

March 25, 2021

The Planning Board of the Incorporated Village of Westhampton Beach held its regular meeting on March 25, 2021 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

Maeghan Mackie, Board Secretary

Brad Hammond, Building & Zoning Administrator

Ron Hill, Village Engineer
Kyle Collins, Village Planner

Anthony C. Pasca, Esq., Village Attorney

ABSENT: Michael Schermeyer

DECISIONS:

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.

Mr. Reilly said there was a determination on the application. Bailey Larken, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application and the reading was waived.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination **Laurence Verbeke, 167 Oneck Lane, (905-009-01-019).** as written; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

Marcus Stinchi, 161 Montauk Highway (905-5-2-12.1) Applicant requests a waiver of site plan to install a temporary split rail fence at the above property.

No one appeared on behalf of the application. Mr. Neubauer stated there was a determination and the reading was waived.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination of **Marcus Stinchi, 161 Montauk Highway (905-5-2-12.1)** as written; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

HOLDOVERS:

1. **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 April 8, 2021**

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

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

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

2. **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 April 8, 2021**
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**

3. **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 May 13, 2021**

ZBA: **GRANTED, 12/20/2018**
ARB: N/A

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

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

4. **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 April 8, 2021**

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**

5. **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.

Frank A. Isler, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application, together with Jerry Rumplick, Architect Bryan Grogan, PWGC and Kim Genaro-Oancea, PWGC., Jim Behringer, Carriage House Developers, and Patrick Lenihan, VHB.

Mr. Reilly stated this is a unique situation, one he has not done in 15 years on the Board. This evening we are going to be taking comments on the DEIS that has been submitted with regard to Rogers Associates,

March 25, 2021

LLC application on Rogers Avenue. The Board tonight is in listening mode, we are going to take your comments with regard to what has been submitted by the applicant. The consultants and applicants are here as well, and will be listening to your comments., It's not an evening for question and answers. I strongly encourage you to submit comments in writing, I strongly suggest you submit them in writing. You may say something tonight, and if its not reduced to writing there's a possibility it can be missed and we want it all brought to our attention to be included in the process. I strongly urge you to avoid repeating what has been said, it will not be productive, if you want to you can but we want to make this as quick as we reasonably can while giving everyone the opportunity to speak. Written comments after the meeting will be encouraged, we're not going to close the meeting tonight we will hold it open for additional comments and discuss more on April 8, 2021. I will turn it over to our attorney to explain the process more.

Mr. Pasca said the Chairman said it all, this is a big part of the SEQRA process and the very purpose is to give everyone, the applicants and the neighbors to make their comments on the DEIS and I think that, the only thing I will add is that we should let the applicant go first and present the DEIS and then I would encourage the neighbors if there are any representatives, be it an attorney who may speak for more than one neighbor we let them go first because it may minimize the number of repeat comments. We will start with the applicants and their representative and then turn it over to collectively neighbors and representatives and then individual comment.

Mr. Reilly said he will ask everyone to remain on Mute until you are invited to speak, if you go off mute and interrupt or interject there will be one warning, and if it continues to happen you will be removed, it's not a free for all and everyone will get their chance.

Ms. Mackie said we will have an order, the applicant will go first; if you wish to speak there's a feature that you raise your hand, not physically, you need to use that. There is also a number of people in the waiting room who have not posted their first and last name, and if there are people texting you or communicating stating they can't get in and you cannot speak on the record without displaying a first and last name. You don't have to worry about not being able to hear things, or missing things because we are able to email links to the meeting and re-watch it, and I guess that's it and try to listen carefully so not to waste everyone's time.

Mr. Pasca said that's why it'll be kept open, if anyone had a problem getting on there will be at least another opportunity to be heard.

Ms. Mackie said yes, and I will try to post the meeting on the website, but if not, I can email you a link. You just have to email me and ask me for the link and you can watch the meeting at your leisure so please do not feel like if you missed something that's it, because that's not the case.

Mr. Reilly said I cannot stay longer than 7:00 p.m. and I will too be watching it on record.

Ms. Mackie said that's it, we can get started with Frank Isler.

Mr. Isler said he represents the applicant, Rogers Avenue Associates, LLC., and we're here tonight as been explained to provide you with the salient points of our DEIS and our site plan as proposed. We have tonight, one of the applicants Jim Behringer is here; and we're also going to be presenting several speakers. Bryan Grogan from PW Grosser, our architect Jerry Rumplick will follow who will explain the elevations, and then Kim Gennaro, PW Grosser to present the DEIS itself, and lastly, Patrick Lenihan, VHB will be the one addressing the traffic issues in our DEIS and the analysis that was done in there. Briefly, the application is for 52 MF unit in 13 buildings on 9.35 acres on the North side of Rogers Avenue. It calls for community facility if tennis court, pool and community building. It is zoned MF20 and has had it since 2003, prior to that it was I1 and through 2012, for over 50 years it has been an active industrial asphalt facility in full operation. It was rezoned in 2003 to MF zoning ad our application that we've submitted to the Planning Board and Village is consistent with the standards for that zone. I want to point out there are three things the applicant is asking for, the first is site plan from this Board; under 179-8, we are seeking Special Exception Use for the Trustees and the last relief is prior to the rezoning, back in 1990 this property was granted a preliminary subdivision to create a 6 lot Industrial subdivision and received final approval in 1992 and a condition of that was a 50' buffer be maintained along Rogers Avenue and the West side of the frontage of the neighbors, and 25' buffer along the Western boundary and that was memorialized by an easement and that subdivision that was approved in 1992 was never implemented and never been approved and no development whatsoever and the rezoning standards under MF are unrelated. We are asking the Village to agree to abandon those buffers that have been recorded to

have clear title, and the buffers we're proposing comply with the MF requirements. I will now turn it over to Bryan Grogan.

