

The Planning Board of the Incorporated Village of Westhampton Beach held its regular meeting on August 26, 2021, at 5:00 P.M. in the Municipal Building, 165 Mill Road, Westhampton Beach.

- PRESENT: Ralph Neubauer, Acting Chairman
- Rocco Logozzo
 Michael Schermeyer
- Brad Hammond, Building & Zoning Administrator
- Kyle Collins, Village Planner
 Ron Hill, Village Engineer
- Anthony C. Pasca, Esq., Village Attorney
- Maeghan Mackie, Board Secretary
- ABSENT: David Reilly, Chairman

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.

Barbara Rasmussen, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application. Mr. Neubauer stated there was a determination, and the reading was waived.

DECISION OF THE PLANNING BOARD
VILLAGE OF WESTHAMPTON BEACH
DATED: August 26, 2021

IN RE:

804F Realty, Corp.

112 Montauk Highway, Westhampton Beach, New York 11978

Suffolk County Tax Map Numbers 905-4-2-14.1

I. The Application for Site Plan Approval

804 Realty, Corp., are the owners of real property located at 112 Montauk Highway, Westhampton Beach, New York 11978, which is designated on the Suffolk County Tax Map as number 905-54-2-14.1. 804F Realty, Corp. (hereinafter, the “applicant”), has submitted an application to the Planning Board of the Village of Westhampton Beach (hereinafter the “Board”), for Site Plan review to renovate a one-story building for accessory convenience store and construct a canopy for relocated gas service pumps with associated site improvements for a Valero Service station. The property is located in the B-2 Zoning District.

The application for Site Plan approval was properly noticed and advertised for a public hearing, which opened on July 9, 2020. The Board thereafter reviewed the application, subdivision, supporting materials, and multiple revisions to the subdivision and supporting materials. The Village’s engineer and planner also reviewed the application and subdivision and provided multiple comments thereon throughout the course of the review process.

The applicant submitted an Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). The Planning Board accepted Lead Agency on August 13, 2020.

The final version of the site plan for which applicant seeks approval is the site plan prepared by High Point Engineering, Chris M. Tartaglia, "Site Plan" dated March 14, 2020, and updated on July 23, 2021, consisting of pages SP-1; SP-2, SP-3, SP-4, SP-5, and SP-6; and A-1.0 "Floor Plan & Elevations", CA-1 "Canopy Elevations", and date stamped received by the Village on July 27, 2021 (hereinafter referred to as the "site plan").

During the prior Site Plan review the matter was referred to the Village's Architectural Review Board for a site plan advisory report pursuant to Section 5-14 of the Village Code. The applicant appeared before the Architectural Review Board on November 19, 2020, and there was no opposition to the application, and the Architectural Review Board provided their report dated May 7, 2021.

The applicant obtained an approval from the Suffolk County Department of Health Services which was date stamped received by the Village of Westhampton Beach on June 14, 2021.

The applicant also obtained an approval from the Suffolk County Department of Public Works on July 26, 2021.

The application was subject to a Special Exception Permit from the Board of Trustees and the Special Exception Permit was granted on November 18, 2020.

The application required variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals which were granted on February 18, 2021.

Findings and Conclusions

A. As of the Board's August 12, 2021 meeting, the Site Plan application is complete and contains all of the subdivision elements set forth in the Village Code. The procedures required for subdivision review have been fulfilled as applicable to this application. The public hearing is hereby closed.

B. The Planning Board approves, subject to the conditions set forth below:

Dated: August 26, 2021

Village of Westhampton Beach

Planning Board

Motion was made by Mr. Schermeyer to adopt the determination of **804F Realty, 112 Montauk Highway (905-004-02-014.01)** 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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application. Mr. Neubauer said that the application has been dormant and he would like the Board Secretary to send the applicant and their attorney a request to appear on or before September 23, 2021 to provide the board with an update or the Board will remove the application without prejudice.

