BOARD OF TOWN TRUSTEES
TOWN OF SOUTHOLD

Minutes

Wednesday, May 19, 2021

5:30 PM

Present Were: Glenn Goldsmith, President
Michael J. Domino, Trustee
John M. Bredemeyer, Trustee
A. Nicholas Krupski, Trustee
Greg Williams, Trustee
Elizabeth Cantrell, Senior Clerk Typist
Damon Hagan, Assistant Town Attorney

CALL MEETING TO ORDER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Good evening, and welcome to our Wednesday,
May 19th, 2021, meeting. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order
and ask that you please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: We’ll start off the meeting by announcing the
people on the dais. To my left we have Trustee Domino and Trustee
Bredemeyer. To my far right we have Trustee Krupski and Trustee
Williams. To my immediate right we have Assistant Town Attorney
Damon Hagan. In the back right is Senior Clerk Typist Elizabeth
Cantrell. We have court stenographer Wayne Galante. And from
the Conservation Advisory Council on Zoom we have Carol Brown.
Agendas for tonight’s meeting are posted on the Town’s website.
We have a number of postponements tonight in the agenda.
The postponements are listed as follows:
On page 15 we have number 10, Costello Marine Contracting
Corp. on behalf of STUART THORN requests a Wetland Permit and a
Coastal Erosion Permit to construct a 4’ wide walkway leading
from bluff stairs to new stairway leading to beach; construct
new 3’x5’x10” stairway from bulkhead to beach in-kind and
in-place of previously existing stairway; allow ordinary
maintenance and repairs to existing upper 6’x8’ platform, 3’x16’
staircase, middle 10’x16’ platform, 3’x5’ staircase, 3’x4’
middle platform, 3’x8’ staircase, 3’x4’ lower platform, and
3'x10' staircase as needed to reconstruct retaining walls; remove and dispose of the existing retaining walls and construct eight (8) new retaining walls, in-kind/in-place consisting of retaining wall #1 is 24' long; retaining wall #2 is 12' long with 8' east and 8' west returns; retaining wall #3 is approximately ±30' long; retaining wall #4 is approximately ±40' long; retaining wall #5, #6 & #7 are all 40' long with 5' west returns; retaining wall #8 is 40' long; and to install ±114 ton of 1-3 ton rock armoring along the seaward side of existing west bulkhead section.

Located: 19375 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-1-20.1

On page 21, we have numbers 24 through 27:

Number 24, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of GARY D. DOROSKI requests a Wetland Permit for the as-built retaining wall 13.7'x35.7'x13.3' with steps to grade to capture stormwater causing erosion; install 3 new drywells landward of retaining wall; install hay bales and silt fencing during construction; plant various vegetation/trees; and to establish and perpetually maintain a 10' wide non-turf, non-fertilization buffer along the landward edge of wetlands.

Located: 425 Monsell Lane, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-97-8-27

Number 25, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of JJS EDGEWATER LLC, c/o SCOTT EDGETT requests a Wetland Permit to remove and replace existing 89 linear foot long and 60 linear foot long jettys in same location with new vinyl jetty's; and new jetty's to be no higher than 18" above existing sand elevation.

Located: 610 Park Avenue Extension, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-123-8-28.6

Number 26, Michael Kimack on behalf of MARIA H. PILE requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 36.0'x34.7' (1,249.2 sq. ft.) two-story dwelling on foundation in accordance with FEMA standards for a AE zone; and a pervious driveway.

Located: 420 Lake Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-59-1-21.2

Number 27, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of GARY MANGUS & MIRIAM MEYERS requests a Wetland Permit to install a 6'x20' floating dock accessed by a 3'x20' ramp with railing built directly off existing bulkhead; ramp and dock deck are to be “ThruFlow” or equal to allow light penetration; install electric to the dock; dredge 25-27 cubic yards of silt to provide 30” minimum to marine bottom for float and boat; angle of repose from proposed marine bottom to existing marine bottom to be 3:1 min.; and spoil to be deposited and contained inside bulkhead for dewatering.

Located: 1295 Island View Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-57-2-16

And on page 22 we have numbers 28 through 30.

Number 28, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of WILLIAM F. GRELLA & GARY OSBORNE requests a Wetland Permit to construct a proposed 110' long by 4' wide fixed dock with un-treated decking and removal and replacement of existing timber jetty’s with new vinyl in same location as existing (one 36 linear feet, one 37 linear feet, and one 49 linear feet in length).

Located: 1200 First Street, New Suffolk. SCTM# 1000-117-7-30

Number 29, DANIELLA C. RAVN & STEPHEN E. RAVN requests a
Wetland Permit to construct a 40'x20' in-ground swimming pool with a pool drywell; proposed 63'x30' surrounding pool patio; proposed 20'x14' cabana with outdoor shower; 73'x40' pool enclosure fencing; a proposed 50'x40' garden area enclosed by 8' high deer fencing; and proposed 3' high, 1-rail board fence will be located along the property lines adjacent to neighbor’s property. Located: 625 Wells Road, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-75-6-3.3

And number 30, Costello Marine Contracting Corp. On behalf of JOSEPH & CAROLYN FERRARA requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 3'x36' fixed dock.

Located: 185 Osprey Nest Road, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-35-7-1

Under Town Code Chapter 275-8(c), files were officially closed seven days ago. Submission any of paperwork after that date may result in a delay of processing of the application.

I. NEXT FIELD INSPECTION:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: At this time I'll make a motion to have our next field inspection on Wednesday, June 8th, 2021, at 8:00 AM.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

II. NEXT TRUSTEE MEETING:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I'll make a motion to hold our next Trustee meeting on Wednesday, June 16th, 2021, at 5:30 PM, via Zoom online platform.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

III. WORK SESSIONS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I'll make a motion to hold our next work session, Monday, June 14th, 2021, at 5:00 PM via Zoom online platform and on Wednesday, June 16th, 2021, at 5:00 PM, via Zoom.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

IV. MINUTES:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve the Minutes of our April 14th, 2021, meeting.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

V. MONTHLY REPORT:
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The Trustees monthly report for April 2021. A check for $12,932.42 was forwarded to the Supervisor’s Office for the General Fund.

VI. PUBLIC NOTICES:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Public Notices are posted on the Town Clerk’s Bulletin Board for review.

VII. RESOLUTIONS - OTHER:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral VII, Resolutions - Other, I make a motion to approve as a group numbers one, two, three, four, five and six. They are listed as follows:

Number 1, RESOLVED, the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, hereby declare itself Lead Agency in regards to the application of JORDAN ARNOLD. Located: 70 Wiggins Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-35-4-28.43

Number 2, RESOLVED, the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, hereby declare itself Lead Agency in regards to the application of KENNETH & JOANN ZAHLER. Located: 63735 Route 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-20.2

Number 3, RESOLVED, the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, hereby declare itself Lead Agency in regards to the application of AF STERN 1997 TRUST, c/o JOLYON STERN, TRUSTEE. Located: 63165 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-14

Number 4, RESOLVED, the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, hereby declare itself Lead Agency in regards to the application of JOLYON STERN. Located: 63035 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-13

Number 5, RESOLVED, the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, hereby declare itself Lead Agency in regards to the application of JAMES WILLSE & SHARON STACK WILLSE. Located: 1665 Mill Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-6-31.4

Number 6, RESOLVED, the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act, hereby declare itself Lead Agency in regards to the application of ELIZABETH CALLANDER. Located: 12244 East Main Road, Fishers Island. SCTM# 1000-3-2-6

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor? (ALL AYES).

VIII. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEWS

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral VIII, State Environmental
Quality Reviews, **RESOLVED** that the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold hereby finds that the following applications more fully described in Section XV Public Hearings Section of the Trustee agenda dated Wednesday, May 19, 2021 are classified as Type II Actions pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations, and are not subject to further review under SEQRA:

Marybeth Sciscente  SCTM# 1000-80-3-16  
Christopher Masotto  SCTM# 1000-44-1-17  
Town of Southold Fishers Island Airport  SCTM# 1000-12-1-18  
Marilyn Rosenberg  SCTM# 1000-10-3-13  
Port of Egypt Enterprise  SCTM# 1000-56-6-6.1  
The Carmela Lazio Revocable Trust, Carmela Lazio as Trustee  SCTM# 1000-56-7-21  
Danyao Danielle Chang  SCTM# 1000-14-2-3.5  
Strong's West Mill, LLC  SCTM# 1000-106-6-13.4  
Molly Harris  SCTM# 1000-66-2-12  
William A. Macomber & Jessica Sidlauskas  SCTM# 1000-115-17-4  
Geoffroy Penny  SCTM# 1000-104-7-2  
David Westermann, Jr.  SCTM# 1000-116-6-2  
David Eckert  SCTM# 1000-78-7-14  
RDEN Associates, LLC  SCTM# 1000-80-3-13  
James & Kathie Capozzi  SCTM# 1000-35-4-12  
Danny Fisher, Barbara Kent, Jack Fisher & Diana Sedenquist  SCTM# 1000-118-1-4.1  
Salvatore & Leslie Panico  SCTM# 1000-78-1-10.11

**TRUSTEE KRUPSKI:** Second.  
**TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH:** All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

**TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH:** **RESOLVED** that the Board of Trustees of the Town of Southold hereby finds that the following applications more fully described in Section XV Public Hearings Section of the Trustee agenda dated Wednesday, May 19th, 2021, are classified as Unlisted Actions pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations:

Jolyon Stern  SCTM# 1000-40-1-13  
AF Stern 1997 Trust, c/o Jolyon Stern, Trustee  SCTM# 1000-40-1-14  
Kenneth & Joann Zahler  SCTM# 1000-40-1-20.2  
Elizabeth Callander  SCTM# 1000-3-2-6  
Jordan Arnold  SCTM# 1000-35-4-28.43  
James Willse & Sharon Stack Willse  SCTM# 1000-51-6-31.4

**TRUSTEE KRUPSKI:** Second.  
**TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH:** All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

**IX. ENVIRONMENTAL DECLARATION OF SIGNIFICANCE PURSUANT TO NEW YORK STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT NYCCR PART 617:**
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral IX, Environmental Declaration of Significance, number 1:
DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: JORDAN ARNOLD requests a Wetland Permit to install a 4'x6' cantilevered platform with hardwood decking off bulkhead; install a 3'x14' aluminum ramp/gangway; install a 6'x20' floating dock held in place by two (2) 10" diameter pilings; floating dock decking to be hardwood to match platform.
Located: 70 Wiggins Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-35-4-28.43

S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:

WHEREAS, the Southold Town Board of Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on May 12, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by Roderick Van Tuyl, P.C. dated March 28, 1980, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Ian Crowley dated March 27, 2021 at the Trustee's May 17, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action under S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Ian Crowley dated March 27, 2021 it has been determined by the Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:

- Scope: The proposed dock is comparable to docks on neighboring properties in an area where docks historically are used for commercial and recreational purposes.
- Scope in relation to the riparian rights of shell fishers: The plan allows a cantilevered platform to float design that will not impede access for those seeking shellfish and crustacea in season.
- Environmental upkeep: The dock design projects a usual lifespan of 30 years with limited pile replacement so as to minimize disturbance of the bottom.

THEREFORE, according to the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees Approve and Authorize the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project.
So moved.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 2, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Jeffrey Patanjio on behalf of KENNETH & JOANN ZAHLER requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to install 155 linear feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff, install 25 cubic yards of clean sand fill and Cape American beach grass.
Located: 63735 Route 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-20.2

S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:

WHEREAS, the Southold Town Board of Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on May 12, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by
Nathan Taft Corwin III Land Surveyor dated September 5, 2013, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Jeffrey Patanjio dated March 7, 2021 at the Trustee’s May 17, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action under S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Jeffrey Patanjio dated March 7, 2021 it has been determined by the Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:
- Vegetative, non-structural measures are not capable of stabilizing the erosion of the bluff alone.
- Protection of the toe of bluff using hardened structures including rock revetment is necessary.
- No existing rocks or boulders are to be utilized, moved, or relocated on the beach.
- As time progresses, continued soil loss at the toe of the bluff may lead to habitat degradation and bluff instability.
- A site inspection by the Southold Town Board of Trustees recognized erosion on this property and the need for a bluff stabilization/erosion control plan.

THEREFORE, according to the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees Approve and Authorize the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project.
So moved.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 3, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Jeffrey Patanjio on behalf of AF STERN 1997 TRUST, c/o JOLYON STERN,
TRUSTEE requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to install 167 linear feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff; install 25 cubic yards of clean sand fill and Cape American beach grass.
Located: 63165 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-14

S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:

WHEREAS, the Southold Town Board of Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on May 12, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by Nathan Taft Corwin III Land Surveyor dated May 17, 2004, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Jeffrey Patanjio dated February 1, 2021 at the Trustee’s May 17, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action under S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Jeffrey Patanjio dated February 1, 2021 it has been determined by the Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:
- Vegetative, non-structural measures are not capable of stabilizing the erosion of
the bluff alone.
· Protection of the toe of bluff using hardened structures including rock revetment is necessary.
· No existing rocks or boulders are to be utilized, moved, or relocated on the beach.
· As time progresses, continued soil loss at the toe of the bluff may lead to habitat degradation and bluff instability.
· A site inspection by the Southold Town Board of Trustees recognized erosion on this property and the need for a bluff stabilization/erosion control plan.

THEREFORE, according to the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees approve and authorize the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 4, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of JOLYON STERN requests a Wetland Permit and Coastal Erosion Permit to install 80 linear feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff; install 25 cubic yards of clean sand fill and Cape American beach grass.
Located: 63035 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-13

S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:

WHEREAS, the Southold Town Board of Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on May 12, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by John Gerd Heidecker dated January 12, 2021, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Jeffrey Patanjo dated February 2, 2021 at the Trustee's May 17, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action under S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Jeffrey Patanjo dated February 2, 2021 it has been determined by the Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:
· Vegetative, non-structural measures are not capable of stabilizing the erosion of the bluff alone.
· Protection of the toe of bluff using hardened structures including rock revetment is necessary.
· No existing rocks or boulders are to be utilized, moved, or relocated on the beach.
· As time progresses, continued soil loss at the toe of the bluff may lead to habitat degradation and bluff instability.
· A site inspection by the Southold Town Board of Trustees recognized erosion on this property and the need for a bluff stabilization/erosion control plan.

THEREFORE, according to the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees approve and authorize the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 5, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of JAMES WILLSE & SHARON STACK WILLSE requests a Wetland Permit for the installation of 266 lineal feet of rip-rap shoreline stabilization along existing eroded bank; rip-rap to consist of 1-2 ton sizes placed in a single row with filter fabric behind them and to prevent erosion between joints.
Located: 1665 Mill Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-6-31.4

S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:

WHEREAS, the Southold Town Board of Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on April 7, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by John C. Ehlers Land Surveyor dated January 23, 2012, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Jeffrey Patanjo dated April 26, 2021 at the Trustee's May 17, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action under S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Jeffrey Patanjo dated April 26, 2021 it has been determined by the Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:
• A site inspection by the Southold Town Board of Trustees recognized erosion on this property and the need for a bank stabilization/erosion control plan.
• As time progresses, continued soil loss at the toe of the bank may lead to habitat degradation and bank instability.
• Protection of the toe of bank using natural, temporary structures including coir logs is necessary.
• Vegetative, non-structural measures are not capable of stabilizing the erosion of the bluff alone.