Mr. Grogan said he will share his screen. He said the proposed site plan and a background and alternatives that were studied in the DEIS, it is a 52 unit proposed plan, with a community center, swimming pool and tennis courts. We will be installing a sewage treatment plant and all utilities on the property. We have a total 52 units, 44 are market rate and 8 are affordable, we're required to have 104 parking stalls and we're proposing 203 parking spaces and we understand this is overparked per say, but it was done intentionally to provide adequate parking for guests so there's no overflow into the community. The property overall conforms to the site plan requirements of the MF 20 zone, our lot coverage is 17.3% our impervious area is 55.1% our max building height is 31' we've changed the site plan slightly in that we're incorporating permeable pavers between and behind the units to recharge storm water on the property and to reduce the overall impervious area. We are proposing a fence around the property and it varies in height from 4' to 6' and primarily 6' around the boundary with the 4' section along Rogers Avenue and the one neighboring property. There will be additional fencing around the sewage treatment as required by SCDHS. We are proposing natural gas from National Grid and there are upgrades to the mains that have to be put in place and they will be done while we are constructing the project. We have designed the site with respect to storm water, all of it generated is contained within the property and we've designed that it meets the Storm Water requirements. We've developed erosion and sediment control and we will prepare a SWPPP plan in accordance with DEC requirements. The property will be fully landscaped, and we're proposing a double row of Leyland Cypress around the perimeter and trees as required throughout the parking area, any trees in good health outside of areas of impact will be retained and will be located in the buffer areas on the West, behind the community center and along the Eastern boundary. It was an active asphalt plant and the majority was cleared with the exception of the South West corner and we're trying to maintain as many trees as possible. TO note, for the site plan we have been addressing the comments given by the Village and their Engineer throughout the process before preparation of the DEIS. Alternative 4 in the DEIS presents reflects comments received during the Scoping session with respect to relocating the community center off of Rogers Avenue and we were able to do so by relocating 8 units in the back and swap with the community center. We maintain all 52 proposed units, and we reduce the overall parking to 178 stalls which still exceeds the minimum required. The 4 units that abut Rogers have walkways to Rogers and their driveway and access are from internal roads. Their front doors will be on Rogers Avenue. Another alternate as Mr. Isler pointed out is Alternate 5 with the scenic easements in place as part of the Industrial subdivision; we've kept all 52 units and reduction of parking and relocation of the community center and tennis courts and we made the site plan work while maintaining the 50' and 25' easements should they not be lifted. They are located along the South West corner and they were done originally for the Industrial subdivision. In all of the alternatives we are treating the wastewater with a sewage treatment plant as per the SCDHS regulations and it will treat the wastewater to below 10 mgs per liter standards, and in all likelihood, it will reduce to 7 mgs per liter, and the DEIS nitrogen load will be presented by my colleague. The proposed treatment plant is better step above and beyond the IA wastewater systems for use on individual property's and the county is reviewing it and we've received their comment. The plant is fully enclosed and equipped with an odor control unit and meets the County setbacks to the surrounding properties. With respect to the community center the proposed clubhouse is 2800 square feet and serves the pool with bathrooms as required by the NYSDOH and a mechanical area an exercise room, and the HOA office and a card room, lounge space for the residents. The community center is not for hire or a catering hall, its basically for resident use only. I will turn it over to Mr. Rumplick.

Ms. Mackie said Jay Borrow has his hand raised, but comments will be at the end after the applicant makes their presentation.

Mr. Rumplick said he is the architect and one of the issues in the EIS is the character of the neighborhood and how this will meld with the neighborhood. The original housing stock of Rogers Avenue is a minimal traditional ranch, bungalow and cape style home that still exist on Rogers Avenue and some newer homes with Colonials and Modern homes. Housing to the East on Bridle Path has post modern homes, along with Colonial and Modern homes. Our project has been designed with the Colonial and the final will be addressed by the ARB and he asked Ms. Mackie to share his screen. I won't spend a lot of time on the stuff, on the screen is a rendering of the community building with some of the units in the background, the swimming pool and they are showing pickle ball and bocce ball courts and there is a rendering of the four-unit buildings, and it shows stone accents column porches with railings, dormer roofs all which meet the Building Code requirements. There is another four unit building with more gables, and they are same items that will be addressed with and by the ARB. What I'm showing is a community building, and Mr. Grogan spoke about it. It has bathrooms, mechanical storage area, card room, billiard room, exercise

room, a lounge area, a postal area and an HOA office, it's not a building that is a function of large parties. The elevations of the community building are neo colonial style, and he also has a four unit building with the units being two stories, bedrooms on the second floor and living rooms on the first floor with a garage, and each garage is counted in the total parking space numbers that Mr. Grogan was discussing. Many people use a garage for storage, and not a parking but they are included in the total parking spaces. There is 8 affordable units, they do not have garages, the market rate units do. There are 44 market rate units and 8 affordable units. There is a two unit building with 13 total buildings. I am available for comments down the road.

Ms. Mackie asked Mr. Isler who else will present.

Mr. Isler said Kim Gennaro, PWGC.

