

SEPTEMBER 8, 2022 PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

R. DiBiase, Chairman (RD)

L. Harris (LH)

- G. Anderson (GA)
- L. Zimmerman (LZ)
- B. Sabatino (BS)
- L. Bekofsky (LB)
- R. Harris, Director Building & Planning (RH)
- T. Murawski, RA (TM)
- C. Suarez, Secretary (CS)
- K. Snaden, Trustee/Liaison (KS)

The Planning Board met at 6:00PM at the Building/Planning Dept. 88 North Country Road, Port Jefferson.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

BS moved to approve the 8/24/22 draft minutes as amended, LZ second, vote 5-0, unan.

The next Planning Board meeting is Wednesday 9/21/22 6:00PM.

Six Acre Park

The Board discussed the draft memo to the BOT regarding the Six Acre Park for future active use.

LB expressed concerns regarding the suggested issuance of a formal recommendation from the Planning Board to the Board of trustees calling for an active use of the "open space" area between Oakland Ave. and Highlands Boulevard without additional information regarding the specific active use anticipated and associated costs, etc. LB suggested that as an alternative, the Planning Board request, through the Trustee Liaison to the Board, that the concept of an active use for the site be evaluated in future planning efforts undertaken by the Village. LB mentioned that there may be grant funding available for additional planning and design activities.

Page 1 of 10



RH stated that advisory committee members do not have to hold any specific credentials and that any recommendation from the Planning Board must be based on a study and not anecdotal.

LZ suggested bringing in stake holders that were not present at the meeting.

KS to bring these comments to the next BOT work session.

Setauket Meadows Change of Zone

The Village received a notice of application for change in zoning and relief from covenants from the Town of Brookhaven.

The Planning Board is interested in being notified as an Interested Party when a public hearing date is scheduled for this matter.

CS to draft a memo to the Town of Brookhaven Clerk requesting notification of a scheduled public hearing.

TRUSTEE REPORT (KS)

- East Beach stabilization project for bluff repairs has begun. Drone footage to be posted on the Village website. Sheet piling already installed
- Catalytic converter thefts have been occurring in the Village
- Rocketship park is undergoing floor repairs
- Old Homestead recharge basin is undergoing repairs funding by FEMA
- LPR (License Plate Reader) technology to facilitate metered parking is coming soon. License plate is entered at the meter instead of a space number



APPLICATIONS

St Charles Hospital Site Plan Amendment

Application: # 0623-22
Location: 200 Belle Terre Rd.
SCTM: Sec.13, Blk.1, Lot 11.2
Zoning: P-O Professional Office
Applicant: Nelson & Pope c/o Karthikeyan Shanmugam, PE
Property Owner: St. Charles Hospital Corp.
Contact: Nelson & Pope c/o Karthikeyan Shanmugam, PE

Description: Proposed building addition to an existing Emergency Department **Action:** Review revised plans and ARC comments

Present: Karthi Shanmugam, PE Sr. Associate, Nelson + Pope; Harry Radenberg, Plant Engineering Director, St. Charles Hospital & John McGuire, RA c/o The McGuire Group.

The revised site plan was presented.

HR explained that the proposed emergency room expansion is to allow separation of detox area. There is a Grant time limit, so the modular type of construction saves time.

Items of discussion:

- Parking stalls relocated closer to main entrance to save existing trees. This also allows regrading of slope eliminating need for retaining walls at bottom of slope
- No net loss of parking stalls
- Retaining wall situated to not block views. Rail/fence to be installed on top of wall to extend to face of new facility
- Alleyway removed

Page 3 of 10



- More open clear space
- Trees to remain with additional 8 ft. trees at the top to screen roof equipment
- Guard rail and tree planter boxes to be on roof
- Metal panel changed to three assorted colors of brick
- Bonding reveals with glass combination added
- Storm drainage to be installed on both sides of main entrance along Belle Terre Rd.

TM requested that the applicant update the cut and fill calculations to include the area where the retaining wall has been eliminated from the

design per ARC comments. Currently listed is 1,200 cubic yards and this will increase with the revised design.

Signs for this project will not be covered under existing sign permit application, currently with the village.

On behalf of the Planning Board RD requests the following items to be submitted:

- Existing lighting levels to remain consistent
- Update plans to show cut and fill and planter boxes
- Electronic and hard copies of revised plans to be submitted
- ARC to review and comment on revised plans and material samples

.....



1601-1607 Main St. & 2 Perry St. Site Development Plan

Application: # 0624-22
Location: 1601-1607 Main St & 2 Perry St. (SE c/o Main & Perry Sts.)
SCTM#'s: 206 Sec.21, Blk.6, Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4
Zoning: C-2 Commercial District
Applicant: Port Jefferson Commons, LLC (Member: Conifer Realty, LLC)
Property Owner: 1605 Main Street LLC c/o Adams & Company Real Estate LLC
Contact: David Buttacavoli
Description: Demolition of two existing buildings and proposed construction of a multistory mixed-use building with underground parking.

Action: Review revised plans

Lou Bekofsky recused from the application and left the room.

Present: Roger Pine, VP of Development Conifer; Salvatore Cocco, AIA BHC Architects; Angelo Laino, Project Manager, VHB Engineering. Christiana Kastelak, Environmental Planner, VHB Engineering; Ryan Winter, Senior Traffic Engineer; Kathleen Deegan-Dixon, Esq.

SC presented revised plans and color renderings to the Planning Board and explained the revisions to include the following:

- Parking
- Ground floor active use with community space in the northeast corner
- Gym/Lease office in the same building
- Green roof
- Third floor outdoor deck with harbor view

KD stated that the plans have been made zoning compliant and that the applicant seeks referral to the ARC for their comments.

