

November 10, 2021

The Planning Board of the Incorporated Village of Westhampton Beach held its regular meeting on November 10, 2021, at 5:00 P.M. in the Municipal Building, 165 Mill Road, Westhampton Beach.

PRESENT: David Reilly, Chairman  
Ralph Neubauer  
Rocco Logozzo  
Michael Schermeyer

Brad Hammond, Building & Zoning Administrator

Ron Hill, Village Engineer  
Kyle Collins, Village Planner

Anthony C. Pasca, Esq., Village Attorney

Maeghan Mackie, Board Secretary

**DECISIONS:**

**Realty Connect, 202 (204) Montauk Highway (905-006-02-030)**, Applicant seeks waiver of site plan to convert a suite previously used for electronics repair for a real estate office use with no proposed or required changes to the exterior of the building or site, a 0.76-acre parcel in the B-2 zoning district.

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination of **Realty Connect, 202 (204) Montauk Highway (905-006-02-030)** as written; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

**Eileen Baumeister McIntyre, 74 Old Riverhead Road (905-002-02-006.03)**, Applicant seeks waiver of site plan to convert a suite previously used for printing/publishing for an art school use with no proposed or required changes to the exterior of the building or site, a 3.1-acre parcel in the B-2 zoning district.

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination of **Eileen Baumeister McIntyre, 74 Old Riverhead Road (905-002-02-006.03)**, as written; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

**Eric & Rhonda Starr, 4 Stillwaters Lane (905-010-04-027)** Applicant seeks site plan approval to install fill within the floodplain in conjunction with redevelopment of the back & side yard areas of a single-family dwelling upon a one-acre parcel in the R-1 zoning district.

No one appeared on behalf of the application.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to adopt the determination of **Eric & Rhonda Starr, 4 Stillwaters Lane (905-010-04-027)** as written; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

**HOLDOVERS:**

**1. 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 December 9, 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**

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

**Status:** **HELDOVER UNTIL December 9, 2021**

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

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

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

**3. 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 December 9, 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**

**4. 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, he understands that they have the findings and are prepared to proceed on the site plan process.

Mr. Reilly asked Mr. Isler what their plan is?

Mr. Isler said they are prepared to proceed on the site plan public hearing tonight, they have everyone here to present the plan briefly and answer questions from the Board and the Village consultants for the Board.

Mr. Collins said it's a good idea to make a presentation and this Board has not seen it being presented nor has the public, and it's a good opportunity to make it and I will have additional comments that don't affect SEQRA and it tweaks Alternative Four.

Mr. Isler said they are prepared to present it and in terms of the schedule, they plan to receive comments, return them to this Board for the December meeting.

Mr. Reilly said he doesn't think they are in the position to have a deep conversation, but they will hear the presentation.

Mr. Isler said the changes are minimal

Mr. Collins said this is alternative four and mitigates the impacts as it relates to character and comments from this board and public hearings, and Mr. Hill and they are all addressed, and they are additional that could be addressed in the site plan process but did not make a significance as it relates to the findings statement. There are recommendations we will make, and the way I envision them to come I will take the plan and I will mark it up and instead of putting it in a memo it will be easier graphically to see and it's about the streetscape in the interior. There are comments about the walkways there are three and instead of three, part of the impact it was a single-family neighborhood and a house that has been designed and a single family house façade doesn't have three walkways to the street which is an example of a site plan comment and you'll tie them together and that's the level of modification of site plan.

Mr. Neubauer asked where we discuss the magnitude of the project, I'm not satisfied with continuing the conversation of 52 dwelling units.

Mr. Collins asked Mr. Pasca to discuss that.

Mr. Pasca said it's an issue for the Board of Trustees because of the Special Permit the site plan review and the SEQRA review is complete, it could have been addressed in that, but the site plan doesn't get in to that. You go through the site plan issues now. It doesn't mean it isn't something that the Trustees will grapple with and they have to review the special permit and there are fields they have to look at.

Mr. Neubauer said the benefit of myself, I missed the boat on the opportunity to downscale the size in SEQRA, and the effort by the community should focus on the Trustees and their lobbying activities the number of units should be addressed with the BOT.

Mr. Pasca said there is SEQRA and Zoning and Planning; SEQRA is in its own bucket regulated by the State Law and in order to justify the downsizing it doesn't mean the Trustees may not find it doesn't meet the Special Permit but that's not a criteria that fits into the Site Plan bucket.