THEREFORE, according to the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees Approve and Authorize the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 6, Docko, Inc., on behalf of ELIZABETH CALLANDER requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to construct ±105 linear feet of 4’ wide wood pile and timber pier of which ±65 linear feet is waterward of the apparent/spring high water line, including five associated ladders, rails, electric and water utilities; construct a ±9’ x ±10’ (90 sq. ft.) wide boulder mounded wood platform/dock with a 4’ wide x ±7 linear foot long access walkway with rails and three new tie-off piles, waterward of the apparent high water line.
Located: 12244 East Main Road, Fishers Island. SCTM# 1000-3-2-6
S.E.Q.R.A. NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE:

WHEREAS, the Southold Town Board of Trustees are familiar with this project having visited the site on May 10, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by James Bernardo Land Surveying, LLC dated February 9, 2021, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Docko, Inc. Dated December 12, 2018 at the Trustee’s May 17, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021, the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on May 19, 2021, the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action under S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Docko, Inc. Dated December 12, 2018, it has been determined by the Board of Trustees that all potentially significant environmental concerns have been addressed as noted herein:

- Navigation: The proposed dock meets standards and does not extend beyond 1/3 across the water body. Depths for the dock terminus are within Town Trustees, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and United States Army Corps. Of Engineers guidelines and there is no recognized Federal/New York State/Town navigation channel in the immediate vicinity of the proposed structure.
- Scope: The proposed dock is comparable to docks on neighboring properties in an area where docks historically are used for commercial and recreational purposes.
- Scope in relation to the riparian rights of shell fishers: The plan allows a standard fixed dock design that will not impede access for those seeking shellfish and crustacea in season.
- Scope in relation to view shed: The seaward end of the proposed dock will not extend appreciably beyond existing docks. As such the perspective will not be discernibly different from the existing view.
- Environmental upkeep: The dock design projects a usual lifespan of 30 years with limited pile replacement so as to minimize disturbance of the bottom.

THEREFORE, according to the foregoing, the Southold Town Board of Trustees Approve and Authorize the preparation of a Notice of Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA for the aforementioned project.
So moved.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

X. RESOLUTIONS - ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral X, Resolutions – Administrative Permits.

I’ll make a motion to approve number 1, Elizabeth Thompson Architect on behalf of JOSEPH & BARBARA ORLANDO requests an Administrative Permit to construct a 8’6”x26’ one-story addition connecting existing house to existing garage.
Located: 900 Goose Creek Lane, Southold. SCTM# 1000-78-8-2
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 2, Suffolk Environmental Consulting,
Inc., on behalf of R&B VANDERBEEK IRREVOCABLE TRUST requests an
Administrative Permit for the as-built 251.11' deck located
along the westerly side of the existing dwelling.
Located: 1150 Ruch Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-52-2-35
The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency
is the as-built deck was constructed without a Wetlands permit.
I make a motion to approve this application as submitted
whereby granting the permit will bring it into consistency with the LWRP.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

XI. APPLICATIONS FOR EXTENSIONS TRANSFERS ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral XI, in order to simplify
our meetings, the Board of Trustees regularly groups together
actions that are minor or similar in nature. Accordingly, I
make a motion to approve as a group items 1 through 12. They
are listed as follows:

Number 1, En-Consultants on behalf of ALEXANDER PERROS requests a One
(1) Year Extension to Wetland Permit #9478 and Coastal Erosion Permit #9476C,
issued on June 19, 2019 and Amended on November 13, 2019.
Located: 19215 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-1-18

Number 2, 1050 WEST COVE ROAD LLC requests a One (1) Year Extension to
Wetland Permit #9501, as issued on July 17, 2019 and amended on September 18,
2019.
Located: 1050 West Cove Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-111-5-1

Number 3, Michael Kimack on behalf of 1505 BIRDSEYE ROAD, LLC requests a
One (1) Year Extension to Wetland Permit #9455, as issued on May 15, 2019.
Located: 1505 Birdseye Road, Orient. SCTM# 1000-17-1-4

Number 4, DOUGLAS & LESLIE HIRSCH request a Transfer of Wetland Permit
#5932 from Geert Martens & Ray Murray to Douglas & Leslie Hirsch, as issued on May
Located: 5028 New Suffolk Avenue, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-10-2

Number 5, DOUGLAS & LESLIE HIRSCH request a Transfer of Wetland Permit
#9445A from Geert Martens & Thomas Murray to Douglas & Leslie Hirsch, as issued on
May 15, 2019.
Located: 5028 New Suffolk Avenue, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-10-2

Number 6, DOUGLAS & LESLIE HIRSCH request a Transfer of Wetland Permit
#5101 from Geert Martens & Thomas R. Murray to Douglas & Leslie Hirsch, as issued on
Located: 5028 New Suffolk Avenue, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-10-2

Number 7, LAGOON LODGE LLC requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #3792
from Grant H. Lennox to Lagoon Lodge, LLC, as issued on January 26, 1990.
Located: 270 Knoll Circle, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-37-5-14

Number 8, David Bergen on behalf of JAMES & PAMELA LUBIN requests a
Transfer of Wetland Permit #1527 from Ralph Condit to James & Pamela Lubin, as
issued on March 30, 1982.
Located: 2765 Wells Avenue, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-86-2-2

   Number 9, RICHARD & STEPHANIE PERL request a Transfer of Wetland Permit #7312 from Peter & Stephanie Cosola to Richard & Stephanie Perl, as issued on May 19, 2010, and amended on September 22, 2010.
   Located: 2880 Minnehaha Blvd., Southold. SCTM# 1000-87-3-43

   Number 10, PETER & STEPHANIE COSOLA request an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #7312 for the as-built 14’x18’6” on-grade paver patio and 3’10”x9’6” outdoor shower on south side of dwelling.
   Located: 2880 Minnehaha Blvd., Southold. SCTM# 1000-87-3-43

   Number 11, Tom Samuels, RA on behalf of JUSTIN & ELIZABETH MIRRO requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9373 for the 12’x5’ uncovered outdoor shower with 6’ high walls with drainage to nearby drywell; reduce pool terrace by 196 sq. ft. at south end of pool, relocate fireplace unit closer to edge of swimming pool; 30’x12’ timber retaining wall.
   Located: 2455 Nassau Point Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-104-13-6

   Number 12, Kristen Frohnhoefer on behalf of the YENNECOTT PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION requests an Amendment to Administrative Permit #8742A for the as-built felling of trees; revegetate the approximate 500 sq. ft. disturbed area by planting 15 trees using native species (red maple, spruce or pine, black tupelo, pagoda/flowering dogwood, eastern red cedar and gray birch); in order to control briar and poison ivy growth lay woodchips under the newly planted trees; ground disturbance will be limited by digging holes for the new trees between the remaining stumps and roots, and only grind any stump or root if necessary to be done to allow for tree planting.
   Located: 1335 Yenncott Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-55-4-25.4

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

XIV. MOORINGS/STAKE & PULLEY SYSTEMS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral XIV, Moorings/Stake & Pulley systems. In order to simplify our meeting, I'll make a motion to approve as a group Items 1 and 2. They are listed as follows:

   Number 1, KRISTOPHER DIMON requests a Stake and Pulley System Permit in Goose Creek for an 18’ outboard motorboat, replacing Stake GL#114. Access: Public

   Number 2, ANDREAS PFANNER requests a Mooring Permit for a mooring in Gull Pond for a 17’ outboard motorboat, replacing Mooring #25. Access: Private

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number three, CHRISTINE DANISI requests a Mooring Permit for a mooring in Little Creek for a 16’ Dorey row boat, replacing Mooring #317. Access: Public.

   After inspections, this part of the creek is very tight as is, so moorings are in different locations. In this particular mooring, where it's proposed, will present a hazard to navigation. Therefore I make a motion to deny this application.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

XV. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral XV, Public Hearings.
At this time I'll make a motion to go off our regular meeting agenda and enter into public hearings.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: This is a public hearing in the matter of the following applications for permits under the Wetlands ordinance of the Town of Southold. I have an affidavit of publication from the Suffolk Times. Pertinent correspondence may be read prior to asking for comments from the public.
Please keep your comments organized and brief, five minutes or less if possible.

AMENDMENTS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Amendments, number 1, AMP Architecture on behalf of MARYBETH SCISCENTE requests an Amendment to Wetland Permit #9823 for the existing 1,801 sq. ft., 1 ½ story dwelling; construct a new 10'x15' above ground pool with new 528 sq. ft. raised patio using impervious pavers around pool with steps to ground; install 48" high pool enclosure fencing around edges of raised patio and a self-closing gate with alarm at base of steps; relocate existing 4'x4.8' outdoor shower approximately 30' landward; install an on-grade 790 sq. ft. masonry patio using pervious pavers; and abandon existing sanitary system in rear yard and install new septic system in front yard.
Located: 405 Lake Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-80-3-16.
The LWRP found this to be consistent.
The Conservation Advisory Council reviewed the amended application and recommends an IA septic system.
The Trustees conducted a field inspection on May 12th, noting it was straightforward. We do have a prior approval from this Board back in February, so it's a slight amendment to what was previously approved.
Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have someone by the name of Jean on the line wishing to speak. Jean, if you want to un-mute yourself speak to the Board.
JEAN: Yes. Thank you. I am the property owner right next to the Sciscente's on 475, and as I brought up in the last application meeting, I have once again not received the notification which is supposed to be sent out. It seems that they once again sent
the notification to my Florida address. We have been here sheltering all winter, in fact the Sciscente’s know and are fully aware of, and yet again they have chosen to send the paperwork somewhere else. And I will not be receiving it at least for another week.

Second, the new patio which is being put on the side of the house comes within, it appears two feet of the property line, which is going to be infringing on my privacy and my family’s privacy here. You know, also there is no flags were put on the property to show where this new patio is being built and how close it comes to the property line. Earlier we also discussed and the Sciscente’s said there will be some type of privacy landscaping put in, but now since there is only a foot or two from the fencing to the property line, I do question that. And also why wasn’t the patio put in the, if you are getting an environmental new permit, why isn’t the patio located in front of the new deck instead of on the side, which is basically right in front of my deck. And it just seems ridiculous. So I guess that’s all.

I still do not in any way feel this is appropriate. And it’s going to change the whole feeling of the neighborhood and the area. Thank you.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you. Is there anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?
(Negative response).
Any other questions or comments from the Board?
(No response).
Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

WETLAND & COASTAL EROSION PERMITS:

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 1 under Wetland & Coastal Erosion Permits, Michael Kimack on behalf of LONG ISLAND ONE REAL ESTATE, INC. requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit for the existing 36.3’x24.3’ (882.09 sq. ft.) one story dwelling on concrete piers; 138.5 sq. ft. easterly wood deck with 11.4 sq. ft. staircase; 196.83 sq. ft. westerly wood deck with 6 sq. ft. and 16 sq. ft. staircases; a 55.5 sq. ft. wood walkway; and for the as-built non-structural wood skirt (36’ in length by 5’ in height: 180 sq. ft.) with drain cutouts at bottom of skirt every four feet to cover cement pilings on seaward side of dwelling.
Located: 58315 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-44-2-12
The Trustees most recently visited the property on the 12th
of May and noted that we will review further plans in work session.

Prior to that, the Trustees had visited this property for what was essentially a small modification of the structure but noted the entire structure did not have a permit. However after some research it was noted the structure had been there and predated the Trustees.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent for that exact reason. The as-built structures were constructed without a Wetland and Coastal Erosion Hazard permit due to how long ago they were constructed.

And Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support the application.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding the application?
(Negative response).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Okay, any further comment from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing no further comments, I make a motion to close the hearing on the application.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve this application thereby bringing it into consistency with the LWRP coordinator.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The next application under Wetland & Coastal Erosion Permits, number 2, Arch MW LLC on behalf of CHRISTOPHER MASOTTO requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit for the existing two-story dwelling with a 36’x22’ footprint; new 5-1/4” Hardi cement siding with the visual of authentic clapboard is being installed replacing existing; replace all windows in-place except for a double window in kitchen at front which is being changed to two (2) single windows; install architectural shingles; replace breakaway walls in same location as existing using a Hardi Backer with a CMU interior core; and existing double doors in breakaway wall to be replace with same solid doors.
Located: 55915 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-44-1-17

The Trustees inspected the property on May 12th, noting that this is a permitted and pre-existing home which has a prior approved wetland permitted bulkhead.

The LWRP coordinator indicated that this pre-existing home does not have permits under Coastal Erosion and Wetland due to the age of the structure.

MS. CANTRELL: Excuse me, Jay, can you have the microphone – TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Okay, I'll repeat that. The LWRP coordinator indicates that this pre-existing home did not have permits under the Coastal Erosion and Wetland permit.

The Southold Town Conservation Advisory Council did inspect
the property but was not able to offer their comment due to lack of quorum at their meeting.

The Board comments were that it was pre-existing and it was straightforward.

Is there anyone who wishes to speak on behalf of this application?
(Negative response).
Are there any comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Not seeing any, does anyone wish to speak or are there any comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 3, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of JOLYON STERN requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to install 80 linear feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff, install 25 cubic yards of clean sand fill and Cape American beach grass. Located: 63035 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-13

The Trustees did a field inspection on May 12th. The notes indicate that it was straightforward. That the bluff vegetation should not be disturbed. That access be by barge only, and no bluff cuts.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council did not inspect the property, did not have a quorum so therefore did not take a vote. Recommends retractable steps and boulders to be brought in by barge.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: Jeff Patanjo is here. Jeff, if you would like to un-mute yourself.

MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjo, on behalf of the applicant. I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Can we clarify that there will not be a bluff cut and access will be by barge only?

MR. PATANJO: Absolutely. There will be no bluff cut. Any of the existing vegetation that is in place will remain untouched, unaffected. And access will be by barge, or as we have done by other applications, I don’t want to limit specific contractors that the applicant can utilize for the project. We want the ability to also no tree clearing on the top of the bluff but we’ll allow the use of a crane with no disruption to the bluff or no tree clearing on the top of the bluff.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I would ask my fellow Trustees to comment on
that.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I think that's fair, as long as there is no disturbance to the bluff.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: If it is so stipulated.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Additionally, I would like to point out that the LWRP coordinator requested no rocks naturally occurring on the beach be used in the project.

Secondly, that the, to limit the actions to the scale necessary.

Is that agreeable to you and the client?


TRUSTEE DOMINO: Any other questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Anyone else wish to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

MS. CANTRELL: Nobody is raising their hand.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Hearing none, I'll make a motion to close the hearing.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I'll make a motion to approve the application as submitted.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 4, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of AF STERN 1997 TRUST, clo JOLYON STERN, TRUSTEE requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to install 167 linear feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff; install 25 cubic yards of clean sand fill and Cape American beach grass.

Located: 63165 County Road 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-14

Point of clarification, there is a Wetland and Coastal Erosion permit. The Trustees visited the site on 5/12/2021, all Trustees present.

Field notes straightforward. Bluff vegetation is not to be disturbed.

Access by barge only, no bluff cut.

The LWRP coordinator found this action to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council did inspect the property.

They were not able to vote as they did not have a quorum.

Recommended retractable hinged steps and boulders be brought in by barge only.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Jeffrey Patanjo present.

MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjo, on behalf of the applicant. Thank you, Elizabeth. I understand the application is straightforward. It’s a similar application to the others that we have along the shoreline there and others that have been previously approved by this Board.

One of the items that needs to have to be brought to light is the existing stairs. It was added on just recently and/or a miscommunication between myself and the contractor and client, but we do want to modify the application to include the
replacement of the stairs as mentioned by the Trustees just now.

So at this point I would like to adjourn this application for the sole purpose of adding the stairway to the submission.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Understood. At this point I'll table this application at the applicant's request.

MS. CANTRELL: Hold on. We have Carol Brown who wishes to speak.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Sorry. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: Carol Brown. I believe she is from the Conservation Advisory Council. Okay, Carol, if you would like to un-mute yourself.

MS. BROWN: I just want to comment that the members who were at the last meeting of the Conservation Advisory Council feel very strongly that the revetment applications are barge only.

Having visited the sites, there is no room without destroying, without destroying a lot of the wildness over there to bring in a crane, to put in any rocks from above. And we feel very strongly it should be by barge only for both the Sterns and the Zahrer's. So I just want to make sure we have that on record. Thank you.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Is there anybody else here that wishes to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Motion to table the application at the applicant's request.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 5, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of KENNETH & JOANN ZAHMER requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to install 155 linear feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff, install 25 cubic yards of clean sand fill and Cape American beach grass.