Ms. Gennaro said she is with PW Grosser consulting and they prepared the DEIS and she will summarize the key findings and is interested in hearing the comments. The DEIS was prepared to address the potential impact issues as identified by the Village, the document soils and topography, water resources, transpiration, land use zoning and relative, land use plans, community facilities and services and community character. They looked at construction impacts, traffic impacts and we looked at 5 alternatives, and you saw two of them from Mr. Grogan and one is the proposed plan moving the recreational amenities to the North and maintaining the easements, and the three addition were 18 single family home development, reduced density single family with no income eligible component and a proposed site access and moving the recreational areas to the North. Soils and topography based on the survey and soil borings and grading plans which includes the implication of top soil and soil mixing, the onsite soils do not pose any constrains. The plan includes the importation of soil and soil mixing for the establishment of lawns and landscaping, 264 trees will be retained and incorporated in to the plan. Soil sampling confirms it is suitable for residential development, there is one area where commercial and demolition debris was discovered, and the debris was concrete, brick fragments, wood and miscellaneous trash and will be removed during construction. The topography is flat, elevations from 41 to 46 AMSL and we have a grading program that requires 24,000 cubic yards of materials to be removed for the basements and will occur over 15 months. The construction traffic was assessed and determined to have no impact on the roadways. With respect to water resources, we looked at groundwater and surface waters and the groundwater ranges 30-35 to below grade, and there will be irrigation from SCWA. Groundwater sampling has been performed and there are no issues posing an impact. The proposed STP is proposed in the North East portion of the Site and will accommodate 15,000 gallons per day and it will reduce nitrogen to groundwater to levels less than if the property was developed as of right with conventional or IA systems. Nearby surface waters were evaluated and they were identified as Aspatuck Creek ¼ mile South East and the property is mapped within a 2 to 10 year contributing area with to the Creek; of importance of property's the County recommends STP's or IA systems and we comply with the proposed STP. As noted, stormwater will be contained on site and using bio swales and drainage, drywells catch basins and permeable pavers and is designed for a 3" rain event which exceeds the Village's 2" requirement. The DEIS evaluated transportation which will be later discussed. As noted by the project attorney it was an Industrial use for 50 years, and in 2003 it was rezoned to MF 20 and the sole purpose was to encourage the redevelopment site of the site for residential use, to preserve the residential character of the neighborhood and to promote more moderate priced housing. The proposed plan would accomplish this with 52 MF units and 8 will be income eligible. The incorporation of the income eligible is consistent with the 2006 comp plan, but its also consistent with the SE Use standards in the Village Code, as well as the Long Island Workforce Housing. The 52 units will be in 13 buildings with a recreation area, including tennis courts and swimming pool and it will be situated to the North. Access to the site is via the curb cut on Rogers Avenue and the improvements at the intersection include a fully controlled stop "T" intersection; and proposed sigde3walks along Rogers Avenue. It includes alleys for access to driveways and garages, and incorporates a traditional front yard and sidewalks throughout. With 40% of the trees to be remained and landscaping in the front side and rear yard setbacks and screening to the neighbors. It will be managed by the HOA and restrictions on the property such as posted hours for the pool and tennis courts, no outdoor speakers and limited occupancy at the pool for seating. They initiated consultation of the Gabreski Airport and as part of the land use analysis, we initiated consultations with the Gabreski Airport to advise of this development and to solicit comments. Recognizing that a portion of this site is within the RPZ, soundproofing and transparency with respect to the presence of Gabreski to future homeowners are all included in this proposed development. Proximity to the railroad has also been considered with vibration mitigation included in the design, and a planted landscape berm with fencing along the entire northern property line is included. With respect to compliance with the MF-20 zoning regulations, the plan complies all of the bulk and dimensional requirements. The development plan is also consistent with Village Trustees criteria for the issuance of a special exception use permit, with a detailed

analysis of each standard in the DEIS. Finally, with respect to the relevant plans, the DEIS evaluates the Village Comprehensive Plan Update from 2006, as well as the SC 2035 Comprehensive Master Plan, and the SC Planning Commission's Smart Communities through Smart Growth Plan. Overall, the proposed multi-family use with an affordability component, on-site recreational amenities, and an intent to retain 40% of the natural vegetation but supplement with native, and drought-tolerant species would result in a development that is consistent with all of these plans. As part of the DEIS, we corresponded with the Police Department, Fire Department and the Ambulance Association. In a letter dated August 18, 2020, the Police Chief advised that the development would not result in an undue demand on the Police Department; responses are pending from the Fire and Ambulance. Replies are still pending from the Fire Department and the Ambulance Association, but as noted in the DEIS, the development is planned with 6 fire hydrants, and the internal road design provides for the proper turning radii for emergency service vehicles including fire trucks. We did not hear from the school district, With respect to the impacts on the Westhampton Beach school district, our analysis indicates a potential generation of 9-10 school-aged children, when rounding. The per pupil expenditures vs. the tax revenues for the development were also evaluated and found that the tax revenues would cover the per pupil expenditure costs. (9.36 max, we would cover 9.29 children). Consultations were undertaken with the District, but a reply has not been received. the final impact issue considered was how the development would alter the community character. DEIS included elevations, a rendering and 3-D computer imagery prepared by the architect to depict post-development views. We also considered the Comp Plan Update and stated goals for the 2003 rezoning. Imagery shows that the Vegetated setbacks, the preservation of select existing trees, and the building setbacks with fencing, WILL largely screen the development. Street trees, lawn areas in the front yards, front porches, alleys, and the varied roof lines of the design, lends to residential neighborhood feel. Lighting would consist of 10-foot lamp poles and building fixtures that would be shielded to avoid any upward glare or off-site nuisance. Sidewalks, crosswalks and posted speed limits, as well as accessibility to units from front walkways as well as from driveways in the rear would also create for a pedestrian-friendly community. Finally, and of importance, is the population that is expected to live in this community. Applicant engaged a local realtor, Kerrigan Country Realty, for a market demand study. From that study, it was found that, those in the 50–60-year-old age bracket seeking a second home would be attracted to this development. More importantly, is the attracted interest of the local community. It is expected that 2 demographic groups with different motives would be attracted. First, is the 30–40-year-old residents of the local community who desire to stay but have been outpriced or have found a lack of inventory. Second, are those in the older aged bracket that wish to downsize from the traditional home, but remain in the area. As such, this community is expected to be a blend of existing local residents and newcomers to the area. Constructed is expected over a 15-month period with a desired start date in summer of 2021. The construction-related impacts associated with land disturbance, noise generation, air quality, and traffic were all evaluated in the DEIS. During construction, proper erosion and sedimentation controls will be in place, and all activity on the site will comply with the Village Noise Code for permissible days and hours for construction. Additionally, dust will be controlled by the wetting of surfaces during dry periods and emissions will be controlled with strict controls on idling vehicles. The constructed related traffic was considered, which Pat Lenihan will address shortly. Five alternatives were considered. Of relevance is Alternate 4 which is the proposed development program with 52 units, but the recreational amenities are relocated to the north side of the property. This alternate was prepared to address concerns about potential noise from activities within the recreational area. As compared to the proposed project, Alternate 4 will have the same gross floor area and will fully comply with the MF-20 requirements, but will have slightly less parking, slightly more trees to be removed, and a slightly larger area of landscaping (which will have a minor impact on irrigation demand). Overall, this alternative will not have any significant adverse impacts and is feasible for the applicant.

