TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Good evening, and welcome to our Wednesday, August 18, 2021 meeting. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order and ask that you please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Okay, I'll start off by announcing the people on the dais. To my left we have Trustee Krupski, Trustee Domino, Trustee Bredemeyer, Trustee Williams. To my right we have Assistant Town Attorney Damon Hagan, Senior Clerk Typist Elizabeth Cantrell. We also have with us tonight court stenographer Wayne Galante. From the Conservation Advisory Council online, I believe, we have John Stein and Shannon Wright. Agendas for tonight's meeting are out in front and on the Town's website.

We do have a number of postponements tonight in the agenda. On page 8, numbers 14 and 15, page 9 numbers 16 through 21, and on page 10, numbers 22 through 24. They are listed as follows:

Number 14, Quiet Man Studio on behalf of JAMES LUBIN requests a Wetland Permit for the existing dwelling with a 1,705 sq. ft. footprint, existing attached 678 sq. ft. garage, existing 21 sq. ft. front entry deck to be removed, and existing 325 sq. ft. rear deck to be removed for a total of 2,729 sq. ft. of existing structures; construct onto existing dwelling a 14'9"x38'2" (562 sq. ft) rear screen porch; construct a 23'3"x7'8" (178 sq. ft.) rear covered porch/deck; construct a 10'0"x38'1" (380 sq. ft.) front covered porch; construct a 4'x6' (24 sq. ft.) outdoor shower; construct a 12'x7'5" (89 sq. ft.) Second floor balcony for a total lot coverage of 3,572 sq.ft.
Located: 2765 Wells Road, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-86-2-2

Number 15, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of D. CANNIZZARO QRPT & B. MILTAKIS QRPT, c/o JOHN MILTAKIS, TRUSTEE requests a Wetland Permit to dredge a total of 40 cubic yards of spoils surrounding existing floating dock to a depth of 4' below mean low water and placement into sealed containers and delivered to an approved upland landfill.

Located: 1460 Strohson Road, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-103-10-29.1

Number 16, 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 17, 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

Number 18, 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# 1000-79-5-20.14

Number 19, 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 sheathing; 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 20, 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 deck (72 sq. ft.), connected to a 4'x24' fixed dock with Thru-Flow deck (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 21, 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 22, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of GARY MANGUS & MIRIAM MEYERS requests a Wetland Permit to install a 6'x20' floating dock accessed by a 3'x20' ramp with railing built directly off existing bulkhead; ramp and dock
deck are to be “ThruFlow” or equal to allow light penetration; install electric
to the dock; dredge 25-27 cubic yards of silt to provide 30” minimum to marine
bottom for float and boat; angle of repose from proposed marine bottom to
existing marine bottom to be 3:1 min.; and spoils to be deposited and contained
inside bulkhead for dewatering.
Located: 1295 Island View Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-57-2-16
   Number 23, Jeffrey Patanjo on behalf of WILLIAM F. GRELLA &
GARY OSBORNE requests a Wetland Permit to construct a proposed
110’ long by 4’ wide fixed dock with un-treated decking and removal
and replacement of existing timber 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 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
   Those have all been postponed.
   Under Town Code Chapter 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 inspections
on Wednesday, September 8th, 2021, at 8:00 AM
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

II. NEXT TRUSTEE MEETING:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I will make a motion to hold our next Trustee meeting
Wednesday, September 15th, 2021, at 5:30 PM, at the Town Hall main meeting hall.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

III. WORK SESSIONS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to hold our next work
sessions Monday, September 13th, 2021 at 5:00PM at the Town Hall
Annex 2nd floor Executive Conference Room and via Zoom online
platform; and on Wednesday, September 15th, 2021 at 5:00PM in
the Town Hall Main Meeting Hall and via Zoom online platform.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
IV. MINUTES:

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

V. MONTHLY REPORT:


VI. PUBLIC NOTICES:

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

VII. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEWS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral VII: 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 14, 2021 are classified as Type II Actions pursuant to SEQRA Rules and Regulations, and are not subject to further review under SEQRA:

Stephen & Karen Cubells SCTM# 1000-144-4-5
Vincent Fischetti SCTM# 1000-86-5-6
Kevin Keyser SCTM# 1000-107-3-11.5
Estate of Theodore A. Eiring, c/o Stephen Gutleber, Executor SCTM# 1000-78-2-18.4
James & Nancy Clous SCTM# 1000-53-6-18
James Lubin SCTM# 1000-86-2-2
Neil T. & Amy McGoldrick SCTM# 1000-116-4-16.4
New Suffolk Properties, LLC/New Suffolk Marina, LLC SCTM# 1000-117-5-29.1
Mary Ann Howkins SCTM# 1000-86-2-7
Mark Alberici SCTM# 1000-99-3-19
D. Cannizzaro QRPT & B. Miltakis QRPT, c/o John Miltakis, Trustee SCTM# 1000-103-10-29.1

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

X. RESOLUTIONS - ADMINISTRATIVE PERMITS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral X, Resolutions - Administrative Permits, I'll make a motion to approve:

Number 2, Michael A. Kimack on behalf of STEVEN ISRAEL & CARA LONGWORTH requests an Administrative Permit for a Ten (10) Year Maintenance
Permit to hand-cut Common Reed (Phragmites australis) to not less than 12" in height by hand, as needed (6,120 sq. ft. +/-).
Located: 1100 Beachwood Lane, Southold. SCTM# 1000-70-10-60
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 1, BRIAN & BARBARA NOLL request an Administrative Permit for the as-built removal of one (1) dead tree, to prune trees.
Located: 450 Maple Avenue, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-107-3-4.1
The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency is that the work was performed without obtaining a Wetlands permit.
So I will make a motion to approve this application as submitted, thereby bringing it into consistency with the LWRP.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 3, GLENN KOOPERSMITH & EVA GREEN KOOPERSMITH request an Administrative Permit to install a 4' high black wire fence around backyard and in left front of house install a 4' high picket fence with a double gate; install an above ground hot tub on an 80" x 93" cement slab.
Located: 1630 Beebe Drive, Cutchogue. SCTM# 1000-103-3-18
I'll make a motion to approve this application as submitted with the condition that the fence is to stay within the lawn area edge.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 4, PATRICK DI LOLLO requests an Administrative Permit for an as-built deck which extends 18'2" northerly off of the house and is 34'2" wide. On the north side of the deck there is an 18' wide step/staircase which is two steps, three risers to grade. On the west side of the deck there is a 4'-6" wide staircase, 2 steps and 3 risers to grade. The deck is topped with brown Trex decking and white PVC railings.
Located: 870 Inlet Lane, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-43-2-8.1
Trustee Bredemeyer did an inspection on 6/20/21.
The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency is the structure was constructed without obtaining a Wetland permit.
So I'll make a motion to approve this application as submitted whereby granting a permit will bring it into consistency with the LWRP.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 5, LEILA ERHARDT & PAMELA SACHER request an Administrative Permit for an as-built 8'x3'9" outdoor shower.
Located: 775 Mill Creek Drive, Southold. SCTM# 1000-135-3-35.1
Trustee Domino did an inspection August 3rd, 2021.
The LWRP found this to be inconsistent. The inconsistency is that the structures were constructed without obtaining a Wetlands permit.
I'll make a motion to approve this application as submitted whereby granting a permit will bring it into consistency with the LWRP.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

XI. APPLICATIONS FOR EXTENSIONS/TRANSFERS/ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral XI, Applications for Extensions, Transfers and Administrative Amendments, I'll make a motion to approve as a group items 1 and 2. They are listed as follows:

Number 1, NORTH FORK LENDING, LLC c/o EUGENE BURGER requests a One (1) Year Extension to Wetland Permit #9547, as issued on September 18, 2019. Located: 64600 Main Road, Southold. SCTM# 1000-56-7-4.1

Number 2, DOUGLAS CARLEN requests a One (1) Year Extension to Wetland Permit #6064, as issued on January 19, 2005 and Amended on August 14, 2019 and Amended again on June 16, 2021. Located: 5550 New Suffolk Avenue, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-10-5
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 3, Frank W. Uellendahl on behalf of SUSAN & TIMOTHY MILANO requests a One (1) Year Extension to Wetland Permit #9519, as issued on August 14, 2019 and for an Administrative Amendment to Wetland Permit #9519 as follows: The Town Building Department deems the existing dwelling to be a demolition; the existing 366 SF 1-story portion of the dwelling to be demolished and replaced with a 214 SF 2-story addition in lieu of a 171 SF 1-story addition. The 36" cantilevered portion of the structure will not create any ground disturbance within the 25' CEHL; the 763 SF garage and the attached 150 SF greenhouse with be reduced to a 728 SF garage and a 56 SF greenhouse bump-out; the proposed 195 SF balcony cantilevering off the proposed north facing living room will NOT be executed and instead replaced with a ca. 180 SF (4'x44') paved walkway at grade; an additional ca. 300 SF (7'x43') paved walkway is proposed on the south side of living room connecting garage with kitchen; an additional ca. 1,220 SF (dimension as per site plan) paved patio is proposed along northwest side of dwelling, encompassing the hot tub and pool and front entry; there are two landscaped gardens proposed between hot tub and pool, no border walls are proposed. The proposed 40'x20' in-ground swimming pool will be increased in length landward to be 50'x20', holding
on to the 74' distance to the top of the bluff.
Located: 745 Aquaview Avenue, East Marion. SCTM# 1000-21-2-9
Trustee Bredemeyer conducted an inspection. Plus, the
Trustees conducted an inspection August 10th, 2021. We did
receive an updated project description dated August 16th, 2021.
So I'll make a motion to approve this application with the
following updated project description:
Frank W. Uellendahl on behalf of Susan and Timothy Milano
request a one-year extension to Wetland permit #9519 as issued
on August 14th, 2019, and for an administrative amendments to
Wetland permit 9519 as follows:
The Town Building Department deems the existing dwelling to
be a demolition. The existing 366-square foot one-story portion
of the dwelling to be demolished and replaced with a 214-square
foot two-story addition in lieu of 171-square foot one-story
addition. The 36-inch cantilevered portion of the structure
will not create any ground disturbance within 25-foot CEHL.
The existing 591-square foot deck will be reduced to
224-square foot deck by removing 225-square feet deck area
on the east side and 142-square feet deck area on the west side
of the existing dwelling.
16"x24" stepping stones laid in sand, 763-square foot
garage and the attached 150-square foot greenhouse will be
reduce to 728-square foot garage and 56-square foot greenhouse
bump out.
The proposed 195-square foot balcony cantilevered off the
proposed north-facing living room will not be executed and
instead replaced with a 180-square foot 4'x44' paved walkway at
grade and additional 300-square foot 7'x43' paved walkway is
proposed on the southside of the living room connecting the
garage with the kitchen.
An additional 1,515-square foot paved patio is proposed
along the northwest side of the dwelling, encompassing the hot
tub and pool and front entry.
There is one landscape garden proposed between the hot tub
and pool. No border walls are proposed.
Located 745 Aquaview Avenue, East Marion. That is my
motion.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