RD stated that the first floor is required to have retail space as per the

Page 5 of 10

pb-090822-MinutesFINAL



Comprehensive Plan: however, permitted uses in the current village code would be allowable.

LZ expressed concerns regarding the following:

- Does not believe that the project is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan in that this would result in a concentration of 20% of the uptown buildout in this one block
- Asked for document from Conifer which demonstrates the new application fits in the EIS created for the comp plan
- Asked Conifer for a list of sites on Long Island where they were approved for similar density
- The project as previously proposed and as presented in its current form is too dense. Would like to see the FAR calculation
- Regarding the 1300 sq ft space on the first floor provides no possibility for a future wet tap connection to sewer nor venting to the outside or grease trap location necessary for wet use. This space is undersized and doomed to fail to be rented resulting in a nonconforming building
- "Great room" on NYS Route 25A is not permitted per comp plan. The entire frontage on NYS Route 25A should be "retail" or a permitted PUBLIC use under village code
- The plans name the first-floor space "Community Space" which is not listed in the code as a permitted use.
- The application should not be considered a phase II project because it is a separate application, there is no service elevator access to the garbage is difficult and sharing facilities is not desirable. Need to see how this would even be feasible with Conifer's first application. Need to see drawings of access.
- Plans show a two-foot slab for a structural ceiling above the parking garage, one inch less than a height which would result in the building being considered a 4-story building with the top floor requiring a setback from Perry Street as per the village's comp plan. (The Village has been consistent within structural ceilings being considered the bottom of the floor slab in all previous applications)

Page 6 of 10



- If the garage is not a story, then the parking is in a cellar, which is not permitted- we will need a zoning board determination of what this will be called and what the permitted uses are
- Twenty percent density in the corner concerning
- Loading zone not functional, it blocks entrance to parking garage and per our code a minimum of 3 loading zones required (perhaps 4-need to calculate per code 250 attachment 4)
- Shared rental office space proposed similar to We Work but the entire frontage will be needed to make this a plausible use
- Lack of drainage facilities onsite to prevent overflow onto street due to intense rain event
- Lack of service elevator
- Lack of storage areas for tenants
- All AC units need to be vented outside the building per code section 250-19(7)

RD agreed with LZ that a two-foot slab is unusual.

RD asked if the parcels can be merged under one property owner prior to obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy, this could alleviate the concerns about this building needing to share services with the adjacent building.

It was asked that Conifer provide floor plan of both buildings together to show availability of shared services, elevators, etc....

KD stated that Conifer 1 merged several lots. Funding sources are different but can have shared service agreements. Same sponsors with two different property owners.

Issue was raised regarding first floor apartment on grade at northwest corner of building, which is not permissible under village code.

RH stated that there may be legal mechanisms to maintain proposed shared services between the adjacent projects in perpetuity.

KS stated that there needs to be more flexibility for the ground floor space,

Page 7 of 10

pb-090822-MinutesFINAL



because retail may be difficult. However, the applicant has committed to installing a grease trap should a restaurant use be proposed in the future.

GA stated that based on the Village's Comp plan, there must be an effort to bring in retail.

RH suggested a resolution clause allowing for any permitted uses in the district to be available options for the ground floor spaces.

BS stated that there are several possibilities for retail as more shops are opening in the area and succeeding. In the past antique stores were successful.

LZ stated that she wants to see all possible permitted uses on Main Street provided for (including restaurant-wet space).

Laura read the Village Code permitted uses in the C-2 commercial district from the Village Code.

RP suggested shared workspaces or take out options as popular and viable options.

By meetings end the consensus was that first floor uses (non-residential) shall conform to uses permitted in C-2 Commercial District.

The Planning Board acknowledged the new 3rd floor balcony that was added to the plan and appreciated the effort on the part of the applicant to provide space for the residents of the new building as well as a great view.

KD stated that rental income-producing spaces need to be profitable, and that the applicant is trying to fit this into the project.

RP stated that the applicant has been through two rounds of New York State funding.

LZ would like to request Campani & Schwarting to review and compare with

Page 8 of 10

pb-090822-MinutesFINAL



the Comp Plan Analysis findings for consistency since they helped draft it.

LZ would like to compare this plan with other municipal densities.

TM requests that the shared services be shown on the floor plans.

The Planning Board needs time to review the presented plans as they did not see these plans before tonight's meeting. A memo stating the Planning Board's concerns to be forwarded to the applicant.

99 Pine Hill Rd. Tree Clearing & Grading Permit Application

SCTM#'s: 206 Sec.18, Blk.1, Lot 28
Zoning: R-B 1 Residential District
Lot Size: 22,521 sq. ft.
Applicant: Leon Shterengas & Larisa Kuznetsova
Property Owner: Leon Shterengas & Larisa Kuznetsova
Description: Applicant requests removal of between 33- 55 trees ranging from 5.5 inches to eleven inches in diameter
Action: Review permit application

The applicant was not present.

The Planning Board reviewed the application and considered the items in the staff report by RH.

The Planning Board concluded that this is an incomplete and inconsistent application, with multiple inconsistencies.

The Planning Board requests a topographic map certified by a licensed land surveyor showing two-foot contour intervals, and tree locations and tree identifications (species) as well as which trees are being recommended for removal.

Page 9 of 10



An existing area of a certain maximum slope cannot be cleared, as per Village Code.

A Full Environmental Assessment is required because the proposed action, including the proposed retaining wall, is a Type I Action pursuant to Chapter 129-2 B (14) of the Village Code.

```
.....
```

The meeting ended at 9:00PM. Respectfully submitted, Cindy Suarez, Secretary to the Planning & Zoning Boards

Page 10 of 10