Motion was made by Mr. Schermeyer to holdover the application of **160 Montauk Highway, 160 Montauk Highway (905-6-1-19)** to September 23, 2021; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried.

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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Schermeyer to holdover the application of **Anthony J. Cassano, Jr., and Louis Commisso, (905-5-1-21) 30 Lilac Road** to September 23, 2021; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

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 September 16, 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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Schermeyer to hold over the application of **85 & 105 Montauk LLC, 85, 105 Montauk Hwy & 105 Oak St, (905-005-01-012, -053.01 & -052.02).** to September 9, 2021; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

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, and he understands after a conference with the Village Attorney and he has prepared a resolution under SEQRA for DEIS has been prepared and we're going to file the draft Supplemental Impact Statement tomorrow and if Mr. Collins is okay with it we will file it, we prefer a different resolution but we're not opposed to the resolution tonight.

Mr. Neubauer said the action tonight is to deem the DEIS adequate for public comment, and the resolution is basically opening this back for public comment.

Mr. Pasca said yes, essentially, but the purpose is to create a public comment period for the neighbors to review and comment.

Mr. Isler said he believes it is 30 days and specifically written.

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo to adopt the determination as written; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to hold the application of **Rogers Associates, LLC., North Side of Rogers Avenue (905-3-1-7.1 through 7.7)** to September 9, 2021; seconded by Mr. Logozzo 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.

James N. Hulme, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application and asked to hold this over to the first meeting in October.

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo to holdover the application of **Westhampton Inn, LLC., 43 Main Street (905-11-1-15)** to October 14, 2021; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application; Galante Architecture Studio submitted a request to holdover the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo to holdover the application of **Prime Storage, 98 Depot Road (905-2-1-19.10)** to September 16, 2021; seconded by Mr. Neubauer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

8. 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., submitted a request to hold the application over.

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo to holdover the application of **55 Old Riverhead Road LLC, 55 & 59 Old Riverhead Rd (905-004-01-007, -009.02 & -009.03)** to September 16, 2021; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

9. 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.

Vincent Pizzuli, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application. They have addressed the suggestion of exiting on to Depot Road, and they are pleased with the layouts, and came to a better amp. They are proposing 22 single lots in the R2 with a minimum of 20,000 square feet and two cul de sacs and access on Depot Road. We have designed a 50' wide dedicated right of way off of Old Riverhead Road and it will have a crash gate or whatever the Board prefers and a pedestrian sidewalk to accommodate connectivity from Depot Road to Old Riverhead Road and I think we have touched all the bases. One is that there is a letter from the SCPC from March 24 2021 and we could not supply you with the information to respond and we are there, and I have submitted maps to the Village and there is a fact sheet to answer the questions, and I respectfully ask you to respond to the SCPC letter. Most of the questions centered upon sewage flow and density and we explained in detail that they are purchasing 10 Pine Barren Credits and that's in our fact sheet and that's a condition of the final approval. I have our Engineer Mr. Hayduk and he has submitted an application to the BOH to purchase the Pine Barren Credits and we are hoping to have a hearing in October and that's all I have to add tonight. I am making a formal presentation, because I would like to consider the layout and lock in to that and hopefully ask you to consider a resolution of Preliminary Approval in September conditioned upon BOH approval.

Mr. Neubauer said we don't give any preliminary approvals.

Mr. Pasca said it's a major subdivision so we can issue that. The only thing I can think of is that we need the SCPC response and Mr. Hill and Mr. Collins review.

Mr. Hill said he gave comments and they satisfied him.

Mr. Pizzuli said Mr. Collins raised a question about the sidewalk that we added. The purpose is to lock in the layout and design and we will engineer everything on the map and hopefully we can consider the preliminary approval in September.

Mr. Pasca said I am open to it, as long as the SCPC is done.

Mr. Schermeyer asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to comment.

Richard Germinder, 64 Depot Road. And the last I heard, we were talking about access on Old Riverhead Road and not Depot, so I guess that's been made? Was it driven by traffic, and that's my concern the traffic coming on to Depot Road and there's no better way because Old Riverhead Road is busy too. My understanding is that there is another condo that wants to go on to Depot Road too?

