BOARD OF TOWN TRUSTEES
TOWN OF SOUTHLAND

Minutes

Wednesday, July 14, 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

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All right. Good evening, and welcome to our Wednesday, July 14th, 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).

All right, I'll start off by announcing the people on the dais. To my left we have Trustee Krupski, we have Trustee Domino, Trustee Bredemeyer, Trustee Williams. To my right we have Senior Clerk Typist Elizabeth Cantrell. We have Assistant Town Attorney Damon Hagan. We have Court Stenographer Wayne Galante. And also with us tonight from the Conservation Advisory Council we have Carol Brown and Maggie Merrill.

Agendas for tonight's meeting are posted on the Town's website and out in the hall.

We have a number of postponements tonight. In the agenda on page 16, numbers 15 through 19, and on page 17, numbers 20 through 24 are postponed. They are listed as follows:

Number 15, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of ESTATE OF THEODORE A. EIRING, c/o STEPHEN GUTLEBER, EXECUTOR requests a Wetland Permit to construct a proposed 1,840 sq. ft. dwelling with attached 320 sq. ft. garage, 224 sq. ft. front deck, and 536 sq. ft. back deck; install a proposed 14'x35' gravel driveway; install a proposed I/A sanitary system in front yard; add gutters to leaders to drywells to contain roof runoff; establish and perpetually maintain a 40' wide non-disturbance buffer along the landward edge of wetlands with a 4' wide wood chip path to the water; and to install a line of silt fencing during construction.
Located: 4077 Main Bayview Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-78-2-18.4

Number 16, Sylvia Ner Karas of Nelson, Pope, Voorhis on behalf of STEPHEN & KAREN CUBELLS requests a Wetland Permit to demolish existing one-story dwelling and construct a new two-story, single-family dwelling in its place; renovate and expand a
one-story cottage from 34.5'x10.5' to 34.5'x22.1'; construct a 16'x36' in-ground swimming pool with 48'x59.8' patio; and adjustments to grades using approximately 431 cubic yards of clean fill over an 11,653.7 sq. ft. area; and to revegetate approximately 1,314 sq. ft. of cleared area adjacent to tidal wetland areas.

Located: 2475 Bay Avenue, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-144-4-5

Number 17, Costello Marine Contracting Corp. on behalf of JOSEPH & MARY ELLEN LOGIUDICE request a Wetland Permit to construct a 4'x40' landward ramp onto a 4'x110' fixed dock with a 4'x40' “L” section at seaward end; construct a 4'x40' lower platform with a 5'x4' access platform and a 4'x16' ramp; install three (3) two-pile dolphins; and proved water and electrical service to dock.

Located: 10995 North Bayview Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-79-5-20.

Number 18, Michael Kimack on behalf of TIMOTHY J. & GINAMARIE STUMP requests a Wetland Permit to construct approximately 315 linear feet of hybrid low sill bulkhead; backfill with approximately 100 cubic yards of course clean sand just below lowered sheathings; maintain approximately 2 1/2 to 1 slope from top of sloughed bank and then flat to bulkhead; install approximately 3,200 sq. ft. of filter fabric over disturbed area and fasten with 8” galvanized pins; plant Spartina alterniflora to high water mark and then Spartina patens to undisturbed line @ one (1) foot on-center (±3,200 plants).

Located: 2200 Minnehaha Boulevard, Southold. SCTM# 1000-87-3-61

Number 19, Michael Kimack on behalf of JANICE HILLMAN SHYLES a/k/a JANICE HILLMAN REVOCABLE TRUST requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 4'x18' walkway with a staircase consisting of three (3) treads and four (4) risers with Thru-Flow decking (72 sq. ft.), connected to a 4'x24' fixed dock with Thru-Flow decking (96 sq. ft.), 168 sq. ft. total; and to install 14 - 8” diameter pilings.

Located: 8340 Main Bayview Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-87-5-23.2

Number 20, 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 21, Jeffrey Paganjo 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 spoils to be deposited and contained inside bulkhead for dewatering.

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

Number 22, Jeffrey Paganjo 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 jetties 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 23, 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

Number 24, 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 275-8(c) files were officially closed seven days ago.
Submission of any paperwork after that date may result in a delay of the processing of
the application.

I. NEXT FIELD INSPECTION:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: At this time I'll make a motion to hold our next field inspection
on Tuesday, August 10th, 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
Wednesday, August 18th, 2021, at 5:30 PM, at Town Hall and via Zoom.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

III. WORK SESSIONS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to hold our next work session Monday,
August 16th, 2021, at 5:00 PM at the Town Hall Annex, second floor, executive
conference room and via Zoom, and Wednesday, August 18th, 2021, at 5:00 PM, in the
Town Hall main meeting hall and via Zoom.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

IV. MINUTES:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve the Minutes of the June 16th,
2021 meeting.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

V. MONTHLY REPORT:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The Trustees monthly report for June 2021. A check for
$9,061.22 was forwarded to the Supervisor's Office for the General Fund.

VI. PUBLIC NOTICES:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral VI, public notices are posted on the
Town Clerk's bulletin board for review.

VII. RESOLUTIONS - OTHER:
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral VII, Resolutions - Other.
In order to simplify our meetings I make a motion to approve as a group numbers 1 through 4. 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 FISHERS ISLAND DEVELOPMENT CORP., c/o FISHERS ISLAND MARINA, LLC.
Located: Central Avenue, Fishers Island. SCTM# 1000-10-1-9

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 HARBOR VIEW COTTAGES LLC, c/o THOMAS SHILLO.
Located: 520 Sterling Street, Fishers Island. SCTM# 10-9-6.1

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 JERRY & CHRISTINE JOVENO.
Located: 1320 Little Peconic Bay Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-111-14-19

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 DARCY GAZZA.
Located: 1500 Beebe Drive, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-103-3-4

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

VIII. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEWS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: 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 the Section XV Public Hearings Section of the Trustee agenda dated Wednesday, July 14, 2021, are classified as Type II Actions pursuant to SEQRA rules and regulations, and are not subject to further review under SEQRA.

Christopher & Amy Astley  SCTM# 1000-13-1-5.2 & 6
335 Hill LLC, c/o John McCarthy-O’Hea  SCTM# 1000- 70-4-31
Felicity Wohltman Trust  SCTM# 1000-53-3-9
Port of Egypt Enterprise, Inc.  SCTM# 1000-56-6-4 & 6.1
Frank & Antoinette Notaro  SCTM# 1000-63-7-30.1
Anthony Ienna  SCTM# 1000-78-2-41
Michael Katz & Melissa Katz as Trustees of the Melissa Katz Revocable Trust  SCTM# 1000-118-4-8
Sticks & Stones Outdoors, LLC  SCTM# 1000-70-4-1
The North Fork Project, LLC, c/o Anthony Martignetti, Member  SCTM# 1000-106-6-4.1
Michael Monteforte  SCTM# 1000-122-4-26.2
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: That is my motion.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: 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, July 14th, 2021, are classified as Unlisted Actions pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations. That's my motion.
Fishers Island Development Corp., c/o Fishers Island Marina LLC SCTM# 1000-10-1-9
Harbor View Cottages LLC, c/o Thomas Shillo  SCTM# 1000-10-9-6.1
Jerry & Christine Ioveno  SCTM# 1000-111-14-19
Darcy Gazza  SCTM# 1000-103-3-4

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:
   Number 1, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION:  Docko, Inc. on behalf of
FISHERS ISLAND DEVELOPMENT CORP., c/o FISHERS ISLAND MARINA, LLC
requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to modify the west dock
"T" float to add four (4) 4±ft. wide x 24±ft. long concrete finger piers to replace the
existing pulley tie-off line berthing system; the existing west dock consists of ±60
linear feet of ±6ft. wide fixed wood pile and timber, and ±100 linear feet of ±6ft. wide
cement floating dock; modify the middle "T" dock end float to add four (4) 4±ft. X 24±ft.
finger piers to replace the existing pulley tie-off line berthing system; the existing middle
dock consisting of ±150 linear feet of ±5ft. wide fixed wood pile and timber pier with a
±90 linear foot x ±6ft. wide "T" float.
Located: Central Avenue, Fishers Island.  SCTM# 1000-10-1-9

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
Docko, Inc. Dated April 29, 2021, and having considered the plans for this proposed
project submitted by Docko, Inc. Dated April 29, 2021 at the Trustee's July 12, 2021
work session; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead
Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the
application as an unlisted action pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Docko, Inc. Dated April 29, 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 shellfishers: The plan allows a standard
  float finger pier 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.
That's my motion.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 2, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: J.M.O.
Environmental Consulting on behalf of HARBOR VIEW COTTAGES LLC,
c/o THOMAS SHILLO requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit
to remove existing ramp, float and pilings as necessary; construct a 6’x20’ extension
to the seaward end of the existing fixed dock; install a 4’x16’ aluminum ramp; install
12 new piles, and an 8’x18.5’ floating dock.
Located: 520 Sterling Street, Fishers Island. SCTM# 10-9-6.1

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 May 11, 2021, and having considered the survey
of property by CHA Consulting, Inc. Dated May 24, 2021, and having considered the
plans for this proposed project submitted by CHA Consulting, Inc. Dated May 24, 2021,
at the Trustee’s July 12, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead
Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the
application as an unlisted action pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by CHA Consulting, Inc. Dated May 24,
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 standard
  fixed catwalk 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.
That's my motion.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 3, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Jeffrey
Patanjio on behalf of JERRY & CHRISTINE IOVENO requests a Wetland
Permit for the removal of existing 6’ wide x 22’ long fixed dock and associated piles;
construct a new 4’ wide x 18’ long fixed dock with Thru-Flow decking supported with four
(4) 10” diameter CCA piles; a 30” wide x 14’ long aluminum ramp; and a 6’ wide x
20’ long floating dock supported with two (2) 10” diameter CCA piles, with the floating
dock situated in an "L" configuration parallel to the bulkhead; all decking on floating dock to be un-treated.
Located: 1320 Little Peconic Bay Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-111-14-19

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 July 7, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by Michael W. Minto L.S.P.C. dated September 8, 2020, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Jeffrey Patanjo last dated April 21, 2021 at the Trustee’s July 12, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Jeffrey Patanjo dated April 21, 2021 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 catwalk 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.
That is my motion.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 4, DESCRIPTION OF ACTION: Louis Caglianone on behalf of DARCY GAZZA requests a Wetland Permit to remove existing catwalk and construct a new 4'x138' catwalk; 3'x14' adjustable ramp; and 6'x20' floating dock.
Located: 1500 Beebe Drive, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-103-3-4

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 July 7, 2021, and having considered the survey of property by Kenneth M. Woychuk Land Surveying, PLLC dated May 5, 2021, and having considered the plans for this proposed project submitted by Louis Caglianone dated June 28, 2021,
at the Trustee's July 12, 2021 work session; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees declared itself Lead Agency pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, on July 14, 2021 the Southold Town Board of Trustees classified the application as an unlisted action pursuant to S.E.Q.R.A.; and,
WHEREAS, in reviewing project plans submitted by Louis Caglianone dated June 28, 2021 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 catwalk 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.