Located: 63735 Route 48, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-40-1-20.2

The LWWRP found this to be consistent, noting that rocks naturally occurring in the environment are the public ownership and should not be used in the structure, and to limit to the minimum scale necessary.

The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property, however a quorum was not present. It was recommended that the work be conducted on the seaward side in order to prevent damage to the bluff.

The Trustees conducted a field inspection on May 12th, noting the application was straightforward, similar to the adjacent properties, no bluff vegetation to be disturbed. And no bluff cut.

Is there anyone here wishing to speak regarding this application?

MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjo on behalf of the applicant. Any questions, I would be happy to answer. The conditions that were just indicated would be the same as previous applications with no vegetation disruption on the existing bluff, no bluff.
cutting, and access will be by barge or, if available for the applicant, from a crane above, with no damage or disruption to any existing vegetation whatsoever. And in addition, no disruption or use of any of the existing rocks at the shoreline.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Thank you. Anyone else here wish to speak regarding this application?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I probably agree with the Conservation Advisory Council on this one. Barge only.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Any other questions or comments? (No response).

Hearing no further comments, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor? (ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application with the condition no bluff cut and access by barge only.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor? (ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 6, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of ADF VENTURES, LLC, c/o FREDERICK FRAGOLA requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit for the installation of 109 lineal feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff; installation of terracing consisting of 2"x12" un-treated timber boards with un-treated timber 2"x4" stakes every 8' along the face of the disturbed bluff; planting of entire disturbed bluff with Cape American beach grass plugs 12" on center; install 10'x19' platform on-grade at top of bluff with 4'x12' walkway leading to 4'x6' steps to 4'x6' platform to 4'x22' steps to 4'x6' platform to 4'x41' steps to 4'x6' platform to 3'x10' aluminum retractable steps to beach; all decking to be un-treated; a temporary silt fence will be installed surrounding the at-grade 10'x19' platform during construction to prevent any sediment from leaving the immediate work area until stabilized; and landward of the top of bluff is selective tree clearing as required to remove deceased or dead trees as marked with orange tape. Located: 17877 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-1-4

The Trustees most recently visited -- which was one of many visits to this project -- on the 12th of May, and noted that we need to attempt to save as much vegetation on the top one-third of the bluff as possible. It should also be noted that on the 19th of May we were submitted a new project description and plans showing that vegetation on the roughly half to one-third top of the bluff being untouched, save the stairs area, the four-foot wide steps.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent and consistent. The inconsistency comes from a 20-foot wide non-disturbance buffer landward of the crest of bluff that was created by covenants and restrictions in 2009. It should be noted that that is going to be put back in place if we were to
move forward with this permit based off the plans that were submitted. The clearing of the trees, construction of the platform and accessing the stairs in 25-foot non-disturbance buffer is not permissible. It should be noted that those things are no longer part of this application. They have been removed. And then he also stated that the rock revetment and stabilizing the bluff is recommended as consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application, noting the proposed location of the swimming pool is 56-feet from the top of bluff, less than the required setback. We are not currently dealing with that. That was the original.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Jeff Patanjlo on behalf of the applicant.

MR. PATANJLO: Jeff Patanjlo, on behalf of the applicant.

Today you were delivered, based on multiple conversations and revisions to the plans what we believe is the final set of drawings, which reflect all the comments that were requested on multiple field visits and comments by the Board. So if you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Any comments from members of the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing in this application.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve this application based on the new plans dated received in the office the 19th of May, 2021, and with a revised project description that I will now read into the record, which will thereby bring it into consistency with the LWRP coordinator.

Revised project description: The project includes installation of 109 linear feet of rock revetment at toe of existing bluff; installation of terracing consisting of 2x12 untreated timber boards with untreated timber 2x4 stakes every three feet along the base of the eroded bluff area only. Planting of the eroded bluff with Cape American beach grass plugs 12" on center; provide temporary drip irrigation for bluff plantings which will be removed once plants are established, maximum of 12 months; install 4x4 upper platform, 4x6 steps to the 4x6 platform to 4x22 steps to 4x6 platform to 4x41 steps to 4x6 platform to the 3x10 aluminum retractable steps to beach; install a 4x25' wide long bluestone path from proposed steps on lawn area through the proposed 25-foot non-turf buffer starting at the top of the bluff line and headed landward. All decking for the stair system is to be untreated. The plant list in the
non-disturbance buffer will consist of 20 placeum (sic) grass, 10 Rosa Rugosa, 10 clethra alnifolia, 12 beach plum and 10 bayberry. All plants to be two-gallon containers and planted six feet on center. Vegetated bluff and existing vegetation is not to be disturbed. That is my motion.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Just one point. I think you said path through a non-turf buffer. It should be non-disturbance buffer.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: We allow four-foot paths through non-disturbance buffers.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I think you read non-turf buffer.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I read non-turf buffer?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I think so.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: (Perusing). Edit to my motion. Plant list for the non-disturbance buffer -- here. Okay: 4'x25' long bluestone path from proposed steps to lawn area through proposed 25-foot wide non-disturbance buffer.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: The next application, number 7, Suffolk Environmental Consulting, Inc. on behalf of FARTHER OUT EAST, LLC, c/o THOMAS & MAUREEN DOWLING requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to perform the following modifications to the existing structures and property consisting of removing existing propane tank along western side of existing dwelling; remove existing hot tub; remove ±132.0 sq. ft. of existing seaward deck and reconstruct seaward deck with steps (minus balcony) for a total of 501 sq. ft. in-kind and in-place; reconstruct/expand existing seaward balcony (inclusive of existing balcony area) for a total of 104 sq. ft.; remove existing cellar entrance; abandon and remove existing sanitary system in accordance with S.C.D.H.S. standards; remove existing shed from landward side of existing dwelling; remove existing chimney from eastern side of existing dwelling; and remove ±358 sq. ft. of existing northeasterly deck; on existing 1,092 sq. ft. dwelling construct a 58.0 sq. ft. addition onto northeastern corner; construct a 20 sq. ft. pergola with counter under against seaward side of dwelling; construct a 67.0 sq. ft. porch along the northerly portion of dwelling; construct a 381.25 screened porch along the easterly side of dwelling; install a new propane tank along westerly portion of property; construct new 50.0 sq. ft. basement entry along westerly side of dwelling; install a new IAWOTWTS septic system landward of dwelling; construct a 2.5' high (maximum height) by 97.5' long retaining wall along the northeast corner of property.

Located: 860 Rabbit Lane, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-31-18-18.

The Board performed a field inspection May 12th and noted the application looks straightforward. Subsequently the Board discussion at work session Monday night further indicated that the project is largely within the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area.
I contacted the applicant, Suffolk Environmental Consulting, to inform them that there was additional discussion concerning the coastal erosion area construction.

The project has been deemed to be inconsistent by the LWRP under Policy 4.1 to minimize human life and structures from floodings and hazards, and further goes on to indicate that to move existing development and structures as far away from flooding and erosion hazards as practicable. Maintaining existing developments and structures in hazard areas may be warranted for structures which functionally require location on the coast or in coastal waters. It goes on to say --

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Sorry to interrupt. If you pull your microphone back, it will pull it all in more.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Thank you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just push it back like a foot.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Okay. The single-family residence does not require a location on the coast or in coastal waters. The proposed screen porch proposes locating eleven-and-a-half feet to the bulkhead is not supported by the policy. According to the Suffolk hazard mitigation tool the parcel is susceptible to storm damage, and this area suffered damage from Tropical Storm Sandy.

The Conservation Advisory Council voted not to support this application due to the insufficient setbacks and the project is within the coastal erosion hazard area, and exceeds 20% of the building lot.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak on behalf of this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We Suffolk Environmental present.

There's a couple of things I want to go over with the Board. The first thing is that what is before them is development on the landward side of the house which consists of a front porch entryway. A second-story balcony that is already there that is slightly expanded. They propose a screened porch. It is true that the property is bulkheaded. You should, the Board should take notice that what we have done with this application is we have reduced the size of the deck so the actual coverage over the property has been capped at the existing coverage. So there is no expansion, building coverage expansion on that lot. So that is important to know.

The second thing that is of import is that it is located in an X-Zone which means it is actually in a five-hundred year floodplain, and that the proposed porch and renovations we intend to do or could be done in the dwelling are not subject to the regulations of FEMA. They are not, there are no first floor elevations strictly required. There happens to be a small basement in this area, under this house, and the basement is dry.

The third thing is that this house underwent an expansion
back in 2006 pursuant to Trustee permit and the second floor was constructed on top of the first floor, which does constitute construction in the, as defined in the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area law.

The next thing to understand is that this particular screened-in porch is not located in a nearshore area or over a beach or on a bluff or on a primary dune or on a secondary dune or on a wetland or marsh or on any mash vegetation. So there are no natural protective features that come into play here.

And finally, that the proposed porch and the balcony for that matter are not considered livable floor areas nor are they considered major additions. So we think the Board is well within their rights to approve the project.

The project comes with an upgrade in the sanitary system to the new IA/WSTS system, and so at the end of the day its protection to the environment will be better than what we have today. You should also be aware that under the prior second floor expansion, the LWRP coordinator considered that exempt.

There are other examples in Rabbit Lane, obviously, where construction, re-construction, I think the Board is well aware dating back to Hurricane Sandy and even before, I believe, that some of these determinations, for example, the property next door, which we handled, we got an exemption on that, and put in that exemption was listings to an existing building or rebuild residential structures which result in no net increase in ground area covered except for parcels located in a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area. But there were expansions and so we think that if the problem is the expansion, that is a structure such as a screened porch, there is no increased structural coverage, and in any event, the porch would be a non-major addition. So we believe the Board is well within their authority to grant the permit. And I think the Board is generally supportive of the application. At least that was my impression when we met in the field five weeks or, I'm sorry, nine weeks ago, I guess.

I'm here to answer any questions up may have.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Thank you. Yes, we were there also on April 7th. The coastal erosion issue which came up in discussion a little later than ordinarily it might have. The, understood that there is no net increase in ground coverage with the existing decks and the proposed addition which is a non-major addition, it by definition, coastal erosion would have that on a beach regardless of the fact it's not structurally on open, unconsolidated beach material. It's behind a bulkhead. Coastal erosion definitionally calls it a beach, and if it were, let's say, on a classic dune or dune area, non-major additions are of course allowed under Coastal Erosion, but I think the Board is in a position where we can't approve a Coastal Erosion approval for a non-major addition on a beach. Even though it doesn't look like a beach, it's within 100 feet of mean high water to the property. So it's a definition in the Coastal Erosion. So unless I stand corrected, I think it it's got to go, if the Board
were to consider approving the Wetland, the Coastal Erosion still has to go on appeal to the Town Board because it's essentially construction on a beach, and that would also take up the matter, the concerns of the LWRP coordinator with respect to construction in a flood area.

I also notice there is another hand up. I don't know if you have additional comments or concerns.

MS. CANTRELL: No, that's Suffolk Environmental.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Okay, excuse me. So I think the Board did not have an issue with the construction per se because it's behind a permitted bulkhead and there is no increase in the ground coverage, but it's a matter of the definitions of what the Board is allowed to permit on our behalf as administrators of the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area ordinance.

MR. ANDERSON: I'm hearing you, if that's the decision of the Board then we'll have to take an appeal, and I presume what happens is a Wetland permit is issued and the Coastal Erosion Hazard permit is held in abeyance pending an appeal.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: That's the discussion now. We are both presuming. We'll have to put that to a vote. That, I believe, is my understanding, which I have not been corrected yet.

Are there any other discussions, any concerns, members of the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve the Wetland application for this project as submitted in accordance with the survey last dated in the Trustee office February 12th, 2021, and move to deny the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area permit for construction in a, for a non-major construction in a beach area under Coastal Erosion Hazard Act. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(Trustee Goldsmith, aye. Trustee Domino, aye. Trustee Bredeymeyer, aye. Trustee Williams, aye).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Nay to the Wetlands.

(Trustee Krupski, nay).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 8, Docko, Inc. on behalf of ELIZABETH CALLANDER requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to construct ±105 linear feet of 4' wide wood pile and timber pier of which ±65 linear feet is waterward of the apparent/spring high water line, including five associated ladders, rails, electric and water utilities; construct a ±9' x ±10' (90 sq. ft.) wide boulder mounded wood platform/dock with a 4' wide x ±7 linear foot long access walkway with rails and three new tie-off piles, waterward of the apparent high water line.

Located: 12244 East Main Road, Fishers Island. SCTR#: 1000-3-2-6

We have notes here from May 10th. Trustee Williams did a
field inspection at 2:50 in the afternoon. The project seems straightforward, and recommends through-flow decking.

The following day, Trustees Bredemeyer and Domino did an inspection at the same site, and there was a question about the request to split the rock and the need for piling in front of it. Otherwise the project is straightforward.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency arises from the section of the code that attempts to minimize potential loss or damage to local development and erosion hazards. The project’s allowable activities include open timber piles or similar supported with top surface area less than 200-square feet which are removed in the Fall. Additionally, unregulated activities would be open timber piles or other similar work to top surface area less than 200-square feet which, again, are removed in the Fall.

Then there is a second point which is eelgrass beds are particularly sensitive to alterations in water quality, temperature, salinity, light penetration, therefore, docks may be detrimental to the eelgrass, and therefore subject to stringent review.

The Conservation Advisory Council did not visit the site, therefore there is no evaluation.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: No one is raising their hand. Oh, there he is. Keith Neilson from Docko is present. Keith, if you want to un-mute yourself.

MR. NEILSON: I'm Keith Neilson, with Docko, Inc., and I prepared the application documents before you. I also agree that this is a pretty straightforward project. We visited the site a couple of times with the Trustees over the years since we first started this project.

We have an extremely rocky shorefront, and just locating a suitable place for a dock was tough. There are two very large, prominent boulders more or less centered in the property between the groin on the west and the property line on the east. And we put the dock in between those two, and it’s aligned to split the difference between the two prominent boulders, one of which we hope to be able to remove, but we have configured the dock where it is just in case we cannot remove that boulder, either due to permitting issues or due to the size of the rock.

The pier is approximately 100 feet in overall length from the top of the bank and 105, roughly, and it has a ship’s ladder-type stair system off the end of the dock. The pier is located in such a way to be clear of all of the mapped eelgrass that we have surveyed initially two years ago, and again confirmed last year. We have utilized through-flow decking for the lower boat boarding area in order, because that is the closest to the eelgrass that comes in on the north side of the large boulder. And we can fit the entire dock with through-flow decking if the Trustees so choose.

The pier is designed to meet all of the eelgrass design
recommendations from the National Marine Fishery Service, which include elevation with open pile and timber structure, no floating dock components, and minimizing the actual impact, physical impact, in documented eelgrass beds. And that area of impact is one-and-a-half square feet, which is comprised of the two tie-off piles at the end of the pier.

This is basically the only place that we can fit this dock into the site, and yet it is a good fit. It does allow for boating access and it does not accommodate a large boat, but it will accommodate a 20, 22-foot shallow draft, 18-inch draft boat. And it can be built. We have had a contractor out there to size up the site.

We have made an analysis of the project in accordance with the Tidal Wetland regulations and the Coastal Erosion zone regulations, and I know that the dock is more than 200-square feet but we really, we couldn't help that with regard to getting adequate water for berthing a boat alongside.

This will be a very sturdy dock using 12-inch Class B piles driven ten to 15 feet or where ever boulder refusal is met. And like I said, it's high in deference to resource preservation.

And I would like to spend just a minute addressing the LWRP inconsistencies. I would point out that the 200-square foot design limitation on area of dock was really a characteristic, a feature that were implemented not for Fishers Island but for coastal Orient Point down through the Town of Southold. And the standard is very difficult to deal with on Fishers Island where we have so many boulders and shallow gradients, and in this case resources and such, and even in spite of that, the overall area of the dock is 265-square feet. We know that we will have to get a variance for that.