Mr. Reilly said this has been an issue of mine with the Environmental Review process and we review it for Environmental impacts and we do that and we get stuck with that when we review the site plan and because it's not environmental doesn't mean it's still bad planning and you're saying it's a Special Exception issue and it's up to the Board of Trustees and we're back to the Valero and maybe we can make a recommendation that they can do with what they want; they issue the Special Exception permit.

Mr. Pasca said that's true there's a referral with respect to the Special Permit.

Mr. Neubauer said we can comment our feelings on any topic would be appropriate.

Mr. Pasca said it has to be related to the SE criteria and there are some that get into these issues

Mr. Reilly said I never felt there was a consensus that 52 units was a good idea. Ultimately if it's a Special Exception issue we don't have the ultimate call on, we're advisory.

Mr. Pasca said because it's not significant impact under SEQRA doesn't mean under the zoning code it satisfies the Site Plan criteria. Site Plan presupposes it's a permitted use and you don't use site planning as a justification saying you don't like the use or want it shrunk.

Mr. Reilly said the plan works functionally, but we can still say it's a good idea.

Mr. Collins said you need to have rational reasons why.

Mr. Neubauer said 52 units is insane.

November 10, 2021

Mr. Collins said the issues under SEQRA are traffic and they did that and based on that they were mitigated to the satisfaction under the SEQRA requirements. Under traffic and community character they satisfied that. They were identified under SEQRA.

Mr. Reilly said there were comments indicating the number of units was an issue, how was it addressed and mitigated.

Mr. Collins said the comments have to be substantial, not liking 52 units is not a comment under SEQRA there has to be reasons, and to say I don't like the number of units is not a statement that has to be addressed, you have to have a reason.

Mr. Reilly said there has to be effects as opposed to too much so that's how it was addressed in this finding statement

Mr. Isler said the SEQRA study did study the impacts of the 52 unit yield, and with the change in the site plan the conclusion was it will not cause an adverse impact on traffic or community character which were the issues of the project and in following up with Mr. Pasca this plan complies with the zoning requirements in terms of the number of units; its subject to a Special Permit and it complies with the code requirements for the number of units and the size and shape of the property so I believe, the jurisdiction of the Planning Board is to evaluate the Site Plan along the lines of what Mr. Collins was saying, is there a need for walks, slighting, landscaping, on street parking but not the number of units. And it's a trustee question.

Mr. Neubauer said you don't have a right of 52 units.

Mr. Isler said there is no question but we have to get a Special Permit and we have to go to the Board of Trustees with their criteria because it's built into the Code that they can evaluate that but from a site plan point of view, those issues are not before this Board because you're looking at the layout as proposed, the roads, the layout interior access, and the SEQRA process and the impact from this plan. On the community character and the traffic being generate by 52 units.

Mr. Neubauer asked if options 1, 2 or 3 propose a reduced size?

Bryan Grogan said yes, there was.

Mr. Reilly said this is academic.

Mr. Collins said there were alternatives.

Bryan Grogan PW Grosser this is alternative plan 4 developed through SEQRA and through the community comments and Mr. Collins and the Board and the location of the club house which was further down in the area and there were comments it was abutting Rogers Avenue and we moved it to dead center on the North end closer to the sewage treatment plant and we relocated the housing units to Rogers Avenue. We have four walkways and I understand Mr. Collins has those comments and I've seen Mr. Hill's comments and they were integrated into this plan; the land banking of parking stalls; we exceed the parking required by the Village Code and that was done to keep all of the parking on the property and not spill out on to Rogers Avenue. We reduced and gained back green space and Mr. Hill would like to see additional parking. We are looking to balance it from the development for parking being adequate and visitors to the development with no impact to Rogers Avenue; those are the two main changes and all the buffers are provided keeping as many existing trees as possible, and this increases the green space and those are the primary changes we looked at for this.

Mr. Reilly said I would air on the side of more parking, the other development on County Road 31 the owners in there have four or five cars per unit.

Mr. Grogan said that's correct and we're proposing more than adequate parking. We realigned the driveway entrance with a new Stop sign and intersection and that was traffic mitigation concern to make that corner safer for pedestrians and a traffic calming portion. We have a landscape plan to show too. We landscaped in accordance with the Village Code. We have a full planting schedule that meets the zoning requirements and perimeter screening and plantings.

November 10, 2021

Mr. Reilly said I would encourage you not to do what's only required, I would do more. When Timber Ridge first constructed that berm I was disappointed but a few years later it looks very nice. I'd like to see something very similar to that. It filled in very nice.

Mr. Grogan said yes, we can do that along Rogers Avenue.