That's my motion

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

**X. RESOLUTIONS - ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS:**

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Resolutions - Administrative Permits. 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 and 4 through 7. They are listed as follows:

- **Number 1, MC DROEGE FAM. REV. TR. C/O MADELINE DROEGE**
  requests an Administrative Permit to construct a second story staircase from rear balcony to grade at (east) garage corner: 4'6" in width; 12'6" high with 2"x12" ACQ stair stringers with 2"x4" treads.
  Located: 885 Petty's Drive, Orient. SCTM# 1000-14-2-24

- **Number 4, GREAT POND RESTORATION COMMITTEE c/o KENNEY'S McCABE'S BEACH CIVIC ASSOCIATION**
  requests a Ten (10) Year Maintenance Permit to hand cut (trim) common reed (phragmites australis) along shoreline to not less than 12" in height and to restore area with native plantings.
  Located: Great Pond, Southold. SCTM# 1000-59-5-25

- **Number 5, Eugene Burger on behalf of JAMES P. RILEY, JR. 2002 FAMILY GST TRUST c/o ELLEN CHRISTINA RILEY, TRUSTEE**
  requests an Administrative Permit to remove cement section of loose blocks and to replace failing wooden erosion control walls with one 95'x4' wood and vinyl wall to be located within property line.
Located: 2950 Vanston Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-111-5-7.2.

Number 6, Nicholas Mazzaferro, PE on behalf of **PAUL POMERANTZ** requests an Administrative Permit to demolish and replace existing wrap around deck and construct staircase. Overall deck dimensions will be 26' 9 1/2" wide by 21' 7" deep with a 26 sq. ft. staircase. Proposed deck to have concrete foundations and structural wood columns with a wood railing system that completely encloses the deck area.
Located: 1205 Bay Shore Road, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-53-4-1

Number 7, Patricia C. Moore on behalf of **WILLIAM R. AHMUTY III REV. LIV. TRUST** requests an Administrative Permit to construct a 12'x28.5' deck and for a 32 sq. ft. outdoor shower.
Located: 3405 Bay Shore Road, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-53-6-10.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 2, Chris Mohr Landscaping on behalf of **VITO TANZI & LENA TRIEV-TANZI** requests an Administrative Permit to install a 4' high post and rail fence on beach in front of home down to high tide line. Located: 3345 Cedar Lane, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-37-7-10.2

The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency is to preserve the public interest in use of land and waters held in public trust by the State and the Town of Southold. Aerial photos show the high tide rack line landward of the property line and where fence is proposed in the west. Each area seaward of the high tide line are held in public trust.

We have new plans for this project stamped received July 9th, 2021, that show the location of the proposed fence, which is above the mean high tide, thereby bringing it into consistency with the LWRP.

Therefore, I make a motion to approve this application as submitted with the new plans stamped received July 9th, 2021.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 3, **JUSTIN & ELIZABETH MIRRO** request an Administrative Permit to erect six (6) 10"x3.5" aluminum signs on the perimeter of property stating: "Private Property". Signs are to be located along right-of-way and beach.
Located: 2455 Nassau Point Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-104-13-6

In review of this project, the Trustees want to stipulate removal of sign #1 on the plans stamped received June 17th, 2021, and furthermore to stipulate that no signs are to be further seaward than the bulkhead.

So I make a motion to approve this application to erect six signs, removing #1, and that none of the signs are further seaward than the bulkhead as on plans stamped received June 17th, 2021.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 8, **CHARLES & GINA CIRAVOLO** request an Administrative Permit to cut back hanging limb on Oak tree, trim top of hedge, prune lower level branches on Oak trees.
Located: 2415 Long Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-52-8-3

We do have a letter in the file from the Shamrock Tree Company dated June 28th, 2021, going over the details of the removal and the pruning.

Therefore, I'll make a motion to approve this application with the condition that the pruning of the lower level branches be no more than 15 feet high.

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

XI. APPLICATIONS FOR EXTENSIONS/TRANSFERS/ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Roman numeral XI, Application for Extensions, Transfers, Administrative Amendments. Under Roman numeral XI, again in order to simplify the meeting, I'll make a motion to approve as a group items 1 through 7 and 9 through 10. They are listed as follows:

Number 1, DANIEL F. & KATHLEEN M. KELLY request a One (1) Year Extension to Wetland Permit #9530, as issued on August 14, 2019.
Located: 2895 Wells Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-4-13

Number 2, KENDALL TODD requests a One (1) Year Extension to Wetland Permit #9503, as issued on July 17, 2019.
Located: 670 Bayview Drive, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-37-5-3

Number 3, ROGER D. TODEBUSCH requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #1161 from West Creek Avenue Trust c/o Peter M. Todebusch to Roger D. Todebusch, as issued on July 12, 1976, and Amended on December 13, 2017.
Located: 1130 West Creek Avenue, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-103-13-9

Number 4, MARK LAZAROVIC requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #9781 from Conrad A. Verostek Family Trust, Jessie Verostek Revocable Living Trust c/o Jessie M. Verostek, Trustee to Mark Lazarovic, as issued on December 21, 2020.
Located: 65 Grove Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-135-3-23

Number 5, Patricia C. Moore on behalf of ALYSE TICKER requests a Transfer of Wetland Permit #9679, from Theodora Marangas, Theresa Marangas, Eileen Rayeski, Catherine Wilinski & Alice Donlan to Alyse Ticker, as issued on August 19, 2020.
Located: 1685 Westview Drive, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-107-7-8

Number 6, FABRY FAMILY IRREVOCABLE TRUST requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9761 to remove 50 lf of existing timber retaining wall and replace with new vinyl retaining wall in same location as existing; and construct 20 lf of vinyl retaining wall to the southern property line.
Located: 3700 Deep Hole Drive, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-17-7

Number 7, KENNETH QUIGLEY requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9757 to reconstruct the fixed and elevated landside Catwalk 4°0'x73°0'+/-; fixed connecting catwalk 4°0'x30°0'+/- in lieu of previously approved 4°0'x18"; a fixed aluminum ramp 4°0'x40°0" in lieu of previously approved 4°0'x24°0"; construct a fixed connecting pier 4°0'x14°0"; fixed pier platform 6°0'x20°0" in lieu of previously approved 4°0'x20°0"; 2- swim ladders; 2- 12" pilings (tie off poles) 32' apart and 12' clear from fixed pier platform. All surface decking shall be “flow through” open grate materials. Clearance of 46" to be maintained over Wetlands Areas. Boat Size 24°9"; Floating Transparent kayak Launch: 5'x12' to be connected to Dock via Docking Lines or Dock Hardware; Water and Electrical termination at Bottom of ramp.
Located: 2245 Little Peconic Bay Lane, Southold. SCTM# 1000-90-1-16

Number 9, Robert I. Brown Architect on behalf of DAVID SCHWARTZ requests
an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9702 for a 801 sq. ft. patio in lieu of the previously approved 720 sq. ft. patio.

Located: 1015 Lakeside Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-90-4-5.1

Number 10, Docko, Inc. on behalf of U.S. DEPT. OF HOMELAND SECURITY, PLUM ISLAND ANIMAL DISEASE CENTER requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9720 and Coastal Erosion Permit #9720C to Install new dot drain system landward of apparent high water to west side of rubble wave attenuator; Construct new concrete head walls for drainage discharge piping. Plug existing drainpipe (dot); Reinstall all underground utilities with above ground panels as shown; and Repave the parking lot in the disturbed area.


TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 8, Costello Marine Contracting Corp., on behalf of JOSEPH & PATRICIA BRANTUK requests an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9819 to construct a 4'x20' ramp up to a 4'x42' catwalk over the wetland area leading to a 4'x107' fixed dock, install two ladders and a bench at offshore end, the entire structure to be decked with open-grate decking in lieu of constructing a 4'x20' ramp up to a 4'x42' catwalk over the wetland area leading to a 4'x77' fixed dock, a 4'x10' ramp to a 6'x20' lower platform.

Located: 44632 Route 25, Southold. SCTM# 1000-86-6-31.3

We did receive new plans stamped received June 14th, 2021, showing the amendments.

So I make a motion to approve this application in accordance with the plans stamped received June 14th, 2021.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

XIV. MOORINGS/STAKE & PULLEY SYSTEMS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral XIV, Moorings/Stake & Pulley Systems. Number 1, JAMES FINORA requests a Mooring Permit for a mooring in Richmond Creek for a 20' outboard motor boat, replacing Mooring #39. Access: Public

I make a motion to approve this application with the stipulation that the mooring be no closer than 75 feet to the ramp and that he has 30 days to move his current mooring out of Little Creek.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 2, JOSEPH FINORA requests a Mooring Permit for a mooring in Richmond Creek for a 19' outboard motorboat, replacing Mooring #991. Access: Public

Again, I make a motion to approve this application with the condition that the mooring be no closer than 75 feet to the ramp, as well as having 30 days to move his mooring from Little Creek.

That's my motion.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

XV. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral XV, at this time I'll make a motion to go off our regular meeting agenda and enter the 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.