We have addressed all of the eelgrass issues through the design, and plus the dock is aligned basically north/south so that sunlight can come in under the pier structure in the morning, and under the pier from the west side in the afternoon. And based on other docks that we have built, we believe that this will have no impact on the eelgrass.

We also would like to point out that on the Corrente dock, which is about half mile to the west of this site, a pier was built and eelgrass existed 50 feet east and about 30 feet west of the chosen dock site. And now, five years, six years after the dock was built and finished, eelgrass grows continuously under the dock. And so I would respectively request consideration of that fact, that docks do not necessarily deprive eelgrass of the opportunity to grow in this habitat.

I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Application documents I believe are complete and responsive to all of the concerns in the regulations. Thank you.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I would respectively request comments from my fellow Trustees.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I got the sea sketch for the eelgrass mapping. It was dated 2017. It seems to mimic what is on the
present application before us. However I think in best practices, as he mentioned, the eelgrass migrates, so if we made the whole dock through-flow it would allow the eelgrass to potentially migrate and it would also bring it into consistency with the LWRP. So that would be my suggestion to make it through-flow throughout.

MR. NIELSON: And we are agreeable to that.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Quick question, Keith, about the square footage. The section of the platform over the boulder is obviously less than 200 square feet because it's 19x10 there. So, but the remaining dock section is, the dock in its entirety is 265 square feet; is that correct?

MR. NIELSON: Yes, from the mean high water line up to the end of the pier is 265-square feet, I believe.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Very good, that was my question.

MR. NIELSON: Thank you.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Are there any additional questions from the Board?

(Negative response).

Anyone else wish to speak to this application?

(No response).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I would like to point out that as per the application before us, we have LWRP language that definition here of being a structure greater than 200-square feet will preclude us from approving the Coastal Erosion section of this application.

Hearing no further comments, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to approve this application with the addition of through-flow on the entire dock. I approve the Wetlands portion of this application and deny the Coastal Erosion application.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 9, J.M.O. Environmental Consulting on behalf of TOWN OF SOUTHOULD FISHERS ISLAND AIRPORT requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to reconstruct two areas of storm damaged runways at Elizabeth Field Airport consisting of: At Runway 30, reconstruct approximately 375' of 6' tall seawall by removing and stockpiling existing boulders; install geotextile filter fabric; install la filter layer consisting of a 4" layer of crushed stone; reconstruct seawall utilizing existing boulders and additional boulders as needed; install four (4) one ton boulders as wavem energy dissipaters; at Runway 7, reconstruct approximately 250' of 6' tall seawall by removing and stockpiling existing boulders; install
geotextile filter fabric; install a filter layer consisting of
4" of crushed stone; reconstruct seawall utilizing existing
boulders and additional boulders as needed; and install eight
(8) one ton boulders as wave energy dissipaters.
Located: Airport Drive off Whistler Avenue, Fishers Island.
SCTM# 1000-12-1-18
Trustee Williams visited the site on 5/10, noting it was
straightforward. Trustees Domino and Bredemeyer visited the site
on 5/11, I believe, noting it is straightforward. Made
recommendations to investigate increasing the rock size.
The LWRP coordinator found this action to be consistent.
And Conservation Advisory Council did not make an
inspection.
Is there anyone here that wishes to speak to this
application?
MR. JUST: Again, Glenn Just. If there are any questions from the
Board.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I have no questions. Does anyone else have any
questions?
(Negative response).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Anybody else here wishing to speak to this
application?
(Negative response).
I make a motion to close the public hearing.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I make a motion to approve the application as
submitted.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

WETLAND PERMITS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Wetland permits, number 1, J.M.O.
Environmental Consulting on behalf of MARILYN ROSENBERG requests
a Wetland Permit to construct a 58 sq. ft. addition onto the
landward side of the existing two-story, single-family dwelling
(711 sq. ft. footprint) with attached 100 sq. ft. front porch; and
436 sq. ft. waterside deck; abandon existing cesspool and install
a new I/A OWTS sanitary system; regrade; expand leaching system;
install roof drain drywell; install a new water line; and
install a stone parking area.
Located: 1952 Peninsula Road, Fishers Island. SCTM# 1000-10-3-13
The LWRP found this to be consistent.
The Conservation Advisory Council did not make an
inspection, therefore no recommendation was made.
Trustee Williams conducted a field inspection May 10th,
noting straightforward. Trustees Domino and Bredemeyer also
conducted a field inspection also noting it was straightforward.
Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Glenn Just present. Glenn, if you want to un-mute yourself again.

MR. JUST: I'm sorry. Once again, Glenn just here, if there are any questions from the Board.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Is there anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 2, PORT OF EGYPT ENTERPRISE requests a Wetland Permit to widen the existing travel lift well area from 17' to 20' by removing associated pilings and relocating them 3' to the west; the existing pier is 43' long and capped with an I-beam that is 2' wide and supported by 14-10" diameter pilings, the new pier will be 57' long and will be capped with an I-beam 3' wide and supported by 18-10" diameter pilings; it will be installed 3' to the west of the existing pier and the I-beam on the east side of the well will require the installation of four (4) additional 10" diameter pilings.

Located: 62300 Route 25, Southold. SCTM# 1000-56-6-6.1

The Trustees most recently visited this property on the 12th of May and noted it is a straightforward application, simply making some space for a new boat lift.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council did not have a quorum, but recommended best practices for the project.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: William Lieblein is here. Just bear with me. I'm looking for your name on the list of the names of people we have on the list. So I found you. Now you should be able to --

MR. LIEBLEIN: Okay, I'll just let you know I'm here to speak if you have questions.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. Is there anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any additional comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve the application as submitted.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Next application, number 3, Costello Marine Contracting Corp. on behalf of THE CARMELA LAZIO REVOCABLE TRUST, CARMELA LAZIO AS TRUSTEE requests a Wetland Permit to remove and dispose of 103’ bulkhead; construct new bulkhead creating a 6’x15’ recessed area for a total of 115’; install new staircase leading to water in recessed area to provide water access; and to replace existing flagpole in-kind, in-place.
Located: 250 Blue Marlin Drive, Greenport.  SCTM# 1000-56-7-21
The Trustees inspected this site on May 12th and noted it is straightforward, but at that time requested the applicant consider a 15-foot non-turf buffer.
Plans received in the Trustee office May 14th that include a 15-foot non-turf buffer as requested.
The LWRP coordinator has deemed this proposal to be consistent with the Town’s LWRP.
And the Conservation Advisory Council performed an inspection, unfortunately was not able to vote on a recommendation because of a lack of a quorum, and were making a recommendation of 50-foot non-turf buffer and retractable steps perpendicular to the shoreline recommended.
It is noted there are steps within the cutout that are perpendicular to the shoreline.
Is there anyone here wishing to speak behalf of this application?
MS. COSTELLO: Hi. Good evening. Jane Costello, just here to answer any questions you may have.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Any questions?
(Negative response).
Seeing none. Any additional comments? Anyone else wish to speak to this application?
(Negative response).
Seeing none, I make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted noting the addition of a 15-foot non-turf buffer.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 4, Richard Gluckman, Architect on behalf of DANYAO DANIELLE CHANG requests a Wetland Permit for the
existing 710 sq. ft. in-ground pool to remain; remove existing 2,658 sq. ft. brick pool patio and replace with 309 sq. ft. of natural stone pool coping and 284 sq. ft. natural stone patio paving; replace existing pool fence with new 50" high x ±305 linear foot long pool enclosure fencing; in total 5,769 sq. ft. of invasive species and 5,065 sq. ft. of mowed lawn will also be replaced by native plantings, furthermore 1,950 sq. ft. of previously brick patio area will be revegetated.

Located: 2830 Grand View Drive, Orient. SCTM# 1000-14-2-3.5

The Trustees completed a field inspection on May 12th at 9:30 in the morning. The notes read the plans require a coastal erosion hazard line. Request a check the permit history of the pool. Suggest no more tree cutting along the bluff. And depict a non-turf buffer and non-disturbance lines and zones on the future plans. All were present.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. The action is inconsistent because the landowner has performed work within the jurisdiction of the Trustees without a permit.

The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property, however, a quorum was not present. No comments were provided. Additionally, we are in receipt of new plans date stamped received May 19th, which show, and have been reviewed by the Board during the work session, which shows the coastal erosion hazard line, shows the non-turf 15' non-disturbance zone seaward of that, and all land landward of that line up to the fence around the pool is a coastal erosion -- sorry, is a non-turf zone.

There is also a planting plan showing that non-disturbance buffer will have a one-time removal of invasive species, not limited to privet, knotweed, multiflora rose, (sic) vine, Mugwort, Black Locust. Replant with Bluestem and Red Fescue.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

(No response).

Questions or comments from the Board?

MS. CANTRELL: Sorry, Mike. Mr. Gluckman is here to speak. Mr. Gluckman, if you would like to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board.

MR. GLUCKMAN: This is Richard Gluckman. I'm here to answer any questions of the Board.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you, sir. Do any of the Board members have any questions?

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Just a clarification. I contacted Mr. Gluckman after our work session with respect to specific concerns and he indicates in the non-disturbance area, it will be a one-time removal of the invasives that are enumerated on the plan clearly, and that it was, the key on the original set of plans was very weak as far as printing came through and didn't, he was unable to tell which native species were being proposed and the submission, I believe, helps address our concerns in work session. And all construction is landward of the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area line.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: We are looking closely at the plans. If you can give us a second.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Is that in the non-turf area?
TRUSTEE DOMINO: In the non-turf area
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: It's in the non-turf area. We should probably get some clarification on that.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Do you want me to ask --
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Yes.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: All right. So, Mr. Gluckman there is, in reviewing the plans, there is a walking path that exits the pool patio area and passes through the gate and then it splits off. One section of the path goes to the steps going down to the beach, and to the right, you know, if you follow the path to the right, it goes all along the area of non-turf to what looks like a rectangular area. Could you clarify what that is?
MR. GLUCKMAN: Yes, the thought was that would be still planted with I think in that location is red fescue, but it would be occasionally mowed, so it could be walked on to. It's not intended to be masonry or non-permeable material of any kind.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: In the non-turf area?
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Is that an issue for you?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I don't know if we want to be mowing, I mean, the purpose of a non-turf.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: If it's not fertilized, I don't have a problem with it.
MR. GLUCKMAN: It would be the same planting as adjacent both sides of it, and conform to the best practices of planting meadow grass.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I mean for me personally after looking at the plan, I think it doesn't hold up to what was removed from there originally.
MR. GLUCKMAN: Is that a question? Sorry.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: I'm not quite sure he understands that point, Nick.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I mean, there was a fair amount of vegetation removed from this property within the past year and I think what is being put back does not hold in comparison to what was removed. We are talking about putting fescue back where there were trees. For me, it doesn't work.
MR. GLUCKMAN: That area is in the middle of a growth of American black cherry trees that we trimmed up and saved every single one of them, including chutes. The only trees that came out were, and they were not all in the coastal erosion hazard line, the only trees that were removed were black locust. And there were no more than five of them. Two of them were broken and one was a leaner.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Trustee Krupski, is it fair for me to characterize you would be more comfortable if that pathway were not there?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I think so. I mean, you know, this property is already subject to a clearing violation and I think we are
really pushing the border of that mowed fescue not being turf. You know, I think we are really on the border of might as well put lawn there.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Any of the Trustees care to weigh in on that?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: That's just one opinion, obviously.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I concur with Trustee Krupski, if you want to make it a mulched path or something like that, but if we are planting grass and going to mow it, it kind of goes against the whole non-turf vegetated buffer aspect. Obviously, you allowed that path through there, but when we are having grass as your path.

And it's a good point, too, you are allowed by code a path to access water, however the second branch of the path does not go to the water. So in essence you are having two paths.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: It might be easier extinguish the path and in place maybe put in some more shrubs in that area.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I would like to see some more trees put back, to be honest with you. I mean, I would leave it open to discussion as to what kind of species, but I think part of the area adjacent to that should be re-vegetated.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Okay.

MR. GLUCKMAN: We would be happy to continue to vegetate that area. We would take things one step at a time, but I know that there is, we have a big plan coming up for creating more foliage on the borders, for privacy. And we would be glad to fill in more native shrubs or plantings on the bluff as well.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I think that is kind of the path we are heading, and we'll need new plans to depict that new planting.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Plans without this particular pathway, too.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Without that particular pathway that heads to the east, as well as a more robust planting plan with trees and/or native vegetation in place of what was previously removed without a permit.

MR. GLUCKMAN: What I would like to comment on, all of vegetation that was removed were invasive species. There was no bayberry, there was no hamamelis.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Unfortunately, we were not able to verify that because it was done without Trustee approval or review. So it's kind of hard for us to say what was there when we went there when there was nothing there. We don't necessarily know what was there to see what was removed. We just know that things were removed.

MR. GLUCKMAN: I think you are absolutely right and I apologize for going off in that direction, but I think what we are doing by removing all of the turf, so much of the turf on the site, shows that we are trying to be good stewards to the property and make sure that everything that was there is replaced by native species. I think it's a well-intentioned direction to recover the bluff with grasses. And the black cherry, we would have kept those. Or any indigenous plants of value.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: I'm getting a sense from the Board here that it
might be best to table this application with the submission of
new plans showing the pathway to the dock and the water,
eliminate this pathway to this rectangular area, and with some
additional plantings in that non-turf area. That would be my
suggestion.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I concur with Trustee Domino. Possibly, you
know, surface berry, blueberry, low shrubs that would be
consistent with native plantings, not just grasses.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I guess, Mr. Gluckman, the ball is in your court
on this. Would you be amenable to that?

MR. GLUCKMAN: So what you are saying is not only do I have to
remove the path but I have to increase vegetation on the bluff
of native species?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Not on the bluff.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Not on the bluff, but adjacent to. And I would
not call it increase when you look at the aerial of what was
there. We can go back and forth all day about what was removed.
I can't verify that at this time, but all I can do is look at
the aerials. I would not call it a net increase.

MR. GLUCKMAN: But everything, you have to believe there was
privet and multiflora out there. You can see the adjacent
property which sort has been untouched has some of the same
plantings. And I would like to add that the path to the beach,
to the steps, you know, was one asset that the public, the
owners, expected to be allowed to enjoy, but if someone can't
make it down those stairs, they should be able to enjoy any
other part of their site.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Perhaps you misheard or misunderstood or maybe I
didn't make it clear enough. We are not suggesting the path to
the dock be removed. Just the section where it splits off and
turns to the east and goes to the rectangular area. You are
allowed one path, four-foot wide, through the non-turf and
non-disturbance to enjoy access to the beach.

MR. GLUCKMAN: Well, all right. So the directive is to remove the
path parallel to the bluff and supplement the proposed plantings
on the bluff, on the higher part.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: That's correct. Okay, any other questions
MR. GLUCKMAN: I certainly thought this was -- so is it possible
to get the approval to put in the pool fence, because we need to --

TRUSTEE DOMINO: No. We are not allowed to segment and we can't
approve without submission of new plans showing that.

