all of the plans with the same date and if there's no changes made you can type that in the revision date box, but everything should be reflective of one date.

Mr. Neubauer said they were satisfied with the third rendering.

Mr. Galante said yes, the SEQRA was issued based on the design and we submitted that to the Department of Health and that's where we stand.

Mr. Reilly asked if the sign was removed from the building?

Mr. Galante said there will be a sign at the road, but hasn't been designed yet, but its not part of this application.

Mr. Reilly said okay.

Mr. LogoZZo said on page 1 of the site plan, has the footprint of the building changed?

Mr. Galante said yes, to match the design that we presented to the Board last month.

Mr. LogoZZo said the rendering was nice, but the footprint appears to be different than the rendering. Page 1 of the submission we received via email.

Ms. Mackie said they had hard copies mailed to us, and what I emailed to the Board was just the landscaping plan so I don't know what one you are referring to.

Mr. LogoZZo said it is the landscape plan.

Mr. Galante said we submitted a site plan and all of the items were resolved to our understanding.

Mr. Hill said the landscape plan, and the lighting plan don't match the site plan.

Mr. Galante said that's correct the changes are minimal and what we're trying to do is manage the fee and not pay the landscape architect until the site plan is settled and then everything will match and be compliant.

Mr. Reilly asked if Mr. Collins reviewed the lighting and landscaping.

Mr. Collins said the landscaping plan along the road there's a gap by the middle light pole and I think there are five VR 3 feet to 4 feet, I would put one more in to buffer the parking lot it won't hide the building but it will soften the parking lot.

Mr. Galante asked if he's referring to the West side of the site?

Mr. Collin said yes, you are proposing five VR trees.

Mr. Galante said okay, they will do that.

September 10, 2020

Mr. Collins said there's one other thing, to the North of the building there's an existing Cypress trees and he'd like them to check the health of it.

Mr. Galante said they will have their landscape architect look at it.

Mr. Reilly asked what they need to get to a final status.

Mr. Hammond said the Board of Health approval.

Mr. Reilly said yes, but what about a site plan with all of the elements? Do we have a full site plan with all of the elements we've agreed to.

Mr. Neubauer said we don't.

Mr. Hill said the site plan is fine, it's the landscaping plan and lighting plan. The changes we've discussed today and if they are made in this final round the application should be fine.

Mr. Reilly said if you submit a full packet to us with all of the elements, we can send you to the Board of Health.

Ms. Mackie said he's already applied to the Department of Health, he got SEQRA he has to submit a complete site plan with lighting and landscaping to our offices with the elevations and everything you need to complete a site plan while the Board of Health is pending.

Mr. Collins said that's correct.

Mr. Hammond said even if the pages don't need to be updated, you should update the revision date so they are all consistent.

Mr. Galante said okay.

Mr. Reilly said Board of Health has to approve the final plan, and we don't issue a determination without the Board of Health approval.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **Prime Storage, 98 Depot Road (905-002-01-019.10)**; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

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 December 10, 2020*
Applicant is before the Suffolk County Department of Health Services Board of Review.

ZBA: *Granted; Received, May 21, 2020*
ARB: *Referred to ARB at January 9, 2020 Meeting;*

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

SCDHS: **NEEDED** *Applicant is before the Suffolk County Department of Health Services Board of Review.*

SCDPW: **NEEDED**
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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application. Heather A. Wright, Esq., requested a holdover of the application to September 24, 2020.

Motion was made by to holdover the application of **HCMC, 51 Old Riverhead Rd (905-004-01-010)** to September 24, 2020; seconded by and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **Kevin Butler, 104 Main Street (905-012-04-032)**. Seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application. Heather A. Wright, Esq., requested to hold the application over to September 24, 2020.

Motion was made by _____ to holdover the application of **55 Old Riverhead Road LLC, 55 & 59 Old Riverhead Rd (905-004-01-007, -009.02 & -009.03)** seconded by _____ and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

REFERRAL FROM THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

14. **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 September 10, 2020**

15. **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.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL October 22, 2020**

*DRAFT Scoping Documents Received on March 3, 2020
Draft Scope referred to Suffolk County Planning Commission, Suffolk County Department of Health Services;
Joint Work Session Held, June 25, 2020 with Board of Trustees*

ZBA: *Undetermined*

ARB: **NEEDED**

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

Draft DEIS Adopted on July 23, 2020

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: *N/A*

SCPC: **NEEDED**

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

16. **804F Realty, 112 Montauk Highway (905-004-02-014.01)** Renovate One-Story Building for Accessory Convenience Store & Construct Canopy for Relocated Gas Service Pumps w/ Associated Site Improvements for Valero Service Station, upon a 0.44-acre Parcel in the B-2 Zoning District.