WETLAND & COASTAL EROSION PERMITS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Wetland & Coastal Erosion Permits, number 1, Docko, Inc. on behalf of FISHERS ISLAND DEVELOPMENT CORP., c/o FISHERS ISLAND MARINA, LLC requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to modify the west dock "T" float to add four (4) 4ft. wide x 24ft. long concrete finger piers to replace the existing pulley tie-off line berthing system; the existing west dock consists of ±60 linear feet of ±6ft. wide fixed wood pile and timber, and ±100 linear feet of ±6ft. wide concrete floating dock; modify the middle "T" dock end float to add four (4) 4ft. x 24ft. finger piers to replace the existing pulley tie-off line berthing system; the existing middle dock consisting of ±150 linear feet of ±5ft. wide fixed wood pile and timber pier with ±90 linear foot x ±6ft. Wide "T" float.

Located: Central Avenue, Fishers Island. SCTM# 1000-10-1-9.

The LWRP found this to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council did not make an inspection, therefore no recommendation was made.

The Trustees visited this site on May 10th and May 11th, noting that the project appeared straightforward. Also did an inhouse review on June 8th, 2021, also noting the project appeared to be straightforward.

Is there anyone here wishing to speak regarding this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Keith Nielson from Docko, Inc. Keith, if you would like to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board.

MR. NIELSON: This is Keith Nielson from Docko, Incorporated.

I'm not sure I heard that correctly. Did you say that the project was determined to be consistent or inconsistent with LWRP?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Consistent.

MR. NIELSON: Consistent. Thank you. The project before you tonight, the application has been prepared by Docko, Incorporated, and it is simply to install four new 4'x20' finger piers on the end of the approved authorized T-docks at the end of the west and middle dock facilities on the south side of Fishers Island Marina/Fishers Island Yacht Club.
The project occupies the same area that has been occupied by the pulley tie off mooring system that has been there for decades, and does not represent a change in use or a change in the size or capacity of the facility. And it's minimal in impact area and there are no environmental resources in the area. There is no submerged aquatic vegetation on the bottom. We are not changing any of the shoreline facilities near Lands End and so there is no tidal wetlands impact. There is no impedance to water quality circulation, no public access impact. And so we believe that this represents in the truest sense of the spirit of the regulations, minimal development, and certainly to the advantage and safety of operations for the gas pumps.

The standard floating dock configuration would be built of wood components with encased plastic flotation Tubos, so there will be no exposure of any flotation materials to the water. They will all be encased and the wood finger piers will be built out of pressure-treated Southern Yellow Pine, with the exception of the decking, which will be plastic, will not be pressure-treated Yellow Pine. And the club has agreed to that.

I believe that we have complied with all of the guidelines, Town regulations, and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you. Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?
(Negative response).
Are there 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 as submitted.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

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

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 2, J.M.O. Environmental Consulting on behalf of HARBOUR VIEW COTTAGES LLC, c/o THOMAS SHILLO requests a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit to remove existing ramp, float and pilings as necessary; construct a 6'x20' extension to the seaward end of the existing fixed dock; install a 4'x16' aluminum ramp; install 12 new piles, and an 8'x18.5' floating dock.
Located: 520 Sterling Street, Fishers Island. SCTM# 10-9-6.1

The Trustees separately visited this application. Trustee Williams noted, questioned the maximum size of the float as well as the catwalk.

Trustees Bredemeyer and Domino on the 10th of May noted that there were two floats that would need modification. One float, a maximum of 120-square feet. Hold for new plans. New plans were submitted, are in the file dated May 25th, 2021, which were reviewed at subsequent inspection, inhouse work session discussion, on the 8th of June. All were present.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. Much of
the inconsistency speaks to Chapter 111, which would be the Coastal Erosion permit. The inconsistencies, Chapter 275 of the Wetland Permit, speak to mitigating potential impact with sea grass and marine habitat.

The Conservation Advisory Council did not make an inspection, therefore no recommendation was made.

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

MR. JUST: Good evening, Glen Just, JMO Environmental Consulting as the agent for the applicant. Good to see everyone with no masks on.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I should also add there is a new description, essentially adding the remainder of the dock in the file today for the record. Do you have anything else to add?

MR. JUST: I met with Trustees Bredemeyer and Domino on the site on May 11th and as shows in the final, they wanted a reduction or revision of the float, which we did, and I understand the implications with the Coastal Erosion Hazard Line, so.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Great. 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 for this application.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. JUST: Thank you, very much.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve the Wetland application for the Wetland permit with the plans dated stamped received May 25th, 2021, and the new description, which I'll read into the record: The applicant proposes to remove existing 3'x11.5' ramp, 8'x15.5', float piles as necessary, all of which were approved under the previous Wetland permit. Construct a 6'x20' extension on the seaward end of a 6'x59', fixed dock, which was approved under a previous wetland permit, and install 4'x16' aluminum ramp, 12 new piles, and an 8'x18.5', float, thereby bringing this application into consistency with the Wetland permit. That is my motion.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And I make a motion to deny the Coastal Erosion permit.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Due to the fact that it being over 200-square feet, as previously mentioned and being inconsistent with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: The next application, Number 3, 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’x5’10” 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

This project has been deemed to be both inconsistent and consistent under the Town’s LWRP.

The inconsistency, which the Board needs to address, draws from the fact that the middle platform was proposed at 10’x16’, which is in excess of the requirement that it be less than 100-square feet.

And the Board, in conducting its field inspection on June 8th, 2021, had noted that new plans had been received that address that with a new, smaller platform. New plans received in the Trustee office on May 26th.

The Conservation Advisory Council supports this application with specific recommendations. One is that the stairs at the base be parallel to the bluff and be retractable; and that the bricks around the pool should be pervious; and lighting on the staircase was noted to -- appeared not to be Dark Skies compliant, was considered a navigation hazard by the Conservation Advisory Council.

Is there anyone who wishes to speak regarding this application?
(No response).

Anyone from the Board, discussion. The lights, I don’t know that we had made specific note of the lights, but we can consider a stipulation the lights will be Dark Skies compliant.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I like that.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Any other questions or concerns of 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 in accord with plans dated stamped in the Trustee office May 26th, whereby the platform was reduced in size, bringing it into compliance with the Town’s LWRP, and further stipulate that the lighting on the stairways must be Dark Skies compliant. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

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

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 4, Martin Finnegan, Esq. on behalf of CHRISTOPHER & AMY ASTLEY request a Wetland Permit and a Coastal Erosion Permit for the merger of two (2) single-family residential properties; the demolition of 900± SF of the existing single-family residence and 200± SF of attached decking 11± feet and 3± feet, respectively, from the top of the bluff, and the removal of an existing 20± linear foot stone retaining wall and 500± SF of existing driveway 11± and 5±, respectively, from the top of the bluff, all on the easterly lot; the abandonment of the existing sanitary system on the easterly lot 15± feet from the top of bluff; the renovation/conversion of 600± SF of existing residence on the easterly lot to a new pool house (the portion of the existing basement garage that is beneath the proposed pool house will remain for storage) with roof deck 11± feet from the top of bluff (within the footprint of the existing residence); the construction of 420 SF deck over the footprint of existing residence on easterly lot 10± feet from the top of bluff; the construction of a 719± SF swimming pool and 78± SF hot tub with a 388± SF paver patio landward of the CEHA line and 55± feet (at a minimum) from the top of the bluff; the installation of a total of 55± linear feet of steel, stone and timber retaining walls for retained areas all 45± (at a minimum) from the top of bluff and all landward of the CEHA line; construction of a new outdoor shower attached to the new pool house landward of the CEHA line and 36± feet from the top of bluff; the installation of a new propane tank and sanitary system upgrades landward of the CEHA line and 75± feet and 50+ feet, respectively from the top of the bluff; installation of a 680± SF permeable gravel patio and some low-profile lawn steps seaward of the westerly residence 19± feet and 11± feet, respectively from the top of bluff; the installation of leaders, gutters, catch basins and drywells throughout the property to control stormwater runoff; the installation of a drywell for swimming pool backwash landward of the CEHA line and more than 75 feet from the top of bluff; the installation of 4 foot high pool barrier fence and gates with variable setbacks to the top of bluff throughout the properties; the installation of a steppingstone walkway and gravel parking area on the westerly lot all landward of CEHA line and more than 75 feet from the top of bluff; and to establish and perpetually maintain a variable width native vegetation buffer area along the top of bluff.
Located: 460 & 320 North View Drive, Orient. SCTM# 1000-13-1-5.2 & 6

The Trustees conducted a field inspection on this site on July 7th. All were in attendance except for myself. The notes read as follows: The pool fence ending at the bluff, depict the pool fence on site plan that conforms with New York state building code. Existing wood tie retaining wall repair and replacement should be included in the plans.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency arises from, it's the interpretation of the Policy 4.1, to minimize loss of human life and structures from flooding and erosion hazards. Section A-3, move existing development structures as far away from flooding hazards as practicable.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved not to support the application because there was not enough information to make a determination such as proximity to the bluff and the erosion mitigation plan.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?
MR. FINNEGAN: Yes. Good evening. Martin Finnegan, here for the applicants Christopher and Amy Astley, who are here this evening.

I understand that you all had had the opportunity to visit the site at some point. There is plenty of information in the file with regard to the details. I just want to do a brief overview and address some of the issues that were raised last week at the inspection.

As you know, this is two side-by-side properties. The bulk of the work is going to be on 320, the property to the east, which is currently improved with a dilapidated home which is and has been an eyesore in the neighborhood at Browns Hill for a while now. The Astley's reside in the 460 property to the west. They purchased 320 with the goal of merging these parcels, eliminating the eyesore and creating room for a family pool.

As you know from the plans, the 320 parcel is bisected by the Coastal Erosion Hazard Line. We are seeking a coastal erosion management permit to complete some of the work on the project that lies within the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area.

The proposal in general is to demolish the north end of the old home on 320, renovate what is left into a pool house with an outdoor deck. The removal/demolition of the north end will go down to the foundation and be graded. The first level, which is now the garage, will remain as storage space. The existing driveway and sanitary system on 320 are to be removed.

During the inspections, some concerns were raised about the wood tie wall along the top of the bluff. We submitted a revised plan to address that and a re-enforcement plan which consists of using, placing tie rods to shore up the wood tie wall along the perimeter of the bluff, and we would ask that the project description be amended accordingly and consistent with the plans. We also submitted revised submitted revised construction plans to address that change.

It's going to be a ten-foot non-turf buffer proposed landward of the top of bluff to be planted with native
vegetation, which we believe will further fortify the bluff. Since none of the proposed activities are considered a major addition under Coastal Erosion Hazard law, no variance relief is required from the Town Board, and as such we are requesting the issuance of a Coastal Erosion permit in accordance with Section 111-4-(b) of the Town Code.