MR. GLUCKMAN: Well, as you can see, there were a lot of plugs
put in for most of the grass. We had not put anything around
the pool fence because we want to get the pool, a ten-foot zone
on either side of the pool fence is for Panicum, and that would
be left bare, which is going to jeopardize the potential for
creating erosion and creating an unhappy situation with the bare
earth. We can't plug and seed until the pool fence goes in

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Mr. Gluckman, that may or may not be correct,
but it would not exist if the violation had not occurred in the
first place.
So at this point would you, again, suggest that we table this subject to new plans showing elimination of the path parallel to the bluff and supplemental plantings?
MR. GLUCKMAN: And this is tabled for one month?
TRUSTEE DOMINO: That's correct. Provided you get the plans in Time.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Is that a motion?
TRUSTEE DOMINO: All right, anyone else wish to speak to this application?
(No response).
Counsel, I'll take that as a yes?
MR. HAGAN: There are no questions and nobody wants to speak to the application, so now you can make your motion.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to table this hearing at the applicant's request.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 5, En-Consultants on behalf of STRONG'S WEST MILL, LLC requests a Wetland Permit to Modify existing haul-out slip dimensions from 24' x 60' to 24' x 72' by welding 12' if extensions to two (2) existing steel travel lift rails over additional piling foundation; remove and replace existing 2' x 59' wood catwalk adjacent to easterly travel lift rail with 2' x 72' wood catwalk, and construct 2' x 25' extension to existing wood catwalk adjacent to westerly travel lift rail; remove and replace (in-place) approximately 216 lf of timber bulkhead with vinyl bulkhead, incidentally dredge up to 10 feet seaward off reconstructed bulkhead to max. depth of -4' MLW, and use approx. 38 cy spoil as backfill; remove 4' x +9' portion of existing 4' x 91' floating dock to accommodate prop. rail extension (4' x 82' portion of ex. float to remain), and remove and replace (in-kind/in-place) ex. +5' x 9' platform leading to float (ex. 2.5' x 20' aluminum ramp between platform and float to be temporarily removed and reset); and maintenance dredge interior of modified haul-out slip to max. depth of -5'MLW (with max. 6" overcut), using approx. 93 cy spoil as backfill behind reconstructed bulkhead.
Located: 5780 West Mill Road, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-106-6-13.4

The Trustees visited the site on 5/12. All Trustees were present. The field notes noting the project was straightforward.
The LWRP coordinator found this proposed action to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council did not make an inspection on this project.

There are two letters in the file regarding this project.
Is there anybody here that wishes to speak to this project?
MS. CANTRELL: Rob Herrmann is present. Rob, if you would like to un-mute yourself.
MR. HERRMANN: Thank you. Good evening. Rob Herrmann of
En-Consultants on behalf of the applicant.
And this is a straightforward application. It's basically a maintenance application of existing bulkheading and existing travel slip with an extension. The proposed extension of existing rails. If you have any questions, I would be happy to try to answer them.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is there anyone else here wishing to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: Yes, we have a Louise Harrison. If you would like to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board.
MS. HARRISON: Thank you. Just so you know, the audio that was just coming out was really fractured. I barely heard my name. So I'm not sure what the cause of that is, but it might affect other people.
Thank you, Trustees. Thank you, for hearing me. I'm representing Save the Sound. We are a bi-state environmental organization that fights climate change and saves endangered lands, protects Long Island Sound and its rivers, and we work with nature to restore ecosystems, and I thank you for the opportunity speak to you tonight about this application.
And yes, we did submit a letter to the panel. We do understand that components of this application do involve replacement in-kind of bulkhead infrastructure and routine maintenance dredging of the owner's marine slip. I also see that the application was listed as a Type II pursuant to SEQRA, requiring in your estimation no further environmental review. However, other portions of the application involve additional improvements to the marina facility that would fall under the Town of Southold Planning Board's final amended scope for a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Strong's storage buildings proposal currently being prepared by the applicant. These additional site expansion-related improvements include extension of the travel lift and associated work. We at Save the Sound participated in Southold Town Planning Board scoping process and submitted detailed comments which were incorporated into the final scope and we assume the Town's Planning Board has shared the DEIS scope of work with you the Trustees and you have had benefit of its review.
First, we believe the Type II designation that you announced today should be corrected by your Board on the record, since this already has a component that is related to something under SEQRA that is subject to a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So we cannot have a Type II and a DEIS for a project where there is overlap in the constituents of the project. And some of the aspects of this project will advance the project that is under the DEIS mandate at this time.
We agree with the Town Planning Board who also submitted comments for your file, today, I believe, that no permit should be issued for any modifications of the property that are related to the Strong's storage buildings project prior to the
conclusion of the SEQRA process. Such issuance of --

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off, but that is not in front of us. The only thing that is in front of us, in front of this Board at this time --

MS. HARRISON: No, you are cutting me off --

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: (Continuing) is the bulkhead and the travel lift.

MS. HARRISON: You are cutting me off. You are cutting me off. (The reporter requests one speaker speak at a time).

MS. HARRISON: You are cutting me off.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The only thing in front of this Board, because you are talking about something that is not in front of us, and we have not had the opportunity to review any plans because the only application we have in front of this Board at this time is for a bulkhead and travel lift. We don't have anything in front of us for anything else.

MS. HARRISON: May I continue my statement, please.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, ma'am, if it pertains to this particular application.

MS. HARRISON: This is the second time that I have testified before your Board where you've interrupted my testimony, and I have never heard you do this with anyone else. I really object to this. I would like to complete my testimony, please. Thank you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, ma'am.

MS. HARRISON: Thank you. There are portions of --

(Audio cuts out).

There are portions of this project that are part of Strong's storage buildings. There is an overlap between the two projects. There is more in this before you than simply in-kind replacement and routine maintenance. The portion that is before you that is not routine maintenance or in-kind replacement is also part of the Strong's storage buildings proposal. And you have heard from the Planning Board today that those portions should not be advanced because they are already listed in the DEIS scoping document. There should be coordination between the different Boards in the Town of Southold, especially under SEQRA review. I don't need to give a lesson on SEQRA, but when you have a Draft Environmental Impact Statement underway, all agencies have to comply with it for any portions that are subject to the DEIS, which portions of this application are.

We feel that if you issue a permit that includes those portions that are also part of that application that is subject to a DEIS, that it would be considered segmentation of environmental review. I thank you for your consideration in listening to the conclusion of my comments. Thank you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Is there anyone else here wishing to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: There are more. We have Stephen Boscola. Mr.
Boscola, if you would like to un-mute yourself to speak to the Board.

MS. BOSCOLA: Hi. This is Stephen Boscola. My family's home is immediately adjacent to the property. I just want to underscore my letter from April 21st, and the Planning Board's letter from today regarding denial of the extension of the travel slips and modifications to the floating docks.

We have no issue with the in-kind replacement of the existing bulkhead, but as Ms. Harrison just pointed out, this really feels more like a Type I action given the amount of modifications being proposed.

So we would just ask that the status be updated and that the application be revised to exclude the modifications to the holdout slip and the floating docks prior to any Board vote.

Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Is there anyone else here wishing to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: Yes. We have somebody simply with the name "Jeff." Jeff, I'm going to allow you to talk. If you un-mute yourself and please state and speak your name for the record since it's not fully shown on our screen.

MR. STRONG: Thank you. Jeff Strong here, President of Strong's Marine and Strong's Marine inlet. We appreciate your time.

For clarification, from the applicant's perspective, the comments relative to your storage building project that is accurate is going through a DEIS review, which we are going through all the normal processes with the Planning Board. No aspect of the bulkhead replacement or the travel lift pit or the travel lift extension rails as requested with the Trustees, not one aspect of that is a part of the storage building application or the Planning Board process.

Happy to answer any questions if anybody has any.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Board?

(Negative response).

MS. CANTRELL: Stephen Boscola would like to speak again.

Stephen, go ahead and un-mute your mic.

MR. BOSCOLA: Thank you. Just a quick point on that. As part of the SEQRA review for the project that is being proposed separate from this, the travel lift slips and the floating docks, the marina as a whole, is included, an assessment of that property is included in the scope, and implications of that project on the rest of the infrastructure of the marina is clearly in multiple areas written in that scope. Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is there anybody else here that wishes to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: It appears nobody else is raising their hand.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion to close the public hearing.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Motion to approve the application as submitted.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 6, JORDAN ARNOLD requests a Wetland Permit to install a 4’x6’ cantilevered platform with hardwood decking off bulkhead; install a 3’x14’ aluminum ramp/gangway; install a 6’x20’ floating dock held in place by two (2) 10” diameter pilings; floating dock decking to be hardwood to match platform.
Located: 70 Wiggins Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-35-4-28.43
The LWRP found this to be consistent.
The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property, however a quorum was not present.
The Trustees conducted a field inspection on May 12th, noting it was a straightforward application.
Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Jordan Arnold. Jordan, if you would like to un-mute yourself to speak to the Board.
MR. ARNOLD: Yes. Good evening to the Board. My fiancé and I are here just in case there are any questions.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you. Anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?
(Negative response).
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approving this application as submitted.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 7, Quiet Man Studio on behalf of MOLLY HARRIS requests a Wetland Permit for the existing 32.4’x40.3 one-story dwelling with attached 10.2’x20.4’ enclosed screen porch; remove existing main entryway and construct new 32.3’x9.6’ deck with a partial roof overhang and seven (7) steps to ground; remove existing rear entry stairs and construct a new 7.2’x6.7’ entry platform with four (4) steps to ground, and install a 3’x6.7’ storage cabinet abutting entry platform; remove existing shed and install in place a new 8’x10’ shed; install and perpetually maintain a 20’ wide non-turf buffer along the landward edge of wetlands by using indigenous material
and native species; install steel edging along the driveway edges to a width of approximately 10' and better define the turn-around; remove existing arborvitae along the eastern property line and replace with skip laurel and hornbeam.

Located: 570 Hippodrome Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-66-2-12

The Trustees most recently visited this site on the 12th of May, and noted it looked like a straightforward application.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent and consistent. The inconsistency is due to the fact that the as-built structures were constructed without a wetland permit. It finds of the rest of the application to be consistent.

And the CAC inspected the property however a quorum was not present.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: Somebody by the name of Bruce and Eileen. So I'm going to assume Eileen is Eileen Wingate on behalf of Quiet Man Studio. I'll start with her.

Eileen, if you want to un-mute yourself and state your name for the record.

MS. WINGATE: I did. Can you hear me now?

(Affirmative response).

MS. WINGATE: You said there was some as-built work. I don't recall.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just for a point of clarification, the entire project is as-built currently.

MS. WINGATE: I don't -- are we talking about the same -- what exactly is "as-built"?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: The house. Do you have a Trustee permit for the house?

MS. WINGATE: There is a certificate of occupancy for the house.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Let me just clarify. Give me one moment, please. Let me just clarify.

It is very common for the Board of Trustees to find applications before us with existing structures that were built prior, before the Trustees' jurisdiction. It's a very common process. So although you may have a C of O, that does not mean that you have a Trustees permit, and that is all that the LWRP coordinator is saying.

MS. WINGATE: Thank you, for clarifying that. Okay.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Is there anyone else that wishes to speak regarding this application or any additional comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

MS. CANTRELL: We have someone by the name of Bruce. So Eileen, I'll mute you so I can let Bruce talk. Bruce, when you un-mute yourself, just state your name for the record.

MR. HEATH: Yes. Bruce Heath, I live next door. Can you hear me okay?

(Affirmative response).

Basic agreement with the project. But I do have a couple
of various concerns. One of the things that is required on the plan is to remove the arborvitae on the eastern boundary of the property. That's about 14 or 15 foot high, and replacing it with another shrub of four to five feet. The arbor vitae is on my property. It's not on the line, it's on our property. I looked back over the survey we have from Eroz (sic), that clearly shows that with the monuments. Same thing with the survey submitted to the Board by your surveyor, also shows it. It does not show it that way on the landscaping plan. That doesn't have the monuments on it either.

So that's one area of concern as to why someone would want to come on our property and remove shrubs that have been there for decades and replace it with something one-third the height.

The other area is we have an easement with our driveways that allows us to cause access and egress to the Harris'. We also use it to park our own cars in the rear of our house.

One of my concerns is that we just put up close to 100-feet of retaining wall, with a cap on it and I just want to basically put my mind at ease here that we are not going to have a situation with trucks driving over that cap. It happened a couple of weeks ago while we were home, and also using the driveway as a staging platform for the workers to be done, then we won't have access to our own driveway. So those are my two areas of concern.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.

MS. CANTRELL: Eileen Wingate wants to speak again. Eileen, if you want to un-mute yourself again.

MS. WINGATE: Okay, thank you. I have talked with Mr. Heath's wife on three occasions. We have been over this. There are two types of shrubs that we have been looking at for the replacements. One is deciduous and one is evergreen. Due to the nature of the evergreens, they are just a little bit smaller. But we have been in this conversation since before COVID, and this is a surprise to me.

We absolutely have full respect and do not intend to use his driveway for anything but access. There is plenty of front yard for us to use. Um, and the arborvitae that are in question, the lower branches are completely over the property line, and if we were to legitimately take what is over the property line down, we would be doing extreme damage to the plant material anyways. So we offered to go back in there and take out things that are not quite right. I believe there is pictures of the arborvitae in the file. The arborvitae on Mr. Heath's property intrude into Jim Harris' property by about eight feet. So we just want to re-claim the side yard a little bit. And as far as construction goes, I think the total is ten footings, they will all be dug by hand. Other than the pickup trucks coming and going, I don't think there will be construction machinery.

MR. HEATH: May I comment further?

MS. CANTRELL: Just a minute, please.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: So just for clarification's sake. If they, if the trees, I mean, you cannot remove trees that are not on your property. The survey clearly shows that --
MS. WINGATE: That's correct. There is no doubt about it. But I did have a conversation with Mrs. Heath and she said if we did the right thing, that was going to be fine with her. That has been the conversation. If things have changed, I'm flexible, and we'll figure this out. I'm not going to take trees down that don't belong to me.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I would be inclined to, and this is just speaking as one Trustee, but I would be inclined to stipulate going forward just that any trees removed would have to be on your client's property for this application, and anything that is off would have to, you would have to work with the neighbor on that.
MS. WINGATE: That's fine.
MR. HAGAN: That's the law.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And that's the law. Correct.
MS. WINGATE: And we are okay with it.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?
(No response).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Any further comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing no further comments, I make a motion to close the hearing in this application.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And I make a motion to approve this application with the stipulation that any trees removed as per this site plan are on the applicant's property, and that during construction stakes are put in place of the cap of the retaining wall along the wetland to prevent trucks from driving on it and therefore having a negative impact. And that staging or parking during construction does not take place on the right-of-way. Thereby granting this permit would bring this application into consistency.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Number 8, Isaac Clay Coffey, R.A. on behalf of HC NOFO, LLC, c/o TODD FEUERSTEIN, MANAGING PARTNER requests a Wetland Permit to demolish existing dwelling and construct new 1,800 sq. ft. footprint dwelling with a 1,175 sq. ft. second story for a total square footage of new two-story dwelling to be 2,975 sq. ft.; construct a wrap-around ground floor terrace on the north, west and east sides of the dwelling totaling 1,008 sq. ft. as well as a new 250 sq. ft. second floor deck; install a 62 sq. ft. built-in planter to run adjacent to the north-side ground floor
terrace; install a new innovative/alternative wastewater
treatment system; construct a 440 sq. ft. two-car detached
accessory garage and install a 1,435 sq. ft. gravel driveway using
the existing driveway’s entrance from Skunk Lane; install 8”
diameter by 2’ deep dry wells with gutters, and leaders for roof
runoff; and to establish and perpetually maintain a 10’ wide
non-turf buffer along the landward edge of wetlands composed of
native vegetation.
Located: 6370 Skunk Lane, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-104-5-3.3

The project was reviewed extensively at our recent Monday
night work session. The applicant has submitted a new set of
plans dated and stamped in the Trustee office May 19th,
indicating that they have moved the dwelling further away from
the wetlands as requested by the Trustees to the maximum with an
allowance for a driveway to their garage.

The Conservation Advisory Council had previously tabled the
application.

The LWRP coordinator had specifically noted that the
structure should be located, and noted it was inconsistent and
that to meet the requirements of Suffolk County hazard
mitigation tool with the susceptibility of the parcel to
flooding, and that the structure should be moved as far away
from the wetlands.

Is there anyone here wishing to speak to this application?
And I would also note we do not have a revised project
description, and the shape of the home and the decks are
slightly different than the last submission stamped in on May
11th. So we'll need to generate a new project description for
what is a fairly complex project.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Isaac Clay Coffey present. Mr. Coffey,
if you would like to un-mute yourself to speak to the Board.
MR. COFFEY: Hello, Board, this is Isaac Clay Coffey. Thank
you, for taking time to review this again.

