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| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | comfortable. After 4:00 today, I |
| 3 | didn't want to switch that around |
| 4 | without everybody knowing about it. Is |
| 5 | everyone comfortable with our work |
| 6 | sessions going back to the old format |
| 7 | where we all sit face to face in the |
| 8 | front with one seat for anybody that |
| 9 | comes up that wants to talk to us? |
| 0 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I would |
| 1 | prefer it to be honest with you because |
| 2 | it's much more productive to me. |
| 3 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: It |
| 4 | is. Yes, as I told Peter, I'm looking |
| 5 | here, I'm looking over there, I'm going |
| 6 | back and forth all night long. |
| 7 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: Great |
| 8 | idea. I support it. Thank you. |
| 9 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay. |
| 0 | So, Paul, we're going to set up that |
| 1 | way. So Jay knows about it to set the |
| 2 | microphones up. Going back to the old |
| 3 | format with the roundtable in the |
| 4 | center for our work session on the 17th |
| 5 | -- I forget the date. Our work session |

is the third Thursday. The work
session will be set up with the old format with a chairs with an open mic. TRUSTEE CLARKE: The 18 th . MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay, the 18 th. I was close.

Okay, Chapter 150, zoning.
This started about a little over three years ago with requests from the Planning Board and the Zoning Board for clarification on the parking provision that was in the code at the time. We were working on just that to give them the ability so they can interpret the code properly and do what was needed on new applications going with
improvements on properties. It's kind of changed a whole lot between Covid and everything else. It's changed a lot from where we were, what we originally started with, to where we are now.

My intention from the
beginning was to just clarify the code.

There was a couple of sentences in
there, we could clarify it to get a
clear determination to the Planning
Board and Zoning Board what they need
to do with an application to clear up
where the code wasn't exactly straight
forward of how to apply it on an
application to happen on the corner of Front and Third Street.

So they asked us for
guidance on that and that's what my intention was from the beginning on this. We've gone a lot of different directions on it now. So actually I'm going to start by just -- you know, we're going to go around the table with everybody: What is your intention? What do we want to accomplish out of this? What is the end game for each one of the trustees and myself of where we want to end up with this and what we want to change and try to do. Okay?
So I'll start with Trustee

Robins. Thoughts you've had over the
past couple weeks since we scheduled this meeting, what do you want to see come out of it; what the endgame is; what the result is; what everybody is actually looking for so we can try to put together something that's workable between management and staff and put something together and present it to the public.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Well, I
mean, the thing that $I$ became -- I've been working on affordable housing for a number of months now; six, eight months, whatever. So I know we started to work on an accessory apartment dwelling, ADU Law, which hasn't moved along. So I was concerned that we haven't completed that.

I think, you know, I'm not
sure if I was the one or, you know, we
all kind of wanted to address the
parking code and give better
definitions to the two parts of that
code that dealt with grandfather
parking and then the second part of it, payment in leu of parking.

I think I put out my
opinion on that and $\operatorname{continue~to~have~}$ that same opinion that $I$ had before that that law needs to be changed. So that was another area $I$ was concerned with.

And then the third thing
that really raised red flags for me and
this has been going on for the past six
to eight months, is that I'm concerned
that the Village development in the downtown waterfront commercial and commercial retail districts is getting out of our control. It's beyond our means to deal with it at this point. The only tool we have to
deal with how we want to see that downtown develop and move forward in the future is with a planning document, okay? And that would be -- our code functions as our ability to control what gets built and where it's getting
built through permitted and conditional uses. We come up with those plans and then we bring them back to the Planning Board for suggestions and then they'll take it, but they have to get guidance from us. I feel that our job isn't so much to hash out the intimate details of the code. We're the policy makers. We're the people that have the -- you know, make the suggestions to what we want to see this Village be.

You know, I had talked
about wanting to use the LWRP as compliments of the plan. I still think that we need to have some kind of a firm plan of what we want to be. I've become -- the past two years, you know, two or three years, pre-Covid even i'd say, I thought that we were becoming a town mainly of restaurants and entertainment venues and dining establishments and $I$ didn't think that that was -- that it should be the sole direction of where we're going.

| 1 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | I mean, I would love to |
| 3 | see more business that would be either |
| 4 | retail or even light manufacturing. |
| 5 | I'd love to figure out a way that we |
| 6 | maybe could attract some kind of a tech |
| 7 | industry to be here, something that |
| 8 | would provide more year round jobs. I |
| 9 | personally don't think that the |
| 10 | restaurant business and industry is a |
| 11 | sustainable, good job for people. You |
| 12 | know, it doesn't give them a long-term |
| 13 | career path. It doesn't provide them |
| 14 | with the benefits and the security and |
| 15 | the things that they need. Couple that |
| 16 | with the housing crisis that we're |
| 17 | experiencing here on the North Fork |
| 18 | and, you know, I don't think that's a |
| 19 | sustainable model for Greenport. |
| 20 | So those are kind of the |
| 21 | outline where I'm coming from. |
| 22 | Obviously, I put out there, as well as |
| 23 | $m y$ two other co-trustees, that we think |
| 24 | that we need a moratorium, that we need |
| 25 | a pause, in order to give us some time |

to get a handle on this and $I$ still
stand behind that.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
If $I$ could just ask: The endgame.
What is it you want to see as the end result of change in Chapter 150?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Well,
there's a lot of parts of Chapter 150 that need change, okay? I think that, ideally, as $I$ said, $I$ think that we need to change some of the permitted and conditional uses that better align with the vision of what we have for the Village.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: I mean,
you know, $I$ believe that's the tool,
the only tool, that we have.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
Any specifics on that or no?
TRUSTEE ROBINS: I think
I've said this before, $I$ really think
that because our job, per se, is not to
write code, that we should have a Code

Committee. I really think that's important thing. That Code Committee should have a couple of trustees. It should have a couple members of the statutory boards, a representative of the business community, and a resident or two. So I think that would be extremely useful to us for them to go over the code and then come back and bring us suggestions to the Board. That would be a proactive thing to do, I believe.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay,
I thought that was the purpose of having this meeting was for us to take care of that because we do write the code, we vote on the code and we change the code. That's a Village trustee and mayor's job.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: No, I
understand that. There's no way we're
going to accomplish this in one
meeting. You know, there's a lot of different parts of the code that need
to be changed.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Yes.
That's why we had two weeks to prepare for this to come and do it. Okay, that's fine.

All right, Trustee
Phillips?
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: As you
know, my biggest concern for raising
the topic was the waterfront commercial
districts and my endgame goal would be
to secure our working waterfront. I
think that we have -- in 1996 when most
of this current 150 was written,
Greenport was a totally different
economic basis. It was different as
far as the direction it was going.
Times changed and code should be kind of have a living document to look at it. And it's time to see what's going on in the area.

There are a couple things
that $I$ want to see that we accomplish
by the time we get through it with
this. One of those, of course, is the suggested two code districts, that I suggested one, which is truly a working waterfront and the other one would be dealing with the parties that do not have actual access to the water, but they have water view.

I think we have to remove the arts district from the code. It's something that we do not use right now. I think that we'd be better served creating the true accessory apartments or creating those to be apartments in existence. I think that's an important step forward.

We have a couple of
definition problems. One of them is
dealing with a multi-family building. I've observed over the years the Planning Board and the Zoning Board struggle with some of the topics that have been brought up in the past and $I$ think that's our role is to look at some of the issues that keep coming up

year-round businesses here, that term or definition really needs to be adjusted, re-looked at. We have a huge building down street that is a huge building that is not being used at the present moment and it's the Arcade building. It could possibly have some type of manufacturing company want to come in and do something. It's a big enough building to have it all enclosed inside, if that's what the property owner wants to do or if it's within whatever code we come up with, but as it stands now, nothing can. It's an archaic code on that and that's what I think is part of what we need to be looking at.
Yes, parking is an issue.

We've all been talking about parking. Parking has been a problem in the Village of Greenport since we put sidewalks in the 1800 's, but do we need to move forward where there is a funding mechanism that helps pay for
paving parking lots, for putting up new signage, for doing lines. Does that really fall on the residents or is that something that has to come along with doing business in the downtown business district?

I could go on forever and
I don't want to do that because I think you know. You and I have talked about the code for years and, yes, I look at it just as much as Mr. Saladino does with the $Z B A$ and the Planning Board does. I feel that I've seen a lot of glitches, a lot of things that need to be cleared up.

Do I think it's all going to happen in one night? No. But my goal is to protect the working waterfront. I think it needs protecting. I think it's what Greenport is. It may not be the traditional fishing that I'm involved in and my husband, but it's still boat building, it's still working, it's
still the shore site services that need to be provided for any vessel, whether it's a recreational boat or a
commercial boat. And $I$ think that we need to clarify that because to me, that is Greenport. That's where I'm at. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.

Trustee Clarke? TRUSTEE CLARKE: Thank
you, Mr. Mayor. Specifically there's a couple of very easy lifts, which I think would be helpful. The first is to complete the zoning classification change that Trustee Phillips is speaking about so that we have it's vision of $W C$ that can go forward with its conforming uses and separate out nonconforming properties that do not have access to the water, as well as -and that happens in several areas and LWRP addresses it in terms of areas that are clearly residential, but are zoned waterfront commercial.