XIV. MOORINGS/STAKE & PULLEY SYSTEMS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Roman numeral XIV, moorings/stake &
pulley systems, I'll make a motion to approve as a group numbers 1 and 2.
They are listed as follows:
Number 1, JENNIFER McGREEVY requests a Mooring Permit for a mooring in
Richmond Creek for a 14' motor boat, replacing Mooring #968. Access: Public
Number 2, JENNIFER LYNN WALLING requests a Mooring Permit for a mooring
in Broadwaters Cove for a 21' outboard motor boat, replacing Mooring BC#1.
Access: Public
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

XV. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Roman numeral XV, public hearings. At this
time I would like to go off our regular meeting agenda and enter
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 comment
organized and brief. Five minutes or less, if possible.

AMENDMENTS:

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Under Amendments, number 1, ROBERT STRONG & JOAN
VITALE STRONG requests an Amendment to Wetland Permit #9805 to relocate the
proposed pool and pool patio back to the originally proposed location which is further
seaward in lieu of the currently approved location.
Located: 750 Lupton Point Road, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-115-11-18.1
The Trustees conducted a field inspection August 10th, 2021. Field notes say
don't see the need to move the pool.
The LWRP found this to be consistent.
The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.
Is there anyone here wishing to speak regarding this application?
Please step up to the dais and state your name.
MR. STRONG: Good evening, Trustees. Robert Strong, on behalf of the applicant.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: So this had previously been approved under
Wetland Permit 9805.
MR. STRONG: Correct.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I know there was an issue with one of the
trees that was to remain. It had carpenter ants. So that was
removed, and now you are looking to move it back to the original
proposed location.
MR. STRONG: That is correct. We spent an immense amount of time
with the landscape architect, our pool contractor JP Peters
North Fork Pools, with Rob Herrmann our expediter.
This project has been in the works for almost two years. We
submitted the original application, the Trustees did not grant
us permission to remove three trees, so we had two. I would like
to extend my thanks for Trustee Goldsmith for coming over when
we had the contractor there to trim the existing trees and
remove the ones we had previously been granted approval to
remove.
So we feel that since that tree is no longer an impediment to the project, it's a much better location, for a whole host of reasons, which we outlined in our letter to the Trustees.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you.
Anybody else here wishing to speak regarding this application?
(No response).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Any questions or comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
So I think upon field inspections and, you know, we have hashed this one out. I think ostensibly, as you said, with yourself and Rob and out in the field, because the original iteration of this project, the pool to us seemed a little close to that bank that goes down to Deep Hole Creek there. You know, in an ideal world that one tree would have remained that had the carpenter ants, but I think it was the feelings of this Board that just because that one tree got removed it didn't necessitate a moving of the pool from its previously approved location.
MR. STRONG: The previously-approved location presented a series of construction issues for us. Mainly, I think the 65 contour line, after we spoke with masonry contractors as well as our pool contractor, that is going to create a challenge for us to, you know, off that line and not in any way breach that line, which makes, based on my understanding, the DEC would have issues if we were to in some cases breach that line. So while it looks like we have a lot of room there, we really don't have a lot of room there. That's why we went with the original location of the pool.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Did you get DEC permits on any of this?
MR. STRONG: We have DEC permits for both locations. We were granted permits for the original one and then when that was denied by the Trustees, the original application, we went back to DEC and we received a second approval.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: It's approved for, regardless of the contour lines, for the DEC?
MR. STRONG: As long as we don't breach the contour lines. But the second location is going to put us almost right up against it. The second location will also put us up against one of the remaining trees during the construction process, which causes all kinds of problems. That's why we are requesting to go back to the original location. It keeps us, we'll remove three trees, all with approval, and put the pool in the center away from the contour line and closer to the house. It's really not that much closer. Although it's somewhat forward of the second location that we were approved on, it's not really a significant, different than our location putting the pool that much closer to the bank.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Anybody else have any thoughts?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Not particularly.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All right.
MR. STRONG: I believe our contractor Jason Peters is on the Zoom
meeting if there is any kind of technical construction questions that the Trustees may have that I don't really feel qualified to address. I know Jason is on the Zoom meeting.

MS. CANTRELL: Mr. Peters, if you would like to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board.

MR. PETERS: Good evening. So what we have here, the tree itself that was the point of contention, there is three or four trees that's the point of contention, in the previous, the first application we had, was the amount of trees that we were looking to harvest to get the pool in that location.

Now, I'm not sure if you guys have this in front of you or surveys in front of you, but the second rendition puts us within five feet of that 1929 contour line. In the first rendition, the edge of patio is actually 51 feet, the second is 50. Edge of the pool itself is not delineated, but roughly 70 feet. The first is 65. So the proximity of the outline of the project itself, in my opinion, is a little bit more conducive in the first rendition, which we do have DEC permitting for. And the orientation of the pool is more conducive with grade as well.

As we go toward Lupton's Point Road, the grade gets a bit heavier in that top corner, and that 1929 contour line gets a bit steep and I'm very close to that corner.