The remainder of the project is landward of the Coastal Erosion Hazard line. The Astley's are proposing the installation of a swimming pool with spa. The pool improvements would all be more than 50 feet, 55 feet from the top of bluff. There will be a new propane tank and upgrades to the sanitary system on the west as needed. Gutters, leaders to drywells will be installed throughout the property to capture stormwater runoff and deal with any pool backwash.

The plan was also revised in response to the Trustees concerns about the pool, to clearly delineate the four-foot required pool fence. It is now more landward of the buffer area and pretty much straddles the perimeter of the pool. That should be fairly marked there.

So, as I said, the project contemplates the merger of the two parcels upon issuance of the required approvals from this Board and also from the Zoning Board. Remember, the Astley's designed this project to make a, to minimize activity and improvements within the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area and shift the structural improvement as far landward from the bluff as far as possible to protect the bluff. The removal and renovation of the old dilapidated house may be esthetically beneficial to the neighborhood but we would submit that the more significant benefit would to be the integrity of the bluff once that structure is pulled back and the bluff is re-enforced.

It's our understanding the project has significant support from the surrounding Browns Hill communities. We are aware of concerns that were raised by the Winter's with respect to the construction, but we feel that the construction methodologies that were submitted in conjunction with the application will provide ample mitigation of any potential impact. The Astley's have retained Holzmacher Engineering who have submitted a geo-technical report addressing many of the issues of concern with the project, and they will remain available as needed to assess, to ensure that all construction is done with the integrity of the bluff in mind.

So with that, we are available to answer any questions the Board may have.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I was wondering if you can comment on a letter received July 12th from neighbors John and Annette Winter, who had expressed concerns about the demolition process.

MR. FINNEGAN: Yes, I just mentioned Holzmacher Engineering has been retained to assist with the process and will be available. We believe that the detailed construction methodology provided in conjunction with the application address any potential impact on the bluff and are in fact intended to mitigate that.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Additionally, I noted on the plans that the swimming pool is 30'4" from the property line that abuts North View Drive. Would you say that is as close as practicable to that, to the road, and as far as possible from the bluff?

MR. FINNEGAN: I would say, yes, it was placed into, I think consistent with the contours of the property. And was, you know, it is far landward as possible. Obviously we have to deal with other setbacks issues in the Town Code as well, so that was the area that was arrived at to be the most conforming location we could find.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: For the record I would like to state that I visited this site with Trustee Bredemeyer in the Spring of 2021, and I'm familiar with the site.

Any other questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Any other questions or comments from the public?

MR. WINTER: My name is John Winter. Hon. Glenn Goldsmith, President, and Board and Trustees of Southold Town, our names are John and Anita Winter, and our waterfront home is directly adjacent and westerly of the two subject properties.

Our concerns regarding this extensive proposal is strictly regarding the bluff's fragile nature and any construction-induced disturbance vibration of the demolition. The Coastal Erosion Hazard line cuts directly through the living room the easterly house at 320 North View Drive, and the top of the bluff is a mere ten feet from the structure's northwest foundation corner. Demolition as proposed poses a potential danger and liability to the bluff stability as well as to physical injury, property damage and collapse. Consequential lateral bluff collapse peril can affect our adjacent property and personal safety. And here is some easterly property history. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation issued a permit to January 3rd, 1997, for the purpose of erosion control and construction of a retaining wall. The new retaining wall was to be located at the top of the bluff, and existing retaining wall is supposed to remain.

Following: The Board of Trustees Southold Town 2006 partial bluff collapse due to heavy rains and a storm. Application letter, site photos and existing site condition documents had been submitted to the Southold Town Trustees for approval of mitigation efforts.

The concerns regarding the applicant's demolition proposal on the easterly property are as follows: Their proposal drawing and descriptives. The easterly structure: The easterly structure's 822-square foot basement slab is to be removed. Bluff facing sand dune and concrete masonry unit wall to be removed down to the first course, which appears to be below grade. And please correct me if I'm wrong with that.

Each demolition is seaward of the Coastal Erosion Hazard line and very close to the top of the bluff. The proposed projects drawings mentions by a small footnote that some areas
will have the demolition process done by hand. That is commendable. Neither the environmental scientist nor the professional engineers reports address or assure that the induced ground vibrations, such as jackhammers or concrete power saws, could not loosen the delta flux soil eastward of the Coastal Erosion Hazard line.

Therefore, we request that the applicants discuss utmost demolition safety protocols with the Trustees and consider the benefits of supervisory and operational direction of an onsite professional engineer during the demolition and removal of the basement slab and CMU wall.

In regard to any issued permits or final determination, we respectfully propose that the Trustees, for both the safety of the bluff and the project, consider prominent language stipulating that additionally both the basement slab and basement wall are to be hand demolished and removed under the direct onsite supervision and direction of a professional licensed engineer. As stated in the proposal's footnote, all machinery or vehicles shall not exceed the drawings' designated confines while working in the area of the bluff.

The applicants' plan to relieve the neighborhood from this dilapidated house to the east is much welcomed. We ask our neighbors to carefully consider the benefits of the engineering these specific aspects of the demolition so deep in the ground near the bluff's edge.

We also ask the Trustees to language any determinations so that their compliance is understood and mandatory. Thank you, very much, for your consideration.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Excuse me, sir, what was your address?
MR. WINTER: 590 North View Drive. We are near the adjacent property.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Are you the owner of the lateral lands to the east directly abutting the property? In other words, the bluff face immediately to the east of the proposed?
MR. WINTER: We are directly to the west, sir.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: You are directly to the west. So you are not the owner of the lateral lands to the easterly as facing the property, the property to the right?
MR. WINTER: No, we are not.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Thank you.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Does anyone else wish to speak to this application?
MR. SHERIDAN: If I may, Ryall Sheridan, Nelson Pope & Voorhees Engineering, 70 Maxess Road, Melville, New York, on behalf of the Astley's. I'm just here to respond to Mr. Winter's comments.
I would like the Board to take into mind that the Astley's are well aware of the integrity of the bluff and the importance of preserving it.
They engaged Holzmacher during the design process to ensure
that we were going to address all of these issues. The report is fairly thorough, addresses the engineering aspects that would be required to take into consideration, and we do intend to advise the Astley's to continue to consult with Holzmacher throughout the construction process as to the importance of maintaining the integrity of the bluff. So that is something the Board could consider in their deliberations. If you have no further questions, I'll sit back down.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Any additional comments?

(No response).

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

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I'll make a motion to approve this application as proposed and in accordance with the plans, Sheridan Architect plans stamped received July 14th, 2021, noting that the merger of the two properties and demolition of 900, plus or minus, square-foot residence on lot 320 will reduce or help minimize the loss of life and structures and in concert with best management practices will address the concerns of the LWRP coordinator with the inconsistency. That's my motion.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 5, Jeffrey Patanjo 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

The Trustees visited this site on May 12th, all Trustees present, noting that the project appeared straightforward, with less bluff vegetation not to be disturbed. Access by barge only, with no bluff cut.

The LWRP coordinator found this project to be consistent. The Conservation Advisory Council inspected the property however did not have a quorum present.

Most recently on July 7th, the Board of Trustees reviewed a revised project description and plan and found the plan to be acceptable.

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

MS. CANTRELL: We have Jeff Patanjo present. Jeff, if you would like to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board.

MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjo on behalf of the applicant. Any questions I would be happy to answer, as you see the revised plan includes the stairs and the platform, which is removable and placed in the exact same location as the existing, and no other changes than that.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is there anybody else here that wishes to speak to this application?  
(Negative response).
Questions for discussion among the Board?  
(Negative response).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Motion to close this public hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Motion to approve the application with new plans and the project description received June 16th, 2021. The project description reads as follows. The project includes installation of 167 linear foot rock revetment at toe of existing bluff. Install 25 cubic yards of clean sand fill and Cape American beach grass to protect the property against additional storm erosion. Remove and replace existing steps in same location as existing with untreated decking consisting of 4.6'x8' platform, 3.5'x25' steps, and 8'x7' platform; 3.5'x48' steps; 3.5'x7' platform and 3.5'x25' steps to beach. Also noting bluff vegetation in place not to be disturbed. Access shall be by barge only, and no bluff cut or bluff modifications will be permitted. That is my motion.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?  
(ALL AYES).

WETLAND PERMITS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 1, ANNETTE CAMPBELL requests a Wetland Permit for the as-built reconstruction of existing previously permitted 180' long by 2 ½' wide fixed catwalk with 60 new posts.  
Located: 1185 Fleetwood Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-137-4-27  
The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency is the catwalk was replaced without a Wetlands permit. Note that a permit was issued for the catwalk in 1991.  
The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application however there was concern with the height and it should be verified to the high tide.  
The Trustees conducted a field inspection June 8th, noting to potentially space out the boards that are there for light penetration or to use through-flow decking.  
Is there anyone here to speak to this application?  
MS. CANTRELL: Annette Campbell, by phone. Ms. Campbell, if you want to press *6 and un-mute yourself to speak to the Board.  
MS. CAMPBELL: Hello?  
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, ma'am.  
MS. CAMPBELL: This is Annette Campbell, I'm on my phone, at home. Can you hear me? Is anyone there?  
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, ma'am, we can hear you.  
MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.  
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Do you have any questions for the Board at this time?
MS. CAMPBELL: No, I don't. Do you have any questions for me?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: One thing we noted when we were onsite, your neighbor also replaced their catwalk. You guys both did it in similar fashion, however your neighbor, the boards were spaced out more to allow light and water penetration. Is that something you would consider? Those outer boards, when we were on field inspection, looked like they had an inch, maybe two inches they could move out to go toward the pilings on either side, which would allow for light penetration through there. Is that something you would be amenable to?

MS. CAMPBELL: You mean take it all down and space the boards further apart?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, space them apart to allow more light to penetration through the wetlands below.

MS. CAMPBELL: Oh, man, I would have to rip it all apart and get the guy back and rebuild it to space it more than two inches apart. Is that what I have to do?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: No, we are just talking the two outer. So you have three, whatever it was, 2x6's, something like that, as the decking, running parallel with the catwalk. So the idea was to take those two outer planks and move them outwards to allow more light between those boards, because the way it's constructed it's doing some shading on the wetlands underneath.