Then we have part of our

intended, the accessory building or accessory apartment within residential R2 district as well. Those two, we're on track and $I$ think are easy lifts for us to complete and would begin a good process.

The second that $I$ see is
to continue to pursue the code change that would eliminate the grandfathering of parking requirements in the commercial retail district and make that a first step in really a two- or three-phase step process on parking in general because there are so many opportunities there that it couldn't all be done at once. It couldn't be done with just code change, but the first step, which would be to eliminate the grandfathering and to create a new code that would protect our exiting businesses and their goodwill that they've created and their financial value, but to make the price of entry for newer businesses a little bit more
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challenging in that there would be a financial piece to benefit the Village should the parking required in our code that the Planning Board enforces, that that parking could be offset with payments in lieu of parking and those payments could go very far in terms of many, many things that I've outlined in our public meetings that $I$ think would benefit from the additional funds; better maintenance of the business district in terms of its parking spaces, its crosswalks, its crosswalk safety, better striping, better
maintenance of the parking spaces, improved parking destination and wayfinding for parking so that our parking lots are filled in a proper basis, the ability to hire and offset the increased cost to our Village residents of additional code
enforcement so we can dedicate more resources to the objectives that we have of having a reduction of traffic,


having modest charges for being able to come from Shelter Island and park in that parking lot for three days, I don't think it should be free. I don't that visitor parking in the summer should be free. I don't think all day parking should be free. I think people should pay for the prime spots and let the business and the business district including the business should benefit from the increased revenue. Those are all phased pieces. You couldn't do that all at once in one code change. I do believe that the code change on grandfathering would be the first step, but $I$ think it's only a first step in terms of addressing the many phased issues of managing parking. We all know parking is not a year round issue. It is not an all day, every day issue, but we do need to recognize that our residents who own real estate in this Village want to be here in August and July as much as anyone else who


| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Those changes are probably |
| 3 | not going to happen tonight. That is |
| 4 | something that is a lot of dotting of |
| 5 | the I's and crossing of the T's, but I |
| 6 | do believe that there are many changes |
| 7 | to those uses and definitions that need |
| 8 | to take place. |
| 9 | Lastly, I'm in receipt of |
| 10 | the document from our Village Attorney, |
| 11 | which unfortunately, I did not get to |
| 12 | until close to this meeting and there's |
| 13 | just a lot of logical cleanup and |
| 14 | clarification, definitions and things |
| 15 | which are low hanging fruit that we |
| 16 | should take advantage of and continue |
| 17 | to work on each week. |
| 18 | I don't know which of |
| 19 | these require a review for public |
| 20 | hearing and which can just be done with |
| 21 | one, very large, blanket resolution to |
| 22 | correct many things or add additional |
| 23 | language. I'm not an expert in |
| 24 | planning, nor in zoning, sor don't |
| 25 | know what that process would look like. |

But there is clearly a lot to do there.
I thank him for the document. It
corresponds to many things that you've introduced, Mr. Mayor, that you've mentioned that you want to do, as well as my other fellow trustees. But the three or four items that $I$ mentioned initially that we do have a beginning on, when we had a speaker at a prior meeting work session two weeks ago, one week ago?

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Two weeks ago.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Two weeks
ago, the chairman of the Zoning Board mentioned that we should not let go of how far we've come in the process of the grandfathering of the parking and that we should close the public hearing and vote on it. As much as I'd like to do that, I still think there's some further tweaking that we can make that would make it better. I'm prepared to do that tonight. I'm prepared on those
three or four things that I first spoke of, to do what it takes tonight to discuss it, flush it out, compromise, come to a meeting of the minds and see what we can't do to accomplish many of the things that you've already begun. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

The feeling of the
trustees, do we want to do this
piecemeal? We've been trying to do that and trying to get certain things done and $I^{\prime}$ ve had other people say do you want to do the whole Chapter 150 as a whole. Is it okay if we move forward with doing some of what we've already gotten done or is it going to get tabled or do we want to move that forward and try to get that taken care of?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Well,
okay, I think that I agree with
Trustee Robins and Trustee Clarke that the parking has already had a public

Special Meeting ~ Work Session ~ August 4, 2022
hearing. We have some information within this document that we received from the Village Attorney today that we really haven't had chance to discuss. It is slightly different than what the public hearing was.

So my one question is: Do
we want to have that discussion or do we want to have the discussion with the realization that the public hearing is still open so that people have the opportunity to comment on what we're saying on our discussion here tonight? That's my one question and that would be for the Village Attorney; is that something that's possible?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

So if you agree what the changes to the parking law would be, then they have to be drafted into a local law and you need a public hearing on the local law. The changes that $I$ gave in the - yesterday when this was circulated were the changes that - - largely the changes
that were requested by the Planning
Board. I recognized, I think, three things basically that the Planning Board had suggested. I went through them. In my presentation of the work session, I went through them. I'd be happy to do that again if that's what you would like to do.

The proposal basically, as
far as grandfathering, would be there would be a new grandfathering, but it would be basically a step forward of 32 years where we would give up the grandfathering or the exception that had existed previously, but there was a suggestion that the parking would be basically grandfathered as it is now for each of these business and it would be significant increases in the parking requirements that would trigger parking, you know, parking compliance with the code. So that's when
something would have to be addressed by the business owner. That's just one.

as it exists as of the date of the adoption of the local law.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But 20
percent of the use. What are you classifying as 20 percent of the use?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

In other words, if the parking
requirement for the business -- without
the 1991 exemption, if the parking
requirement for a business would have been 50 cars and because of an
expansion of the business or a change in the business, the requirement is 75 cars, then the business would have to provide the parking for the 25 cars, the increase, because it was more than
a 25 percent increase from the requirement that would have been imposed at the date of the adoption of the local law.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay, so that's where the 20 percent is being based on the requirement for the use of the building.


| 1 | 34 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 3 | Pardon? |
| 4 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: Does that |
| 5 | particular change also involve offering |
| 6 | payment in lieu of, in that instance |
| 7 | where they're going to do a - - |
| 8 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 9 | Right, so that's a whole different |
|  | discussion. So the way the law is now, |
|  | it would be available, this waiver that |
|  | we have. It's proposed to have some |
|  | limitations on that, you know, whether |
|  | there's a few different limitations |
|  | that we had spoken about. So basically |
|  | a significant new use or a significant |
|  | change in use would not be able to |
|  | buyout all of the requirement that it |
|  | had. There would be a limit as to the |
|  | amount of waiver that would be available. |
|  | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Isn't |
|  | the waiver - - |
|  | THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, |
|  | I cant' hear you. |
|  | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm |

sorry, I do that. Isn't there
something within the code, and I'd have to go back to look, dealing with the Planning Board as to the amount of the waiver that they can do or as to what they can charge?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
There's an amount, but $I$ don't think
there's a limit. I don't believe
there's a limit. And then the other proposal was a scaling of the amount depending on the side of the business. So a smaller business would pay less for a parking waiver than a larger use. TRUSTEE ROBINS: So can I just clarify? So preexisting businesses that are grandfathered right now they're exempt, correct?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

Yes, but they're exempt not by the use, they're exempt by the building.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right,
the existing building.
VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes.


| 1 | 37 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | correct. |
| 3 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: So that's -- |
| 4 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: The |
| 5 | public hearings is not closed. |
| 6 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But |
| 7 | the question was brought up: Should |
| 8 | we finish moving forward with it, close |
| 9 | it -- |
|  | TRUSTEE CLARKE: Yes. |
|  | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS -- and |
|  | then vote on it and my question is that |
|  | we have language change from the |
|  | original public hearing document. I'm |
|  | talking about a process and we all know |
|  | I stick to the process. |
|  | TRUSTEE CLARKE: Sure. It |
|  | was also suggested that we need to |
|  | still revise that. I don't see us |
|  | being able to, tonight, whip out a |
|  | public law and schedule a public |
|  | hearing, but it still goes back to the |
|  | question; which is, are we willing to |
|  | work on these in succession, individually? |
|  | I am. |


| 1 | 38 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | I don't see - to answer |
| 3 | that question and to just close that |
| 4 | loop and be able to move forward, I |
| 5 | think we could pick off four or five |
| 6 | things that we all have in common that |
| 7 | we started working on and we all are |
| 8 | passionate about and let's get that |
| 9 | done tonight and then find out where we |
| 10 | can continue to move forward on the |
| 11 | others. I don't see a need for us to |
| 12 | resolve every single thing in Chapter |
| 13 | 150 and have one gigantic public |
| 14 | hearing and one gigantic vote for the |
| 15 | entire chapter in order to move forward. |
| 16 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: I think |
| 17 | that would be impossible to be honest |
| 18 | with you. |
| 19 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: Okay. I |
| 20 | just wanted to make sure. |
| 21 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: And I |
| 22 | think a good place to start, since we |
| 23 | were, all four of us, and I believe |
| 24 | Jack as well, in agreement on the |
| 25 | waterfront commercial, the vision of |

the two zones, would be a great place to start. Let's start with something that all of us agree on.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I agree. TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's
what we all agreed on, but getting back
to what the Mayor is saying, Chapter 150 has needed to be revised for a long time. It is something that has been either put on the back burner, wasn't put forward. We've had issues where the Zoning Board and the Planning Board have had questions and it's not something that just has cropped up within the last year.