Mr. Neubauer said they have three, Depot Road, Montauk Highway and Old Riverhead Road and it's an old plan and they need a new one.

Mr. Germinder said it will be very busy at this intersection.

Mr. Neubauer said we have a long way to go and you should sit in on those conversations.

Mr. Germinder said as it builds you can understand. As long as it's not a cut through, it won't be as bad. But can we request a traffic study at the light?

Mr. Neubauer said we did them and you can look at them.

Mr. Hill said we suggested that; the Village suggested send something to the County to revisit the light.

Mr. Germinder said it's a real disaster on Friday and Sunday.

Mr. Pasca said that traffic signal is controlled by the County.

Mr. Pizzuli said there was a full traffic study and studied both and it has been reviewed in detail by Mr. Hill.

Mr. Germinder said the single-family homes are the best scenario in this area.

Mr. Neubauer said you can see what's going on in that area.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **Beechwood Westhampton, LLC., 44 & 60 Depot Road (905-4-1-14.6 and 13.1)** to September 9, 2021; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

10. 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.

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo to holdover the application of **PGJG Holding Corp, 214 & 238 Montauk Highway (905-006-02-031 & -032.01)** to September 16, 2021; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

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

No one appeared on behalf of the application. Richard T. Haefeli, Esq., submitted a request to hold the application over to September 16, 2021.

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo to holdover the application of **Firestar Holdings, LLC., 14 Rogers Avenue (905-6-2-17)** to September 16, 2021; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

12. WHB Kitchen LLC for J & C Realty Corp, 161 Main Street (905-011-03-003.01) Applicant seeks modification of site plan to install an outdoor patio & fences for restaurant seating, consisting of six (6) tables with four (4) chairs each for a total of 24 seats, upon a leased portion of a 29,111 SF parcel in the B-1 zoning district and as accessory to the 16-seat restaurant located on the adjacent parcel at 149 Main Street (905-011-03-001).

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo to holdover the application of **WHB Kitchen LLC for J & C Realty Corp, 161 Main Street (905-011-03-003.01)** to September 16, 2021; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

13. WHBH Real Estate LLC, 7 Beach Lane (905-011-03-010) Applicant seeks site plan approval to renovate & construct additions to the three-story hotel/inn (16 units) with associated site improvements, including a swimming pool with patio, pergola & outdoor seating area, upon a one-acre parcel located in the HC zoning district.

James N. Hulme, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application, and they are revising the site plan based on conversations had with the ZBA and sliding the parking to eliminate the parking variance, we've rotated the pool.

Mr. Neubauer asked if he's submitting new plans?

Mr. Hulme said yes. They have discussed the pool rotation to eliminate variance requests and to address a neighbor's concern. And the neighbor to the South and North have all reached an agreement about how to deal with one another, and its not for the Village records but it will be in the final version of the landscape plan. We were before the ZBA and we're providing Belgium block lines for the parking, and we had a nice meeting with the ZBA about the Special Permit more than the area variances, and we're looking on additional information about the gross floor area and we will submit that to the ZBA. I don't know if we've received any feedback from Mr. Hill and Mr. Collins and the Board. And the ZBA indicated that they'd consent to this Board being Lead Agent.

Mr. Neubauer said we have to wait for them to submit the plans.

Mr. Hulme said what we're submitting is minor. We are trying to get a sense of whether we're headed in the right direction or not.

Mr. Neubauer said you're cooperation is exemplary. He asked if there were any comments or questions from anyone in the audience?

Motion was made by Mr. Logozzo commence coordinated review for purposes of SEQRA Lead Agency status; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **WHBH Real Estate, LLC., 7 Beach Lane (905-11-3-10)** to October 14, 2021; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

14. WHB Development Partners LLC, 107 Old Riverhead Road (905-002-01-019.05) Applicant seeks site plan approval to construct an automotive service station (eight pumps & canopy) with accessory one-story convenience store (4,872 SF) and associated site improvements, upon a 1.6-acre parcel located in the B-3 zoning district.