What I'm looking not to do is my proximity fence is going to be directly on that line at five feet, and from a construction standpoint, if I'm given a bit more room to be able to get machinery in and out to be able to complete the project and not breach any of those lines, as well as the orientation of the pool, we are not, there is one tree plotted on the secondary survey, the newest of surveys. There are two trees in that location. So there is one just east of the one that is plotted. There are two trees in that location. The three that are inside have all been taken down. The other two that are seaward are not going to be touched, but as we are getting closer to those trees and I start to tangle with the roots and digging down, if we turn the pool and move it away from those trees, the likelihood of them surviving, it becomes a 100% number. And as I'm not trying to take down or hurt anymore trees, I just feel that the location, the first location that we proposed is doable, is a doable feat, and keeps me away from two substantial trees that are in the path of the project at the secondary proposed location.

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

MS. CANTRELL: There is another hand under the abbreviations of AJG. So whoever AJG is online, if you can un-mute yourself on line, if you can un-mute yourself and spell and state your name for the record before you begin asking questions.

   Can you un-mute yourself, whoever AJG is?

AJG: Can you hear me?

MS. CANTRELL: Yes.

AJG: I have no questions at this time, I'm waiting for a different issue.

I just wanted to make sure that I would be able to communicate when the
time comes.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you. Okay, anybody else have any
comments regarding this particular application?
(Negative response).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Any questions or comments from the Board?
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I think that I have two issues with the
application in front of us, to be honest with you.
Number one is that we worked with these folks extensively
to try and develop a plan that could save a couple of trees.
And then without permits you went and removed the trees.
MR. STRONG: That's not true.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Let me finish.
MR. STRONG: Okay.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Now you want to move the project back to
where you originally proposed.
Number two, we also tried to work with you in, you know,
constraints of protecting the environment, pulling the project
back away from the wetlands as far as possible, which was what
was done for the secondary iteration that you came to us with.
Which you agreed to and thought it would be fine at the time to
work within those contours and constraints.
So this is a little tough one for me.
MR. STRONG: Well, not to be argumentative, but we didn't remove
any trees without permits. We have permits for every single
thing we've done. All this has been before the Trustees and
aboveboard. We have approval for everything. Every single tree
that was touched we have approval for.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: You were there for the second tree letter?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes. They had -- we gave them approval to
remove a couple. That's when they called me for the one they
were going save, and it was infested with carpenter ants. So we
gave them the tree letter for that one.
Any other questions or comments?
TRUSTEE BREDEMIEYER: I guess with the large number of trees being
removed maybe we can have a discussion concerning replacement
trees of a suitable caliper in an area that would not interfere
with pool operations.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: On the original?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I thought we did.
MR. STRONG: It's a sum total of three trees that were removed
from the project. That's it. All with approval.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Would you be open to a stipulation of
replacement of trees that have been removed in the other
locations of the property?
MR. STRONG: Yes, I guess we would be willing to do that. I
mean, it depends if I have to go out and buy a 60-foot tree, I
mean, the cost of that is going to be enormous. This project is
already way over our budget as it is. If you can give me a
little more specifics on exactly what you would like, a native
tree, something within the confines of the Trustees, we would be
willing to entertain that.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Any other questions or comments?
(No response).
Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Seeing as how we already went through this, we made the changes, we approved it in the location, it was supposed to preserve whatever trees were left, as well as move it as far back away from the wetlands as possible, I'm going to make a motion to deny this application without prejudice.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 2, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of **SAM ORLOFSKY** requests an Amendment to Wetland Permit #9638 and Coastal Erosion Permit #9638C for the restoration and revegetation of a 12'x80' area on bluff due to work on bluff; all disturbed areas to be planted with Cape American beach grass plugs at 12” o.c. with an additional 65 cubic yards of clean fill to restore area; proposed installation of coir logs (@ 107') with 20 cubic yards of clean fill at the top of the bluff; plant with native vegetation and graded landward of existing bluff to direct all drainage to proposed drywells; existing bluff staircase will be cut back to new grade and 4' platform from end of stairs to level ground, as needed; proposed drywell to capture roof runoff and surface runoff prior to reaching top of bluff and running over bluff; restore hedgerow on east and west property lines; construct egress basement window (30" wide x 48” deep) to existing foundation to comply with building code; reconstruct existing raised patio to original dimensions (14'x25’) and (8’x8’), and resurface with new IPE decking. Located: 18575 Soundview Avenue, Southold. SCTM# 1000-51-1-12

The Trustees most recently visited the property on the 10th of August, noted that terracing fill and coir logs may reduce erosion presently occurring, grade berm so becomes a non-turf buffer. We were also looking for new plans at the time, which I'm in receipt of.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent, noted that no rocks or boulders are removed from the beach. The bluff slope will most likely not hold vegetation unless terraces are modified.

The Conservation Advisory Council did not support the application because the damage has already been done. The restoration requires more terracing and backfill. Coir logs will not hold the existing damage to the bluff. The CAC requests more history on what occurred with the previous agent.

So just a little background before I open it up. The Trustees have done extensive work on this project with both the homeowner and the applicant. I'm in receipt of new plans stamped
received August 18th, which show everything that is proposed and existing on the property to include a ten-foot non-turf buffer to be graded away from the bluff to prevent runoff. Also going to two drywells, and show the size of the what was an existing patio, which has been redone and to remain.

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

MS. MOORE: Patricia Moore, on behalf of the applicant. I'm here to answer any questions. I think the description of the application in your explanation covers it, so I'm happy to respond to anything else you might have.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I assume that this description in the file stamped August 11th, is that your latest project description?

MS. MOORE: Actually I brought another one in August 18th because I wanted to be sure that the ten-foot non-turf vegetated buffer, so I brought in another one today because -- I had a non-turf buffer originally, but then the Board wanted ten feet. It should be there.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Yes, awesome. Okay, is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

MR. STEINBUCH: Yes. My name is David Steinbuch. I am a neighbor. And with all due respect, I have to disagree with Ms. Moore. I do not believe it's clear what is going on. This project has been going on for two-and-a-half years and nothing has been clear of what has happened next door to my home.