I've listened for the last
five, six, seven years to Planning
Board meeting and Zoning meetings and even Historic meetings. And $I$ know the word moratorium scares everyone, but I think it's time, if we really want to make this truly for the benefit of the community and for the betterment of our residents in the business district,

| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | that we need to take the time to go |
| 3 | through it with the major ones up first |
| 4 | and getting clarification on some of |
| 5 | the other things and give us breathing |
| 6 | time for not only us to come to |
| 7 | decisions, but to have the public have |
| 8 | comments on it. |
| 9 | As far as the water front |
| 10 | commercial, I have heard it for years. |
| 11 | It's disappearing. Greenport's |
| 12 | changing. Yes, I think that's number |
| 13 | one. We need to get that off the table |
| 14 | and move it along, okay? I do think |
| 15 | that there's things that come along |
| 16 | with it. Trustee Robins and, I |
| 17 | believe, the Mayor and Trustee Clarke |
| 18 | and Martilotta, we all realize that |
| 19 | there's a housing crisis here as far as |
| 20 | for workers, but also tied to the fact |
| 21 | is, what kind of businesses do we want |
| 22 | to start encouraging into the |
| 23 | properties that perhaps may move away |
| 24 | from the tourism industry. |
| 25 | Suffolk County itself has |

pushed with it's sales tax on the tourism as being the economic engine. Well, the economy is going the opposite way. And I've watched over the years, I've watched it since I've been here since 1977 at my first job at North Fork Bank, when the economy starts to falter, tourism start to falter.

And I do not want to go
back to the 1990's when we had
storefront upon storefront empty and no businesses here that really could sustain anything other than the grocery store that was being supplied by the fishing vessels that were still here because the State of New York had a tax on fuel. That's the most ridiculous thing I've seen.

But going back to the
Village of Greenport, I think that I have said it before, we've also been unique and I'm starting to see that uniqueness disappear. And if that means that we have to put a lot of time

is - and I said that, you know,
Mr. Trustee Clarke and Planning Board Member Patricia Harris, we went through and set goals and pulled out certain things that were within the waterfront commercial district and 150. We started the document. That is a guideline. The Village Attorney has given us a document that's a guideline. So I think we need to deal with the zones first because the rest of it gets attached to the zones and the zones create the definitions. So I think that's where we need to start with is all of the current district zonings within the Village of Greenport, waterfront commercial being the first.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: It sounds like you are suggesting that we start with 150-3, the classification of districts.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : Okay,


| 1 | 45 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: $\quad-\quad-\quad$ and |
| 3 | tax map number and all of that. I |
| 4 | understand that. |
| 5 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Joe, |
| 6 | you also mentioned here the term |
| 7 | district boundary along a body of water |
| 8 | that is only within the Village needs |
| 9 | to be clarified. So are you saying |
|  | that that needs to also be discussed |
|  | with the properties that are not? |
|  | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
|  | I don't think that effects the |
|  | waterfront district, but that's in the |
|  | District Boundary Section 150-5 and |
|  | that has to be modified. I just don't |
|  | think it's clear enough. |
|  | TRUSTEE ROBINS: You don't |
|  | think the language is clear enough? |
|  | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
|  | The language is not clear enough, no |
|  | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I do |
|  | know that on the zoning map there's a |
|  | couple things that I've noticed that |
|  | the zoning map has errors which needs |

to be corrected, but also it's come to, in thinking it through, the park district has come up as one of the districts that's here that needs to be discussed. We need to clarify that a little bit further and $I$ think we need to put Widows Hole, that's the Peconic Land Trust, currently that's zoned R2, I think we need to put that property into the park district and I'm not sure how we do that; is that just through public hearing?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
Well, there's a notification process to the people that are effected and the owners that are effected and then it's a public hearing and then vote. And there's a process under the General Municipal Law, the Village Law, there's a procedure that has to be followed. TRUSTEE ROBINS: So if we're going to start about the waterfront commercial, then we need to discuss some of the uses that are
currently within the two different -because we have conditional uses and permitted uses.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.:
First, are you in favor of separating it the way the Village Attorney has;

WCA, WCB and/or WCI, 150-3. I'm trying to just not go from one to another and keep going from that to the other
things. We need to focus on one thing, decide what we want to do so the Village Attorney can write that up and start doing that and move forward with the plan.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I think
that makes a lot of sense. The only complication $I$ have in my mind with that, the commercial retail district change or the $W C$ change in the downtown area to change it to WC2 instead of WC1 or whichever we decide is easy.

I got tripped up in the
recommendations in the last go around of LWRP about the sections of WC that
are outside the downtown area,
specifically the residential corner on
Sterling Street and Avenue and on
Atlantic Avenue where we have
nonconforming uses that, $I$ believe,
there is a recommendation in that
document to either acknowledge that in
a different form of zoning or not.
And I'm not saying that to
muddy the water or make it more
difficult. The clean play here is to resolve specifically Front Street and Lower Main Street and those properties within the Commercial Retail that are zoned WC that don't have direct water access. But to be thorough about the entire review of $W C$-- and I'm not prepared because $I$ don't have that chapter of the LWRP at my fingertips, but it specifically addresses the portions of nonconforming use in those areas outside of the downtown district. TRUSTEE ROBINS: I have a question. So we're going to have a
zoning change and you mention in here, Joe, in your document proposal, that you said that a list of property owners and addresses with tax map numbers needs to be assembled and those owners need too be notified, obviously, that there's going to be a zone change with the property.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: The
change from waterfront to water view could potentially have an impact on property value. It does in real estate, you know, whether something is waterfront or water view. Usually something that is waterfront has a higher value. I'm just wondering, Joe, do you see that becoming a problem in any way? In other words, could property owners who are going to have the property changed -VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

That's one of the considerations. That's why the owners need notice.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right,
and then we have to wait and see if there's any objections from any of the owners, correct, or not?

Yes. So an objecting owner -- I mean, obviously they have the process of the public hearing, but objecting owners can also sign a petition. If there's enough people signing a petition, they can force a supermajority vote of the Board on some of these changes, a requirement of the supermajority.

Right, so before Joe goes through and gets the tax map numbers and names and identities of everybody on all the properties, we need to say, this is what we want to do before we go and give him a task of identifying 50 property owners and notifying all of them. So we need consensus of the Board if that's the direction that we want to go.

## VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.:

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
I don't know how many people have 150-11 available to them right now, but if you look at 150-11, it has the list of the permitted uses and conditional uses and I think what you might consider doing is dividing those up between the two districts.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That
was the original goal in the
discussions. It was taking out some permitted uses -- $I$ mean, dealing with conditional uses that were in the waterfront commercial, to review those conditional uses to see if they should stay within the waterfront commercial or they should go into the new zone that's called waterfront 1 -- I mean waterfront 2 or whatever.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
Right, conditional uses are very
important, but I would look at the
permitted uses and see if you would
like to see them stay permitted or not

two districts or it would just be out of the new waterfront district?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: They
would be taken out of that district
that actually has water access. Is
that the best way to put it?
VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: That's clear.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: So
you want no motels and waterfront?
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yeah,
no hotels and restaurants --

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: I
couldn't hear what you said.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm
sorry. I'm sorry, this mic's not doing
me too well today. I would prefer to,
and I'm suggesting, that in the
waterfront commercial that actually has
waterfront access, that we take out
hotel, motels and restaurants.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: I concur.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: I agree


Right, so two of the things I mentioned was that a restaurant should be redefined as a business which is primarily the service of food and alcohol is accessory or ancillary. And then the other one is a bar, would be a business, which is primary the sale of alcohol and food is secondary. TRUSTEE CLARKE: Expressly eliminating motels, hotels, conference facilities, eating and drinking establishments as conditional uses. Elimination of any type of housing or condominium in that portion of the $W C$ that has direct water access, adding potentially passenger ferry as a conditional use since that's come up recently. I haven't had a chance to review yours. I'm working with three documents, so I'm doing my best to keep up.

But that would be the spirit of the division so that then any of the, in my logic, is A is existing
and $B$ would be the new district or 1 is existing and 2 is the new district. So the A or the 1 would continue to have the stricter restrictions in it's usages and that would free up the B or 2 zoning classification to not have so many conditional uses and to enjoy more of the permitted uses that are already published under the commercial retail district.

So that instead of every
one of them having to go to the
Planning Board and have a hearing, it
legitimizes the 99.9 percent usage that
they all currently have. They're all
either retail or restaurants or bars.
I mean, obviously there's -- I don't
know if there's anyone who is going to
remain in $W C-A$ or $W C-1$ with direct
water access. Claudio's houses and marina, Preston's enjoys a -TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Marina
related.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: -- marina
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related usage that's permitted. Many of the others don't, but the majority of those who would fall into the new classification all have conditional
uses, I believe. I mean, you'd have to go through, as we said, each tax map and business to double check, but certainly the majority of them fall that way.