James N. Hulme, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application, together with Irwin Krasnow. On August 13, 2021 we submitted a modified plan and it was to remove some land banked parking that was determined to be unnecessary and we submitted a traffic study as requested. We spoke with 7-11 about what they'd like us to submit for renderings and we did so, and we're happy to discuss those renderings and get feedback and we're in the midst of SEQRA as well. The ZBA was okay with this Board taking Lead Agency. We are before the ZBA for the size of the building and rear lot line setback and we're working through the ZBA with those issues, and we will report back to this Board as we can. Other than the removal of the parking spaces, the project has not changed.

Mr. Neubauer said at our last meeting we discussed the esthetics of the building and it seems we forgot what we talked about. We were looking for photographs of the Oyster Bay location.

Mr. Hulme said not completely, we were asked by 7-11 to present this, and return to them with this Boards feedback, and then we can work on the renderings if needed.

Mr. Neubauer said he would like to hear what Mr. Collins thinks of this building, at the gateway of our Village and it doesn't really exemplify that in my personal opinion and we'll rely on Mr. Collins consult on that. This isn't the spirit in which we discussed at the last meeting and we expected to see photographs of other 7-11's.

Mr. Hulme said we will provide them.

Mr. Krasnow said he totally respects this Board's input and when we went back to 7-11 and I hired an architect and had them come up with other renderings, they said this is our new 2.0 store and it'll be the first on Long Island and we're not modifying the façade and if you want something different we'll do a smaller store with less amenities, such as the lunch room seating area which will be beneficial to the men and women at the air base and industrial park, and the beer cave and just go with the box store and the façade, but it won't be this new prototype, so based upon them telling me that they won't change this design. I haven't signed the NDA to get the plans, they asked me to please come to this Board, show what they'd like to do and get the feedback and let the Board see it and we can decide whether or not to roll this out on Long Island and it's the gateway to WHB and were not next to anything to stuff that's contrast, it's a very industrial area and we're in front of a storage facility. I've also said from day one this Village has been very helpful and they changed the Code to get this and I want to make you happy and my client said we want to do this but this is the concept and our corporate image and look and Nationally this will be the first on Long Island and we don't want to amend it, and if we have to we can't give all the amenities and services that are nice for this area.

Mr. Logozzo asked why they wouldn't be amendable to modifying the store. I think it's nice, but it may not fit the picture that everyone wants to see, but wouldn't they want to modify the standard store to include these amenities.

Mr. Krasnow said they are rolling out this new concept, and this was part a and part b had fresh fast food but they couldn't get an approval to make it bigger and do that; so because it's the new concept and they like the glass front and the luncheonette will be in the front area they said corporate will not allow them to modify the façade has to be different I asked the architect to change the façade to what this Board asked for, and 7-11 had me hire him and I paid for it but they can't do it and they want me to go to the Board and see what they'd consider. We'd have to rethink the size of the store, the façade and the amenities that might be in the store, and reducing the size of the store, and I'm not corporate I can't tell you why they won't let me change the façade but this is what they told me.

Mr. Logozzo said they are punishing themselves.

Mr. Krasnow said it's not smaller.

Brian Reilly, Stonefield Engineering; we are the Engineers and I understand what Mr. Logozzo is saying and it's a new program and design and they don't want to roll out a new design and change it and they are trying to push the package, and they want the amenities and the new brand.

Mr. Logozzo said you want everything, and you're right but not being flexible with the appearance might cause a problem and it may not fit everyone's opinion. It makes no sense to scale it down and not offer everything because you have to change the appearance.

Mr. Brian Reilly said on a corporate level for 7-11 they don't have them designed yet to have the façade to match the size of the building.

Mr. Hulme said all we can do is that we've made our case.