Patrick Lenihan, VHB said they have performed a detailed Traffic Impact Study to evaluate the transportation impacts on this MF Development. It was performed in accordance with standard procedures and included in the DEIS and deemed complete. The elements evaluated are traffic safety, site access, parking and circulation future volumes and capacity and we looked at five key intersections around the site for the weekday AM and PM peak periods, a Saturday peak period which is traditionally included in studies. Due to its location and concerns in the community the final scope also included a Sunday Peak period an we looked at the volume and conditions of traffic during the Summer months specifically during August to capture peak conditions. We looked at Montauk Highway and Old Riverhead Road; Old Riverhead and Rogers Avenue Extension; Rogers Avenue Extension at Hazelwood Avenue; Rogers Avenue and Montauk Highway; and Rogers Avenue Extension at Rogers Avenue which is the proposed site access and coincident to the access of the prior asphalt plant. In addition to these areas, based on the site location the study included as per the final scope an evaluation of potential cut through traffic including trucks an evaluation of speeds on Rogers Avenue, area pedestrian accommodations and alternative plans. With regard to traffic, it is noted that the 52-unit complex would generate a modest

number of peak hour vehicle trips. MF housing per unit does not generate traffic to the level that a single-family home does, but less. In its highest peak hour, it's a weekday peak hour, we would expect approximately 33 vehicles trips to be generated and that includes entrance and exit traffic, and these vehicles would use the adjacent street system to travel in various directions. Once you get a few feet from the site access you would not see 33 vehicles pass you by you'd see less, but that represents 1 vehicle per 2 minutes. One point of access is proposed on the site and that's in the same location to the former access of the asphalt plant, and improvements will reduce speed, improve safety and provide pedestrian accommodations. Reducing speed will make the roadway less attractive for cut through. The intersection is less of intersection and more of a sharp curve, there's no intersection, there's no traffic control except for a stop sign coming out of the asphalt plant and this is the opportunity to improve that and we intend to eliminate the existence of a sharp curve and make it a three way intersection with a curve radius and slow speeds in the area and make it less attractive and include sidewalks on both sides of the roadway, and a concern was the curve and walking and finding themselves in an area with vehicles traveling at a high speed with no pedestrian accommodations. In terms of impacts to traffic anticipated to the site, the study finds very small increases due to the project and Mr. Grogan spoke about the site parking in detail. The study does not find the need for off site traffic. This study also regarding the speeds, cut throughs and trucks and they are existing issues and have no relation to the proposal we identified some methods that could be employed to address them and they are driver feedback signs, they warn a motorist of their speed, speed humps which reduce speeds locally, and additional local travel traffic regulation, local traffic only signage and based on our study it is my opinion that the site will not result in any significant negative impacts on traffic conditions.

Mr. Isler said we are at the end of our presentation and we turn it back over to the Board for the next level of the presentation.

Ms. Mackie asked Mr. Collins or Mr. Hill if they had any comments.

Mr. Collins said at this time he does not have anything to ask or add.

Mr. Hill said he does not either.

Ms. Mackie said she will turn it over to Mr. Reilly, the Chairman.

Mr. Reilly said they are in listening mode and will be taking in the public comment at this time, and if there's no one else for the applicant he believes the residents have retained counsel. We will listen to Counsel first and then we will listen to each individual resident after.

Carl Irace, Esq., appeared on behalf of a few residents' homeowners in the vicinity. They are the proponents of a better project. Before he starts, a concern is traffic, has the Village Engineer reviewed it?

Mr. Reilly asked Mr. Hill if he's reviewed it, we're still in the commentary portion of it.

Mr. Irace asked if Mr. Hill had any comments.

Mr. Hill said he's preparing them, I do have comments that I will present, yes. I will try to have them done so there is enough time for you to review them and put it in the written record.

Mr. Irace said thank you. We have a traffic engineer that we hired to review it and he will speak on this tonight after I do. We have concerns about this, and not about its scale but its fundamental zoning matters, land planning for the future, water use and discharge issues and volumes of traffic that this proposal will put on to quiet residential streets. They have a team that was assembled after receiving a hearing notice. The public notice provision in your code seems a little under inclusive, only 3 homeowners fell in the 20-foot radius,

Ms. Mackie said the radius is 200 feet.

Mr. Irace apologized and said only 3 people got the letter. There are a lot of people here tonight.

Mr. Reilly said we have been very inclusive of the residents in the area, early on we encouraged them to create a phone or text tree if you will and the Village has been acting very affirmatively to keep them involved and posted on the website, and I appreciate your concern but we've been very proactive.