And so it would
legitimize, in our code, the fact that that's how they've operated for years and will continue to operate, so that
the transference of ownership or the opening and closing of new business should be easier and faster and not encumber our Statutory Board, the Planning Board, and yet we, at the same time, could strengthen the
non-permitted and conditional uses for $W C$ in order to protect the remainder of the property that isn't either
grandfathered into something that is
conditional or has not yet been

| 1 | 58 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | developed into a non-WC permitted |
| 3 | use - - |
| 4 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay. |
| 5 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: $\quad-\quad$ from |
| 6 | going that way, which I believe is the |
| 7 | objective. |
| 8 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: Joe, |
| 9 | would those guidelines to the Planning |
| 10 | Board then come from us in terms of the |
| 11 | criteria for conditional uses? |
| 12 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 13 | Well, that would be in the code. So |
| 14 | you currently have, in 150-11 you |
| 15 | currently have standards for |
| 16 | conditional uses. So you should look |
| 17 | at them and see if there's anything you |
| 18 | would like to modify. |
| 19 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: I |
| 20 | think it would go: The waterfront |
| 21 | commercial 1 would be the people that |
| 22 | are on the waterfront now. |
| 23 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes. |
| 24 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: The |
| 25 | new code would bee - the new zone would |

be waterfront commercial 2 or water view, whatever we want to call it,
would be the people along the street side and all.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes.

The reason $I$ said water view was to give the visual perception. I mean, it can be called $W-2$, whatever, but it's those properties. They fall under the conditional uses under waterfront commercial and when they get to the Planning Board, it gets to be difficult for them to continue because they're caught in that.

## Also, if we were to change

that, we would be able to give them the opportunity, perhaps, because we have the Artist Loft Law that has allowed certain living units within those properties that are now water view, okay, that we could finalize them into apartments and perhaps be able to create, if the property owner chooses, to create some more apartments.

working on separating waterfront
commercial 1 and waterfront commercial 2, the two sides?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: $\quad I^{\prime} m$
strongly for it, so, yes.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I am too.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: I
just don't want him to spend days and days identifying property owners and going through all the work to do that if it's not something that everybody is going to be in favor of and we're going to try and do and try to pass.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm in
favor of it because $I$ kind of already did that, but that's okay.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay,
so then, Joe, if you can work on that portion of the code change, identify
those properties, and we can do that.
We're going to have to do a public
hearing on it and we'll move it
forward. We're going to do that
separately, do that zone change first.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes.

Let's get that to the table.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: We'll
move forward with that now as a zone change?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Correct.
Let's get it out on the table. It's the first step of coming out of this meeting.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: The

Artist Loft is something we've been talking about for quite a while.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : We
got to stick with one topic at a time. We can do that afterwards. I'm just saying - -

TRUSTEE ROBINS: It's not
a part of this?
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Well,
okay, it's up to the Mayor and I think it's probably up to Joe as to which is the best process would be to do it, but I do feel, at this point, we need to be secure to tell the Mayor that we're in
agreement that we need to move this
forward. It's the first step to deal with the different points of those zones.

So then we can move on to
the other things that are within this code that are maybe not major topics, but need to be clarified. So I think that once we get the basis for that, then we can move forward and I think, Mr. Mayor, we should just getting rolling now.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
In the document that was circulated by the trustees in the work session, the water view district was referred to as the west side of Front Street, east of Main or something. What is the west side? Was there another street that it was supposed to be? It says west side of Front Street the water view, the new water view.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: That
would be the south side of Front Street.


like us to continue and perhaps address that question at the end of the meeting rather than in the middle of it. I'm not sure what bearing it would have on giving our opinions right now.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I also
think at one point there was a discussion about looking at the

Commercial Retail. My main focus was waterfront commercial, but $I$ do believe that Trustee Clarke and Trustee Robins did have some concern about the commercial retail development that's been going on or potential or some of the terms that are within the commercial retail. So I kind of would like to agree with Trustee Clarke. I'd like to keep this going and then get near the end and ask that question again, Mayor.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I did
need to address that in terms of my
priorities when you asked, George, for my vision of tonight and my priorities
because I think it's too big of a bite.
I would say we would go from here
into -- the only thing I don't have
that kind of goes with it is the
proposed accessory dwelling legislation
and where that fits in and whether we
should pick that up and add it to this first step because that's something that exists. And if we legitimize the apartments above $W C$ that are there by changing the zone classification of those buildings to a new one, then $I$ think following on the heels of that, we've now legitimized accessory apartments in a new zone classification. We would then want to address the remainder of the accessory dwelling and apartment code that was on the table because to let that go when we're on that subject doesn't make sense to me.
(Whereupon Trustee
Martilotta entered the meeting.) MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.

The only reason $I$ was asking was
because if we don't have the zone change, then we're doing work that's not going to amount to anything if we don't do the zone change.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I'm
totally in for the zone change.

There's zone classification; is that what you're asking when you say zone change?

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : Yes.

To separate the waterfront commercial
to two different zones for zoning.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Yes.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: It
would be two different zones?

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Yes, sir. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : We
say we're going to do that, but I want to make sure it's going to be voted and approved to do that before we go and do a bunch of other work contingent on what may or may not pass a vote.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Understood.

So you would prefer to invest resources

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Yes.
I just don't want to make the thing too burdensome that we have 20 items that are all together that we're going to try to change the zone on and then have that get picked apart, and say well, I don't want this part, $I$ want that part. And then we have a huge thing that's there that we can't vote on and get approved.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Okay,
very good.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: So
pick out the key points that you want to do as part of this one zone change so we can put the documents together, put the map together, put together the local law to change it and we'll move forward with the public hearing.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Very good. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Again,
as we go, as things create the conditions for these additional jobs to get done?
-

```
Special Meeting ~ Work Session ~ August 4, 2022
```

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
Were going to do logical succession.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: It sounds better.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I
think, Mr. Mayor, what it is is we have to take the first step to get on to
step two. And $I$ think this is step one where, in all honesty, I think we're all in, kind of, agreement that this is what we need to discuss and move forward. And in my mind what will happen is, once this is moving forward, some of the other things that are in
here are going to fall into place as part of the discussion.

So I think that I would
like to look at it as part of a
process. We're going to start with the zones and move forward and I think we've all talked it to death now. So what do we need to do to move this forward, Joe?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

Well, I'll draft a local law based on what I heard tonight. I'll draft
language based on what $I$ heard tonight and I'll circulate it and get input and then we'll have a discussion.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Can we
have the discussion in work session in two weeks?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

Yes, I'll have it ready. I mean, I'll
have it ready in advance, yes.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: The
document that you sent us today - -
VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

I sent it yesterday.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yesterday, I'm sorry. We discussed it today.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

I just want to say, I wish that I had sent it a month ago, but the amount of work that went into this just didn't - you know, between our work session and yesterday, the amount - - I'm sorry, excuse me, I just want to say this: If I only worked on this and nothing else for you, it would have been close as to whether $I$ could have it gotten it done even by yesterday.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I
appreciate it and I told you that. I think it's a big piece of work that you did. I found it very useful.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: I appreciate it.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: And I'd like you to have the opportunity to complete it.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay.
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then Joe was just telling us the process that needs to be done, if we need to notify property owners that the district is being changed. I think the rest of the Board is in agreement that this is a good thing and we should move forward with it now.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Okay. TRUSTEE ROBINS: And the Mayor wants to make sure, before we have Joe put in the work that he's going to have to do to notify property owners and stuff like that, that we're all in agreement.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : OkaY.
Now the accessory apartment law. We've talked about that, but there was some documents that come out about how that effects R2, it's not just downtown. So those questions on the R2, stuff that was proposed and stuff we had a public hearing on and some people were not happy with that. So what part of the accessory apartment law would you like
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to move forward with?

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I don't
remember what happened with that, I'm so sorry.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : In R2
somebody could have three or four
apartments with no parking next to a house in a residential area with some stuff that was proposed on it. And during the public hearing - -

TRUSTEE CLARKE: You mean
the code, as we were revising it, left an opening for that to develop?

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: It
was proposed by one of the trustees to be part of the accessory apartment law and then that's where discussions kind of ended and we never went back onto it. So I don't think we have something written now that's a consensus of the whole Board.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I did
take a very liberal approach to that in
saying that if you had a home in R2


| 1 | 77 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: There |
| 3 | wasn't - - |
| 4 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : |
| 5 | Myself I felt that was unmanageable and |
| 6 | people at the public hearing said they |
| 7 | thought 240 square foot apartment is tiny. |
| 8 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: Yes. I |
| 9 | believe those comments came from you |
| 10 | and Trustee Robins. So if you would |
| 11 | like to address the Mayor, we can move |
| 12 | forward with that. |
| 13 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: That we |
| 14 | need more discussion. I agree, 240 |
| 15 | square feet is really, really small. I |
| 16 | think $I$ was proposing that a second |
| 17 | story be added to a garage to increase |
| 18 | the square footage. |
| 19 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: I can't |
| 20 | hear you. |
| 21 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: I talked |
| 22 | about whether a second story could be |
| 23 | added on a garage to increase the |
| 24 | square footage because, yes, a one car |
| 25 | garage at 240 square feet would not be |

big enough. I did I get some plans form somebody from the Long Island Builders Institute and they were for a second story added on.