Mr. Pasca said there's more complications, and they are seeking a variance for the size. 7-11 is saying they are making it smaller, and that makes it more conforming.

Mr. Krasnow said it's not a threat, I took this and I put the architectural style that you'd like to see they told me they can't get an approval for that from corporate and if they don't approve this style it'll go back to the smaller store, and changing it won't have the new layouts of their new design.

Mr. Neubauer said it won't need a variance.

Mr. Krasnow said yes, it will because it'll be above 3,000 square feet. I'm the messenger, and I apologized because I don't want to not send things, and I paid for new drawings but the corporate office is saying they can't do this with this store. It's coming from their corporate office in Dallas, and we know the Village has been extremely supportive and we'd like to see some feedback and see if there's a possibility to do this or go back to the drawing board. They'd have to rethink their idea.

Mr. Jones said I don't have a problem with the design of this, and I don't think everything in this Village needs to have the same roof, mansard and cupola, I think it's a very fresh look and I like the front glazed corners think it looks nice. I think it's interesting to have three entrances, the one in the rear and side and the front.

Mr. Krasnow said he thinks it's for loading purposes.

Mr. Brian Reilly said the rear entrance is emergency egress and there's a side door and main front door.

Mr. Jones said it's a fresh approach.

Mr. Krasnow said as I drive down Old Riverhead Road, there are a lot of contemporary buildings and on Dune Road there's a lot of new construction that's contemporary. Metro Storage doesn't have a Hamptons look and this will be in front of that; I'm not next to anything Historic, it's a DPW and a car wash and restaurant that has a Latin theme. I don't think I'm out of character, there's no specific character here.

Mr. Jones said the earth tone softens it up a lot and makes it blend in.

Mr. Krasnow said we will put a lot of beautiful landscaping in and we're flexible and if I could change it, I would but 7-11 asked me not to. I have mixed feedback from this Board. It'll be a win for this Village and it will help a lot of people out. We haven't had any opposition at the ZBA and no one has come to this Board yet, and the Trustees are very supportive and I'm asking you to consider it and discuss it among yourselves and see how to move forward together.

Mr. Jones said the canopy of the front, you have to look through the canopy and there's trees; the bollards are good because it stops people from driving in.

Mr. Logozzo said the canopy will block the building.

Mr. Schermeyer said the road side picture, we don't have with the canopy and landscaping. There are trees and with the canopy and there was signage everywhere on that. I see that has that.

Mr. Hulme said to ignore all of the signage. We want to work on the concept first.

Mr. Krasnow said we won't allow signs in the windows.

Mr. Schermeyer said there's a canopy and a lot of the trees; the store itself doesn't bother me either but maybe we could see a street view. That would be helpful, and the canopy would block it. If you put a peak on it, it will feel better.

Mr. Hulme said okay, we can do a street view.

Mr. Jones said I like the glazing.

Mr. Krasnow said that's important to have the glass and exposure I consider it a plus in terms of safety.

Mr. Jones said the Cumberland Farms in Manorville, the upper glazing and they have a yellow tile back drop and you can see inside and that's what it looks like here and that's nice.

Mr. Krasnow said the luncheonette area if you are facing the building there are counters for people to sit and look out at and they can do a grab & go from the Amazon, or the Air base. Pre Lidl everyone would go to Best Market and they would sit there and have lunch, now that went away there's no option anymore. We gave parking because we don't need them. I'm taking a 70,000 square foot lots and I can do 7 buildings on this lot, and I'm doing one less than 5,000 square feet and there's not an imposition of stuff on this lot, and making it very simple and the access to the train station, the drop off and pick up and less traffic on Depot Road; people can get food and drinks here before they get on and off of the train.

Mr. Logozzo said at a busy time, I can see it run out of parking. It's just a general comment.

Mr. Krasnow said we can put the spots back if you'd like to. There are a few places on Long Island and the areas are renovated, and they have parking problems and the downtowns were vacant and parking problems are better than vacant stores. I noticed a lot of the new buildings on Main Street they are modern.