September 10, 2020

Barbara Rasmussen, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application, together with David Bittner High Point Engineering and Chris Tartaglia High Point Engineering, and Rob Chase, East End Marketing.

Mr. Reilly said they need the large to scale plan from Suffolk County that's been approved with their comments for Mr. Hill to review, because the engineering will drive your design and we have to make sure it functions on the corner before we can go in to a plan, which at a minimum there is a feeling about the number of curbcuts, and I think we asked you to go to the County and are coming back with their suggestion, and we should use that as a starting point that's why we need that plan and those comments to be reviewed by our Village Engineer.

Mr. Neubauer said there's no approval from the County, you took a preferred set of plans and asked if they would accept that, there is no approval is that correct?

Ms. Rasmussen said that's correct, and the Engineers for the applicant can discuss that. The Board wanted feedback from the County so that's an informal conceptual acceptance from the County of the proposed plan, and we discussed whether that curbcut on Old Riverhead Road was wide enough at 28' wide and the Engineers went back to the County and that's what they would like to keep it at.

Mr. Neubauer asked what happened to 35' wide curb cut.

Chris Tartaglia, High Point Engineering said to insure that they are on the same page and how things work; in order to get a formal DPW approval we need a 239F Referral from the Building Department and we have spoken with Mr. Hammond and we cannot get that from your office until we have a package to submit to this Board and we just want to get the Boards concurrence on the site layout including the access. We spoke with the County DPW and we got an email response that they approved the access as submitted and we hoped that we can get concurrence that the layout is acceptable and we can move in to the Civil Design and then move forward with a more formal review with your office, and then the County DPW review if we can get the referral from the Building Department, and Mr. Neubauer is correct that we do not have a formal 239 approval which we need from your office to do so.

Mr. Reilly said when we initially discussed this there was some feeling and general consensus we aren't sure which way to go in terms of the process because we did not know what the County's thoughts were; so we wanted that sorted out beforehand, but I don't think there was any ever feeling that we are relinquishing our role based on a conceptual idea of the County. It's not the County that has the final say on it.

Mr. Tartaglia said the County has final say on the access on their roadway and we provided an approval indiciting the same; the Village has the right to opine on the matter relative to the Site Plan, but we can't be put in to a position where we are stuck in the middle between the Village and the County.

Mr. Reilly said you did not get an approval, you only got feedback from the County.

Mr. Tartaglia said there is an email from the County reviewing, and there is an approval of access.

Mr. Reilly said that doesn't preclude us from saying that we have another idea and we want you to go back to the County.

Mr. Neubauer said maybe it's something that wasn't presented to the County. They would like to see one curbcut on Old Riverhead Road and Montauk Highway, are the preferred curbcuts.

Mr. Tartaglia said that's what the County wanted and in our discussions with the County we cannot get the gasoline truck in and off the site.

Mr. Neubauer said before we considered the diagonal islands with the pumps, initially it would be parallel to the building, but with diagonal that changes the perspective.

Mr. Tartaglia said the problem with the diagonal is that when you turn the pumps on an angle the Western most pump cannot be accessed. We work with a lot of different municipalities, and generally speaking every agency accepts the State DPW or DPW Highway Comment and approval understanding the position they put the applicant in when the municipality disagrees with the County. If the County wants it one way, that's how we essentially have to do it.

Mr. Pasca said Mr. Reilly asked me to opine on the jurisdiction of the Boards. There is something coming in to focus, both Governments have a say over what happens, and one level Mr. Tartaglia is correct, if the County says we won't approve a curbcut there is conflicting decisions, we've never been at that place, but we are also being told is that part of what's driving this problem that the applicant has is that they want the extra pump on the site but what our job is, and this is why it's a Special Permit and that criteria requires the Village to make sure it can accommodate the combined uses that's being proposed and that's the main function of the Board of Trustees who have asked the Planning Board to weigh in on this, to make sure what is being proposed works. And we are hearing is that we can't get an extra pump and that's all part of the conversation and it's not just the applicant saying what they want and the only way to get what we want is to do it their way, it has to be a conversation that you convince the Planning Board that this site can accommodate the uses they are proposing. If you want three pumps and the convenience store and the only way to do that is to get two curb cuts and the County said that's okay, this Board has to accept it, that's not the answer.