MS. CAMPBELL: If I move the two and got someone to rebuild it, and move the two outer planks on each side, and left the one in the middle, I mean when I walk down it, we would fall between that space, if it was any bigger. How am I and my husband going to walk down to the boat if those are any wider? I mean he's 80, I'm 74. We can't fully walk through with the space that is there, which is the space that was there the last time I got the permit, which I didn't know that I had to re-permit it to rebuild it. Because the other one had, you know, broken apart. So I thought I was doing a good thing. But that was my fault. But to take it down, the person who I paid to build it, and space it wider, I wouldn't even, we would not even be able to walk down there with those spaces between those three boards were any more than two inches. I'm sorry, I wish I could have been there. I'm in Floral Park, or I would have been there.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I think all that the Board is asking is that the outer boards are moved out slightly to allow for light to pass through so the vegetation underneath is not killed by shading. I don't think we are looking for very much in terms of spacing, and in terms of work it's probably an hour's worth of work.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: An inch-and-a-half, maybe.

MS. CAMPBELL: You mean they all have to be -- a hundred yards has to be removed on two sides, and then I just have one board to walk on in the middle like a tight rope? I don't understand how I could possibly walk down the middle board if the two on the other side, there's three boards, that I have to get someone to rip it all up on both sides for 120 feet down, I mean, it's
an unbelievably large job, and then I would not be able to walk down the middle plank. The one middle plank.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, ma'am. The only thing, if you had come to us prior to, the current best management practices and dock building standards, we require through-flow decking, which allows you to walk, allows light and water to penetrate, which allows the wetland to grow underneath your dock. The fact that you built it without a permit and we were not able to tell you this prior to construction, so we are coming, kind of coming in late to the party here, trying to make the best of the situation.

MS. CAMPBELL: Well, my neighbor, since you brought him up, it's the same spacing as his. And my wetlands grass has already grown underneath there. It's already coming through like it used to. Are you sure that size is not acceptable now?

I have come to the meeting here the last time, but the papers weren't delivered to me to sign for my neighbors. And I spoke with the lawyer and he spoke with the Board, I was there two months ago, but because my papers didn't come in the mail, so my neighbors couldn't get the, you know, the letters that they needed. So it was put off to this. This isn't the first time. I've talked to the constable. He came and looked at it. He said there shouldn't be any problem. I mean it's not like this is my first time with you. Yes, I know, but I didn't know I needed a permit to again. You have on record my last permit, I think it was 2008 or '09. We did it the same way. We did it the same as my neighbors. My grass is growing underneath. If I move those boards out, we would not even be able to walk down it. A dog wouldn't be able to walk down it. I'm sorry, I'm really upset because I don't know what you are asking of me. I have a meeting on August 18th, I believe. I don't know what that is about. Is that a discussion I can have and show the boards over again? I took all the pictures, they were all accepted until now. Um, I didn't think I was going to have a problem. I spoke to Elizabeth about it in depth, and she had all the copies.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Mrs. Campbell, are you available to meet with us onsite on August 10th?

MS. CAMPBELL: I don't know if I'll be out there. Let me get my calendar. I have a calendar here. Bear with me one second. I don't know, I have to look at my calendar. Thank you. Hold on.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: In the meantime, is there anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?

(Negative response).

Are there any other questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

While she checks her calendar -

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I don't think she fully understands what we are asking.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: No. That's why I thought we could meet with her on August 10th to show her what we are talking about, which might clear up any misconceptions.

MS. CAMPBELL: Okay, you are asking if I can be there, what date,
sir?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: August 10th. That's a Tuesday.
MS. CAMPBELL: Is that my only choice, August 10th? Then I would have to cancel my -- okay, we'll do it August 10th.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All right. So, Mrs. Campbell, what we'll propose to do is table this application so that we can meet with you at your house and look at the dock together, so that we can all look at it, discuss it and show you what we are talking about, and then we'll table the decision until the following month. Is that okay?
MS. CAMPBELL: All right. What happens with my court date on August 18th? What do I do with that? What am I supposed to do?
MR. HAGAN: You can send a letter to the Justice Court requesting an adjournment with the consent of the Town Attorney's office based on the fact you are going to have a field inspection and a Trustee meeting that is going to occur after your court date.
MS. CAMPBELL: All right. I'm sorry, I don't even know what I'm doing without my grandson here. So if you don't mind restating what you just said so I can write it down and do the right thing here.

Now, you want me to cancel, I can't just make a phone call and say that I'm seeing you August 10th at my house, at what time? What time are you coming?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Probably after lunch.
MS. CAMPBELL: After lunch. Okay. And the court date is on the 18th. And you don't cancel it. I have to cancel it how?
MS. HAGAN: No, ma'am. You can still keep your court date on the 18th. This is Damon Hagan, I'm the Assistant Town Attorney, I'm the man who spoke to you in court with regard to the ticket.

So you can keep that court date. I'm sure the Trustees will be with you at the field inspection, and explain what adjustments will be made and then we'll deal with the court date on the 18th, okay?
MS. CAMPBELL: So I'll meet you, August 10th I'll meet with you at my home, and we'll re-discuss all this?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, ma'am.
MS. CAMPBELL: Okay.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you.
MS. HAGAN: That's it for me?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: That's it
MS. CAMPBELL: All right, that's it. Thank you.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Motion to table this application.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 2, Robert Brown Architects on behalf of FELICITY WOHLTMAN TRUST requests a Wetland Permit to construct a single-family dwelling totaling 1,694.1 sq. ft.; 133.2 sq. ft. rear steps; 67.3 sq. ft. side deck; 62.8 sq. ft. front deck; 26.2 sq. ft. Bilco door; 36.7 sq. ft. stone pavers for a grand total of
2,020.3 sq. ft.; a proposed 735.4 gravel driveway; a proposed rock wall or wood fence along the landward edge of the existing 50' non-disturbance buffer; and a 4' wide access path to the water to be maintained.

Located: 705 Bay Shore Road, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-53-3-9

The Trustees recently visited the site of the application on the 7th of July. All were present, and noted that, except for Trustee Domino, and noted essentially the same as the prior expired permit. That includes a 50-foot non-disturbance buffer, and then also questioned if there would be an IA septic installed.

The LWRP found this application to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council supports the application with an IA septic.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak with regard to the application?

MR. BROWN: Robert Brown, Architect for Ms. Wohltman. I'm really here to answer any questions you might have.

Just a little history, when the property was purchased by Ms. Wohltman, the existing Trustees permit was transferred. It was submitted, the application was submitted to the Building Department with all the relevant other permits, and the Building Department required some changes to the title documentation.

In the time it took to get the title documentation, because of the world as it was, by the time we submitted those, the Trustees permit had expired. And here we are.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just for clarification, do you already have septic through the Health Department?

MR. BROWN: There is a Health Department permit that has been, it was submitted with the Building Department package. To be honest with you, I don't recall whether it was an IA system or not. It was prior to a current legislation requiring an IA system in this kind of environment.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: So you do have approval from the Health Department already?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Okay. Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application? Any thoughts or comments from the Board?

(No response).

Hearing none, taking into account prior Health Department approval, I make a motion to close the hearing in this application.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And I make a motion to approve the application as submitted.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Number 3, 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
   This application is deemed to be inconsistent with the Town's LWRP, for the fact that the construction took place without the benefit of a Town Wetland permit.
   The Board of Town Trustees inspected the site, indicating that we wanted additional buffer protection, and we wanted to additionally ask for a 15-foot non-turf buffer.
   The Conservation Advisory Council voted to support this application with a 15-foot non-turf buffer. The Board is, was in possession of revised plans to numerate the buffer dated in the Trustees office June 28th. The buffer which is by and large a 15-foot non-turf buffer with a smaller portion of a ten-foot non-turf buffer further upland to accommodate the kayak rack, and we are also in possession of a new project description conforming with a new set of plans received.
   Is there anyone here wishing to speak to this application?
(No response).
Not hearing any comments, I make a motion to close the hearing in this matter.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve this application in accord with the revised plans received in the Trustee office June 28th, 2021, whereby granting a permit will bring this project into consistency with the Town's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program. That's my motion.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 4, Graham Associates on behalf of PORT OF EGYPT ENTERPRISE, INC. requests a Wetland Permit to remove and legally dispose of two (2) 2,000 gallon and one (1) 1,000 gallon above ground single wall storage tanks; install one (1) 8,000 gallon and one (1) 5,000 gallon double wall above ground gas and diesel tank; new double wall piping to existing dispensers; new hi-level alarm, leak detections alarm(s) and sensors; and install ±15 new 6" diameter concrete filled steel traffic bollards for impact protection @ 4' o.c. max.
Located: 62800 & 62300 Route 25, Southold. SCTM# 1000-56-6-4 & 6.1
The LWRP found this be exempt.
The Conservation Advisory Council on July 7th resolved to support this application.

On July 7th, the Trustees did a field inspection and noted that the concrete pad and tank were in place.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: We have Mr. Lieblein from Port of Egypt. Bear with me. You are using an older version of Zoom. Please bear with me.

MR. LIEBLEIN: Hello. Can you hear me?

(Affirmative response).

MR. LIEBLEIN: Yes, do you have any questions?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: No sir, I have no questions at this time. Do any of my fellow Trustees have any questions?

(Negative response).

Any questions or comments from the public?

(No response).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Mr. Lieblein, I'm hearing no further questions or comments from others. I'm assuming that you are just available to answer questions. I'm going to make a motion to close this hearing.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

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

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 5, Sean O'Neill on behalf of ANTHONY IENNA requests a Wetland Permit to abandon and remove existing sanitary system and install a new I/A OWTS system; and relocate existing shed from west to east side of property.

Located: 2400 Glenn Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-78-2-41

The Trustees visited this site on July 7th, 2021, noting that the plan was straightforward.

The LWRP found this action to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support the proposed action.

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

MS. CANTRELL: We have Sean O'Neill on Zoom present. Mr. O'Neill, if you would like to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board, go ahead.

MR. O'NEILL: Hello, this is Sean O'Neill, Bridgewater Environmental Services, just here to answer any questions any of the Trustees or audience may have.

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

(Negative response).

Questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

I make a motion to close the public hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I'll make a motion to approve the application as submitted.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 6, 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 jetties in same location with new vinyl jetties; and
new jetties to be no higher than 18" above existing sand elevation.
Located: 610 Park Avenue Extension, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-123-8-28.6

The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency is: The proposed jetties will impede public access along the shoreline. The application does not show mean high tide line in relation to the proposed jetties and the shoreline. The 18" maximum elevation of jetties above grade is an impediment to the public walking along the foreshore.

The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application using best management practices.

The Trustees most recently conducted an inhouse review of this on July 7th, noting that the jetty should be no higher than 18".

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding this application?
MR. PATANJO: Jeff Patanjo, on behalf of the applicant. I think this was two months ago, actually, when we came back to this. You had postponed, or I had postponed the application hearing based on the approval of the New York state DEC permit, which we have in place, and I forwarded that to the Trustees. No other changes have happened. Any other questions, I would be happy to answer them.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Jeff, I do have one question on plans received June 18th, 2021. The westerly jetty on the plans shows 57 feet, but in your project description you are showing 60 feet. Can you modify that to 57 to match the plans?
MR. PATANJO: Absolutely. I'll send that in my project description. I'll make an amendment to the application. It's shorter than what I have, so absolutely.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Okay, is there anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?
(Negative response).
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing no further comments, I make a motion to close the hearing.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
I make a motion to approve this application with the following project description: The project includes removal and replacement of two existing jetties in same location as existing. The east jetty is 80 linear feet total length, and the west jetty is 57 linear feet total length. Both jetties will be a maximum of 18 inches above existing sand elevation and be of vinyl and treated timber construction. And limiting the height to no more than 18 inches will bring it into consistency with the LWRP. That is my motion.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 7, Jeffrey Patanjio on behalf of 335 HILL, LLC, c/o JOHN McCARTHY-O’HEA requests a Wetland Permit to construct a proposed 13.5’x32’ in-ground swimming pool and associated brick paver patio; and install 4’ high pool enclosure fencing. Located: 335 Hill Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-4-31
The Trustees most recently visited this site on the 7th of July and noted it is a straightforward application.
The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.
And the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support the application.
Is there anyone here that wishes to speak regarding the application?
MR. PATANJIO: Jeff Patanjio. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak regarding the application?
(Negative response).
Any discussion or comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Hearing none, I make a motion to close the hearing.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve the application as submitted.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Next application, Number 8, Jeffrey Patanjio on behalf of JERRY & CHRISTINE IOVENO requests a Wetland Permit for the removal of existing 6’ wide x 22’ long fixed dock and associated piles; construct a new 4’ wide x 18’ long fixed dock with Thru-Flow decking supported with four (4) 10” diameter CCA piles; a 30’ wide x 14’ long aluminum ramp; and a 6’ wide x 20’ long floating dock supported with two (2) 10” diameter CCA piles, with the floating dock situated in an "L" configuration parallel to the bulkhead; all decking on floating dock to be un-treated.
Located: 1320 Little Peconic Bay Road, Cutchogue.
SCTM# 1000-111-14-19

The Board inspected this proposal on July 7th, noting that the dock removal and new construction looks straightforward.

The Board did note that behind the existing low sill bulkhead there was a lack of beneficial wetland vegetation. So at the time we did place in the record a suggestion for the planting of Spartina alterniflora in the barren ground section behind the existing low sill bulkhead.

The LWRP coordinator finds this project to be consistent.
And the Conservation Advisory Council voted to support this application.

Is there anyone 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 BREDEMeyer: The only question would be can we get some Spartina alterniflora on that lower low sill bulkhead. There is a barren area of maybe 100 square feet.
MR. PATANJO: I did see that when I was out at the site to post a sign. No problem. If you can make an amendment to the application or to the permit approval that we plant say 25 plugs of Spartina, we would be happy to accommodate.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Sound good to the Board?
TRUSTEE KRUPSki: Yes. I was thinking like one foot on center.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: I think that would cover that.
TRUSTEE KRUPSki: Yes.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Somewhere in that realm. All right, is there anyone else who wishes to speak to this application?
(Negative response).
I'll make a motion to close the hearing.
TRUSTEE DOMino: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMith: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: I'll make a motion to approve this application as submitted with the stipulation that 25 Spartina alterniflora plugs be placed on one foot centers.
TRUSTEE KRUPSki: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMith: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMino: Number 9, En-Consultants on behalf of THE NORTH FORK PROJECT, LLC, cio ANTHONY MARTIGNETTI, MEMBER requests a Wetland Permit to remove and replace in-place approximately 56 linear feet of existing timber bulkhead with vinyl bulkhead, and backfill with approximately 25 cubic yards of clean sandy fill to be trucked in from an approved upland source; temporarily remove and reset approximately 16 linear feet of existing stone armor adjacent to bulkhead during bulkhead replacement; and replace existing wood tie planter wall landward of bulkhead if/as needed.
Located: 5670 West Mill Road, Mattituck.  SCTM# 1000-106-6-4.1
The Trustees did a field inspection on July 7th at 2:40 in the afternoon. The notes read this is a straightforward bulkhead replacement.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

And on July 7th, the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

In addition, in the folder is a letter of memorandum from the Superintendent of the Highway Department Vincent Orlando, and I'll summarize: It says in connection with this project, plans prepared by En-Consultants dated June 1st, 2021, the Highway Department has no objection to the proposed activities, provided all work occurs in strict adherence to any approval issued by the Board of Trustees.

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

MS. CANTRELL: We have Rob Herrmann of En-Consultants is present.

MR. HERRMANN: Yes, thank you, Liz. Good evening, Rob Herrmann of En-Consultants on behalf of the applicant.

It is a straightforward application for a bulkhead replacement, and I see that you did get the letter from the Highway Department, so if the Board doesn't have any further comments or questions, I don't have anything to add at this time.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you, very much. Any other questions or comments from the public?

(Negative response).

Any other questions or comment from the Board?

(Negative response).

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

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

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

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 10, En-Consultants on behalf of MICHAEL MONTEFORTE requests a Wetland Permit to construct a two-story, 5 bedroom, single-family dwelling with a 1,996sq.ft. Footprint (including covered entry and partial 2 floor cantilever) and steps; with a 146 sq. ft. covered patio and steps; a 530 sq. ft grade-level pervious gravel patio; a 376 sq. ft. raised masonry patio and steps; and 12'x28' saltwater swimming pool; install pool equipment and A/C units; install 4' high pool enclosure fence; install pervious gravel driveway and walkways; install stormwater drainage system; install I/A sanitary system (using approximately 50 cubic yards of ratable soil in-place of existing subsoils) more than 100' from wetlands; and to establish and perpetually maintain a 50' wide non-disturbance buffer adjacent to the landward edge of tidal wetlands boundary, with a 4' wide access path to be cleared and maintained.

Located: 4060 Ole Jule Lane, Mattituck.  SCTM# 1000-122-4-26.2
The Trustees did a site inspection on July 7th, 2021, noting that the project seemed straightforward. And also note to, would like to see sound screening for pool equipment.

The LWRP coordinator found this action to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

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

MR. HERRMANN: Yes. Rob Herrmann of En-Consultants, on behalf of the application. It is a straightforward proposal to develop a presently vacant lot consistent with all the setback requirements and permit standards in Chapter 275.

The house will be serviced by an IA sanitary system situated outside Chapter 275 jurisdiction.

With respect to the pool equipment, as mentioned during field inspections, you should have received from us a revised site plan that relocated the pool equipment from its originally depicted location very close to the side lot line to a position immediately waterside of the proposed pool patio. So hopefully that should resolve the issue with the pool equipment. Of course, if you have any additional questions or comments on that, I'm happy to try to answer them.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: On the new plans, I'm looking at new plans, it looks like we received on July 9th, the pool equipment is now adjacent to the pool; is that correct?

MR. HERRMANN: It's on the, adjacent to the waterside of the pool patio. And that's correct, that you would be plans you received last Friday.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Okay, is that -- so it's a raised patio. Okay, does anybody feel the need to review this, or any input from the Board?

(Negative response).

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

(Negative response).

Any comments on the pool side? Everybody happy?

(Affirmative response).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: That's good. I would like to make a motion to close this public hearing.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I would like to make a motion to approve this application as submitted noting the new plans received July 9th, 2021, showing the pool equipment now not at the property's edge but adjacent to the pool.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 11, FRANK & ANTOINETTE NOTARO request a Wetland Permit to construct a 20'x40'x7' deep in-ground swimming pool with 800 sq. ft. of on-grade slate pool surround
patio; one 8' diameter catch basin for pool; and install 188 linear feet of 4' high pool enclosure fencing with two self-latching gates.

Located: 625 Calves Neck Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-63-7-30.1

The LWRP found this to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support the application.

The Trustees conducted a field inspection on July 7th, a question of the trees to remain. Question of tucking it closer to the house. And noting that the project was not staked.

Subsequently at our work session we had some concerns with the location of the patio and pool and the proximity to the top of the bank.

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

MS. CANTRELL: We have Mr. and Mrs. Notaro. If you would like to speak to the Board, please un-mute yourself.

MS. NOTARO: This is Antoinette Notaro, here to answer any questions.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Looking at the plans, we do have some concerns. Currently it looks like the pool is 14 feet from the top of the bank, and the patio in one section looks like it's less than four feet from the top of the bank.

So in discussions at our work session, we would like to see no structure, patio and/or pool closer than 25 feet from the top of that bank.

MS. NOTARO: 25 feet from the top of the bank would mean we would have to put the pool into our house.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Not necessarily. You can reconfigure the pool. It's 14 feet currently. It looks like you do have some more room to tuck it up closer to that porch, but then on the northeast corner you have a patio that is literally adjacent to the top of the bank, at the 20 foot contour line on the plans stamped received May 5th, 2021.

So our concern is any runoff or anything going right over that, off that patio, can destabilize the top of that bank and lead to erosion. So we need to move any structures further away from the top of the bank. It's up to you how the configuration of the pool or relocation or whatever --

MS. NOTARO: All right, if we make the patio around the pool porous, will that, because it's on grade, can we, we can move the pool closer to the house by two feet, make the surrounding patio more narrow?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: That could potentially work. Just in the purview of this Board, we don't like to see any sort of structure, pool or otherwise, that close to the top of bank. I can't recall us ever approving something only 14 feet away. So the general consensus among the Board --

MS. NOTARO: Well, the approval -- this is very similar to an approved permit we had about ten years ago that we unfortunately allowed to lapse. In fact it's almost identical. I believe that
permit was in 2008.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I mean this certainly is a new Board.