Mr. Neubauer said they have a design standard, and I will wait for Mr. Collins feedback. There are standards and lines in the Code that lead you to believe that.

Mr. Hulme said it's in your purview.

Mr. Pasca asked who is designing the canopy for the pumps?

Mr. Krasnow said it came from their corporate office.

Mr. Neubauer asked if the canopies will be an issue?

Mr. Logozzo asked the bottom height?

Mr. Brian Reilly said 16'.

Mr. Logozzo said it might be close enough to the street you can see the store.

Mr. Pasca said there was a lot of attention paid to the canopy at the Valero, one comment was striping and it was minimized and if 7-11 is saying it is all this, take it or leave it.

Mr. Krasnow said we're not discussing the signage.

Mr. Pasca said I'm talking about the canopy with the stripes and things, we want you to consider it all or nothing is the question,

Mr. Krasnow said the striping I think if we want to tone it down, instead of a cupola or gable I think they'd be amendable to that but that's part of the reason, I know what you wanted from the last meeting, I did the best I could however what I'd like to do is get comments on this and go back to 7-11 and tell them this is what the comments are and can we make them and return with another rendering for this Board to review, anything to make it easier for this Board to review.

Mr. Jones asked what the two white boxes are on the side.

Mr. Reilly said possibly the CO2 gas for soda, it is for safety in a container. It is mechanical equipment for the soda machines.

Mr. Krasnow said this is their concept and not necessarily specific it hasn't been built on Long Island.

Mr. Hulme said between now and the next time we can interact with Mr. Collins.

Ms. Mackie said she will email Mr. Collins and ask him to provide comments.

Mr. Hammond said we did not coordinate it for Lead Agency.

Mr. Neubauer said we'd like more direction on the canopies and whether or not they come with the package.

Mr. Pasca said it's premature to discuss the traffic now without SEQRA being commenced, and they have to go before the ARB too.

Mr. Hill said there was nothing done on Saturday and that has to be done, and also when you did the other developments you missed others and I would refer you to the two (2) studies for Rogers Avenue and Country Pointe, there are 12-14 developments and they aren't real big, but there others.

Andrew Vilari Stonefield Traffic Engineer, he said they reached out to the Building Department and on July 22, 2021 we appeared before the Board and they only referred us to those two studies.

Mr. Hulme said there were two studies which are good starting points, I did not get the sense that they communicated we should only look at them, and at the end of the day we have to follow Mr. Hill's guidance.

Mr. Hill said they had the traffic listed and mapped out and I cautioned at the meeting, I don't know if you should have all of the access on to Old Riverhead Road and of course the County is the ultimate on that, but I would not give the left turn out on to Old Riverhead Road.

Mr. Hulme asked if the County has signed off on this?

Mr. Krasnow said yes, they did but there are two exits on to Old Riverhead Road; the new one is the issue the one that exists is fine.

Mr. Vilari said we reached out early on for the access, and the driveways as shown are in a good position which was the feedback we received from Mr. Hillman said they are in a good location.

Mr. Hill said he will reach out to Mr. Hillman at Suffolk County. It is very close to the railroad, and that was the concern because often when a train comes through the traffic backs up beyond the train tracks.

Mr. Hulme said the railroad weighed in and did not mind it.

Mr. Hill said from a left turn in it doesn't matter but a left turn out should not be, you want to limit the accesses on highly developed roadways and you have a perfectly good access on the South built for these properties to have access and now we're creating a new one.

Mr. Villari said the second driveway leading reason is the fuel delivery in and out of the facility, if we had one driveway it is not possible.

Mr. Hill said he has no problem with a right in and right out.

Mr. Neubauer asked if they were renewing the road along the train tracks.

Mr. Hill said that's beyond this Board, and it will take pressure off of Old Depot Road but I will hate to see a left turn there, its too close to the railroad.

Mr. Neubauer asked about a right hand turn, that could solve a lot of problems.

Mr. Hill said that access is railroad property.