Mr. Irace said the comment is at the Village Code, and perhaps its an opportunity to increase the noticing provisions at the Trustee level. That wasn't so much substantive its just a public comment about people being concerned about the project. The scale if this project is a big part of the concern, the other concerns come from the scale they aren't necessarily issues on to themselves until they are magnified by 52 MF units and it seems aggressive. 52 lots, there are 6 currently and it seems like a lot. They are in a MF Zone and I had to do unwinding to figure out how they got to the number of 52 and it doesn't seem to be reflective of the site and before I go further, I'd like to address the error that drives the yield goal and it's something that happens and it's the term as of right, it describes development that complies with local zoning requirements and can be issued without referral to any agency for review. We have a MF 20 Zone and the Village Code permits, one family detached homes, and two family detached homes. On each of these 6 lots they can only have 1 home or a two-family home; therefore, the base line for the comparisons should be 6 units or at most 12; and the EIS and its studies don't contain information that the Board should need to compare the 52 Units to the as of rights yield to what's there. On behalf of my clients, I request you keep it open to submit comparisons to the proper as of right yield, we request time to conduct our own review, and we submitted FOIL requests to review them and I know you'll keep it open but I don't think April 8 will be enough time to prepare and submit and have substantive responses. I live nearby, I'm not in the Village of Westhampton Beach and I've considered it my home and it seems that the community benefit could be other thinking and land planning to this site doesn't come often and with the senior center plan there may be alternatives to serve the on site that might serve the community; there may be benefits for the environmental to turn it into a solar farm and there are so many opportunities and with the concern about the future and needs for alternative energy and suit the community needs rather than one particular applicant.

Mr. Reilly said you will have time to submit written comment, and that's preferred by this Board and if we need more time, we will deal with it as we get to it. We are not closing the hearing tonight.

Mr. Irace thanked Mr. Reilly.

Mr. Reilly asked if there was any other counsel, you mentioned a traffic expert, would he like to comment now.

Steve Schneider, Schneider Engineering. I have been doing traffic engineering for 51 years, and I did review the reports submitted and there's one major flaw in it and the major one is the base in which their counts were taken. They took counts in August of 2020 which is normally a good time to take it but the problem in August of 2020 the pandemic was here, and whatever counts they took are worthless because they are not typical of two or three years and they mentioned in their report 11 traffic studies that they looked at of which 5 or 6 were what they called low numbered, and not generating a lot of cars but a few did generate many cars and what I recommend that they do and Mr. Hill may agree, is that they look at the other studies and compare them which could have been in August 2019 and you get a true number of the cars there without the pandemic and you're starting from a good base and then you add 2.8% per year to that to get to the future traffic of 2023, or 2.8% x 5 years or so, 5 or 6 years depending on what they add to see if those numbers compared to their count taking counts during a pandemic is not good. ITE cautions everyone and there was a report in July 2020 from the industry wide standard stating not to count during the pandemic and the reasons are obvious. In 2 to 3 years, we're hoping back to "normal" and it may not be the same as before, but in order to do the analysis I would have taken another study done prior to 2020 and used those numbers as the base and compared to the 2020 numbers. I did go online to the County DPW and they did have counts at CR 31 and CR 80 from 2016; now that is a few years but if you want to increase that by 2.8% you can come up with something reasonable. They should relook at the counts and adjust them to what is reality because of the analysis that they did is based on those counts and they are not worth a lot until they can be proven to be reasonable. I am suggesting they redo the study and compare it to the other documents; even the traffic studies that they mention are a small study and does not generate a lot of traffic and they may have included traffic counts or turning movements at the intersections. I know CR 31 and CR 80 were looked at and they should be using that. I have other comments but I reserve them until I hear what Mr. Hill has to say. Their reports based on inaccurate data.

Mr. Reilly thanked Mr. Schneider. He asked if there was any other counsel or representatives present. Mr. Borrow had his hand up first, we will start with him.

Jay Borrow, Bridle Path said he appreciates the presentations made. Forgive me, my questions and comments kind of spread through the presentation but because we weren't able to ask questions after each. I appreciate the comments by counsel to the residents, and I agree with him we should be looking at a community use rather than developer economics. This is a 9-acre parcel and something good could be

done rather than possibly creating difficulty for the people in the area. Mr. Schneider brings up a great point about the car count during the pandemic. It was common for the car insurance companies to give money back to everyone, their insured for the reduction in mileage that everyone incurred during the pandemic. I got a refund, and I think everyone did for less mileage driven this past year and that will continue into next year. I live on Bridle Path and I have lived here for 35 years, and I got no notice of this, I found out about it when I was walking through my development and saw a path from Bridle Path that goes back in to this development area which caused me to figure out and find out what was going on. I got no notice about all of this. I am concerned about the density it creates, as counsel to the residents pointed out, maybe 18 homes instead of 52. One thing with the site plan said there will be fencing all around and he showed a plan with walkways from the development on to Roger's avenue, how does that work with a fence enclosing the development, how is there access from the homes facing Rogers Avenue to Rogers Avenue. I was concerned about the tennis court lighting; will that cause a disturbance to the residents and concerns about the STP and the odors that it will emanate. There are a lot of homes on Rogers, Hazelwood and Bridle Path that will be impacted. They also mentioned outside catering, which won't be allowed in the club house is that prohibited forever, or subject to change as circumstances change. The number of people we're talking about is going to be 100 at least, 2 people per unit and it could be more I didn't hear anyone discuss the number of proposed bedrooms and 2 or 3 you can multiply 52 by 2 people per unit, 3 people per unit, 4 people per unit it will be over 100 people and that translates into a lot of cars and traffic. Then they mention water usage, with that kind of density I wonder about the availability of water usage and the potential contamination of ground water from natural lands to land that will have grass, fertilizer and that. There's the noise that can occur during the construction, I understand that there are town requirements for when that can occur, and the difference between one home and 52 homes with respect to noise and accumulation of noise seems significant. I understand the requirements of the Town, but those seem to me to be relevant for construction of a home, I don't know how you manage when you're talking about 52 homes. I'm not sure I got the information, but does the Planning Board hire or have their own outside independent experts to review each of the filings that are submitted by the applicant, for traffic, sewage and that stuff.