Mr. Reilly asked for a full set of the plans to review. He asked if there was any public comments or questions.

Chris Clapp, 51 Rogers Avenue. There were questions about the yield and how they were able to put forth a plan for their desired yield before they got the SE permit; because there is a Conservation easement on the South and the edge along the residential lots, so what is the allowable acreage when you remove that? They were able to go ahead with the assumption that they have the full property to work on. What is their acreage before they get the SE permit to extinguish that easement, and then you work from there, the baseline of density. There was a question about flow and yield and nitrogen and contaminates and in the old world before July 1 of Conventional systems now you get the IA systems and they get the same. So they get extra density for what now? Things to consider, traffic we discussed, I don't know how 33 more cars per hour is insignificant and a stop sign won't do much, they blow it at Hazelwood Avenue and the Extension as it is and they are going 50 mph down the road and we can't expect the police to be there all of the time.

Mr. Pasca said there's been no determination on yield yet, for SEQRA purposes that has to happen under the law that's why we started that way but just because they met the procedures at this point it turns back to the Village Code which has a dual tract this board and the Board of Trustees the Board of Trustees have more discretionary decision to make about the Special Permit and this boards review is related to the stie plan details. What the comments that you're making you should look at the Special Permit criteria that's the time to discuss those comments. They have to determine the yield and that's set in the Code and there's a formula provided and its maximum, not as of right and they have to determine and it's not up to this board to make that and just because it got through SEQRA it's not entitled to a special permit under the Code. You should prepare your concerns to give to the BOT when they ramp up their hearing. There is a quirk in the Code that says the Site Plan has to happen first, and that's sort of backwards, but we're analyzing a site plan without a special permit process approval.

Mr. Reilly said the big picture items are going to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Collins said some Special Exception items are Site Plan related items. Mr. Clapp's question, the area that sits under the conservation easements is for the buffer.

Mr. Pasca said that's for the Board of Trustees to discuss, not this Board.

Mr. Reilly said okay, thank you.

Mr. Isler said the buffer being referred to was put in when it was Industrial Zone and there was a 6 lot industrial map approved with 50' on the Wets for the industrial subdivision and that was because it was industrial and that never occurred and to encourage it did not they rezoned this to MF-20 to allow it to be redeveloped rather than have an industrial site. This is in the Village record and its all laid out, in addition to that the subdivision never was developed and the lots were not sold out it was sold out single and separate lot, it was 6 lots and now its one. Because its in single ownership the lot lines are gone and its been merged. The underlying purpose of the buffers became academic. This yield is proper.

Mr. Reilly said okay, you can talk to the Board of Trustees about it.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **Rogers Associates, LLC., North Side of Rogers Avenue (905-3-1-7.1 through 7.7)** to December 9, 2021; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

**5. 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 December 9, 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*

**6. 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, Ted Galante Architecture submitted a request to hold the application over to December 9, 2021.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **Prime Storage, 98 Depot Road (905-2-1-19.1)** to December 9, 2021; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 5 ayes, 0 nays, 0 absent.

**7. 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 to December 9, 2021.

Motion was made by Mr. Neubauer to holdover the application of **55 Old Riverhead Road LLC, 55 & 59 Old Riverhead Rd (905-004-01-007, -009.02 & -009.03)** to December 9, 2021; seconded by Mr. Logozzo and unanimously carried 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent.

**8. 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.

**Status:** **HELDOVER UNTIL January 27, 2022**  
**ARB:** **N/A**  
**BOT:** **N/A**

**SEQRA:** *Needed*  
**SCDHS:** *Needed*

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

**9. 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).

**Status:** **HELDOVER UNTIL December 9, 2021**  
**ARB:** **N/A**  
**BOT:** **N/A**

**SEQRA:** *Needed*  
**SCDHS:** *Needed*

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

**10. 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.

**Status:** **HELDOVER UNTIL December 9, 2021**  
**ARB:** *Needed*  
**BOT:** **N/A**  
**ZBA:** *Needed*

**SEQRA:** *Needed*  
**SCDHS:** *Needed*

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

**11. 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., and Irwin Krasnow appeared on behalf of the application. He believes the Board has seen this plan in one or more forms, and this is the preferred plan and if it becomes the plan it may change base on subsequent discussions but to discuss the preferred plan there are a number of reasons why its preferred. The first observation is that the orientation is common for this use with the building in the back and the gas pumps in the front; there are always exceptions but if you drive around the community this is the orientation and not with the pumps in the rear. Talking to the client, 7-11 that is their industry standard and this is the way they'd like to see a vacant lot developed The reason for that is that it's a convenience store and gas station and the way it's most convenient is that they can identify the pumps, the parking spaces to park and go into the store, and it has to be convenient to get in and out of. We also think this addresses safety issues and traffic and I think a building in the front and the corners could result in circumstances that you can see the oncoming traffic with vehicles entering and exiting, and the other is personal safety and I think in this somewhat commercial part of town to put a store in the front and pumps in the back may give people pause at night, with the railroad tracks and storage facility. Those are the broad pictures of this layout and why it's preferred and its orientation and we think it makes the most sense.