The other option is also
for somebody to apply for a variance to add an addition on to the existing home to create additional space that might be large enough to provide, you know, a living space of a bedroom, a kitchen, bathroom on the basis of that.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But I
also think that before we even -- and you know, the definition of multiple dwellings and the code that we have currently with multiple dwellings, Joe, we've run into problems with that in the past.

I believe, especially with
the way the code is written, because originally the multi-family code was written for the property down at the end of Third Street for the North Fork Housing Alliance. That's because it
has a playground; it has a multitude of different requirements to it. So I think that multi-dwelling, we need to get a clarification before you even get into accessory apartments if I'm thinking logically. Am $I$ or am $I$ off base?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
It's related, but it's a separate topic. Our code contains a term called multiple dwelling and multi-family and the original idea, which was meant to be a good idea and not restrictive, was to allow multiple dwellings in the multi-family district.

And what that did was it
has been interpreted by the Zoning
Board to not allow multiple dwellings in the other districts basically, especially in the commercial district where building owners want to have more than three apartments in a building. So that's something we should deal with also. And it effects also the other
residential district.
So my notes indicate that
where the stall on the accessory
dwelling law came was there was a
discussion started about allowing more than one per lot and then there was also a discussion about, in the
original law, the minimum size was 450 square feet and the discussion started to have the minimum size of 250 square feet. And I think what happened was that at the same time we were having that discussion, we had that discussion for a month or two, we found out that the state adopted a law - - the state adopted a law allowing ADU's or proposed it and that got killed. But then shortly after that, they came up with a law, the Fair Housing - - the Affordable Housing Law that we're dealing with now with the Town and we wanted to see how that played out.

But I don't think that we should wait for that anymore. Whatever
happens with the Town with that
Affordable Housing Law, in my opinion, it shouldn't be a reason to hold up the accessory dwelling.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I think
there's a way forward here in the Village for us to create some additional housing. You know, originally $I$ was gung-ho on it. I backed off a little bit because, you know, $I$ had some advice that, you know, creating accessory dwelling use is expensive especially because it involves plumbing, you know, kitchen, bathroom creation.

But at the same time, you know, here we are in this Village, we have a sewer. Whereas people in

Southold Town have to deal with waste water and advanced waste water treatment systems and stuff like that. We don't have that challenge here in the Village. So I think it kind of behooves us to try and really hammer


People are going to leave because they don't want to stay here. But I don't think anybody ever planned for the fact that they might want to return and that we're going to need them here. They couldn't wait -- I know a lot of kids that went to high school here. They couldn't wait to leave. I don't want to be in a small town and stuff like that. But you get a little older and you start having families and stuff like that, some of them really want to return.

We really should find a
way to encourage them to return and find a way for them to be here. I'm not saying that people are entitled automatically to come back and live in the place they grew up, but those are the people that would be most dedicated to our community, people that come back and serve the community. They'll be our first responders and our teachers and professionals, not just the
restaurant workers and things like that that don't necessarily have ties to us here. I think that we as a Board can do something. And everything is small right now, okay? But even if it's just moral victory, I think we can do more than that as a Board and I really think it behooves us to try and make this thing happen. So I think this especially, we should really dig our heels in on this one and find a way forward to do this.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I don't
mean to be looking at it full circle. If we're going to be talking about accessory residential use, it's going to drive us right back to parking requirements if you think about it. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Yes, it will. I was just going to ask Trustee Robins, in her original proposal, she wanted, if anybody was going to go and build an accessory apartment, it had to be affordable in

restrictions on it. There was like ten restrictions on the page that you had.

I don't remember all of them because it was months ago, but there was just a
lot restrictions on it. That's why the
law kind of just ended right there because we couldn't get a consensus of how we wanted to move forward and try to do that. If we want to allow the accessory apartments, we should do that as a whole without a lot of restrictions to get something on the law to have things to be able to be built.

And as I used it as an
argument at that time, if somebody is
going to go and put $\$ 100,000$ expansion on their house, they're not going to
try to rent it out for $\$ 800$ a month because it doesn't make financial
sense. They're not going to do that. It's a bad investment.

So if we want to allow
them, then it's going to be market
value. Definitely restricting, they
cannot be Airbnb's. They cannot be
rented out that way. They have to be year-round rentals. All those
restrictions $I$ can definitely go along
with, but you can't tell somebody to
spend that kind of money to rebuild
their garage or build a new garage or
whatever and say it has to be
affordable with an $\$ 800$ cap on trying rent it. I don't think it's going to solve anything. It's not going to happen, is just my opinion on that. TRUSTEE CLARKE: Your
point is well taken. They won't create the unit.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.:
Right, because I'm not going to spent
that kind of money to get $\$ 800$ a month
to cover the mortgage or the loan that
I have, the construction loan, to do it. TRUSTEE CLARKE: I do have
to take responsibility that $I$ also
brought into the conversation that the
majority of our homes in the R1
District have the space for an
accessory dwelling unit and $\quad$ recognize
that that flies in the face of the
zoning and then that raises the idea
of, you know, the zoning classification
change for the residential. So all of
these things play together, but to
accomplish something that accomplishes
the goal that you sought, I'm willing
to put that aside for a moment.
The other interpretation
that $I$ had was for commercial retail.

The envisioning of the day where
someone might want to redevelop a
single story commercial building and
that there would be, on the depth of
some of those buildings on the north
side of Front Street, there could be
development that would house more than two units above a property and I would like to enable these conditions.

But, again, if my idea
complicates the technicalities of
zoning code change, I'm willing to set that aside for a later date. What I'm learning is that trying to get something done we can agree to is better than trying to wait until it's perfect with every code that touches it getting changed in order to enable it before taking action.

So I would remove those
desires now in our conversation about this. That, let's get it done and leave R1 alone and leave the limitation in $C R$ at two units for the time being.

It can always be addressed in the
future. How does that sound?
TRUSTEE ROBINS: I like
the idea of moving forward with it.
You know, I think that the Town just passed their resolution to move forward with the referendum with the CBF funds. I believe that one of the things I read in their resolution was that those CBF funds would be available for the creation of rental housing and not just

So, yes, I'm in favor.
I'd like to see something happen and move along. Like you said, sometimes we start something and then it can be perfected later on in other ways. But I tend to agree with Trustee Clarke, that we probably should try and get the accessory apartment law moving forward. I'm willing, at the moment, to remove some of those things. I have to go back and look up all of the things, all the stipulations that $I$ had on there. I agree, I think we should just try and create some additional housing in the Village right now.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
Joe, can you go back with the notes, what we had before and everything else
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and work on drafting something for the accessory apartments?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
Yes. What is the minimum size?

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : I
don't think we had a minimum size on it.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: We do.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

It was 450.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : What
is State code for a minimum?

VILLAGE ADMIN PALLAS: MY
memory is that state code doesn't
actually define for a dwelling unit size. It depends on sizes of rooms.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: We
have other places that were just 650 square feet.

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I thought
400 squarefeet.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. :

Didn't we just have another place that
just built according to code was 650
square feet?

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Isn't there one where the bathroom and kitchen is the minimum if we're talking - MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Is everyone comfortable with 600 square feet as a minimum?

## VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

We had 450 .

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I want to
speak to somebody. I have a consultant from the Long Island Builders

Institute. I'd like to have an opportunity to speak with him.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay,
well, Joe can check if there's - -

TRUSTEE ROBINS: We can
have that discussion.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: If I may,
George, our existing code in viewing
it, specifies the minimum size of each room within a housing unit. So if we were to just build it off of what's already in our code, you would come up with a number that then would make that

| 1 | 93 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | code legitimate as well. |
| 3 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : Well, |
| 4 | that's something that the Village |
| 5 | Attorney would review and come up with. |
| 6 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: There's |
| 7 | definitely a spot in the code that |
| 8 | talks about the minimum size of a room |
| 9 | is 10 by 12 or something like that. |
| 0 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 11 | Yes, okay. |
| 12 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: So |
| 13 | that's -- |
| 14 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: That's |
| 15 | a bedroom, but not an overall unit. |
| 16 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: Yes, but |
| 17 | if you need three rooms like that, then |
| 18 | that tells you -- plus a bathroom, it |
| 19 | tells you that your minimum is going to |
| 20 | be 360 plus a bathroom is 400 or 450 . |
| 21 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : Okay. |
| 22 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 23 | All right, we'll come up with a number. |
| 24 | Thank you. |
| 25 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: If |


| 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | you can put that together and get it |
| 3 | back so we can all see it, the public |
| 4 | can review it, and then we can go and |
| 5 | try to move that part forward. |
| 6 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay, |
| 7 | and I agree with that, but once again, |
| 8 | it's going to bring it back to parking. |
| 9 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: Yes. |
| 0 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Yes. |
| 1 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Because |
| 2 | here it says one and a half parking |
| 13 | spaces per each dwelling unit. So I'm |
| 14 | assuming that an accessory apartment is |
| 15 | going to fall under one of the |
| 16 | definitions of a dwelling unit. So we |
| 17 | discussed the parking code before was |
| 18 | mainly dealing with downtown. When we |
| 19 | start to discuss the accessory |
| 20 | apartments, we're going to have to |
| 21 | discuss parking along with that. |
| 22 | I don't think we can just |
| 23 | discuss size of a unit. We're going to |
| 24 | have to discuss how the intensification |
| 25 | of the street scape is going to be, |

especially since some properties do not even have driveways anymore, they're actually out in the street.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Sure.
One is going to come before the other.
It will force your hand on more work on
the portion of the code that involves
parking, but $I$ don't think it would
preclude you from taking this action.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, I'm
just saying that --
TRUSTEE CLARKE: It just
means there's still more work to do.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I'm
just putting it on the table.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: Okay.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: That's
what the Mayor wants. He wants to know what we're thinking. He want's to know what direction we want to go. Each time we make a decision on this, it has other things that are tied to it. So I think that it behooves us to just keep moving on.
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specific, that that parking requirement should not be across the board, but should be specific to where the
location is of the proposed accessory unit. Because $I$ think there are some areas in the Village that it could be waived, that parking requirement of the additional space. So I think it should be location specific, not just flat. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: I
don't think you can do the code that way, but it would be something that you would refer them to the Planning Board to get a variance for them not having the parking spot. VILLAGE ADMIN PALLAS: Right. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Or