Mr. Reilly said we have a Village Engineer, Ron Hill and Village Planner, Kyle Collins and are extremely experienced and have been with the Board longer than I have. It is possible we would hire outside experts if need be but that's never happened as far as I can recall, but I don't know that there's anything that prohibits it.

Mr. Borrow said okay, I am just asking whether its relevant for a project if this size and scope to supplement and help with people who work for the Town and hired by someone else and paid for by the applicant.

Mr. Reilly said nothing prohibits any of you from hiring your own consultants and having them advance your position in this process.

Mr. Borrow said he has no other comments. He agrees with counsel for the residents, April 8 is not enough time to review and comment.

Mr. Reilly said we will go through that as we go through the process. He thanked Mr. Borrow for his comments, and he believes Chris Clapp is next.

Christopher Clapp, Rogers Avenue thanked the Board for hearing the neighbors. Real quick., we have tried to make this easier by retaining help so you don't have 80 people writing and calling saying the same thing over and over, and for people on Rogers Avenue and Hazelwood Avenue it's a significant expense to do so. We are trying to streamline the process and we want to see the best possible project that benefits everyone, the developer, Village and community. When I read the traffic report, the Appendix "K" when you say 33 additional vehicles per hour, an additional vehicle every 2 minutes, that's a lot of traffic. I don't know where you live that is considered reasonable, it's a pretty significant amount of additional traffic to a neighborhood. The one little bit of expertise I do have to offer you all as you know I sit the Village's Conservation Board and I sit on a number of Advisory Committees and Boards in the Town of Southampton, East Hampton and Suffolk County dealing with water quality; I am a marine scientist, and I know more than I wished and wanted to with how sewage interacts with the environment. The analysis is not the most robust, and the fundamental flaw in their analysis where they think it is somehow better than an existing 18 or 9 or whatever the number single family units is based on the old conventional septic system of a tank and pool which is no longer allowed as of July 1 it has to be the IA system; and 90% of those are achieving 80% reductions. IF they are achieving under 10 mg per liter there's no public benefit to giving added density. If you put in a STP and reduce the nutrient load by 70-80% the double density

March 25, 2021

was allowed because you're reducing than you would have with single family units. The county allows the appendix A and they allow double density and we don't have to and get nothing for it, so that's one thing that stuck out in that analysis to me that unfortunately I am an expert in. All other things aside, having more time to continue this is appreciated and I look forward to working with you as this moves on.

Mr. Reilly thanked Mr. Clapp; he said Mario Alba would like to speak.

Mario Alba, Rogers Avenue said he is an attorney as well, he does not practice in this area but I will keep it short. I am going to look at my notes. I am part of Mr. Clapp's group, represented by Mr. Irace so the one point our side made and I want to back it up is the traffic study. The traffic study is silly to be done during the pandemic when traffic was low, also it should be done post pandemic now with more people moving out here the traffic will increase as the restrictions reduce. The traffic is going to increase and Rogers Avenue has always been a road where its definitely used as a cut through and its definitely has a speed issue and I've felt unsafe many times to be outside and playing in the front yard. I want to reiterate that on the traffic study. I forget who on the Builders side raised this, he said that they contemplated various types of projects but they were all, as far as I heard, they were all 52 townhomes. Has there ever been a contemplation of less, and I believe one of my neighbors brought it up, he mentioned maybe 18 homes would be better. I believe he says that, or why I agree with him is because every plot of Land on Rogers Avenue is approximately is very close to ½ acre; ½ acre for each and there's 9.5 acres, that's 19 houses I would concede you could build more but 52 is very excessive, so I would like to know has there ever been a contemplation of less than 52 and what that was.

Mr. Reilly said without the details, that's part of the process we're engaged in right now and will be a topic.

Mr. Alba thanked Mr. Reilly. Another point, the young lady mentioned the sidewalks, sidewalks as everyone knows is not characteristic of WHB; I would say I don't know how many sidewalks there are, the only ones I know off the top of my head are the surrounding blocks near the traffic circle near the theater. So, for one, who pays for those sidewalks, at present, and second who pays for the maintenance in the future? That's been a big issue, this is my second home I live in Garden City and they recently replaced a water line on my block and did a review of the side walks and forced everyone to redo the sidewalks and cement is not cheap and it cost every house on the block \$3,000 to \$5,000 of 75 linear feet of sidewalk; that's a concern, the cost of maintaining the sidewalk.

Mr. Reilly said that's not part of the process at this point, there's no answer now, it depends how it will happen and who will do it.

Mr. Alba said okay. Another thing that has not been brought up and maybe it was in the past, has there ever been a contemplation of creating a mirror of North Perimeter Road so the entry is on a new perimeter road on the other side of the railroad.

Mr. Reilly said I don't know the applicant has the ability to go through land by other people for a road.

Mr. Alba asked whose land it is.

Mr. Reilly said I don't know what land you're talking about.

Mr. Alba said the land South of the LIRR.

Mr. Reilly said I don't know the answer.

Mr. Alba said his last question is, has there been a discussion regarding the price point of these town homes, and if so, what is the price point?

Mr. Reilly said I don't know if its part of the application and not sure if its part of this discussion.

Mr. Alba said they spoke with a realtor and did a market analysis and I would assume the sales price of the town homes, so I'd ask them to share that if they can and if they have not, I would ask them to.

Mr. Reilly said we're taking comments and that will be part of it. If there are questions, it has to be in the form of a comment, rather than us answering questions. We are listening only; we are not having a question and answer.

Mr. Alba thanked the Board.