Mr. Krasnow said it is and they have submitted a letter and they are okay with this project and if you want us to approach them, we will; that's why we laid it out so if we can have that access over that and one way and to the train station going West we'd work with the Village to accomplish that.

Mr. Neubauer asked what the procedure to do that.

Mr. Hill said the Village would have to contact the LIRR and the Village would have to take the lead.

Mr. Krasnow said it will be walkable initially, and we will take the steps to make it more, if we can. The steps go down from the platform and you can walk either way, so it will be walkable. If LIRR allows vehicle access, we will work with the Village, it has to come from the Village and it can happen in the future and we did it this way to allow that to happen and we don't want that to hold us up.

Mr. Neubauer said it will be a big asset to the Village.

Mr. Germinder said the same thing as having a cut through from Old Riverhead Road to Depot Road and if this has a cut through you can beat the light at the corner and go down Depot Road and Station Road and if its one way or a pedestrian path, picking cars up at 7-11 will definitely keep the traffic down.

Mr. Hulme said access to the railroad other than foot is not part of this project. The Village would need to take the lead to create further access.

Mr. Germinder said that goes back to the accident frequency and such.

Mr. Neubauer asked if there was any other public comment or questions.

Mr. Pasca said we have to commence SEQRA Coordination; and that doesn't preclude you from discussing comments with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Krasnow asked if there's a work session?

Mr. Neubauer said no.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **WHB Development Partners, LLC., 107 Old Riverhead Road (905-2-1-19.5)** to September 23, 2021; seconded by Mr. Schermeyer and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

NEW APPLICATION:

15. DLV DD LLC, 379 Dune Road (905-017-05-055.01) Applicant seeks a modification of site plan to expand the sport court and reorient/relocate several parking stalls affected for the Dune Deck Beach Club located upon a 4.8-acre parcel in the R-3 zoning district.

David Gilmartin, Esq., appeared on behalf of the application together with Ted McCarthy, Hart Howerton, Architect. Mr. Gilmartin said they'd like to expand the sports court and shift parking and he has a submission from the general perspective they look at completing the project after Labor Day and we've extended the permits and we look to being open in May of 2022 and effect these changes we'd look to have them done by then too.

Mr. McCarthy said it has been 6.5 years since they first appeared before this Board; and at that time they were grandfathered at 101 actual spaces, inclusive of the ones under the 800 building. We also at that time included a valet parking plan just to show the ability to increase the parking count and ultimately the trends in popularity of the sport, they'd like to go from 82' x 38' multi-sport sport court, located on the West side of the property currently a staging area and incomplete portion of construction, and they'd like to increase that sport court using the same material and increasing the size to 50' x 88' and get two pickle ball courts and in doing so it had very limited alterations to the landscaping and it made it easier to get the landscape to work around it and the spaces to the North we had 20 perpendicular spaces and we got a variance for them to be 9' x 18' and that's part of the Code. But, because of that we'd reduce from 10 perpendicular to 4 parallel spaces and we knew we were grandfathered on the parking count standpoint and to meet this Boards recommendation to maintain it we went

around to look for limited impact spaces, so you'll notice there are no alterations to Northern parking so the primary experience for anyone driving by on Dune Road will see no changes to that area or the landscape associated with that parking area. Essentially as you travel South and East there are 6 key locations where we're looking to add spaces to address the 6 removed. One is in the inner run of spaces and there's a slight shift to the landscape peninsula and then 3 spaces are in the main motor court where traditionally they are parking cars for quick access and then two additional are in the service parking lot or staff parking area.

Mr. Jones asked where the main entrance is, is it to the right of the motor court?

Mr. McCarthy said the building entrance is the main stair well and there's a court to give access back to the parking lot or under the 800 building. It is a fairly straight forward ask, and if there are questions, please let me know.