Zoning, depending on where it is. If you go commercial retail, there's no parking down there. TRUSTEE ROBINS: Right.

I'm not talking about that, I'm talking about in the R1 and R2 District. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Well,

R1 they're not allowed. It's just R2.
You take a road like Bay Avenue.
Everybody parks on the street and
there's hardly any parking spots.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: That's
why I was saying depending on location.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.:
Right, but if you're going to do that, either we just ignore the parking and go forward with the code. Or, Trustee Phillips just brought up the question of parking. So if she wants parking along with it, then if you're going to do a 500 square foot dwelling unit, you need one parking spot for that dwelling unit. You don't have that, it's not part of the application process, then Paul would refer that to the Planning Board for site and review to go and see if they can do away or get a waiver of the one parking spot. If they have room for the one parking spot, then it's not a problem. That's the way the process should be, right, Paul.


| 1 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | reason why the person can't make two |
| 3 | parking spots. And then the Boards |
| 4 | would go and review that and take care |
| 5 | of that. |
| 6 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 7 | So how many of these are allowed per |
| 8 | lot? Are these allowed in R1? |
| 9 | TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: No. |
| 10 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: No, |
| 11 | there was none in R1. It was in R2. I |
| 12 | think we said two units. |
| 13 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 14 | No R1. |
| 15 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Two |
| 16 | units. |
| 17 | TRUSTEE CLARKE: Two units. |
| 18 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: It's |
| 19 | been a while since I read through the |
| 20 | things. I'd have to look through at |
| 21 | them again. Two units, 500 square foot |
| 22 | minimum, one parking spot for each |
| 23 | spot, no Airbnb's or short term rentals |
| 24 | allowed in these accessory units. Is |
| 25 | that the general feeling for everybody? |

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS:
Airbnb's have got to be.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.:
Definitely. Okay? All right, we got that part. You had one more you said you had that you wanted to bring up. TRUSTEE CLARKE: Oh, I wanted to dig into the parking and the grandfathering. Joe has his suggestions here. They acknowledge -I've had some further thoughts about it since the submission that we made at the work session. So $I$ think that a discussion of that tonight and the specificity of going through everything else would make sense to move it forward.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Uh-huh.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: I think
that the -- I'm more comfortable with a 10 percent increase than a 20 percent increase just because we are specifically taking this action in order to prevent intensification
without consequences. So that
intensification of really any kind, in my mind, subjects a property to review of a removal of the grandfathering. And I believe that the fee structure, I'd like to re-discuss again. I had some thoughts about that being beneficial both to the business developers, as well as to mom and pop, as well as to the Village that the fees might be better for us if they were set annually. So rather than requiring this larger sum right at the outset when you're opening a business and you have so many expenses, that the fee be spread over a number of years.

I like the sliding scale
that Joe has that 0 to 10 is one number, over 10 is a number, another number higher, and then once you get to over 40 or 50 , it's yet higher. But making those all annual paid with a percentage of the fee each year than a lump sum up front, I think, A, would
create a more stable consistent fund of revenue for the Village to work with on using these funds for improvements, ideas to the business district. And I think it would be less of a heavy lift for smaller business owners looking to either open a business or intensify an existing business. So I apologize that those are changes in my thinking, but I think it would be an improvement to what we have. That's my opinion. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay, other discussion?

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I don't
like the payment in lieu of parking thing at all to be honest with you. For me, it's pay to play. And $I$ have to say that when the owner of the property on Front Street who wants to build a hotel went into a meeting a month or so ago and stood up and pulled out his checkbook and said, how much you want for me to buy the parking here and be able to do what $I$ want, $I$ was
mortified, to be honest with you, that he did that at our Village Board meeting. I think it's a terrible message to go out there.

And $I$ don't see how funds
that we're going to collect are going to be able to -- they're certainly not going to create any parking. And how much, you know, they're going to do to help maintain and sustain the infrastructure in the Village, $I$ don't think it's going to be enough money coming in to make that happen, to be honest with you, I question the usage of the money. So I'm not sure I'm comfortable with this at all. I may be the only dissenting voice on it, but that's how I feel.
As far as the
grandfathering, I do think that the existing businesses and any new like business that would be the same type of business as the small owner-occupied shops and things like that should be
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what they need, that's fine.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: We're
trying to help the Planning Board make decisions, Trustee Robins, in being confronted with market realities that a person who has a lot of money and a checkbook is already here. Whether you charge them or not, it doesn't remove them or change anything about our dynamics.
So not giving any more
assistance to the Planning Board on making decisions about which projects to approve and which to deny, I think, would be irresponsible for us. And this is a tool that we can use to provide them with -- they would have an opportunity, to your point, to waive the requirement, but they would also have the opportunity to enforce it. And I disagree, I'll take the word infrastructure out because I think that confused a lot of people. Because as the Mayor himself defended,
you know, it came up that we don't have money to pay for the sewer department and the electric department and that was never the intention. So I want to take the word infrastructure out to make sure I'm really clear.

That money would be used
for all the things I mentioned, which I don't consider infrastructure:

Striping streets, putting up signage, developing parking systems, creating offsite parking lots, developing more lanes. They're are all really tangible improvements that aren't really infrastructure improvements. They're community improvements and I think that the money could be put to very, very good use and it would take some of the pressure off of the Village tax payer, both in the commercial district and in the residential district, that they're their taxes could be supplemented for some of these activities that we sorely need.
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that would actually be available to do the kind of things you're talking about, okay? And, you know, I mean for code enforcement? First of all, our code enforcement can't deal with moving violations anyhow. That's the Southold Town Police.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Okay. I
don't want to nitpick either, but I
think you understand the gist and there are several properties in the Village;

Arcade being one, the property formally
known as Amelia's Pizzeria is the
second. There are several properties that are ripe for development,
including the one that you mentioned at the corner of East Front and Main that the Village would certainly benefit from a nice payment from each of those three properties and it would go further than zero to helping us with the many lifting tasks that we have. It's heavy lifting that we have around here.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there
a budget for that?

TRUSTEE PHILIIPS: I think
as far as the heavy lifting, let's come back for a second.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Sure.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: The
parking down street, you have prime areas that we could be generating income if we had meters on them, okay? They're the ones that you need to turn over on Front Street because there's only one side of Front Street. You have East Main Street and Main Street. That, at one point, was a source of income that came into the Village to take care of road repairs, okay?

I understand at the time, once again, we're going back to the 1990's where we had empty store fronts, we had an economic downturn in the Village of Greenport, so the parking meters were removed to encourage the business. Now what I'm seeing, and

I've been watching, we all watch, in
the summertime, cars don't move on
Front and Main for two hours. Some of them are there for two hours. Some of them this summer, because we haven't had the enforcement capabilities, have been there most of the day. To me, if I was a store owner on there, I would like those parking spots to keep turning over - -

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Absolutely.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: - - to get
more customers. I think that the parking is something that the Planning Board has to really take into consideration the location of the property's application. And we have to take into consideration looking for other forms of income to help pave our parking lots, do the striping, because in all honesty, it's a seasonal issue, it's intensified in the summer. That's when the wear and tear really takes place and why shouldn't the Village as
whole benefit from the tourists
coming in here?

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I agree with you whole heartily.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: But the waiving of the fee, my question for that one is, if we were to deal away without the waiver, Joe, where does that sit with the ZBA? Do they have the capable to go to the ZBA with that if the Planning Board denies they're application?

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

Then they would go to the ZBA, yes. I have another comment, but I'll wait until you're done.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, I'm
done.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Well,
it's not denying the application if the

Planning Board enforces the newly
created code, which is you need to pay
$X$ and somebody doesn't like it, can
they appeal that decision?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, I'm talking about Trustee Robins' thought that if we do not have any waivers at all. She's talking about nothing paying -TRUSTEE CLARKE: I have to play that out in my head. Meaning, so all applications that don't provide the requisite parking are denied; is that what you're saying?