Mr. Tartaglia asked how many pumps are on the site now? We aren't trying to add additional pumps. There are three on the site now.

Mr. Collins said you have three pumps you just want a different configuration; you aren't losing a pump you just want a different configuration.

Mr. Pasca said they are being changed.

Mr. Tartaglia said the efficiency of the layout that we have and we're happy to discuss it and the positive aspects of it, we're not saying it's our way, we are saying the Board gave us orders to go to the County and we did so and we went back and forth for two months and they wanted one curb cut on each road way and we looked at it and we're able to have a site layout that works and that the County finds acceptable; we can have a dialogue with this Board but we do ask that you be open minded to the fact that the site isn't laid out so it doesn't work safely, we respect the Boards opinion and we have been doing this for 25 years and every gas station you pass by, if its relatively new I have designed it and we really specialize in this and we're happy to get to a comfortable place and we want to keep moving forward.

Mr. Reilly said this application was before this Board 15 years ago and there's nothing new, we had these conversations 15 years ago and no one held anyone up for 15 years. We were very demanding to the point where it compelled the applicant to withdraw the application at that point, and what I'm trying to say this location in particular, it is the Main entrance in to our Village and it's a very tight traffic configuration under the best of circumstances and it's been 15 years and we don't do this repeatedly and we want it done right, and it's not our fault if there's a delay to the applicant, but we want this done right and once. If we come up with a plan that we think is better than that's what we may send you back to the County with to see what they say about it. We aren't going to do what the County says if its not a plan that we feel comfortable with.

Mr. Tartaglia asked how do they get to the next step?

Mr. Collins said he has recommendations.

Mr. Reilly said because we sent you to the County and asked for their suggestion, our Engineer has to review it and use it as a starting point. It would be unreasonable to say we don't like it, we need it reviewed by our Engineer. We need to have a proper full sized set of plans to analyze.

Mr. Tartaglia said that's understandable and acceptable, but back to procedures and logic on our side. What we've provided so far, the site plan is an electronic site plan and that has red lines on it with the County comments, we did that specifically in red line so it's clear what the comments were, is that acceptable to submit in a full size set of plans?

Mr. Hill said as long as the site plan is laid out and there and you want to mark up the changes but I would rather see a lot of the proposal.

Mr. Tartaglia said they were emailed a week or two ago; did you see them?

Mr. Hill said he saw them, and he wonders why he didn't get a response to his comments two weeks ago. I discussed the front yard buffers and parking in the buffer and the traffic study.

Ms. Rasmussen said she got them on August 27, 2020 and that was taken up and bogged down and the esthetics of the canopy, and that was the primary focus to get you all renderings and photographs about the canopy and what they'd like to see, whether its pitched, flat roof, cedar, white and that was the bulk of the conversation and some of your letter has not been addressed, but the traffic study is being addressed and I have something from Stonefield and she has it and will circulate it electronically and will drop off ten (10) sets along with the new site plan. There are photos and she was hoping they would get feedback on what was sent electronically, and what the Board is leaning towards as far as esthetics.

Mr. Collins said we need an alternative and you can see the underlay of the existing diagonal pumps there. Given that you are redoing the pump configuration I want to see an alternative to show a diagonal setup with three pumps and you can adjust it and still maneuver within the lines that show how the tanker will move on the site and still accommodate three pumps and on a diagonal. As it relates to the esthetics, there's an existing pitched roof and it should be a pitched roof canopy similarly to what is used to be Hess in Southampton on County Road 39; and we need to see that alternative to make a decision on how it will function practically, customers coming on to the site and as well as the fuel delivery and the esthetics and this is the gateway to our Village.

Mr. Tartaglia said to go back to the first part of the statement; what does the diagonal pump accomplish versus the perpendicular.

Mr. Reilly said style its black and white it's not even close.

Mr. Tartaglia asked if they mean esthetically?

Mr. Collins said you haven't provided a visual analysis that was presented 15 years ago with a 3D rendering of the configuration you are proposing so we can't compare anything.