As you have accurately stated, we moved the proposed
structure as far away from the wetlands as we can based on the
zoning envelope. We also moved the proposed IA system to the
other side of the property, which is also further away from the
wetlands, and we would like your feedback. I would be happy to
answer any questions.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Yes. I had opportunity to, during public
work session, to circulate the plan briefly with the Board and
did note on the plans that it's, the permeable terrace now 50
feet on one corner and 46, I guess on the other. I would note
though that the original non-turf buffer is ten feet. Typically
the Board is asking for 15 feet non-turf buffers.

And with the, to address the inconsistency on the LWRP, the
movement of the house and the IA system will help address that.
But the Board may wish to consider a 15-foot non-turf buffer,
and that we will need to get a detailed project description. I
think there are already two in the file but I can't use them
because they were for prior plans submitted.
MR. COFFEY: Okay, we can certainly update the description. I think the client would be amenable to the 15-foot non-turf non-disturbance buffer between wetlands as well.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I believe the Board was satisfied with, because there is an existing wetland that is stable wetland there, I think they were only requesting a non-turf. I don't think we had a problem with non-disturbance. Your extensive wetlands there are essentially protected are non-disturbance
MR. COFFEY: Okay, so we'll accept the 15-foot non-turf border.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Okay, that would be great. Submit plans with a 15-foot non-turf buffer and a detailed project description.
And I have not opened it up to Board members for any additional comments or concerns.
MR. COFFEY: Thank you.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I like the direction you are heading. Thank you, for working with us, and from what was originally proposed to now is a great improvement, so I think we are on the right track.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I would reiterate that, yes. Thank you, very much. It's a good experience and, you know, working with us. So I will table this application. I move to table this application at the applicant's request to generate plans for a 15-foot non-turf buffer and submission of a project description.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 9, AMP Architecture on behalf of WILLIAM A. MACOMBER & JESSICA SIDLAUSKAS requests a Wetland Permit to demolish existing one-story dwelling, construct new 1,294.0 sq. ft. one-story dwelling with a 925 sq. ft. addition on northeast side; proposed 221 sq. ft. deck with steps to ground; proposed 175.5 sq. ft. covered porch; for the existing 94.8 sq. ft. covered storage area, existing 102 sq. ft. shed; and to establish and perpetually maintain an 840 sq. ft. non-turf vegetated buffer area along the landward edge of wetlands.
Located: 4040 Deep Hole Drive, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-17-4
The Trustees completed a field inspection on the afternoon of May 12th. All were present. Notes read: Needs an IA system. Gutters to leaders to drywells. And non-turf buffer for the entirety of the rear yard. Ten feet.
The LWRP found this to be consistent.
The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application.
Requests a 15-foot non-turf buffer landward of the bulkhead along the southeast corner of the property.
Is there anyone here to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Anthony to speak for this application. Anthony, if you want to un-mute yourself and state your name for the record.
MR. PORTILLO: Good evening, Board. This is Anthony Portillo,
AMP Architecture. I just want to let you know I can answer any questions. We are currently filing with the Health Department for approval of the IA system. So we are awaiting that approval. While we are going to resubmit due to the change in the IA system, we originally had it as a conventional.

If there are any questions, let me know.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you, for that. I want to mention for the Board that we are in receipt of new plans stamped received May 19th, that show a hydro-action system.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Does that include the buffer continuing throughout the backyard?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Yes, it does. Can you see that, Nick?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I do. Thank you.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Anyone else wish to speak to this application? (Negative response).

Are there any questions or comments from the Board? (Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor? (ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I'll make a motion to approve this application as submitted, noting that the new plans show a hydro-action IA system.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor? (ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 10, AMP Architecture on behalf of WILLIAM F. GRELLA & GARY OSBORNE requests a Wetland Permit for the as-built shower (5'3"x7'6", 41 sq. ft.); pavers on sand (19'8"x47'4", 713 sq. ft.), and other landscape structures; and for a proposed exterior right turn staircase (4'2"x11'7", 83 sq. ft.)

Located: 1200 First Street, New Suffolk. SCTM# 1000-117-7-30

The Trustees have been out to the site several times, most recently on 5/12/21. We did an inhouse review at the work session, with all Trustees present, and we have questions regarding the pervious capacity of the pavers.

Is there anyone to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Anthony again.

MR. PORTILLO: Again, Anthony Portillo, AMP Architecture. I think, I hope we could get this approved and move forward. I think we would like to remove the non-compliance that is currently existing, and would like to comply with Trustees requirements and put this behind us. So my clients are ready to basically demo the existing. We are really waiting for the Board to approve us. They would like to clear up the violation. Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I understand that. You have some stones in place is that we asked about the pervious nature of the stones
and you gave us, submitted something from Ecoloc that does not satisfy our concerns. To the best of my knowledge.
MR. PORTILLO: That's fine. Can I suggest if you guys want to make a suggestion on what the type of pavers you would like are equal to, and I will make sure that is what is installed. But I think we should move this forward so we can comply and, you know, remove the violations that is holding up things for my client, and they would like to get this done, take the shower out. I think we really want to move this forward.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Anthony, let me say compliance is our main goal. Unfortunately, the pavers were put in without proper permitting and, you know, we are just simply asking what is the, you know, it's supposed to be pervious. And do you have any engineer calculations as to the perviousness of the stones?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: It was submitted, wasn't it?
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: It says 3% open surface area, but that doesn't tell me the stone is pervious, impervious. It doesn't address the --
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Can I --
MR. PORTILLO: I can understand that. But you guys are going in and out.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I think what Trustee Williams is trying to say is they have to be pervious stones and if the engineer's report says that they are 3% pervious, then they are 97% impervious. Which is not good. Not good math, for lack of a better way to put it.
MR. PORTILLO: Would you want to recommend the pervious amount and put that as what is required as per your approval and we'll make sure to meet your preferments criteria.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I think 100% pervious would work for me.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I think if you reached out to the Town Engineer and discuss what the definition of pervious is according to Chapter 136.
MR. PORTILLO: I can do that.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: That's what we need.
MR. PORTILLO: Okay, that's fine for me. Can we put that as the requirement, as your, and that's what they'll install, they'll have to meet that requirement. I mean, I really think they are trying. And that's my mistake, I should probably have researched that. I received this from the person that was going to put down the pavers and he said this was what has been approved in the past, so I should have looked at it a little closer. But I just think we have been here three times and I do think they are, they want to put in the right thing. So we'll meet the Town's requirements, I'll make sure that that is, that I talk to the Town Engineer and the pavers to be put down will meet what he requires us to put down.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: At this point I think it would be best for you to do so some research, find an appropriate or suitable paver that is pervious as per the Town Engineer's definition.
MR. PORTILLO: Okay.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I mean, at this point it would be best for you
to do some research to find a pervious paver that meets the Town Engineer's requirements as per the definition of pervious and then submit new plans. We can't approve something subject to. We need a complete detailed plan to approve them as per the Town Attorney's office.

MR. PORTILLO: No, I understand. But it does indicate pervious pavers on sand base on the plan. My point is they have to put down what is required or when you guys do a final inspection it's not going to be approved, so, you know, thank you, for pointing out that this is not what meets your requirement, but I'll make sure that the pavers they put down meet your requirements. I think the ruling is based on the sand buffer and us putting the proper pervious pavers down. And I think if we don't do that, you come to the final inspection, and we still have the same problem we have today, and I think the whole idea here is to resolve that problem.

We are not trying to not. So that's all I'm getting at. I mean, I don't know if coming back makes sense when we are ready to deal with the violation. As long as you guys agree to the proposed plan.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I'll defer to the Town Attorney to answer that.

MR. HAGAN: I think the issue here is the Trustees want to be very clear on what is being installed at this site. There is a lengthy history with regard to issues of things being constructed and built on the property without Trustee permits, without Trustee review. I mean this is an as-built application that has been brought about based on violations on the property. So in the interest of clarity and in making sure this is in full conformity with the desires of the Trustees as well as the Town Engineer to make sure that we have the proper amount of drainage there, I believe that's why the Trustees are asking you to be very clear as far as what is there and not just give some sort of condition that, oh, it's going to be pervious. They want to make sure the plans are very detailed and clear so there is no mistakes between what the Trustees are desiring and what your clients understand need to be there.

MR. PORTILLO: Right. I'm just stating the fact that as a professional I will do the research, I'll make sure that the Town Engineer agrees to that paver. I think the plans indicate that we are going to do that and when I say that we are going to verify it, I'm going to verify that and make sure that the pavers we use, I mean, we don't want any more problems. My client doesn't want to spend any more money and rip up more pavers. That's all I'm getting at. I think the plans provide the information. It's our job to meet the specification. So my point is I'll verify the specification and we'll do the right thing here.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: So at this point we don't have a specification. We appreciate your willingness to do the research and amend the plan, and at this point I would suggest you table
it to do that, and we'll revisit this at the next meeting.
MR. PORTILLO: Okay, sure.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Is there anyone else wishing to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: Nobody seems to be wishing to speak.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion to table the application at the applicant's request.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL YES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 11, Suffolk Environmental Consulting, Inc. on behalf of IRA & SUSAN AKSELRAD requests a Wetland Permit to construct an addition to the first story of existing dwelling along its southerly face measuring 10'x31.2' (311.25 sq. ft.); construct a roof deck above the first story addition and extending 46.2' from the westerly end of the addition towards the seaward face of the existing dwelling (10'x46.2' or 461.25 sq. ft.); construct a first story deck immediately seaward of the proposed first story addition measuring 10'x27.3' (273.3 sq. ft.); construct 198 linear feet of bulkhead previously approved shortly after hurricane Sandy not built but removed, a 12 foot return on the South and of the bulkhead, a 12 foot wide splash pad between the lower and upper bulkheads, a 4' x 19' descending stairs to a 6' x 8' landing, a 3' x 10' descending stairs to a 10' x 20' at grade platform, a 4' x 6' platform at proposed lower bulkhead with 3' x 12' steps to the beach.
Located: 4125 Nassau Point Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-111-9-6.4

The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistencies are the 10'x20' at grade platform is proposed to be located in a FEMA Flood Zone VE. Structures there should be relocated or minimized due to threat of repetitive loss and damage from storms; as well as Policy 4.3, protect public lands and public trust lands and use of these lands when undertaking all erosion and flood control projects.

The bulkhead seaward projection may result in an impact and loss of public lands.

The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property, however, a quorum was not present.

The Trustees conducted a field inspection May 12, noting that the project would benefit from toe armor.

Is there anyone here wishing to speak regarding this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Suffolk Environmental present.
MR. ANDERSON: Bruce Anderson, Suffolk Environmental Consulting for the applicant Ira and Susan Akselrad.

First of all, thanks for meeting me out in the field on April 12th. You'll recall during that meeting we agreed to make certain refinements to our plans, including installation of toe armor, and you are in receipt of revised plans dated April 16th, 2021. Those plans depict a bulkhead, lower bulkhead, being
pulled back by a couple of feet. And also the toe armor that was requested by the Board and a reconfiguration of the platform at 8’x25’. I think the remainder of the, which is precisely what was requested here.

As per the LWRP coordinator, please be aware that the platform is not subject to FEMA requirements. It's an accessory platform. FEMA pertains only to principal dwellings. And in this case our principal dwelling is in an X-Zone in any event.

We have pulled back the bulkhead. It was essentially pulled back from what existed there prior to. So if there is an actual retreat from the shoreline, which I think will resolve pretty clearly what was discussed at the meeting.

Having said that, I'm here to answer any questions you may have. But I think we have met or addressed your concerns in full.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: One thing that came up in subsequent review was in Chapter 275-11(b)(1)(a). It allows for the one-time replacement structure seaward of the original. But then it also states any subsequent repair or replacement following the first replacement requires the structure to be built on or landward of the original structure. So since this is not its first replacement our hands are somewhat tied here by the code not allowing a seaward projection.

MR. ANDERSON: But I would point out that the original, the original bulkhead was not subsequently replaced. So I think we are within the definition of that. I think we are within that definition. In other words, there was a bulkhead there, it lined up with the two bulkheads on either side. And your plans requesting simply that it was not built or re-built. So this is a one-time replacement. It's not a subsequent replacement.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All right. So in regard to the LWRP and the inconsistency with this proposed structure going seaward, that may impact the loss of public lands, we will need a longform environmental for this, for potential loss of public lands and encroachment onto the beach before we can make a determination on this particular one.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay, but please be advised, that the meets and bounds are shown on the site plan before you, and we are not on public lands. We are wherein our property. It's already depicted on the site plan before you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Do you have DEC approval on this particular project?

MR. ANDERSON: No, we are awaiting your approval. We already discussed it with them, they do understand we have a problem with this tall bulkhead. And as we discussed out in the field, it is failing, and that if we were to lower it, rebuild it, I don't know what, the result would be to destroy the bluff.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Is there anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any other questions or comments from the Board?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: This is a healthy bluff, but it's very, very steep and it's failing. For that reason, I understand why they are trying to do what they are trying to do the project. My only caveat is I would like to see the toe armor be a little bit higher. The think the more toe armor you have there, the more sand you are going to retain, and you'll grow more beach front.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Anyone else?

(Negative response).

At this time I'll make a motion to table this hearing for submission of a long environmental form as well as a potential higher toe armor to potentially address the inconsistency with the LWRP concerning the seaward projection of the proposed bulkhead.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: At this time I'm make a motion for a five-minute recess.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

(After a recess, these proceedings continue as follows).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: We are back on the record.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 12, Suffolk Environmental Consulting on behalf of MILDRED PASCUCCI requests a Wetland Permit to construct a proposed two-story, single-family dwelling with the first floor area to include 518 sq.ft. of living space, a 1,445 sq. ft. deck, a 70 sq. ft. ramp, and 148 sq. ft. of stairway; second floor to include 1,741 sq. ft. of living space, a 345 sq. ft. deck, 112 sq. ft. of stairway, and 625 sq. ft. landing; install sanitary system along the easterly portion of the lot; install 151 linear feet of retaining wall; place an approximate 370 cubic yards of clean sand surrounding the proposed IA/OWTS septic system; install a well; install a 30'x15' French drain 2 feet deep and construct a 560 sq. ft. gravel driveway; landscape the property consisting of 2,600 sq. ft. surrounding the house to be planted with red fescue, 6,600 sq. ft. planted with Cape American beach grass; install three groupings of Atlantic Red Cedar and supplement plantings adjacent to the septic system with Groundsel Bush installed 6 feet on center and within the bounds of the property.

Located: 305 Narrow River Road, Orient. SCTM# 1000-26-3-11

The Trustees most recently reviewed this application on the 12th of May, which was one of many, many reviews. We discussed the new test hole data, groundwater elevation, which appeared to be unchanged from the prior report. All were present.

I would also like to note there is a letter in the file, a recent letter in the file, adding two folks names here from Narrow River Road. They are neighbors. The letter discusses some of the wetland issues with the environmental form, the need for a drywell with the sanitary system, as well as engineer's
report discussing the surface waters and drainage and basically how much water consistently floods this property. 

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. 
And the Conservation Advisory Council I believe supported the application with an IA system.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Suffolk Environmental present. Please introduce yourself.

MR. ANDERSON: Bruce Anderson, Suffolk Environmental Consulting.
We provided you the requested material on May 6th, 2021. I'm available to answer any additional questions you may have.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: Somebody by the name of Carolyn who would like to speak. Bruce, I'll mute you. Carolyn, if you un-mute yourself and state your name for the record, please.

MS. MCLAUGHLIN: Carolyn McLaughlin. Three points on the resubmitted short environmental form. One is I'm glad that now everyone agrees that the lot is wetlands. And then the decision, I guess, becomes can wetlands be built on.

The resubmitted short environmental form stated that the project is consistent with the predominant character of the built or natural landscape. And I point out that no property in the area has a six-and-a-half foot high retaining wall along the road. The short form also said that the storm water discharge will be directed to established conveyance systems, but does not state what those systems are. The road drain, and we've submitted pictures, shows that the drain is full even on light rain or high tides, so the water would run down the road to adjoining properties.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have a, forgive me if I say the name incorrectly, Nina Eshoo, who would like to speak. If you would like to un-mute yourself.