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: I don't
see that as a good step in development at all. I could not support that. And my objective, my primary objective was to cool the transformation of the character of the business district from being primarily eating, drinking and entertainment at night to a more mixed use and I thought -- I don't think, I believe, that the change in the code would help cool that. Or, if it didn't cool it, at least there would be resulting benefits to the business district and the Village as a whole.


The initial idea was that,
you know, if you sold your property, it could be reopened under another name, but you'd have to go through the Planning Board and then you'd be assessed because the grandfathering was gone. And then we said, okay, maybe that's too draconian. Many business owners approached me and expressed their concern that could effect the value and resale value of their businesses that they put their life savings into. And, of course, I was persuaded that a compromise to allow them to grandfather what exists.

We now have the 45 or odd eating and drinking establishments, let that be grandfathered in with, in my mind, a zero change to the number of seats or amount of intensification, but everything else that happens from this day forward is going to generate either a fee or could -- well, generate a fee. I mean, that's really what I'm after.

check on it.
I don't want to invest --
I want the Planning Board to be able to do it's job unencumbered by the Board of Trustees, but at the same time, I want the code to reflect a very clear message from the Board of Trustees of what we're looking for the Planning Board to do, which $I$ believe was what the initial objective was as to how this came about.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Yes.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes,
right.
TRUSTEE CLARKE: So I'm
trying to send a message. No, we don't want every property to become a 50 seat or 100 seat eating, drinking
establishment with entertainment and this is the only way $I$ can see to curb what is a naturally occurring activity in not just our Village, in many. So we need to have the fortitude and the wherewithal to put some sort of check


TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, you
are. And I'll be honest with you,
Mr. Mayor, I think that we're still
circling around the topic again on the parking. I know that it's an important thing, but $I$ don't see us all at agreement. Jack, you really haven't said too much.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Sure.
So a couple things, $I$ don't know if you guys -- $I$ know you have a parking study. TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes, 2009 .

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: 10,
15 years ago or something. So if you guys look through that, you know, it asks the same questions 15 years ago. So, you know, it talks about meters, all that stuff.

A couple quick things. I
keep coming back to this, guys. You know, we were asked to make a clarification for the Planning Board and we've got like new deal
legislation. There's 800 changes we're making. I think that we would be better served if some of these things would come out.

To Trustee Clarke's point,
I agree with the intensification. It's not that we're not taking care of the parking lots. We are, but we're taking care of everything. If we do not collect a fee from the businesses, then the homeowners are paying for the parking lot for the businesses. Which is fine. You know, we all live in the same town together, but that's the reality of the situation.

So I think it's important
that we collect the fees because, again, right, we can use that. I live on Fifth Street. If we build a parking lot on Morris Lane, I will not park on it because I live on Fifth Street. So we're investing all this stuff for the betterment. For the betterment, yes, to decrease the traffic or parking
problems in the Village and that would be great, but really it's for the
betterment of the businesses. And
these are heavy lifts. And $I$ think
it's unreasonable to take a business
that used to have, I don't know, max
occupancy 5 to 10 , increase it to 50 to 60 and just high five them; all right, we're good, you know? Because were
not. We don't have enough parking now, to Trustee Clarke's point. So I agree with him on that. Again, $I$ don't think any of this isn't something we can't do. I don't know -- I know we spoke about this last time. I was in favor of the last legislation before and we kind of moved in a different direction.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: I thought
we were all on the same page as we've been working on this.

TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: I
thought so, but it disappeared. I was
in support of it before. I like how
it's written. And, again, I really

the parking study and it was done back in 2009, 2010, it had steps for us to deal with parking and one of them was for us to start enforcing our code. We started to enforce code even though the last -- COVID kind of put a damper on some of it, but the next step was to deal with looking at the code and changing it for parking.

And if we need to put the parking meters back in, put the parking meters back in places that is are high intensification of usage, which is the downtown business district. Not the parking lots, just the street side parking spaces. We did have it once where we were trying put parking meters in. At the time the community wasn't ready for that. Technology has changed. I think the community might be ready for it now. But what we also have to realize is that we have much more traffic than we had ten years ago and $I$ think that that is part of
because we're a destination and somewhere along the line we have to get income off of that destination
classification. I'm sorry, it may be hard-nosed for some people but $I$ just, I've seen it in other communities that have parking problems. They have established it. I think it's time that we really put our feet to the ground. TRUSTEE CLARKE: I agree.

I agree with you whole heartily. I just don't think it is a substitute for taking action on our Section 150-12C as well. I don't think it's one thing or the other. That's why I mentioned the three-phase approach. I don't think that's going to be done in one fell swoop, but $I$ think to abandon this now and then go and chase the meters is the right move. I think we should do this and when work on metering.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: No, I'm
not saying put the meters. Let me clarify. It has to be steps. Let's

that's open in Greenport now. They're open. They have whatever -- if they have parking, they have parking. If they have no parking, it's not going to change anything at all for any business that's here right now. If any business changes, if they sell it and they stay the same, there's still no change on that. It doesn't change anything at all.

We're taking away the grandfathering just so that it's not part of the code that gets confusing between planning and zoning. If they go and they have the business and they have their 50 seats, if they want to add 2 outdoor tables to what they have now, they would have to go and get permission to do that and then this would take effect at that point.

So we're not harming
anybody. We're not putting anybody out of business. If you're buying a 100 seat restaurant, you're buying a 100
seat restaurant and you don't need additional parking and there's no fee for that at all. It's status quo, you're all good. But then anybody who wants to intensify and change or do something different, then it goes to Planning Board and Zoning and it gets reviewed and then this would kick in on that.

Just so everybody is
clear, that's what we're trying to do.
It's not effecting anybody right now.
So nobody is going to lose a nickel on
the value of anything that they have.
They can sell it for whatever it's
worth and it would stay exactly the same.

TRUSTEE CLARKE: Yes, sir.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay,
so we all agree with that part of it?
So to go and take out the
grandfathering, if we pass that and
we're all in agreement, we can take out grandfathering, which would clarify


| 1 | 129 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | comfortable with this. |
| 3 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: Yes. |
| 4 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay? |
| 5 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes. |
| 6 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: All |
| 7 | right, so we'll move that forward, |
| 8 | Paul. I'll close the public hearing on |
| 9 | our work session in two weeks and then |
| 0 | we can move that forward and take care |
| 1 | of that section of the code. |
| 2 | It was brought up at the |
| 3 | last meeting, there was one other |
| 4 | section that we had to take out one |
| 5 | sentence on. I don't remember that, |
| 6 | 150-18 or something? |
| 7 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Yes, |
| 8 | 150-18 or something like that. |
| 9 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: I |
| 0 | don't remember exactly the number. |
| 1 | TRUSTEE PHILIIPS: I have |
| 2 | to find my notes. I honestly don't |
| 3 | remember. |
| 4 | MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: We |
| 5 | can go back and look at the record. Do |

you remember it, Joe?
VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
No, but I'm sure I can --
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I sent
it to you in an e-mail.
VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

Oh that's right, you did. I apologize.
I think $I$ have it. I'll go back.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Well,
we can bring that up at the work
session when we close the hearing. It was, delete one paragraph and take one sentence out. I don't have the exact section either, but we'll look back at the record and we'll do that, okay? So we can move that portion forward.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
Can I make one comment?
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Yes,
please.
VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
I just wanted to make a point. I've discussed this with Mr. Connolly and Paul Pallas and the parking waiver
that's available is discretionary to
the Planning Board and it's not a
question of okay, so you need -- if you want to do this, you need 100 parking spaces and you're only going to provide 10, so 90 times 2500 is whatever. This is the amount. It's supposed to be really a part of a planning process and it's not automatic.

You know, the Planning
Board doesn't have to grant any waivers if they don't want to on a particular project. I mean, it would be appealed.

Yes, there is an appeal process if
that's the case or there could be a scaling of the project, you know, based on the parking that's available or the waivers that the Planning Board is available -- that the Planning Board wants to make available.