MS. NOTARO: I understand.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And we are definitely looking to really, you know, look after the environment here, and this is not something that this Board has been in the practice of approving. I mean, we are definitely willing to work with you, if you want to have a pre-submission with us in the field and sort of go over some of our thoughts and some of your thoughts, and stake out the pool to see how close we can move it up into that deck. It might be, if you want more patio, it might be more appropriate to go out into the side with the patio as opposed to having a large area of patio seaward of the pool. I mean I think --

MS. NOTARO: No. I'm not interested in having a large patio seaward at all. I just wanted to make it so when the kids run around they are not in the dirt.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Right. Yes, I mean --

MR. NOTARO: Gentlemen, this is Frank Notaro. Presently we are showing on survey that I drew, six feet off the steps. The pool starts 20 feet, then I put an eight-foot porous patio on grade beyond that. Now, where are you actually looking for us to put the pool itself?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: We don't design it, however from the plans, your plans here that are stamped received May 5th, 2021, you can see that the pool, according to your dimensions, is 14 feet from the top of that bank. So that is a primary concern. You know, whether it's moving the location of the pool and/or changing the width of the pool, something to give more than a 14-foot area to the top of bank and any sort of structure. That is what we are looking for.

MR. NOTARO: But you came up with a number, did you not? From the top of the bank, 25 feet.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: We did discuss 25 feet, however, maybe meeting in the field if that's not possible, like I said, it's workable as far as different dimensions of the pool, different location of the pool, potentially even moving it to the side yard, which I know would require a variance, but you do have a lot of room over on the side yard. So our main concern is the distance to the top of that bank. So we want to maximize that.

MR. NOTARO: Right. This is the only area that is relatively flat on the property. As you go toward that side that you speak about, you can see the contour lines, it dips down. And we really actually don't want to cut and fill at this point. So let's discuss this again. I show it six feet away from the step, which is a safety issue here. Okay, in other words if I put it at the bottom of the step, somebody could potentially fall right in from the step. So you know, we have a very stable top of the hill at 25.

MS. NOTARO: We can make this --

MR. NOTARO: Well, they're asking, Toni, 25 minus 14. Okay? So that's another ten feet. We are willing to bring that pool four
feet off the steps. That brings us 24 feet out. Okay. At that point. As far as grassy, the other side, we are open to like just a very small perimeter on that, on the 25-foot elevation side. So that would cut us back substantially from what we proposed. And this is extremely similar to what we were approved of already. I know this is a new Board. You've already said that to me, thank you. But the bluff is actually as stable as it was then. If not it's probably more overgrown at this point. So there is a lot of the stability there.

MS. NOTARO: Do you want to us meet you --

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just to that point, I just want to speak to that last comment. The bluff is stable, and we want to keep it that way. The bank. Excuse me.

MS. NOTARO: Right. We do, too.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: The point is trying to keep it that way. And I know as good land stewards of the property you do as well. But I think what you discussed, we are heading in the right direction, and if you want to meet in the field to sort of go over some details, that would probably be the most appropriate thing to do.

MS. NOTARO: Well, when, August 10th?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes, ma'am.

MS. NOTARO: In the afternoon?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: More likely late morning for you.

MS. NOTARO: Okay. All right. So we'll put the stakes in for you and we'll see you August 10th.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you.

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

(No response).

Hearing no further comment, I make a motion to table this application to meet in the field.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 12, Ural Talat on behalf of MICHAEL KATZ & MELISSA KATZ AS TRUSTEES OF THE MELISSA KATZ REVOCABLE TRUST requests a Wetland Permit for the renovation of existing 1,861 sq. ft. one-story dwelling consisting of: Removing first floor 12 sq. ft. waterside bay window; construct a 13 sq. ft. new first floor addition on waterside; existing 1,694 sq. ft. basement with grade access two-car garage, below dwelling to remain; new 1,810 sq. ft. second floor addition over existing first floor dwelling; proposed new two-story 116 sq. ft. landward side addition; proposed new 260 sq. ft. covered entry porch and exterior stairs on landward side; proposed new 52 sq. ft. entry deck on waterside; remove existing 250 sq. ft. entry stairs and patio on landward side; existing 16 sq. ft. masonry stairs on south side to be removed; existing 1,015 sq. ft. waterside deck adjacent to dwelling to remain; proposed new 64 sq. ft. hot tub built into existing waterside deck adjacent to dwelling;
existing 62 sq. ft. wood steps from top of slope at waterside of dwelling to deck structure adjacent to existing bulkhead to remain; existing 329 sq. ft. deck structure at top of existing bulkhead to remain; existing 39 sq. ft. beach stairs from top of existing bulkhead to beach to remain; proposed new 15 sq. ft., 20kw generator on south side of dwelling; existing 383 sq. ft. patio on south side of dwelling to remain; proposed new 200 sq. ft. exterior ramp on grade to existing landward side of dwelling; existing 33 linear foot long retaining wall on landward side of dwelling, north side to remain; install a proposed new sanitary system, located at landward side of dwelling, north side of property; and existing gravel driveway to remain.

Located: 8045 Nassau Point Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-118-4-8

The Trustees most recently visited the property on the 7th of July. They noted that an IA system would be more ideal. Landward side addition is straightforward at a minimum of six-foot non-turf buffer should be on the plans. And verify gutters to leaders to drywells.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. A Wetland permit was issued for the property in 2011 that required the removal of the deck 329 square feet, and the establishment of a 13-foot wide buffer. The buffer is not shown. The applicant is proposing to retain the deck, which is oversized and not permissible. Platforms associated with stairs are not to exceed 100-square feet. Also require the installation of an IA system. If approved.

The CAC supports the application with a pervious driveway with an IA septic system and the installation of hay bales and silt fencing during construction. It should also be noted I have in the file the C&Rs filed with the County Clerk’s office in 2011 for a buffer to be installed at 13 feet, which is presently does not exist on site.

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

MR. TALGAT: Hi, I'm Ural Talgat, here to answer any questions you may have.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Great.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Well, I should also mention for the record that we do have new plans showing the IA system, which when I first reviewed them, or we first reviewed them, we did note first of all that the buffer should read non-turf on the seaward side as opposed to just ground vegetation. It should be clear. However now with the new information of the C&Rs and the LWRP report you do have a filed 13-foot buffer. So your plans would have to match that. We are sort of bound with that.

And then furthermore we would have to discuss the platform, which is not permissible in the code, or some sort of workaround. If it's associated with stairs, it can't exceed the 100 square.

MR. TALGAT: I have a question. Which deck are you talking about?
Is it the deck that is against the bulkhead or --

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Yes. That one, um, is the one on the plans that is shown at 300 and, what did I say, 29 foot? Square feet?

MR. TALGAT: Yes, 329 feet. So that needs to be reduced?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Yes, within the -- you have no plans for that at this time, correct?

MR. TALGAT: No, there are no plans for that. One of the things that has happened, the property owners, the Katz, purchased the property just recently, they were aware of some of these things more than I was, so therefore this is a surprise to them, and more so to me. They are on Zoom right now watching, so I'm sure that we can work something out with reducing that to what is allowed.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Within the code, if it's associated with the stairs, a/k/a attached to the stairs, it would have to be 100 feet or less. 100-square feet or less. The Board would be open to hearing, if they wanted to do something detached from the stairs or, you know, not to design anything for you but something with regard to that, if you wanted to go that route.

MR. TALGAT: Okay. All right. So I understand what you are saying, if it's detached and the stairs just end on that upper level at the bulkhead and then there is a deck there, that's what you are suggesting.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Right. I'm not suggesting that. But that is an option.

MR. TALGAT: That's an option. And what is the square footage that is allowed as an option for that?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: The Board has to take a look at that on a case-by-case basis.

MR. TALGAT: Is it possible --

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I believe it's less than 200-square feet.

MR. TALGAT: So 199 square feet?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Okay, so we believe that it is a maximum of 200, but that would have to be confirmed in the code. There is something listed in Chapter 275.

MR. TALGAT: Okay. So it's 200-square feet at that lower deck area, that --

MS. BROWN: 100 lower, 200 on top.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Associated with steps, it's 100 lower. But on grade, unassociated with steps, it could, I believe it's the size larger.

MR. TALGAT: So, therefore you would need new drawings from us indicating such. And the issue here is the lower deck being disassociated with the steps. But the project from the bank up, you were mentioning something about instead of six feet, which you had mentioned onsite, you are asking 13 feet based on the fact it was approved --

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Exactly. Filed with the County.

MR. TALGAT: All right, so I guess that's what we'll have to do.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: And just make sure with any new set of plans will be clear with the non-turf buffer as opposed to the ground cover or, you know, the wording.

MR. TALGAT: Non-turf. It has to be non-turf buffer. Do we have
to list the plants and spacing?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: No.
MR. TALGAT: Okay.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: All right. So at this point do you wish to
table the application for submission of new plans?
MR. TALGAT: Yes.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Is there anyone else here wishing to speak
regarding this application?
(No response).
Any additional comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Hearing none, I make a motion to table the
application for submission of new plans.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Next application, Number 13, Stromski
Architecture, P.C. on behalf of STICKS & STONES OUTDOORS, LLC
requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 1,302 sq. ft. masonry
patio with a 448 sq. ft. pool within the masonry patio; existing
20'x12'6" wood deck to remain; construct an approximately
210 sq. ft. addition on north side of existing dwelling; demolish
existing detached garage; construct a proposed 730 sq. ft.
attached garage on north side of dwelling with bonus space
above; and to install a proposed 975 sq. ft. asphalt driveway.
Located: 3995 Wells Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-4-1

This application was inspected by the Board of Trustees on
July 7th, questions exist concerning the need for a retaining
wall of support which would be the south side or the waterside
of the pool. Questioned of the existing large oak trees and the
need to try to save them, and/or if that’s not possible, discuss
replanting or replacement.

The Conservation Advisory Council indicates support for the
project with a pool drywell. If it’s not apparent, I don’t see a
drywell location on the set of plans.