Jessica Maguire, Rogers Avenue said she's been observing the presentations and she has an environmental science degree and she notices alternatives and the two were never joined together as an option. The buffering of the landscaping that is possibly required, and the suggestion of moving the community center to the back of the property it would be nice to moving the community center but also keeping the buffering. It looks like they lost parking, but they never jeopardized losing property's, and maybe considered scaling them down and offer a lower number of housing. She thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Reilly said the person labeled as iPhone Lori is next.

Lori Solomon, Rogers Avenue said she read regarding pricing, it ranged from \$450,000 to upwards of \$900,000 in terms of pricing. I've owned by home since 2012 and do have a second residence. Traffic is a nightmare, and I'm not against the development, but I agree it should be scaled back and absurd to do a traffic study during COVID, it makes no sense what so ever. I am glad I was able to listen in and I hope we extend the April 8 deadline.

Mr. Reilly thanked Ms. Solomon. He asked Mr. Borrow to mute. He asked Ms. Mackie if there were any other comments.

Ms. Mackie said Mr. Sussan. She said that we have covered the topics on noticing, and the traffic study done during COVID, if we can focus on things that have not already been brought up.

Lou Sussan, Rogers Avenue said changing the bend in the road, and sidewalks and this and that, and if at some point in time the decision is made to move forward and if depending on the size it ultimately is it is determined that we're going to put in sidewalks, if we put a sidewalk in on Rogers Avenue to Montauk Highway, I would like and hope that it be looked into. I don't know if it's done on both side of the street, even if its on one side and when I look at Rogers Avenue but if you put a sidewalk in no matter what side its on the impact on those homes in terms of ripping out trees and gardens and that really describe the character of the block that we live on. That's our second home, I'm retired home and it will be my primary home I don't want a NYC street so I hope we look at those impacts.

Mr. Reilly said he appreciates his concern and Oak Street did not have sidewalks and the Village installed them, and I don't know if I won or lost, but they are on my side.

Mr. Sussan said Sunset Avenue has sidewalks, and when you drive down Sunset Avenue the character on that block, and its night and day with the character of Rogers Avenue.

Mr. Reilly said Ms. Shapiro is next, and asked Mr. Sussan to mute.

Ronni Shapiro, she formerly lived at 71 Rogers Avenue and she moved in September but she's actively looking to move back to the neighborhood so while I'm not technically a resident I hope to be one. I had one question, at some point the neighbors put forth a suggestion to at least explore the option of making Rogers and Hazelwood into a very long cul de sac and using the extension to enter the property. That may or may not require the owner to possibly purchase land, I'm not sure but I think there is space available and I had included also some photographs, I sent in photographs of the traffic parked on Rogers Avenue Extension and that never went anywhere and I was hoping that could be on the table as a possibility.

Mr. Reilly said we're interested in looking at any matter of possibilities.

Ms. Shapiro said she sent the photos to Ms. Mackie taken over multiple days and I hope they got passed along, and if not, they should be in an email.

Ms. Mackie asked if she's referring to the photos of the cars parked closer to Old Riverhead Road, that's a traffic complaint.

Ms. Shapiro said I wasn't complaining but it exists.

Ms. Mackie said right, but it's due to the commercial businesses on Old Riverhead Road, not houses on the extension.

Mr. Reilly said Mr. Clapp is asking to speak again.

Mr. Clapp said he wanted to thank the Board, and someone mentioned this is my group and it's not it's the neighborhood group, I was asked to just help get people together.

Mr. Reilly said all we know; we have a concerned group of people on Rogers Avenue however they choose to categorize themselves is not up to us.

Mr. Clapp thanked Ms. Mackie for her hard work, and for the Boards efforts.

Mr. Reilly asked Ms. Mackie if there was anyone else who wishes to comment.

Ms. Mackie said no.

Mr. Isler said he knows the people who have spoken and they want to make comment; my first one for the applicant is that I request for the open ended extensions of time, we urge to close the hearing on April 8 and that will be 70 days from the notice of completion of the DEIS and after you close the hearing, there's another 10 day right for comment and the amendments done to SEQRA were designed to make sure the SEQRA process moves efficiently and quickly, and they are done to make sure they go on and there are people who have the right to be heard and they've had the DEIS for 70 days, and including the 2 weeks to April 8 and then there is another 10 days for filing written comment. Then there is the preparation for the FEIS and we vigorously ask the Board to adhere to the timeframes of the April 8 meeting; and I don't know if you're going to take public comment or just accept written comment, I would like clarification on that.

Mr. Reilly said we're keeping it open for written comment, and we're waiting on Ron Hill's comments and Kyle Collins' comment and we intend to adhere to the law and that's done in consultation with the Village Attorney.

Mr. Isler said the actual public hearing ends today, and the written submission is through April 8?

Mr. Reilly said we haven't determined that. But my instinct is that we've had public comment and so long as the Village Attorney doesn't suggest otherwise, I prefer written commentary from this point.

Mr. Isler said that's their preference too.

Mr. Reilly said it will be nailed down by April 8.

Mr. Isler said if there's any other members of his team to address question or comment.

Mr. Reilly said that's fine I don't want to rehash what we've done, and I presume they'd prepare a written statement.

Bryan Grogan, PW Grosser said with respect to Mr. Borrows comments on fencing on Alternative 4 there was no fence proposed abutting Rogers Avenue and it's shown on the site plan and included in the DEIS. The STP as required as the SCDPHS includes odor control to eliminate the odors from the STP itself. With respect to the alternatives there were 5 developed 2 included reduced density and analyzed in the DEIS. In respect to Mr. Clapps comments, we used the IA's for the 2 alternatives, as well as the STP where applicable and that's in the analysis. Regarding the perimeter road comments, there are multiple property's South of the RR tracks not owned by our client, one is County owned and a number are private and Perimeter Road is not an attainable item to allow access.