MS. ESHOO: Thank you. This is Nina Eshoo. I just want to articulate a few things from the letter we wrote, some questions that we have. And I'm just wondering if we can talk about what a drywell is and if there is one in the plans, given that it was stipulated that they have to have somewhere for the backwash to go and how that would be taken care of on this lot to make sure there is no overflow or other things. Again, I think between the septic system and the drywell and French drain, which I understand is distinct and different, there is just going to be a lot of water and risk on this site. So my first question is, is there a drywell on the plans.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Why don't we have Bruce address that to the Board.

Actually, did you switch them yet, switch who is talking yet?

MS. CANTRELL: No. Nina is still talking.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Okay, I think we'll circle back to your question there, but for starters would you like to run through your list of questions?
MS. ESHOO: Sure, thank you. So that is the main one. And I think we highlighted in the letter between the interplay between the septic system, the drywell and the different things in the manual about the septic system.
I think that we also just wanted to note yet again that the lot is the low point, and that while the engineer's report does talk about how our properties drain down to that property, that is only by the nature of the geology. None of us, you know, there is only one raised property in this whole area. We are all sort of on this sinking ship together where the land is just very low. And obviously we have been through that, so I won't go into anymore detail. So, thank you.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.
MS. CANTRELL: Would you like Bruce to know --
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Bruce, if you would like to speak to the concerns of the adjacent neighbors.
MR. ANDERSON: Bruce Anderson, Suffolk Environmental Consulting.
The plans depict a French drain that is located between the house and Harbor Road. This is the same drainage plan that was proposed in the previously-approved applications. It was also approved by the Town Engineer at that time.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Am I to understand that the water that passes through, any softening would go to that French drain?
MR. ANDERSON: Yes.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: As per the Health Department requirement?
MR. ANDERSON: As per the Town's drainage requirement. It is setback from the leaching pools and septic systems in a manner compliant with the Health Department, and having seen approval from the Town Engineer in the previous application, which is in your file.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?
MS. CANTRELL: Nina Eshoo would like to speak again. Bruce, I'll mute you.
MS. ESHOO: Thank you. I guess, and I'm not an engineer, there is a distinction between a French drain and a drywell, as I understand it, and there is more dangers with a French drain that is so shallow.
As to whether this will really be able to absorb a lot of water, particularly with the storms, if this is the natural place where water goes, and also with the backwash. So I guess if there is something to see, but I had understood that a drywell was distinct and different from a French drain. And I guess the issue that I'm concerned about, and maybe the Town Engineer looked at this, but as wetlands, there seems to be a risk that this water will create more of a blockage and potentially just create more of a danger to the underlying area in what goes into the ground, if there is the overflow and
everything else.
So I raised it, I tried to do a bunch of research, I understand they are different, there are definitely issues around the volumes of water, so I guess I would be interested in how the Trustees view that in terms of the wetlands. Thank you.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: As a point of clarification, I have been Trustee for a number of years, and it's, the standard engineering practice that comes out of the Town's Engineering Department, they typically like the French or trench drains in some low-lying conditions as a matter of capacity and design elements, and in many of the new modified manmade wetlands incorporated similar structures in their design. I'm not an engineer but what we see coming out of the engineering department this is fairly typical and seems to be at least the preferred method here of, not only Southold but other east end communities, with shallow ground water.
MS. CANTRELL: We have Jeanne Markel who would like to speak. Jeanne, if you would like to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board, go ahead.
MS. MARKEL: Hi, I'm Jean Markel. I'm a neighbor at 100 Harbor Road and I'm just incredulous that this property is being considered for development. It's always wet, and during a rain, even a small rainstorm, not only is the property wet but the corner where the road turns is also wet. And then when there is a high tide, you know, the triple threat of rain and wet property and high tide, then there is overflow from the marsh right across the street. You know, I don't know how many feet across, 15 feet, whatever. But, um, I'm against development of this land and I just wanted to say that.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. Is there anyone else to speak to this application?
(No response).
Any additional comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing on this application.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve this application noting that with the updating of the test hole and additional engineering report would bring this application into consistency.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The next application, number 13, Suffolk Environmental Consulting, Inc. on behalf of DEKKA, LLC, c/o CHRISTIAN BAIZ, ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER requests a Wetland Permit
to repair the existing ±480.0 linear foot long concrete sea wall located along the shoreline where needed; install a proposed 30.0 linear foot long bulkhead return back to the secondary retaining wall within the southeastern corner of the property; install a proposed 20.0 linear foot long bulkhead return off the northern terminus of the existing sea wall within the northeastern corner of the property; install a ±439.0 linear foot long retaining wall located ±15' landward of existing concrete sea wall, and comprised of vinyl sheathing, two (2) tiers of timber whalers (6"x6"), two (2) tiers of timber backing clamps (6"x6"), timber top cap (2"x24"), timber pilings (8"-12"± on center), timber deadmen & lay-logs (8"-12" on center) with tie-rods; deposit ±700 cubic yards of clean fill obtained from an upland source between the existing concrete seawall and proposed secondary retaining wall; grade and groom same, and plant with native plantings (i.e., Cape American beach grass @ 1.0' on center, etc.); and relocate the existing shed situated within the northeastern section of the property landward and to the southwest to a minimum distance of ±100.0' from the existing concrete sea wall.

Located: 120 Bay Home Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-56-5-1.3

This project had been reviewed by the Board last month. We discussed and requested of the applicant that they consider moving the proposed bulkhead further landward to protect vegetation. This also would help address the inconsistency of the LWRP.

We are in receipt of new plans stamped in the Trustee office May 7th which did depict that move of the proposed bulkhead.

The LWRP coordinator with his concerns effectively was to, concerns about turbidity controls, which is not necessary, it's been moved landward.

The Conservation Advisory Council supported the application. They questioned the legality of the existing signs. Public lateral access of the shoreline should not be blocked. The proposal as modified does not block the shoreline. Is there anyone here who wishes to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Bruce Anderson from Suffolk Environmental, if you would like to un-mute yourself.

MR. ANDERSON: Robert Anderson, Suffolk Environmental Consulting, on behalf of the applicant. Can everyone hear me all right?

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Yes, we can.

MR. ANDERSON: Wonderful. I believe I have complied with the Trustees request to pull back the bulkhead and extend the returns as to preserve any existing, the existing and flourishing tidal vegetation therein. I'm here to answer any questions that the Board may have.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Thank you, Robert, we appreciate the new plans. Is there anyone else wishing to speak to this application? (No response).
Any board members for questions?
(Negative response).
Seeing and hearing none, Robert, I'll make a motion to close this hearing.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted in accordance with new plans showing the more landward location of the proposed bulkhead 20 feet landward of the existing concrete sea wall. Plans dated in the Trustee office May 7th, 2021.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 14, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of GEOFFROY PENNY requests a Wetland Permit to install a 20'x40' in-ground swimming pool and associated 30'x50' pool patio with 4' high black pool code compliant estate fencing; install pool backwash drywell and pool equipment area.
Located: 570 Mason Drive, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-104-7-2
The Trustees did complete a field inspection on May 12th.
All were present. The notes indicate that the Trustees stipulate the saltwater pool and soundproofing for the pool equipment.
The LWRP coordinator found this application to be consistent.
The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property. a quorum was not present. And a (sic) transplant should be required for the proposed project. I believe that should be satisfied by the drywell that is shown associated with the pool.
Is there anyone here speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Jeff Patanjo present.
MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjo, on behalf of the applicant. We have no problems making it a condition to the approval that the pool be a salt water style pool system and landscape screening be supplied around the proposed pool equipment.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: The landscaping, I guess that we just need to clarify because the Trustees were asking for some sound deadening or soundproofing around that equipment, because it's so close to the property line.
MR. PATANJO: Yes, we can absolutely do soundproofing by way of landscape screening, such as arborvitaes or some other dense mutes of some sort, whatever is accepted, we would love that as consideration and a condition of the permit approval, that it must be screened, the pool equipment must be screened from noise, as a condition
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Any comments from the Board on that? Does that satisfy?
(Affirmative response).
Is there anyone else that wishes to speak to this application?
(Negative response).
MS. CANTRELL: Nobody raising there, their hand.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you. Seeing no additional comments, I make a motion to close this hearing.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to approve this application with the stipulation that this be a saltwater pool and that there be the landscaping around the pool equipment.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 15, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of DAVID WESTERMANN, JR. requests a Wetland Permit for the existing 1,846 sq. ft. (footprint) two-story dwelling with associated 1,694 sq. ft. attached timber deck with integral 8’x8’ hot tub; and to construct an addition to the dwelling by enclosing an existing 12’x7’ covered patio and converting it into living space with no expansion to existing footprint or additional impervious area added due to proposed work.
Located: 10098 New Suffolk Avenue, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-116-6-2
The Trustees most recently visited this site on May 12th.
All Trustees were present. Questioned if a foundation will be installed under the addition. And the house needs gutters to leaders to drywells.
The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent, noting that the as-built structures were existing in 1978 aerials.
The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property however no comments were provided.
I believe after a close review of the plans there is a foundation noted on the plans. To satisfy that question.
Is there anybody here that wishes to speak to this application?
MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjo, on behalf of the applicant. Any questions, I would be happy to answer them.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Jeff, is there plans to do gutters to leaders to drywells?
MR. PATANJO: None at the present time. It just has not benefitted from a Trustees permit apparently. I don’t know if it pre-dated the Trustees permit requirements or if it just never happened. I would think if it was built with the Building Department when it was required they would have, they would have needed Trustees approval. So I didn’t do much research due to the fact that it predated Trustees jurisdiction. So if we could just make that a stipulation in conformity with Trustee requirements.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: We can make that a stipulation.
MS. CANTRELL: We have Scott Edgett wishing to speak.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Before we take Scott, do we have any comments from the Board on the gutters?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Typically we want to see drainage.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Would you please invite Scott Edgett.
MS. CANTRELL: Scott, if you would like to un-mute yourself.
MR. EDGETT: Hi, guys. How are you. I have, we can easily tie
the gutters into existing drywells if you would like. I mean
there is, if I'm not mistaken it's a total of 19-feet of gutter
roof line.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: All right, would that satisfy the Trustees, to
make that a stipulation of the permit? Does that work for you,
Scott?
MR. EDGETT: That works for me.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is there anyone else here who
wishes to speak to this application?
(Negative response).
MS. CANTRELL: Nobody is raising their hands.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Any other questions or comments from the
Board?
(Negative response).
I would like to make a motion to close the public hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I would like to make a motion to approve the
application as submitted, whereby issuing a Trustee permit would
bring this into consistency with the LWRP and in addition the
dwelling would have to have gutters and leaders tied into
existing drywells.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Number 16, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of
JAMES & PHYLLIS RUBIN requests a Wetland Permit to construct a
proposed 215 linear foot long natural stone boulder border along
the landward side of existing wetlands to prevent salt water
intrusion during storm tides; during construction a silt fence
will be installed between the proposed stone and the existing
wetlands and remain until area is stabilized; 40 cubic yards of
clean sand fill will be placed landward of the proposed stone
and the disruption area will be planted with non-fertilizer
depended grass seed; and for the removal of existing catwalk and
replacement in same location a proposed 4' wide x 32' long fixed
catwalk; all decking to be thru-flow and all work to be
performed from an upland location.
Located: 745 Cases Lane Extension, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-109-5-14.45
The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency
is a permit for the existing dock was not located in laserfile
files; Chapter 275 Wetlands and Shorelines, requires no new
docks permitted over vegetated wetlands in West Creek.
The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support the
application.
The Trustees most recently conducted an inhouse review on
May 12th. We reviewed new plans. We do have new plans stamped
received April 29th, 2021, that shows the proposed stone wall moved a minimum of ten feet back from the edge of the wetlands.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Jeff Patano present.

MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patano, on behalf of the applicant. This is a follow over from last month, and the items that were addressed at last month's hearing have been addressed on these revised plans, moving the proposed rock wall ten foot away from the existing edge of the existing vegetation as suggested. And otherwise I believe we meet all the other requirements as addressed.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you. Anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any other questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application with the new plans stamped received April 29th, 2021, and noting that the existing dock predates the code, so therefore it will bring it into consistency with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: NUMBER 17, Jeffrey Patano on behalf of JAMES WILLSE & SHARON STACK WILLSE requests a Wetland Permit for the installation of 266 lineal feet of rip-rap shoreline stabilization along existing eroded bank; rip-rap to consist of 1-2 ton sizes placed in a single row with filter fabric behind them and to prevent erosion between joints.

Located: 1665 Mill Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-6-31.4

The Trustees most recently reviewed this application on the 12th of May. It was follow-up from I believe a month prior, in April, when we suggested that coir logs be used in place of rocks due to the size and scope of this project and the location of this body of water.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

I also wanted to note that I have a letter in the file stating that there was submission of new plans and new project description.

I'm looking at the plans which do in fact show coir logs, however I do not see the project description.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Jeff Patano.
MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjio, on behalf of the applicant.

Plans were revised based on comments addressed at the last hearing. Obviously, as mentioned, coir logs have been installed, well the plans are modified to have coir logs. And in addition, specific plants have been identified, which was recommended by the Trustees, which would be on the lower level. And on the upper area we were going to do Bearberry, which was recommended by the Trustees at the last hearing.

I believe all the items that were of issue have been rectified for this submission.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Did you send the project description? Is it a separate document from the plans?

MR. PATANJO: Absolutely. It would have been -- I can actually look here. Any time I send in revised plans, the revised project description would come along with that.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And that was submitted the same date as the new plans. Jeff?

MR. PATANJO: Yes. Typically, that’s how I would do it. Um, and if anything, on that revised project description it would have included plantings, and I believe that was the only change were wetland plantings to this application.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Okay. Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Does the Board have any comments on this application?

(No response).

Hearing none, I make a motion close the hearing.

TRUSTEE BREDENMAYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve this application based off the plans stamped received in the office April 29th, 2021, and upon the receipt of a project description matching said plans, which essentially just replaces the rip rap in the exact same location and scope with coir logs and plantings.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I’ll second that

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDENMAYER: The next application, number 18, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of KONSTANTINOS ZOITAS requests a Wetland Permit to construct bluff stairs consisting of an 4'x8' landing/ramp to grade at top of bluff to 4’x18’ stairs to a 4'x4' landing to 4’x3’ stairs to a 4’x4’ landing to 4’x18’ stairs to a 4’x6’ landing to 4’x7’ stairs to a 4’x4’ landing to 4’x8’ stairs to a 4’x4’ bottom landing to 4’x12’ stairs to ground; establish and perpetually maintain a 10’ wide non-turf buffer along the landward edge of the bluff; and to landscape and grade for rear yard lawn within the 100’ area from top of bluff.

Located: 980 The Strand, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-30-2-78

This project is deemed to be inconsistent under the LWRP,
with concerns about the stairs on the project where there is a community stairs present. And additional concerns concerning the re-vegetation along the bluff.

The Conservation Advisory Council voted to support this application with a suggestion of retractable stairs to the beach.

The Board further reviewed new plans submitted, which was submitted on May 12th. We reviewed them at our morning work session before field inspection, and it was noted that we wanted to see the, have the project description modified to include the 20-foot non-turf buffer, and that there would be no bluff re-vegetation. Apparently, it might have been a bit of miscommunication, because subsequent to that, we are in receipt of stamped and received on May 13th was the communication that was received via E-mail later in the day on May 12th with the new project description but it still describes plants being on the bluff and irrigation on the bluff. So we'll have to discuss getting a new project description and also reviewing the plans. I noticed that there are lines pointing to plant species that are intended to be replaced on the bluff.

Is there anyone who wishes to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: Pat Moore is present. She is not raising her hand.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I know there was a lot of requests for revised plans during this current meeting cycle and it was difficult for people to get them in, and things got confused.

MS. CANTRELL: Hang on. Pat had her hand raised and took it down.