My concern, immediate concern right now, is the stairs that they put in that go down to the bluff, they are now approximately ending eight foot above grade. I have some photos I just took this afternoon, I would be happy to share with you. I don't understand what they are trying to do up there, a rocket launching pad or something, I don't know. But it's just horrible. We have been living next to a horrible mess, noise, dirt, sounds, you know, garbage everywhere, for two-and-a-half years. So it just keeps, it just continues to go on and on and on. But my main concern right now is where the stairs land. My concern earlier was with the bluff and the revetment of it, and the destruction of the bluff and the damage that was caused to my property adjacent to it because of all the disturbance on the bluff. I have about a 30-foot section that has since collapsed directly adjacent to them, to where the work was performed. There is nothing I can do about that now.

But it appears that they are going to have an elevated deck at the edge of the bluff, and I don't believe that is acceptable.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.

MS. MOORE: I just to address that. About three months ago, the contractor was working on the bluff and there were some modifications that were done that were outside the original permit, so the project was stopped. It's been stopped for about three months, and that is why you have not seen, there has been no activity there, because when the contractor was given the stop-work order, he stopped.

The stairs being cut back to grade just as the design is
planned, but again, if the grade of the stairs ends, depending on where the coir logs and the berm is going to be positioned. So once the berm and the coir logs go in, then the stairs will, common sense it will end there, so the steps will come down. So there is no plan to modify these stairs as a launch pad or a platform or anything. It’s as they were originally designed. But as you know from construction of stairs, it always depends on where the final grade of the property ends, where the final point of the stairs will terminate, so. It will make sense in the end and look like a normal set of stairs.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just for clarification, for any concerned neighbors, the contractor’s original plan was to bring in fill and bring those stairs up very high, which was not on the plan, which is part of the stop work. Which is part of the reasons the Trustees got heavily involved and made them change that.

MS. MOORE: Okay, thank you. I was not aware of that. Thank you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: That was the plan, right.

And to that point, I see we have someone else here that wants to speak, but to that point, I do have quite a few letters in the file from neighbors that the Trustees have reviewed extensively that speak to some of the construction issues and some of the drainage and erosion concerns that we, the Trustees have been working on these issues from the start of this project and taking them heavily into account.

Is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application? Step forward state your name.

MS. DUPONT: Yes. My name is Beatrice Dupont. I am also an adjacent neighbor, and as David mentioned, we live near an awful mess with the construction and the construction workers on the roof. That’s not the point. What is upsetting me about this plan is there is a claim there was an existing 14x25 deck on the property. There never was a 14x25’ deck on the property. I have sent pictures to the Trustees, showing where the deck was, and it’s very clear where it’s stopped and where it’s not. I see there is an extension on the documents which you just went in to and it was told where we are and it never was in that. We are so upset that concrete foundation with home and the destruction that can’t continue with the problems that is going on with the erosion on that side of the bluff. (Inaudible).

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

(No response).
Any additional comments from the Board at this time?
(Negative response).
All right, in summary, the Board has taken into account a lot of the concerns here and tried to work very, very closely with the applicant to fix some of the mistakes that were made during the construction of this project.

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

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
I make a motion to approve the application with the new
description that I will read into the record, and with the plans
stamped received in the office August 18th, 2021.
Amendment to permit 9638 and 9638C, restoration and
revegetation of 12'x80' area on bluff due to work on bluff; all
disturbed areas to be planted with Cape American beach grass
plugs at 12" on center, with an additional 65 cubic yards of
clean fill to restore area; proposed installation of coir logs @
107' with 20 cubic yards of clean fill at the top of the bluff;
plant native vegetation and graded landward of existing bluff to
direct all drainage to proposed drywells; establish 10' non-turf
vegetated buffer landward from top of bluff; existing staircase
will be cut back to new grade and a four-foot platform from the
end of stairs to level ground as needed; proposed drywell to
capture roof runoff and surface runoff prior to reaching top of
bluff and running over bluff; restore hedgerow on east and west
property line; construct egress basement window (30" wide x 48"
deep) to existing foundation to comply with building code,
building permit 44320; reconstruct existing raised patio to
original dimension (14'x25') and (8'x8') and resurface with new
IPE decking; remove retaining blocks from bluff area.
That is my motion.
TRUSTEE BREDENEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

WETLAND PERMITS:

TRUSTEE BREDENEMEYER: The next application, under Wetland permits:
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.
This project deemed to be inconsistent with the Town’s LWRP in
that the catwalk was a replacement of a structure that had a prior permit
which was issued in 1991 as 3961.
The project has been supported by the Conservation Advisory Council
with concerns about the height of the deck in reference to the high water mark.
The Board of Town Trustees performed inspections on the site on
June 8th, and again on August 10th, with Ms. Campbell present at that time,
wherein the Board discussed concerns of the spacing between the deck boards
to allow for proper growth of the wetland beneath the replacement structure is
historically what catwalks were intended before adoption of some new standards.
It is my understanding that Ms. Campbell did agree to increase the board
spacing to allow the wetlands to grow and that was subsequently inspected by
Trustee Krupski to see that the dock was brought into compliance with respect to
the wishes of the Board.
Is there anyone here who wishes to speak to this application?
(No response).
Okay, not seeing anyone, I make a motion close this hearing.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve this application
as submitted, noting that the board spacing is increased to an inch-and-a-half,
and whereby granting a permit will bring it into consistency under the Town's LWRP.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I recuse myself from the next application.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 2, 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