Mr. Reilly asked if the uses are permitted?

Mr. Hulme said yes. We understand that this is the entrance to the Village, and we're not adverse to addressing that in the canopy and the building itself and those things, but that has to be looked at in the context of the neighborhood and it is a way into the Village and there's a railroad track that will be there forever, there's a storage facility behind it and I think we can do a nice job with the orientation to improve on what's there.

Mr. Jones said there is a larger building that was proposed, and it had a modern façade and new design, and is this the same square footage or less?

Mr. Hulme said it's the larger.

Mr. Krasnow said it's based on the new design, and if you do like it, it's about 4,900 square feet and the modern building is 4,000 square feet but the orientation is the same. It would just have a smaller footprint.

Mr. Jones said that being smaller, wasn't the larger based on having places to sit on the inside?

Mr. Krasnow said the original concept has seating for about 7 people and again, with the change from Best Market to Lidl and losing the prepared foods we thought with the new amazon facility and with the

extra 100,000 square feet they're building and the air guard this may take traffic to give people a chance to grab and go and get gas and or stay and eat there. There are a few modern buildings on Old Riverhead Road and there's a lot of architecture on it and we're in a section with mixed architecture and we will do what you want because we'd like to move forward. There are extra amenities with seats, etc., that a smaller store would not have.

Mr. Hulme said the plan would be either store would sit oriented this way.

Mr. Krasnow said this is the orientation that we are seeking, it's the most convenient and can be seen and visible from Old Riverhead Road. Also based on the curbcut that the DOT was willing to give us it helps with the delivery flow. We feel the design makes the most sense and we feel it's the safest as well.

Mr. Reilly asked Mr. Collins if he had comments or questions.

Mr. Collins said they do need a Special Exception permit it's not permitted explicitly. There are standards for lighting under the Code in this location, there will be canopies and the building is approximately 91 feet and the site is over 250 feet wide, and you place the building along the road you have adequate site from either angle. When you walk down town main street they don't have a problem walking to municipal lots in the rear of the stores. Access, for vehicles but we have sidewalks and its not easily accessible for pedestrians. There was a site plan down in Wappinger, New York and the gas station submitted is the typical layout and the intention of the B3 Zone, this is the first site you get to in this Village when you enter it and defines the entrance. He provided the Board with alternative layouts; and there is a diagonal layout with the train tracks near it, and the common drive in this scenario leads you back to the self-storage. It goes through in this scenario there is the building facing the street, there is a pedestrian amenity and outdoor tables, and I emailed this to the Board with my memo and this is the concept that would create a street wall and the character of the Village is defined by the canopy and not the asphalt.

Mr. Reilly said the one upstate is bound by two roads not one.

Mr. Collins said this, one looks like a road and there's a right of way that's dirt along the train tracks and what you notice in the approved plan, yes you can see in the site with both scenarios you can see inside the site even on ours given the common driveway and the public right of way width.

Mr. Hill said they were not supposed to have a separate entrance and exit on to County Road 31 and in this case its appropriate it should be a right turn in and a right turn out and they did go to the County and they did say they can have the driveway but they should the delivery truck not able to make the turn and that is a large part of that where the tanks are placed, so I think we can move those around. We can move them to a place where the trucks can make a right in and turn around and go back out and we don't need the site plan to force how we want access. A right turn in and a right turn out is fine.

Mr. Hulme said in the context of this plan we can address Mr. Hill's comments with the turning lanes and things like that, but you need to get a sizable truck in to the site t bring the fuel in and this maximizes the ability to do that and we're taking advantage of the existing right of way that's to the South of us. This is not Main Street so you can't compare it to Main Street and this is not in the B1 it's not walkable area, the B2 and B3 are not, and in the master plan they are supposed to emphasis drivable uses. This is very appropriate for that and from that perspective. The other feature, of Wappinger Falls was developed with the same reasoning, it's on a corner lot and it was flipped from one street to the other and the pumps and stores were visible from the street; this is not a corner lot despite the rail road right of way.