Mr. McCarthy and Janice Sutton had a conversation among one another while looking at the plans. She asked what was changing on the side that abuts her property. She asked if they were adding trees or removing any? Mr. McCarthy said there's a tree they intend to relocate and they plan to push it back to put a space in. Ms. Sutton said she'll see the parking space from her terrace because she sees the basketball hoop now. Mr. McCarthy said once its done, the sports will be relocated. Ms. Sutton said she'll look at a car? Mr. McCarthy said yes, and he doesn't know whose car it'll be but it will be a car. She asked if they are removing trees? Mr. McCarthy said no, and she asked if they could add more? Mr. McCarthy said he will take a look he did not know there was a screening issue but he will talk about it with her. He said it's a straight forward ask and he's open to any questions, and their Engineer is available to answer questions.

Mr. Hill said I don't know about the three spaces in the motor court they ruin the function of the motor court and I'm not sure what the original function was but it looks like it was to go around in the middle and it was there for a reason and it won't be as usable. And the other spots are adding are where the loading dock is and once a truck backs in they won't be functional spaces and I'm sure that's why they weren't there to begin with. I would like to look at it and send Maeghan the original site plan to compare to, but I don't think they're all spaces and if they are put in they won't be usable.

Mr. McCarthy said the original intent of the motor court was the reality of the nicer cars being left there and getting back to the parking area or garage. I do believe the original intent of how it'll be used can be achieved.

Mr. Neubauer said it's a handy place for three spots.

Mr. McCarthy said it doesn't really affect he parking. They are still valet parking there too and when it's close to being full it is valet parking.

Mr. Hill asked if that's where they drop the cars for the valet?

Mr. McCarthy said they are immediately dropped at that stairwell.

Mr. Hill said that blocks up two-way traffic. You only have 24-foot aisles, and if someone is dropping off there you can't circulate around. I have to look at it and compare to the original plan and I have a lot of questions about it.

Mr. McCarthy said they will be marked, I agree that they're not the first three spaces for cars but I believe they are functioning and viable.

Mr. Hill said it seems to me, and I remember it from the original plan is the loading dock.

Mr. Hammond asked when they get delivery and when its being used and when the parking is at its peak.

Mr. Neubauer said we'll hold it over to look at the original site plan.

Mr. Gilmartin said his experience is that everything is valet for everyone and there's security and I think the issues were raised and we'll confirm this, if there's a delivery coming in and you can jockey the cars to allow for it and still allow for the parking. It appears from my experience is that the circulation is unaffected by the motor court and its all valet parked. So, you move through efficiently.

Mr. Neubauer said we'll give Mr. Hill to look at the stie plan and we hope you address the neighbors concerns about the trees.

Ms. Sutton said they are great neighbors.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **DLV DD, LLC., 379 Dune Road (905-17-5-55.1)** to September 9, 2021; seconded by Mr. Jones and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

Trustee Referrals:

16. Peter Haskell, Haskell's Seafood 77A Main Street (905-11-2-9) Applicant requests outdoor tables, chairs and benches; 11 tables and 28 chairs.

Peter Haskell, said they have the back area which is underutilized and I have two locations and over the course of the winter we wanted to beautify the back and focus on the flower beds and make it more inviting for the space.

Mr. Neubauer asked if it's out?

Mr. Haskell said we have umbrellas and furniture and cushions and its two seat tables, and more of a café effort,

Mr. Neubauer said they do not have any objection to it.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to refer the application of **Peter Haskell, Haskell's Seafood 77A Main Street (905-11-2-9)** to the Board of Trustees with no objection; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

FILL APPLICATIONS:

17. Glen Shor, 44 Reynolds Drive (905-010-03-030) Applicant seeks site plan approval to install fill within the floodplain for a sanitary system installation in conjunction with additions to the single-family dwelling located upon the 41,306 square foot parcel in the R-1 zoning district.

No one appeared on behalf of the application. Mr. Neubauer said that Mr. Hill and Mr. Hammond reviewed it and he understands there is a determination.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination of **Glen Shor, 44 Reynolds Drive (905-010-03-030)** as written; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adjourn the meeting at 6:15 p.m.; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.