The Trustees most recent field inspection at this site
occurred on August 10th, and notes all were present. The notes
read discuss the planting plan and tree caliper size.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this
application with the installation of drywells to contain pool
backwash.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MR. ZUHOSKI: Ian Zuhoski, the applicant and the contractor on
site. Happy to answer any questions you may have.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you, sir. I think that the main concern
the Board has here, looking at the Stromski Architecture plans,
revegetation plan, stamped August 3rd, is that we would like a
notation about the caliper size of the trees that you are
proposing to plant there. The gingko trees and -- three gingkos,
I'm sorry, and one tall oak. We are concerned about
survivability. Can you address those issues?

MR. ZUHOSKI: There is a total of seven trees being planted.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: We are most concerned about the ones in the
rear yard.

MR. ZUHOSKI: Okay. Everything is going to be automatic
irrigation, you know, Organics to be brought in to
professionally install these trees. I'm in the industry of this
a long time, so if something is not going to live, it will be
replaced, no question.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: And the caliper size? We were suggesting
something north of four-inch caliper.

MR. ZUHOSKI: That's a pretty large tree to purchase. You know,
again, I'm in that world. This year, especially with the
nurseries, things are very tough to get. I have no issue pushing
to three inch, and if I have access when construction starts, if
we can get five inch, we'll plant five inch. We are looking to
plant substantial trees here to replace substantial trees we are
looking to take down.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you. Any questions or comments from the
Board?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: No. Minimum of three inch?
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Anyone else wish to speak to this application?
(No response).
MR. ZUHOSKI: There is something on that plan, it actually shows
a small driveway, it will be permeable. It won't be gravel. It
was not noted, but it's supposed to be noted.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Is that an issue?
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: No.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: That is out of our jurisdiction.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Hearing no further comments or questions, I'll
make a motion to close this hearing.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to approve the application as
submitted with the caveat that the trees that are replanted will
be three-inch caliper at minimum.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
MR. ZUHOSKI: Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 3, 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 Trustees went to this site several times to inspect the
property. Both times all Trustees were present.
   The Conservation Advisory Council reviewed the application
and resolved to support it.
   And the LWRP coordinator found this action to be consistent.
   Our Trustee notes, the first time we looked at it there was
concerns with the project being too close to the bank. On 8/10
we met with the applicant and through discussion, working with
the Board's concerns, the project was changed, with new plans
submitted August 18th, to the Trustees satisfaction, moving the
project a minimum of 27 feet from the top of the hill or bank.
   Is there anybody here that wishes to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Antoinette Notaro on the line. Ms. Notaro,
if you want to un-mute yourself and speak to the Board?
MS. NOTARO: This is Antoinette Notaro, I'm here to answer any
questions you might have.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Sounds good. Thank you. Are there any
questions or comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
Anybody else that wishes to speak to this application?
(Negative response).
I'll make a motion to close the public hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I'll make a motion to approve the application with the new plans submitted received in the office August 18th, 2021.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 4. Sylivia 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
The Trustees conducted a field inspection on August 10th, 2021. Notes say 15-foot non-turf buffer.
The LWRP found this to be consistent.
The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.
Is there anyone here wishing to speak regarding this application?
MR. BRYNER: France Bryner, from Nelson, Pope and Voorhis, on behalf of the applicant Stephen Cubells.
I was here before the Board in July during work session.
We discussed the project. I do have the plans with me in case there is any clarification needed. We submitted updated plans to the Trustees office a couple of days ago. We believe those plans address the comments the Trustees gave to the applicant and his contractor during the walk-through on August 10th. It is showing a delineation line that the Trustees I believe approximated while they were in the field, and we took a 15-foot offset from that, landward offset from that, and ultimately it created a significant buffer. So I believe the plans do demonstrate that.
If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them. From my understanding, that was the issue the Trustees had and that's what we wanted to speak to tonight.
So, other than that, the application is for the replacement of a single-family dwelling, the renovation of an existing cottage on the property, installation of the swimming pool with some fill, proper drainage and some grading. All of that activity is intended, was intended and designed landward of the Trustees jurisdiction boundaries.

So again, we hope that the issues are just down to the buffer.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Thank you. And, yes, we do have new plans
stamped received August 17th, 2021, that do so that 15-foot non-turf buffer as you described and discussed in the field.

Is there anyone else here wishing to speak regarding this application?
(Negative response).
Any questions or comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Not of concern.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Hearing none, I make a motion to close this hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted, with the new plans stamped received August 17th, 2021, that show the 15-foot non-turf buffer as requested.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 5, Ural Talgat 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 site on the 10th of
August, noted that the project was straightforward with the new plans and the description was received.

The reason for this secondary inspection was initially along with the LWRP coordinator's comments there was not enough buffer, we believe on the property. And we also needed new plans with an IA septic system, which we are in receipt of.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent. His inconsistencies are as follows: In 2011 they received a wetland permit that included the removal of a 329-square foot deck on the establishment of a 13-foot wide buffer. The buffer is not shown. After meeting with the applicant and reviewing the plans, the 13-foot wide buffer, which is not on the plans but it is at the base of the bluff landward of the bulkhead, um, and the deck was actually drawn incorrectly originally. It is not a 329-square foot deck anymore, I believe it's a 99-square foot deck. So that would satisfy the requirements. Also, we are in receipt of new plans for the IA.