So we were at both ends of
this discussion where one end of it is there shouldn't be any waivers and then the other end is the waivers should be
available to generate funds based on the impact. Well, the impact is also to determined by the use of the infrastructure, but the scaling of these projects in the downtown vista and, you know, that's part of the planning process that the Planning Board has to go through. So if somebody needs -I'm sorry to repeat myself. I'll just make it brief. If somebody needs 40 parking spaces to build a project, that doesn't mean you need 40 waivers. So 40 times 2,500 is whatever. It means that there's some kind of planning process that could be done and it might involve some waivers, it might involve a lot of waivers or a scaling of the project. You know, that's a planning process that we need to --

TRUSTEE ROBINS: I'd like to bring that up, scaling a project. Because $I$ think that's a means to deal with the fact that if a property or a
business can't provide all of parking that's necessary, maybe they have to scale that back a little bit so that they can. In other words, they want to fill the entire lot with what they want to build, well maybe you can't. Maybe have you to take 40 percent of that for parking or something like that. I'm not saying that has to be the absolute law, but $I$ think that has to be incorporated in this.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:

You know, these buildings last 50 or 100 years. I mean hopefully a business that comes in will last 50 or 100 years. The fact that in 2022 somebody writes us a check for $\$ 100,000$ or $\$ 50,000$, whatever it is, is really insignificant to what the impacts of these building -- of development over the life of the project. So I just want to mention that it's part of a planning process, not just all or nothing.

| 1 | 134 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 |  |
| 3 | No, I agree with that and people that |
| 4 | have some of the buildings that they |
| 5 | own downtown. I mean they've worked in |
| 6 | those buildings, had them for 30 or 40 |
| 7 | years, have had a business and |
| 8 | everything else. I'd hate to deter |
| 9 | them being able to sell their building |
| 10 | to be able to retire and do what they |
| 11 | want to do going forward in life after |
| 12 | working in a place for 35 years when |
| 13 | they can't sell it because nobody can |
| 14 | do anything with it, and then that |
| 15 | takes away the market value of what |
| 16 | they plan on requiring with. |
| 17 | So they have a mechanism |
| 18 | where somebody can buy it and still do |
| 19 | something else with the property. They |
| 20 | realize their life's dream of being in |
| 21 | business for 35,40 years. Now I want |
| 22 | to get out; I want to sell it; I want |
| 23 | to be able to retire. I don't want to |
| 24 | say, well, nobody's going to be able to |
| 25 | do anything with your building, you're |

stuck with it and they would not be able to do that. That's the American dream, you buy something, you build it, you sell it, you retire.

So I just want to keep
that option open as we're going through this to not deter somebody from losing value of their lifelong investment and what they've done and better Greenport by being in business and having a store here. I know a couple people now that are planning on retiring downtown and $I$ wish them well and $I$ hope somebody buys their business and they get the market value of 40 years of investment from it and $I$ want to us to encourage that.

And for the new generation that's taking over for them so in the next 40 years, they can do the same. TRUSTEE CLARKE: I totally
agree. I totally agree. So in
striking 150-12C, you know, that's very
easy. Joe is talking about replacing
it here with this wording. Our
discussion was that we actually not replace it at all, but use the 150-16 as the authority in parking and that is where the Planning Board has commented and 150-16G is where we talk about payment in lieu of. So, yes, it's very easy to just do that one thing and grandfathering is gone, but $I$ don't think it's going to do everything that I was looking for. I think that I would like to look at 150-16 as well. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay
and that was the payment in lieu?
TRUSTEE CLARKE: The definition
of the payment in lieu with the specific intensification percentages, specific payments, specific recommendations on what can be waived by the Planning Board and not. There was specific amendments that we put forward for 150-16 that $I$ think that it would be, yes, a separate code change, but I think it's in the same scope of the conversation.




| 1 | 140 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | clerk. My question is, is that |
| 3 | Overriding zoning? |
| 4 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 5 | So I think what. |
| 6 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Is that |
| 7 | over riding a zoning appeal? |
| 8 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 9 | It's not overriding it. It's |
| 10 | eliminating it basically. So what |
| 11 | should happen is there should be a |
| 12 | decision from the Planning Board. |
| 13 | There should be a decision from the |
| 14 | Planning Board and then the appeal of |
| 15 | that should go to the trustees, not the ZBA. |
| 16 | TRUSTEE ROBINS: Really? |
| 17 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 18 | Yes, from 12G. |
| 19 | TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay, |
| 20 | I'm just... Sorry, Mayor, I just was |
| 21 | reading that as we were discussing it |
| 22 | and I wanted to make that a known to |
| 23 | everybody. |
| 24 | VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP: |
| 25 | I've discussed that with Mr. Connolly. |



we have everything together and we have consensus of it all, then we'll be able to do that in a shorter amount of time at the work session and pick on other parts of it as we move forward trying to get this all rectified and taken care of.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: As I
said, $I$ found this important to move along on things and $I$ think we've accomplished a lot and $I$ just want to say thank you.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
Any other discussion?
TRUSTEE CLARKE: I would
like to, you know, see us move into the revocation of permitted conditional and not permitted uses within our zoning classifications as soon as we can as we move this along. I have to say, it's related.

One of my thoughts in
terms of your question of whether we want to pursue a moratorium or not, I
think, depends on our ability to
realistically calendarize and achieve the work flow with the resources that we have that we view is necessary to protect us at this time and update the code. So what we put forward in the work session has many other pieces and to pursue those pieces, is that something that we can do on a scale of three to six months or is this something that is going to take us into a number of years?

So I think that therein
lies the appetite for moratorium or
not. I think that unless we, the
trustees, feel secure that enough resource and action is put forward to the points that we've brought forward in a timely basis and unless our feet are held to the fire to provide the information and consensus that's required, which is a stipulation that you've made to us, that we may need to resort to the moratorium. But if we
can wisely calendarize and plan the
activities to change the code to
protect what we're looking to protect
as we've done tonight, perhaps the
appetite for a moratorium would decrease.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.
The procedure for moratorium is going to take you a minimum of four months to get it through, to get it passed. If we can just be diligent on what we're doing here and get this stuff -- have the Village Administrator and Village Attorney put something out there that we can vote on, hopefully it's a
consensus that everybody will agree on and we can vote on it. To have a public hearing and vote it into place, it's going to be faster than trying to do the moratorium.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: As I
said before, if the word moratorium got us to this point, that's fine. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.:

Originally you had set a date of

December 31 st. By the time you write the law, have a public hearing, send it to Suffolk County Planning for approval and everything else and get it back, you're talking probably four months, four to six months before you get it back. And you've only got four months before you have the deadiine of the moratorium.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: It was only a suggested date. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: I think if we get this stuff done, as long as we can come to a consensus and vote on this stuff and get it passed. Have a public hearing, get it to the Planning Board, because it's Chapter 150, they review it, come back with stuff that's workable for everybody. Then we vote on it, we could do this stuff all before the end of the year and have this all done, all this code change, everything we talked about this evening.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Okay.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: We
got to just stay focused on the overall goal and keep everybody centered on exactly what we want to try to accomplish.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: What I
would like to do is I would like to offer, and Trustee Robins has some expertise in some areas Trustee Clarke has some in others and $I$ have some, that if we could help the Village Administrator and the Village Attorney with any research or any follow-up or any help with anything, I would be more than willing to take the time to do that. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: I
think that would helpful for all of
you. You can schedule an hour on a
Wednesday to come in and meet with Paul and Joe, sit down, you know, just one-on-one with them, look at the zoning map, look at what they're proposing, give them ideas and look at it before we get as a whole big group
here going in different directions.
So if you each could take
an hour and just sit down with them.
You can't do it altogether, but you can
sit there and just voice your opinions
and everything there, look at it, well
I'm not comfortable with this, what
about that, and just discuss it with
them. I mean, I do this almost daily
with them because we're talking all the
time, but I'm just one. And you can
say what about this, how do you want
this to read, where do you want this to
go when it's with respect to the law.
So I'm constantly communicating with them.
But if you sat down, when
Joe says $I$ got the draft, you get the draft. All right, Joe, $I$ want to sit down with you for 45 minutes on Tuesday morning, you know? My favorite time is a quarter to eight in the morning before I go to work. So I meet with all of them very early in the morning before everybody gets going, so I don't
get interrupted while I'm at work. But you all could do the same thing before everything gets hectic and crazy. I do it before Village Hall even opens. A half hour, 45 minutes is very helpful, one-on-one with direct questions. Here's the thing, boom, Joe, what about this, this, and this, you go down it and you're done and it's very helpful. TRUSTEE CLARKE: Is

Wednesday the preferential day or is that just -MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : No.

That's just a day. I use whatever day. TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: I do
have to say though that, I mean, I do communicate with Paul and Joe. They get texts from me and it's very helpful to talk to them one on one, but $I$ also know that sometimes we need to have the documents before us and that's where I'm concerned that that's where it might get held up. The both of them do have a lot to do, so that's why I'm


MAYOR HUBBARD, JR. : We're all busy. We all have lives also and other things to do, but, you know, when it's all written, read it, questions on it, and then try to move it forward, discuss it with them ahead of time so that we don't have a whole thing at the table to vote on something until we're ready to go. When we come in, we got the law, we know what it is, any little questions you had that we could have ask them beforehand, ask them beforehand so we're ready to go.

TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: As I
said, that's why I am offering to help with that process.

MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: They
all appreciate it.
VILLAGE ATTORNEY PROKOP:
Probably the most important thing is, I appreciate the Village office bringing the stenographer here tonight. If we can ask Rebecca to please get us the transcript right away because that's
the most important thing. When I do
these things, I go back to the
transcript to see what each of you said
so I make sure that $I$ get exactly that and exactly what you wanted and if you could do that, it would be really
appreciated. So an expedite. That's what you call an expedite, please. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Okay.

Everybody done?
(No response.)
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: All
right, I'll hear a motion to adjourn
the meeting 9:19.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Second. MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: All
in favor?
TRUSTEE CLARKE: Aye.
TRUSTEE MARTILOTTA: Aye.
TRUSTEE PHILLIPS: Aye.
TRUSTEE ROBINS: Aye.
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Opposed?
(No response.)
MAYOR HUBBARD, JR.: Motion
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