Mr. Collins said it's a subdivision road.

Mr. Hulme said it's not through traffic.

Mr. Reilly said as we have done in the last several years, there are a lot of buildings up against the road and a few new ones on Old Riverhead Road and what happens is that there's a false front along the roadway and there are doors but no one uses them and they become dead facades with the access in the rear and I understand the planning process. But how do we suggest to the applicant something so people aren't looking at the back of a building.



November 10, 2021

Mr. Collins said you can design a building with two fronts, yes I know what you're saying but it won't always be this way in terms of the access.

Mr. Reilly said how do we assure that there's an active front access?

Irwin Krasnow said it wouldn't be access.

Mr. Collins said the front façade facing the street will look like a front. And if you look at the buildings that were approved by this Board and that site plan looks better with grass and landscaping and then a building and the parking in the rear than parking in the front and when you balance your issue with the front façade the site plan is better with the parking in the rear not the front.

Mr. Hulme said this is a convenience store that works this way.

Mr. Jones said it looks convenient to me, they are all laid out this way. They have a lot of pumps and you can see what you're going in to and there's a room between the pumps to get cars to circulate around them, the landscaping proposed and there's a nice buffer between the railroad and what I liked about the plan, there's glazing that extended around on the East and South and it makes it look safer and more inviting and it's more inviting than the last plan.

Mr. Neubauer said this design is the typical 7-11.

Mr. Reilly said we are drifting into this conversation, how it looks is not on the table until we decide it's location.

Mr. Logoza said I don't like how the dead front of True Value looks, you don't know what it is until you drive by.

Mr. Jones said there are pictures in the windows.

Mr. Neubauer said instead of using that as an example use the one next to it.

Mr. Logoza said we don't want to recreate True Value on this corner.

RN said I don't have a problem with the same building on the corner, the concept of True Value was a number of stores and that sort of wound up happening.

RL said we have a less than pretty picture for that building.

RN asked if you'd rather see a parking lot?

JH said this isn't Main Street, it's a road into the Village.

RN said this is the road into the Village.

JH said you're holding us to a different standard.

KC said the zoning requires it; it requires it to be held to a different standard.

JH said that can be accomplished in many ways. Any business here will be focused on the parking lot, it's not a walkable destination, people aren't going to walk there.

KC said we aren't trying to do that here. We're trying to establish a streetscape.

AP said I want to point out to the board, the gas station part is a permitted use and its principle use and it is different where the principal use is accessory and I don't know if that changes the calculus and we can't talk about the gas station that its unwanted

JH said we can do renderings to show the streetscape for our preferred plan and help visualize.

KC asked to see alternatives.

RN agreed with KC.

KC said it's an unlisted action and under SEQRA we can request alternatives.

DR said I'm not crazy about either plan.

JH asked if he can submit different renderings?

DR said yes, he'd like to see that. He'd like to see the applicant's vision.

LJ agreed with DR. It's their project and their proposal.

DR said we want streetscape views of what you're proposing as someone is going down County Road 31 with the canopy up front and the landscaping and that will help us look at it.

**12. Hampton Synagogue Parrish House, 13/15 Brook Rd & 161 Sunset Ave (905-012-01-039, -040, & -043.01)** Applicant seeks site plan approval to construct a two-story parish house with attached pool cabana & mikveh, swimming pool, basketball court, gazebo, storage shed & associated site improvements for Westhampton Synagogue (demolish existing residential structures) on an assemblage of parcels totaling 39,474 square feet in the HC zoning district.

Frank Lombardo, Architect appeared on behalf of the application.

**WAIVER OF SITE PLAN:**

**13. Ivy on Main, Inc., 103 Main Street (905-11-2-20.1)** Applicant requests a waiver of site plan to replace side windows with accordion doors and install a retractable awning over an existing patio for the existing 16-seat luncheonette within the building located upon a 7,009 SF parcel in the B-1 zoning district.

Gerald Ferrari appeared on behalf of the application.

**NEW APPLICATIONS:**

**14. Roger Ross, 104 Point Road (905-017-02-004)** Applicant seeks site plan approval to install fill within the floodplain in conjunction with an emergency sanitary system replacement for a single-family dwelling upon a 4,779 SF parcel in the R-5 zoning district

**15. 10 RR Corp, 10 Old Riverhead Road (905-004-02-012)** Applicant seeks modification of site plan approval to convert the northerly suite for a medical office use with no proposed alterations to the exterior of the building or site upon a 40,352 SF parcel in the B-2 zoning district.

Paul Pawlowski appeared on behalf of the application.