The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application with a pervious driveway, an IA septic system and installation of hay bales and silt fencing.

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

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

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you.

Okay, is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application?

(No response).

Or any additional commentary from the Board?

(Negative response).

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

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion to approve this application based off the new plans stamped received August 12th, 2021. Also noting that after the Trustee inspection, the application is brought into consistency with the LWRP coordinator and an IA septic system will be installed.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Number 6, Suffolk Environmental Consulting, Inc. on behalf of VINCENT FISCHETTI requests a Wetland Permit for the as-built 300.0 sq. ft raised slate patio on the southeasterly side of the existing dwelling; as-built ±40.0 linear feet at maximum height of 2.0' slate wall located along the seaward side of the raised slate patio; as-built reconfigured/expanded ±740.0 sq. ft. slate patio at grade in sand; as-built 33.0 sq. ft. slate steps; as-built 6.6'x6.9' spa; as-built northeasterly 428.4 sq. ft. slate patio in sand; as-built 102.0'x2.0' (40 sq. ft.) northeasterly
slate squares walkway in sand; as-built 30.5 linear feet at a maximum height of 0.5' slate wall; as-built two (2) 25.0' long at a maximum height of 4.0' sections of white picket fencing; and for a proposed 660.0 sq. ft. garage addition.

Located: 650 Spring Lane, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-86-5-6

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

The inconsistency comes from the requirement to comply with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the Trustees, in that structures did not have a Wetland permit.

The consistency draws from the fact that the garage structure is deemed to be consistent.

The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application with concern about setbacks of the as-built structures being in compliance with Town Code.

The Board of Trustees inspected the site on August 10th, noting the need for an appropriate buffer, suggesting a 15-foot buffer would be appropriate. And also viewed the existing as-built structures with respect to their environmental significance and did not find serious issues with the patios that were pre-existing. As a result of the Trustee inspection to provide an appropriate buffer as requested, a 15-foot non-turf buffer was included and a new set of plans stamped received in the Trustee office August 17th.

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

MR. ANDERSON: Hi, Robert Anderson, Suffolk Environmental, Incorporated, here to any answer any questions the Board may have.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Any questions?
(Negative response).

Not seeing any, does anyone wish to speak in regard to this application?
(Negative response).

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

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

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

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I make a motion to approve this application in accord with the plans stamped received in the Trustee office August 17th, denoting a 15-foot non-turf buffer, bringing this application into consistency with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

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

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, very much.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 7, Patricia Moore, Esq. on behalf of KEVIN KEYSEER requests a Wetland Permit to construct a 12'x50' swimming pool with a pool patio around pool (17'x64.5' total); 4' high pool enclosure fencing; finish installing a new 30'x20' pervious brick patio (replacing old brick patio); a proposed
4’x12.6’ path to water; and install a 6’ high fence enclosure with two gates at entrance (each gate 12.5’x4’ high).
Located: 1356 Grand Avenue, Mattituck. STM# 1000-107-3-11.5

The Trustees conducted field inspection of this site on August 10th. All were present. The notes, ten-foot non-turf buffer is requested and depict shower dimensions, the shower dimension were missing.

The LWRP coordinator found this to be inconsistent and consistent. The inconsistency arises from the fact that structures on the property that were built without Trustees permit. The pool fence is, as recommended, is found to be consistent.

And the Conservation Advisory Council did not support this application and requested to move the pool landward.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?
MS. MOORE: Patricia Moore --
TRUSTEE DOMINO: If I may interrupt for a second. We have received new plans stamped August 17th from Hamptons Landscaping, and these depict the ten-foot non-turf buffer and shows the shower dimensions. Thank you.
MS. MOORE: Okay, good. Yes, I provided you with those plans and they -- do you need the actual shower dimensions? Because I misunderstood you, I think you wanted the shower. I included the shower but I didn't have the dimension of the existing shower.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: It's depicted in the description.
MS. MOORE: Good. It's pretty easily identifiable.

Okay, that's all. I'm here to answer any questions. Mr. Keyser is here as well with me, and we hope this application will be approved. Thank you.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Is there anyone else wishing to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: The person on Zoom with the initials AJG has raised their hand. Whoever AJG is, would you please state and spell your name for the record before you start asking any questions.
MR. GALEOTTI: Yes. My name is Anthony Galeotti.
MS. CANTRELL: Thank you.
MR. GALEOTTI: Thank you. Basically, my first question is, I'm familiar with that property, and I'm curious to know why a property that is so large, is there a necessity that we have to negatively affect the environment and the esthetics of that creek and disrupt it for a pool. It doesn't seem like it's something that is necessary, and it's definitely not necessary to put a 50-foot pool. So my question is why are we thinking or considering disrupting everything for a pool when we have the most beautiful creek basically in Suffolk County?
TRUSTEE DOMINO: Would anyone care to answer that?
MS. MOORE: That is a subjective opinion. It is a beautiful piece of property, for sure. It is quite a large piece of property, and actually he is the owner of two properties; one adjacent to the other. So it is all proportional and it is well within the
zoning limitations, certainly less than 20% lot coverage overall on this property. So it's a matter of opinion. Some people like pools and some people don't.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Quick question. What's the distance between the pool and the --

MR. GALEOTTI: I think most people like pools and most people appreciate the property there. But there is no reason to basically affect the creek front.

MR. HAGAN: I'm going to ask any participants partaking in the hearing direct their questions to the Board, not to individual members of -- it's not a back and forth between the applicant and other people in the community. Thank you.

MR. GALEOTTI: I'm sorry.