Mr. Lenihan said two issues he'd like to speak to, and he'd opine in the FEIS for them as well; certainly, the pandemic has affected traffic volumes significantly, but of course some places are affected more than others. Reviewing the existing traffic data available, specifically the traffic studies by the village; of the traffic studies we received only a single one contained turning movement data and that turns out as the same one as the County from 2016 and was performed in early April of 2016 so as we know that volumes and patterns change seasonally. Based on the pandemic, the unavailability of the date, there was discussions had that resulted in the conclusion to proceed the way we did and we will opine in the FEIS. I stand behind the methodology we used and regarding the increases on Rogers Avenue and the Extension, the 33 vehicles will split in different directions, and the largest portion heads towards Old Riverhead

Road, and if you stand west of the stie you see on average 17 trips combined over 1 hour course which is closer to 1 vehicle every 4 minutes. I won't say it wont increase levels, clearly it will that's why we did the study and it quantifies the impacts and they are minor, I do want to say it will not change the character of these roadways. We won't go from a low volume street to a freeway its an average, and traffic is random and I don't want to downplay the neighborhood concerns but I would ask they review the study and further comments we will respond to accordingly.

Mr. Reilly asked Mr. Isler if they had anything else to add.

Ms. Gennaro said it would benefit the final scope for the DEIS is in A[appendix "D" and it's the outline of what was required of the applicant and it outlines the 5 alternatives and what they are expected to include in it and includes 18 single family homes and different configurations of the MF use. And the permitted yield discussion is the DEIS and it's 6 units of the MF 20 so I refer you to Section 1 on how we determined the yield.

Mr. Reilly said I think everyone has had a reasonable opportunity to speak.

Mr. Isler said alternative ways it could be used, the fact of the matter is that the application is consistent with the 2006 Master Plan and current zoning and they have the right to proceed under the current zoning pursuant to studies and evaluations, and that is the reality of the situation. We have a right to go forward under the current zoning and proceed and I thank the Board and the public.

Mr. Reilly thanked Mr. Isler.

Mr. Pasca said I thought I would comment on the public comment, I suggest it be adjourned to April 8 for all purposes and with Zoom we don't know if someone has an opportunity to comment, at the next hearing there should not be a repeat of comments but if there are new comments, we should hear them and you can anticipate its appropriate to close the public hearing unless you determine there's a need to keep it open. There is an automatic 10-day post hearing comment period where anyone is entitled to submit written comments, the SEQRA regulations require a post hearing comment period as well and that seems like enough time to get the comments in on the DEIS but I don't know why we would preempt anyone from commenting especially if they have not had a chance to comment.

Mr. Reilly said he agrees with Mr. Pasca.

Mr. Isler said if we have comment and we close it with the 10-day period that makes the most sense.

Mr. Reilly said I am sure the Board is inclined to listen to our attorney. I would like to thank everyone for their patience and civility and professionalism and I look forward to proceeding forward and taking everyone's concerns into account, and I wish everyone as happy Easter and Passover, and our motion is to hold the hearing over to April 8.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application to April 8, 2021; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

6. 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 April 8, 2021**

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*

7. **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 April 8, 2021**
ZBA: N/A
ARB: Referred to ARB at January 23, 2020 Meeting;
SEQRA: Coordinated Review Commenced January 27, 2020;
Accept Lead Agency Status
SEQRA Determination Adopted, August 27, 2020

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: N/A
SCPC: Received SCPC No objection;

8. **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 April 8, 2021**
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;

9. **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.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL April 8, 2021**

ZBA: N/A
ARB: **NEEDED**
BOT: **SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT**

SEQRA: August 13, 2020 – Planning Board Accepted Lead Agency Status
SCDHS: **NEEDED**

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

REFERRAL FROM BOARD OF TRUSTEES

10. **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.

11. 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.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL April 8, 2021**

ZBA: **GRANTED, February 18, 2021**

ARB: **NEEDED**

BOT: **Received November 19, 2020 – Special Exception Granted**

SEQRA: **August 13, 2020 – Planning Board Accepted Lead Agency Status – Type II Action**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: **NEEDED**

SCPC: **N/A**

12. PGJG Holding Corp, 214 & 238 Montauk Highway (905-006-02-031 & -032.01)

Applicant requests modification of site plan to convert a portion of site parking and access way for a seasonal dining area (40 seats) with façade changes to install accordion doors at the existing standard restaurant “Baby Moon,” upon property totaling 44,650 square feet in the B-2 zoning district.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL April 8, 2021**

ARB: **NEEDED**

BOT: **N/A**

SEQRA: **N/A**

SCDHS: **N/A**

SCDPW: **N/A**

SCPC: **N/A**

13. Beechwood Westhampton LLC, 44 & 60 Depot Rd (905-004-01-014.06 & -013.01)

Applicant requests preliminary subdivision approval to subdivide 13.06-acre assemblage of parcels, into twenty-two (22) single-family lots with associated road, drainage and utility improvements in the R-2 zoning district.

Status: **HELDOVER UNTIL April 8, 2021**

ARB: **NEEDED**

ZBA: **N/A**

BOT: **N/A**

SEQRA: **LEAD AGENCY LETTERS SENT OUT, 2/12/2021 – COORDINATED REVIEW COMMENCED**

SCDHS: **NEEDED**

SCDPW: **N/A**

SCPC: **NEEDED**

NEW APPLICATIONS: (TO BE HEARD APRIL 8, 2021)

14. Firestar Holdings LLC, 14 Rogers Avenue (905-006-02-017) Applicant requests minor subdivision approval to subdivide a 35,250 square foot lot, improved with a single-family dwelling, into two lots of 18,090 & 17,157 square feet in the R-4 zoning district.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adjourn the public hearing at **7:00 p.m.**; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

March 25, 2021