The LWRP coordinator has deemed this project to be
consistent. And I do note a question that arises from reviewing
the plans now at the time of the public hearing, there is a
concrete cover that is seaward of the proposed pool. The
question I have is whether that is a sanitary system cover and
that question would be that the pool, proposed pool excavation,
may be in conflict with existing sanitary lines going out the
back of the house.

Is there anyone here that wishes to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Robert Stromski, from Stromski
Architecture wishes to speak. If you would like to un-mute
yourself to speak to the Board.
MR. STROMSKI: How are you doing. This is Robert Stromski,
architect for the applicant. To answer your question, the
retaining wall is going to be a double tier retaining wall built
out of boulders and gravel. The applicant, who, which I believe is also part of the Zoom meeting can also answer some questions, but we had discussed some of these questions before the meeting, three trees, a mulberry, a cherry and a large oak on the south side of the property closest to the water are to remain and be pruned to enhance the health of the trees. Seven trees closer to the house are proposed to be removed. Three mainly due to poor health and leaning toward the house. Four of the trees are actually within the pool and patio area, so those would need to be removed. There are plans to replant four native deciduous trees along Oaklawn Avenue side of the property and one deciduous tree on Wells Avenue side of the property.

With respect to the concrete cover, I had spoken with the applicant prior to the meeting just to verify what that was. I believe it is just a concrete cover. There is no septic system underneath that. Or an existing drywell. I believe it was just a concrete cover. The existing septic system, I believe, is on the northwest portion of the property. Which is not in any way affected by the proposed pool construction. So other than that, if you have any questions.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Thank you, for that clarification. The concerns about the trees are substantial, I think exist in the mind of the Trustees. And also the Board would need to see the drywell on your plans, and I believe since the rock revetting wall structure does not appear in the plans, the Board would want to review the details of that retaining rock structure as part of the proposal.

MR. STROMSKI: We could submit some revised drawings for that. There is an intention to put a drywell, a 4x8 structure for backwash of the pool that was discussed with you prior to the meeting.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Okay, that would be quite helpful. Also, could we possibly get a confirmation on either the set of plans or on the survey where the sanitary system is, can we get a confirmation of that through building inspection? And also it might be helpful on the plans to outline specifically which trees you plan to remove, and the sentiment of the Board to replace trees at least one for one and maybe a new location for the replacement of the large deciduous trees that have to be removed would be helpful.

MR. STROMSKI: On the revised drawings we can indicate that information for you.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: And the Board would be revisiting the site with the revised plans, and if you could ribbon to make it easier for us visually, so if you could ribbon the trees you proposed to have removed.

MR. STROMSKI: I don't see an issue with that.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Thank you, very much. Any other questions or concerns from the Board?

(Negative response).

Any other comments or requests?
(No response).
Hearing none. So we'll table this at your request to provide us that additional information, if you will.
MR. STROMSKI: When would you need our revised drawings by?
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: We need them for approximately a week before the field inspections on the 10th.
MR. STROMSKI: Okay, we'll make sure that you have it at least seven days prior to the 10th.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Okay, thank you, very much. At this time I'll make a motion to table this application pending additional information and submit to the Board new plans.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 14, Louis Caglianone on behalf of Darcy Gazza requests a Wetland Permit to remove existing catwalk and construct a new 4'x138' catwalk; 3'x14' adjustable ramp; and 6'x20' floating dock.
Located: 1500 Beebe Drive, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-103-3-4
The Trustees conducted a field inspection on this site on July 7th. The notes read as follows: Confirm that there would be through-flow decking. Look at the pier line, just not completely clear on documents submitted. Otherwise, it's fairly straightforward.
The LWRP found this to be exempt and inconsistent. The inconsistency arises from the, pursuant to Chapter 268, seaward extension catwalk or dock is not recommended.
The Conservation Advisory Council on July 7th resolved to support this application.
Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MR. CAGLIANONE: Louis Caglianone, representing applicant. The existing catwalk does not extend far enough for them to moor a vessel, as you probably have noted. So their request for this extension was to make more usable use of their property and their waterfront.
As you know, the plans that were submitted show the height of the catwalk at four feet above grade, which is not consistent with the Town code. That was, the DEC was submitted concurrently with this Town and they replied twice. One of their comments stated that they cannot waive the four-foot height until the Town rejects it. Then they would consider going down to 26 inches. I have an E-mails supporting that. And they are waiting on the outcome of this hearing to determine if they can waive the four foot height. I believe that's the only thing that is inconsistent with the code. What else -- you mentioned they were incomplete or unclear on the drawings. Can I answer any questions as to what that might be?
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Our first consideration is we generally request through-flow decking on the surface to allow light penetration

MR. CAGLIANONE: That should be clear on the plans.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: And the second consideration is the pier line. I have before me a document you had submitted that shows a pier
that would be to the west -- I'm sorry, to the north of the, of your proposed catwalk, but it doesn't show the neighbor which should be to the south. And that, it's difficult for us to determine the pier line.

MR. CAGLIANONE: I had labeled all the lengths of the existing piers, correct? Do you see that? Is that clear to you?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: No, I do not see that. If you can show me. Can you see that?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: We did view that. It's just a little difficult to ascertain the pier line from that.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Yes. And I can't make a determination based on that. It's much too small. The margin of error would exceed what would be acceptable in dealing with these hydrologic information, which is the basis for expanding it out into deeper waters, so.

MR. CAGLIANONE: So you need a clearer view on this adjacent dock plan? Is that --

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I believe so.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes. So what we need is, since you show the dock to the north, we also need the dock to the south to establish that pier line. Because the scale that you had where you had them all measured out is a little too small for us to get an accurate representation for water depth and everything like that. So we are concerned that this proposed dock will not exceed that pier line. But we need to establish that pier line in order to make that determination, and we can't do that based on what is in front of us at the moment.

MR. CAGLIANONE: Can you clarify what you mean by the pier line? Of the two adjacent properties?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The two adjacent docks, yes.

MR. CAGLIANONE: So the lengths are shown on here, but you want to see the line between them.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The line on your plans, June 28th, 2021, where it says adjacent docks, you are only showing one adjacent dock. We need the other one to the southerly.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Again, I think we established that you have shown the length but at that scale, as Trustee Domino said, with the margin of error, it's very difficult for us to ascertain an accurate pier line.

MR. CAGLIANONE: Also submitted with the application was a hydrographic survey from Fox Land Surveying, which showed the line of the adjacent docks. Did you see that in the application as well?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: No, they are not there. The deficiency on this is that you did not show the proposed structure. So this is showing what exists.

MR. CAGLIANONE: Yes. Correct. And if you look at the line extending between the adjacent docks and our proposed --

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I did that. And it runs through a depth of 2.3. And your --

MR. CAGLIANONE: Exactly, so --
TRUSTEE DOMINO: On your other diagram you are showing at 2.6, which leads me to infer you are exceeding that pier line.
MR. CAGLIANONE: Correct.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: And I can't make that determination because I don't have that information in front of me.
MR. CAGLIANONE: We are exceeding the pier line to get to the depth of the water, which is why the adjacent dock plans shows there are several docks on the same waterway that are longer than ours. Which was my intent there.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: I would also point out to you that the shoreline is not straight. The shoreline moves in on this. So those are all mitigating factors that we take into consideration. I would also point out that we do approve shorter docks in less than 2.5 feet of water. However, they can have a floating dock. It would not have to be a affixed dock. That's another option. So it's not --
MR. CAGLIANONE: So, as proposed, the length of the dock is proposed to get to two-and-a-half foot depth of water. It still is less than one-third of the width of the waterway, and it's not necessarily any longer than some of the piers on that same creek. So is there anything that we can do to extend the pier to a useable length? What would be approvable by the Board to extend the pier so the homeowners can have a floating dock and a watercraft off it.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: The one-third rule is just one of the criteria that we consider. Additionally, the Board is not in the habit of designing docks or structures for applicants. I understand that puts a burden on you. But our criteria, the concern to us in this application is the pier line.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: And this is not a determination on those facts, now, but as Trustee Domino said, the inclusion of your proposed structure on the hydrographic survey that shows the neighboring docks, even in the current configuration, we would have to look at it in light of mitigating factors that we are discussing. So I think that leads itself to different options as far as how you might want to resubmit revised plans.
It also might be helpful, too, in submission of revised plans, is any revision you make, please make sure you stake the seaward most part of the dock for subsequent inspection.
MR. CAGLIANONE: So the desirable revision to this is to overlay the proposed structure on the hydrographic survey showing how much it exceeds the existing pier line?
That would be helpful in your review?
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: We would have to review it. I mean, there is a mitigating factor with the way the shoreline runs in the creek. I mean, I can't say, and I know other Board members may have concerns about it. If you went straight up to the pier line, the Board typically would, if you don't have depth, we are going to want to have a fixed dock.
MR. CAGLIANONE: So is there any situation where the pier can exceed the adjacent dock lines and still be an approvable?
Because --
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I don't recall us approving anything like that in recent memory. Everything needs to fall within the pier line. And the problem is, if you do not have a water depth for a float by staying within the pier line then you have to reconfigure to a fixed catwalk design, maybe an extension with a step down, or something like that, which we have allowed. But if it doesn't have two-and-a-half feet of water depth and it has to stay within the pier line. And those are the two criteria.

MR. CAGLIANONE: I understand the criteria, and I understand that this may not be the Board that approved, but if you look at some docks on this same waterway they extend much further out than adjacent piers. And I'm wondering what the circumstances were there.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: We can't speak to what was done by prior Boards.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Prior Boards, different rules, different regulations. Different DEC standards.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Let's not get off into that.

MR. CAGLIANONE: All right. So can we table this and I'll provide more documentation for additional review. Is that a possibility?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Yes, sir.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Sure

MR. CAGLIANONE: Thank you.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Is there anyone else that wishes to speak to this application?

(No response).

Hearing no further comments or questions, I make a motion to table this application at the applicant's request.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. CAGLIANONE: Thank you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Motion for adjournment.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MS. CANTRELL: Ladies and gentlemen who are still listening and watching the meeting on Zoom, we are now ending the meeting. Have a good night.

Respectfully submitted by,

[Signature]
Glenn Goldsmith, President
Board of Trustees