Mr. Tartaglia said we're going down a road that doesn't seem to jive; we have to make sure we can get cars and trucks on to and off of the site properly, but I heard Mr. Reilly said from a style perspective we have to turn the pumps. We will do anything we need to do esthetically but turning the pumps 20 degrees will not make an esthetic perspective, and I don't want to sacrifice esthetics for functionality and we will put whatever façade on it and colors on it to make the Village happy.

Mr. Collins said you can see from the Plan that the County DPW reviewed, you have the existing pumps there and you shift it to get outside of the line of the truck, and maybe spin it you can get a diagonal pump so they come on and off the site.

Ms. Rasmussen said the proximity of the new covered pumps to the existing building.

Mr. Tartaglia said the parking as well.

Mr. Collins said it was proposed 15 years ago this way, it's moving it further away. It was prepared by High Point.

Mr. Tartaglia said we're talking about what we have today, I don't know what was proposed 15 years ago, but I will suggest the reason why it didn't get built is because it didn't work.

Mr. Collins said we need to see the alternative to have the discussion.

Mr. Tartaglia asked what the angled pumps accomplish, in your perspective.

Mr. Collins said it's the esthetics. Under this scenario you have a diagonal pump and looking from the corner you have how many linear feet of the canopy is in direct relationship to Montauk Highway, but turning a diagonal the number of feet of that canopy on Montauk Highway is substantial. You can look at the pictures that were prepared by your firm 15 years ago, it was prepared by High Point Engineering with a diagonal canopy.

Ms. Rasmussen said you may be talking about 2012.

Mr. Collins said the plan was prepared by High Point Engineering, whether it was 15 years ago or not, it was prepared by High Point with a diagonal canopy.

September 10, 2020

Ms. Rasmussen asked if you are looking to have it diagonal for the curb cuts or esthetics point.

Mr. Neubauer said the curb cuts are a major factor in the conversation.

Mr. Collins said it is both. It has to function practically there is no question about that. In relationship to what the County DPW said too, but from the site plan I see it.

Mr. Reilly said there's a relationship one will drive the other, and no where in our Code does it say functionality is the number one concern and esthetics is number five. It's a number of the concerns.

Ms. Rasmussen said she knows it's important to the Village, and that the esthetics are a huge factor and I appreciate that. Perhaps we draw a plan to show them both ways to be reviewed by the Board and see if it works with the curb cut factor it's something we can consider and look at and we aren't saying no.

Mr. Collins said that's all they're asking, to see that alternative.

Mr. Reilly said if you want to persuade us that there's no reason it won't work you have to show us that.

Mr. Tartaglia said I'm just trying to find out why you want this.

Ms. Rasmussen asked if this Board saying they won't consider a plan that has three curb cuts

Mr. Neubauer said they want to see an alternative to three curb cuts.

Mr. Reilly said we are not there yet, but we need a plan for Ron Hill to review and give his thoughts on it.

Ms. Rasmussen asked if it's a two page or one page rendering.

Mr. Reilly said they need scaled drawings, not reduced to review for Mr. Hill to be able to guide this Board accordingly.

Ms. Rasmussen said it will be a rendering.

Mr. Collins said it has to be scale.

Ms. Mackie said it has to be to scale, a full sized set of hard copy full sized to scale plans. It can be sent via email, but it has to be scaled not reduced.

Ms. Rasmussen said she thought they need a conceptual notion about where they going and what the Board wants to see, it's a concern of her client we want to streamline this and get a conceptual idea from the Board so we're not chasing our tail and submitting something you can conceivably approve.

Mr. Reilly said Mr. Hill needs measurements to review.

Ms. Rasmussen said if they come back with three curb cuts is that a no go?

Mr. Neubauer said we want to see more than that, that's what we're telling you.

Mr. Hill said as far as the site plan, we don't need drainage, landscaping and lighting right now we need a layout for the site and it sounds like the Board wants conceptual plans of the canopy.

Mr. Tartaglia thanked Mr. Hill and understands what he wants, and they will give options for functionality and if it's okay, I am a big proponent of getting a 2D layout to show how it works and I want to make sure it works and di know the Board feels that way, the site has to function and it will be beautiful and I want the pumps, parking stalls and curbcuts in the right place. Can we all agree to get a 2D Site layout?

Mr. Reilly said yes, that's where I was heading. We owe it to you to show the layout with the three curbcuts and alternatives and we will see what we can do with that after it's reviewed.

September 10, 2020

Mr. Collins asked if its one way in and out off of Montauk Highway?