Pat if you want to un-mute yourself.

MS. MOORE: There we go. The icon was not showing un-muting. It's Pat Moore. Can you hear me now?

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Yes, we could hear you. Could you hear me?

MS. MOORE: Yes.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: So go ahead.

MS. MOORE: So I was not, it's a new procedure you must be implementing with the project descriptions, because generally the project descriptions don't change. You asked, consistently you have asked for improvements in my buffers. I gave you the 20 foot landscape buffer. I was able to get that relatively quickly, surprisingly. And I submitted that right away. I was not given or I didn't see any comments about not re-vegetating the bluff area. That seemed to me something that was favorable. Certainly you want, if the beach stairs affect vegetation, you want to revegetate, in fact the DEC requires that to restore areas that are affected, and the landscape plan provided additional plantings to increase the vegetation on the bluff. But, so I'm not, I was not aware that you wanted to change that. I've come back to you with three different, three times revisions to the plans that, but this is a new one, so.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Yes. There may be a miscommunication somehow here, but when we did go over the plan on 5/12, specifically did say that we didn't want bluff vegetation, that the plan that was
received in the Trustees office on April 16th was showing the 20-foot non-turf buffer, still shows two species with a general line going to the bluff. And it would not be clear whether that is strictly limited to the immediate area around the stairs. So there is, from the top of the bluff, we are looking at beach plum, chenille prickly pear, winter berry and northern bayberry as a general annotation to the bluff, and it may well be that you didn't receive a copy of the field inspection report that we filled out on the morning before field inspection on 5/12, where essentially it said no bluff vegetation, meaning re-vegetation, meaning we wanted to leave the bluff alone. So I apologize if somehow that didn't get to you.

And then also you had written us a project description later for later that day, 4:36 on May 12th, and the project description you gave us, the new project description, irrigation of plants on bluff until plants establish, so it was not a new project description that was going to limit plants on the bluff. So I think this is probably one we would request that you would consider tabling until we can tidy it up and have the plans remove the vegetation on the general bluff, as the plans need annotation to plant species revegetated in the immediate areas around the stairs. I see that as one solution. Any additional Board concerns or?

(No response).

I'm not seeing any hands.

MS. MOORE: Okay. Yes. Unfortunately, that message never got through because I was following the drawings and the only modification I knew about was the increase in the non-turf buffer. So. Okay.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: I can only apologize as we all know it's been difficult given the volume of work lately and getting plant returns on plans may have simply fallen through the cracks.

MS. MOORE: Things happen. I just want to be clear so I can get the proper instructions to Briarcliff when they do this. I think we still want the plants that have been spec'd out to be used for any disturbed areas; is that correct?

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Yes, I saw general heads shaking up and down in agreement. The disturbed areas in the immediate vicinity of proposed stairway construction, yes. But not the entirety of the bluff.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Is it unclear on the bluff --

MS. MOORE: I understand.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I'm just looking for --

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: The new sets of plans show an entire hatching of dark green for the bluff and then just has lines drawn to it with plant species, which could mean the entirety of the bluff could be, cleared or altered putting those plants on it.

MS. MOORE: No, no, no, I want to be clear, there is no clearing intended here. I think it's just supplementing if there is any bare spots using the plants to fill in bare spots. So. I mean that was in my description. I didn't anticipate any clearing.
I think they used an aerial shot here, so --

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: The lines that go straight to the bluff, that are general lines. If they simply went to an area that was shaded or described, the immediate area around the stairs.

MS. MOORE: Okay, I'll try to get them to do some more -- I'll see what I can do. I can't draw it for them, so. All right, disturbed areas to be revegetated.

As far as irrigation, generally -- may I ask a question?

Are you ready?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just give us one second, Pat.

MS. MOORE: Okay, sure. No problem.

(Board members perusing documents).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I understand. Yes.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: We can do that, just subject to no irrigation. I can read her description and simply add on.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: It's your call, I was just asking if this was something.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: We have a 20-foot buffer. They did give us plans on that.

All right, Pat, can you hear me?

MS. MOORE: Yes.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Okay, I think we just took a look at the plans. I think we are in a position we can stipulate there will be no clearing and no alteration of vegetation on the bluff, and no irrigation on the bluff, and then we can move with the current set of plans. It's ordinary to do minor re-vegetation under stairs and we don't always stipulate it. It's sort of happens automatically. So would that be amenable to you?

MS. MOORE: Yes, absolutely. Now, I think that's the intention here, so I'm glad you are coming to that conclusion. I'm fine. Sure.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Okay, it was a bit confusing opening up the file here. Okay, is there anyone else who wishes to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

Seeing none, any additional Board comments?

(Negative response).

I'll make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: I make a motion to approve this application subject to the plans received in the Trustee office, stamped in April 16th, showing a 20-foot wide, non-turf buffer with the stipulation that there shall be no re-vegetation/replanting. All native vegetation on the bluff is to remain intact and that irrigation to be limited to, solely within the 20-foot wide non-turf buffer.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Just add the condition that any re-vegetation under the stairs only.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: And any re-vegetation to occur would be
under the immediate area of the stairs. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thereby bringing it into consistency --

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Thereby bringing it into consistency with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 19, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of DAVID ECKERT requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 60'x44' two-story dwelling with 294 sq. ft. front covered porch; a 425 sq. ft. deck attached to the seaward side of dwelling with steps on west side of deck to ground; new sanitary system on landward side of dwelling; 50' buffer area and limit of clearing and ground disturbance during construction; hay bales and silt fencing during construction; and gutters, leaders and drywells installed, and in compliance with Town Code 236.

Located: 1035 Waterview Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-78-7-14

The Trustees most recent field inspection, at this site was on May 12th, slightly afternoon. All were present. Notes simply read that this was a straightforward application.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property however a quorum was not present. Recommended that the driveway be permeable and that the applicant consider an IA system.

I will note that the plans stamped March 11th, 2021, show a gravel pervious driveway.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MS. MOORE: Yes, hello. Thank you. I won't belabor. If it sounds reasonable, I'll wait to answer any questions, but otherwise I'm, we had a good meeting in the field and my client had a previous permit, this was due to COVID, he was ready to get a building permit, he got a building permit but it would have expired a week after his construction commenced, so we thought prudent to reapply. And that's why we are here. Thank you.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

No further questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Motion to close the hearing.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Motion to approve the application as submitted.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 20, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of RDEN ASSOCIATES, LLC requests a Wetland Permit for the existing
1,872 sq. ft. one-story dwelling with 10'x22.2' front roof over concrete patio; 23.6'x23' garage and roof top of patio; 3.4'x10.5' outdoor shower adjacent to patio; 26.2'x25' raised stone patio, bar-b-que on patio; remove existing 7.5'x16.3' swim/spa and convert to patio area; a 2,020 sq. ft. brick paver driveway located 65' from the bulkhead; on north property line, a stockade fence runs 285.94' along north property line to the bulkhead and on the south property line 267.99' stockade fence to 45' chain link fence to the bulkhead; install drainage consisting of drains to downspouts to four (4) Storm-Tech SC-740 chambers and trench drain on west side of driveway and three (3) Storm-Tech SC-740 chambers with trench drain 200' from bulkhead; existing 15'x4' wood walk to 6'x12' wood deck to 4'x12' wood ramp and 6'x20' floating dock with piles; and existing 10' wide non-turf buffer to be maintained.

Located: 1760 Reydon Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-80-3-13

The Trustees visited this site most recently on 5/12/2021, noting that the site visit was straightforward.

The LWRP coordinator found this action to be inconsistent, noting that the water depth for the dock is not in the plan.

The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property however a quorum was not present and they did not make a vote.

Is there anybody here that wishes to speak to this application?

MS. MOORE: Hi. Patricia Moore.

This is, my clients, this was started under a prior owner. My clients purchased the property. The project continues. These are all pre-existing structures. Everything there has been previously built before Trustees' jurisdiction, and we are bringing everything into a permit, so that way they can be maintained and repaired.

We are adding drainage, and that was the additional, those will be the additional improvements. So the only new construction is drainage for the impervious surfaces. Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: That sounds great. Thank you. Anybody else here that wishes to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

Seeing no hands raised, any comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

I'll make a motion to close the public hearing.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion to approve the application as submitted, noting that the Trustees inspected the dock, historically been there with similar docks on neighboring properties, by issuing a permit and bringing this into consistency with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 21, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of
JAMES & KATHIE CAPOZZI requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 14'x28' in-ground swimming pool with a 1,135sq.ft. Pool patio; install a 165 sq. ft. landing off back door to patio; install a 6'x35' walkway to a 210 sq. ft. gravel area; install steps to upper landing and pool 20' long x 4' deep (80 sq. ft.); install 4' high pool enclosure fencing along sides of property and along the landward side of the 10' wide buffer; remove ten (10) trees, retain eight (8) trees and add landscaping, and perpetually maintain a 10' wide non-turf buffer along the landward edge of the bulkhead.

Located: 1525 Gull Pond Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-35-4-12

The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency is require a pool dewatering well in compliance with Chapter 236, Storm Water Management of the Southold Town Code.

The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property, however a quorum was not present.

The Trustees most recently conducted a field inspection on May 12th, noting four trees without ribbons at water side to remain. Other than that it was straightforward.

We did receive new plans stamped received May 18th, 2021, that do show a drywell as well as a tree removal plan stamped received May 18th, 2021, that shows the four trees to remain as indicated in red on the plans.

Is there anyone here who wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. MOORE: I'm here again, and if you need me, but otherwise we can move forward. Thank you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you. Anyone else here wish to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Any questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I'll make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application subject to the new plans stamped received May 18th, 2021, that show a drywell as well as the tree removal plan stamped received May 18th, 2021, that shows the four trees to remain as indicated in red. And by having the drywell brings it into consistency with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 22, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of DANNY FISHER, BARBARA KENT, JACK FISHER & DIANA SEDENQUIST requests a Wetland Permit for the existing 4'x16.2' fixed wood dock with removable 3'x14' wood ramp and two (2) "L" shaped floats: 6'x20' and 6'x10' with a 4' wide access path through the non-disturbance buffer; existing wood pedestrian bridge consisting of a 4'x15.3' wood ramp to 4'32.5' wood bridge to
4'x7.8' ramp with 4' wide access path through the non-disturbance buffer to cross Wunnewetta Pond on applicant's property; for a proposed 16.5'x40' in-ground swimming pool with 6'x9' spa; install drywell for pool backwash; proposed 758 sq. ft. patio and turf steps to grade; a 24" proposed stone wall surrounding pool and patio; along northerly property line 56 sq. ft pool equipment with proposed split rail fence with mesh to pool code; install 258 linear feet x 4' high pool enclosure fencing with 4' self-latching gate along south side of pool, and proposed 120 linear feet of 4' high wire mesh fence as per N.Y.S. pool code; establish and perpetually maintain a proposed 9,448 sq. ft. non-disturbance buffer along the landward edge of wetlands; establish and maintain proposed 3,440 sq. ft. non-turf buffer of natural vegetation with 4' wide access path to water to be maintained for a total of 12,888 sq. ft. of vegetative buffers; a portion of existing driveway along property line is to be removed and re-vegetated with evergreens (landscaped); portion of existing driveway to be relocated 85' south along Bridge Lane re-paved with pervious material and steel edging; install a proposed 1,000-gallon buried propane tank, and 120/240 V. Kohler generator set on 3'6"x8' elevated wood platform next to dwelling; existing 6'x5' outdoor shower modified in-kind; stepping stone walkway on grade in place of existing 200 sq. ft. of brick walkway, existing 60 sq. ft. landing resurfaced in-kind; proposed 18 sq. ft. masonry landing in place of existing 20 sq. ft. brick landing; proposed 333 sq. ft. on-grade terrace with step in place of existing 22'x10' terrace with step; existing timber steps (non-treated railroad ties) to be replaced in-kind; proposed stepping stone walkway on-grade in place of existing 105 sq. ft. brick walkway; proposed 14'x4' wide stone step in place of existing 9 sq. ft. stone landing; existing 24'x14'6" deck and 18 sq. ft. steps to be replaced with wood deck and steps in-kind and in-place; proposed 48 sq. ft. Masonry stoop in place of existing 27 sq. ft. brick stoop; proposed on-grade steppingstone walkway; and proposed 30 linear feet x 4" wide timber steps; proposed 275 sq. ft. masonry walkway in place of existing 39sq.ft. Brick walkway; and proposed evergreen screening.

Located: 1652 Bridge Lane, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-118-1-4.1

The Trustees most recently visited the site on the 12th of May and noted it was sort of a kickback of a prior application that had been discussed, and that it was straightforward.

The LWRP found this application to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council did not make an inspection. I would like to note that the LWRP coordinator would like any docks and catwalks, if and when reconstructed, to be done with open-grate decking.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MS. MOORE: Patricia Moore, once again, and I'm here to answer any questions.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. Is there anyone else that wishes to speak regarding this application?
(Negative response).
Any comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve the application with the stipulation if and when the docks and/or catwalks are rebuilt they are done so with through-flow decking.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The next application, number 23 --
MR. HAGAN: Sorry, Jay, if I could stop you for just a second.
Just for Diane, she has to write this, so any future repairs have done with through-flow decking. I just wanted --
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Is that not what I said?
MR. HAGAN: No. For future repairs. Got it.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Next application, number 23, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of SALVATORE & LESLIE PANICO requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 44.9'x27' driveway extension; a 54'x22.3' two-story addition; a 10'x26' deck and a 6'x21' handicap ramp.
Located: 575 Sleepy Hollow Lane, Southold. SCTM# 1000-78-1-10.11
This project is consistent under the LWRP.
The Conservation Advisory Council did not have a quorum and could not make a decision.
It's a straightforward application. The Board made a note on our May 12th inspection that we would like to simply tie in the leaders to the existing drywell, and that we were requesting to add a non-disturbance buffer starting at elevation 8 and running seaward.
Is there anyone here that wishes to speak to this application?
MS. MOORE: Yes. Patricia Moor on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Panico. There was no problem with the non-disturbance at elevation 8. And the house does have drywells. So 236 requires drywells for any new construction as well. And we'll obviously conform with that.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Great. Not present in the file, unless I'm missing it, was a new plan with the elevation 8 seaward of the non-disturbance. I guess I know there was a question whether you can get it in on time, or is it in transit?
MS. MOORE: I, quite frankly, that would have required the architect to send me new drawings, and I'm not even sure on what, I'm trying to remember what had the elevation 8 on it. Was it the survey?
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Elevation 8 is on the licensed survey of Michael K. Wicks.
MS. MOORE: Yes, that was, I requested it but got no response,
so. I actually called from the inspection. Right after the inspection we requested it.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Can we table this at your request? I understand there is a handicap ramp and there is a child with issues or -- is there something we can do on this?

MR. HAGAN: What's the exact issue? I'm a little unclear.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Stipulating a non-disturbance from --

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Stipulating an elevation on the survey.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: And for any type ramp construction.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: No. Okay. Pat, we'll have to ask you to table at your request so we can get the plans in to show a non-disturbance from elevation 8 to the waterward.

MS. MOORE: Well, if I can make a suggestion. I'm going to need to file covenants for the non-disturbance at elevation 8. So there will be control over this. You don't get a C of O unless there is covenants. So if it could be drawn in

(The Board is reviewing documents).

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: (Perusing). Okay. All right. It appears that we can move ahead because we have a clearly delineated line on the licensed land survey. So I guess we are in a position to do that. Let me ask, are there any more questions on this application? Is there anyone else wishing to speak to this application?

(No response).

Not seeing anyone, I make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted with the stipulation that gutters and leaders tie into existing drywells on the property, and that the as-requested and agreed-to non-disturbance buffer starting at elevation 8 is listed on the license land survey of Michael K. Wicks as stamped in the Trustee office March 26th, 2021, be a requirement of the permit. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Motion for adjournment.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

Respectfully submitted by,

[Signature]

Glenn Goldsmith, President
Board of Trustees