Mr. Tartaglia said yes.

Mr. Logozzo said he would like to consider the gas tanker traveling from the West on Montauk Highway and go North on to Old Riverhead Road and that may be able to still accomplish rotating the islands.

Mr. Tartaglia said they are showing now, and they have been in touch with the supply company and they said that they come from the South for delivery and one thing the tankers do is access the locations is safely and efficiently as possible, and we don't want to send them in different routes but we are open to suggestion.

Mr. Reilly said the other consideration that came up is that it may be less of an issue is the timing of the delivery.

Ms. Rasmussen said she understands that the deliveries are made in the eve of the early morning.

Mr. Reilly said we can discuss that down the line and keep that in mind, because the convenience store will have delivery trucks as well, and if we can alleviate the traffic flow and arrange or set it up so the deliveries are only made at a certain time it may help.

Mr. Tartaglia said they will look in to that, sometimes that's difficult due to order but they are comments they get often and understood.

Mr. Collins said in looking at the proposed layout versus the diagonal; the closer you get the pumps to Montauk Highway you stack the cars in to the curb cut and Montauk Highway with the diagonal it gets them further from the curb cut on the site.

Mr. Tartaglia said not necessarily right, but they will provide the sketch.

Ms. Rasmussen said she hopes to submit the hard copies by Monday.

Mr. Tartaglia said Monday will be too tight, I would say early next week.

Ms. Rasmussen said you will have the electronic versions as soon as possible.

Mr. Reilly said submit it as timely as possible, and we can review it.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **804F Realty, 112 Montauk Highway (905-004-02-014.01)** seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

NEW APPLICATIONS:

17. Stuart Blumberg, 150 Dune Road, (905-020-01-029.02) Applicant requests site plan review to install fill within the floodplain in conjunction with a sanitary system in association with the construction of a new dwelling upon the 0.97-acre parcel in the R-3 zoning district.

Agena Rigdon, DKR Shores appeared and they have the comments from Ron Hill and they have the plans drawn and she will submit them.

Ms. Mackie said Mr. Hill and Mr. Hammond went to the site and gave her comments and we need those changes.

Ms. Rigdon said she has Craig Arm's revised drainage plans and has to submit them today.

Mr. Reilly said you have to submit them to Mr. Hill, and once he reviews it and they decide its going to work we will render a determination at the next meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **Stuart Blumberg, 150 Dune Road, (905-020-01-029.02)** ; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

September 10, 2020

18. Michael Brunetti, 65 Main Street Unit 5 (905-011.02-02-005) Applicant requests a waiver of site plan to replace front windows with accordion doors in conjunction with a modification of site plan for a 16-seat pizza takeout restaurant, approved March 12, 2020, upon a 0.59-acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Main Street & Mitchell Road in the B-1 zoning district.

Michael Brunetti appeared on behalf of the application.

Mr. Reilly asked how far the doors open on to the sidewalk.

Mr. Brunetti said they open 2.5 feet out.

Mr. Reilly said there are four door panels, is that correct. One opens to the left and the other three open to the right, there is a picture which shows them in an open position but it looks like more than three on the right.

Mr. Neubauer said there are five door panels. He asked Mr. Hammond his comments.

Mr. Hammond said it's a modern update and seems to be something a lot of places, and there is outdoor dining out front and maybe this gets people inside that can feel like they are outdoor and will help to reduce spill out on to the right of way. They also want a retractable awning that should be part of this and I made a note that it could not be further than 6' because that's as far as the property allows.

Mr. Reilly said I would consider them together, if they go over the doors it's got to be considered as one.

Mr. Collins agrees with Mr. Reilly will it include the arch or not. Where is it going?

Mr. Hammond said between the door and the arch.

Mr. Brunetti said yes.

Mr. Reilly said he would like to see the awning, he asked if it will be on the agenda for September 24, 2020.

Mr. Hammond said yes.

Mr. Reilly said he'd like to discuss them both together and see the awning, and he told Mr. Brunetti they'd hold it over to September 24, 2020.

Mr. Brunetti said okay.

Mr. Hammond suggested Mr. Brunetti submit an elevation rendering to show the awning and the doors.

Mr. Neubauer asked for a full description of it all.

Mr. Collins aske for full specs on the door.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **Michael Brunetti, 65 Main Street Unit 5 (905-011.02-02-005)** seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adjourn the public hearing at 6:15 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.