MS. MOORE: If I can address the location. Unfortunately -- this is a beautiful piece of property, but this is the rear yard. This is the only rear yard. Because of Grand Avenue, that is the front yard, the house location places the pool area being just this part of the house being the rear yard. That was the only location that met the zoning requirements.

MR. GALEOTTI: Does it require a 50-foot pool?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I'm sorry, can you repeat that question to the Board?

MR. GALEOTTI: Yes. She said it's the only place to put a pool. Is it necessary to have a 50-foot pool to disrupt the environment and the esthetics? That's pretty much bigger than the average size pool out here in Southold.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Thank you. We are just taking some measurements on the size of the pool right now and the distance to the wetland.

Could the applicant give us a distance to the wetlands?

MS. MOORE: Unfortunately, I don't have the exact dimensions. It was behind the house, so it's landward of existing structures. We are in line, maybe within a foot of the house and then the proposed patio.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Looks to be about 60 feet. I do have a question, Pat, if I may. Is the pool planned to be saltwater?

MS. MOORE: My client is right here, so.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, it is.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: It does appear from the plans the pool is more than 50 feet back from the edge of wetlands when we scaled it out here.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I think it's almost, it's almost 100. It's closer to 100 than it is to -- yes. It's 75. But I think, at least my personal take, is that a pool when not impacting a bluff or a bank creating erosional issues, especially when the pool is salt water and doesn't have harmful chemicals in there, is certainly better than fertilized turf. That would be my two cents on the pool.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: I agree totally. The Board's general take on these, I think in general, properly maintained saltwater pools
is less impact.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: They are not taking down any trees in this application either.

All right, anyone else wish to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

Any further comments or questions from the Board?

(Negative response).

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

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE DOMINO: I make a motion to approve this application as proposed and depicted on the Hamptons Silverleaf Landscape plan stamped received August 17th, 2021, thereby bringing this application into consistency with the LWRP.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 8, 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' x 35' 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

The Trustees visited the site several times, most recently on 8/10. Field notes from the first one, not staked. Field notes from the second visit that we request an additional ten-foot non-turf buffer.

The LWRP found this action to be consistent.

And I don't see that the Conservation Advisory Council had the opportunity to review this application.

We do have in new plans that were received on August 16th with the added ten-foot buffer to the plan.

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

MR. HAGAN: Patricia Moore on behalf of the applicant, again, here to just answer questions

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

MS. CANTRELL: We have somebody by the name of "G" who raised their hand. Looks like they wish to speak.

Nope, turned off.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Is there anybody else here that wishes to speak to the application via Zoom?

(No response).
Any questions on comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
I would like to close the public hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I would like to approve the application as submitted, noting the new plans that were received August 16th, 2021.
MS. CANTRELL: Stop we lost recording again.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Should I restate my motion?
MS. CANTRELL: If you can please restate your motion because it stopped as you were talking about revised plans.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Sure. So we'll start from the beginning. I would like to approve the application as submitted, noting new plans received in the office August 16th, 2021, showing an additional ten-foot buffer. So that is my motion.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Number 9, Michael Kimack on behalf of JAMES & NANCY CLOUS requests a Wetland Permit to demolish existing 1,479.5 sq. ft. dwelling and foundation, and back fill with approximately 400 cubic yards of fill; construct a proposed new foundation and 1,971.3 sq. ft two-story dwelling with a 113.5 sq. ft front porch, a 20 sq. ft. south landing, and 15.7 sq. ft. north landing; install 35 sq. ft. Bilco door to basement; install a OWTS system; and install gutters to leaders to drywells to contain roof runoff.
Located: 3805 Bay Shore Road, Greenport. SCTM# 1000-53-6-18

The LWRP found this to be consistent, provided that the Board clarify the purpose and placement of the 400 cubic yards of fill.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application.

The Trustees conducted a field inspection on August 10th, 2021, noting they would like to see the house moved back 50 feet from the bulkhead, and that it needs an IA septic system.

Anyone here wishing to speak regarding this application?
MR. KIMACK: Michael Kimack, on behalf of the applicant who is present this evening.

I would like to start from the front and work to the back of the property. You've got two things in your file. You've got the architectural site plan showing the house which was done by Architect Mark Schwartz, and you've got a copy of a photo of the property, primarily. Aerial photo.

The original house, primarily, is 41 feet from the bulkhead. Primarily. The new proposed house will be 47 feet from the bulkhead. But I draw your attention to the aerial photograph shot that I've got here. The existing house is setback further than both properties on both sides within 300
feet. And it's been your policy consistently that you look favorably on the fact if you line up the house and don't go any more seaward than what was originally in place, that that would be something acceptable to you.

On top of that, the 47 feet represents only one-third of the entire front structure. If you look at the way it is, two-thirds of the house is back 51 feet, anyway. The one section of the house is 47 feet. The little nook section outside, which is about four feet. So two-thirds of the house on both sides of the two sections are back 51 feet.

On top of that, we cannot move it back, primarily because of the, how tight the septic area is on the back side. Now, let's talk about that for a while. The septic area is back 100 feet, primarily. And this, when I wrote up the description, this is my error, we did not, we are not proposing an OWTS system. We had submitted primarily to Suffolk County for a sanitary system. It's outside the 100 feet and it was my error I put the OWTS in there. But the standard system is in front of the Health Department approved, primarily, and is just waiting for the Trustees permit.

Take a look at the architectural plans, basically, you'll see it's on there, it's a standard-system design.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Do you have Department of Health approval on that standard --

MR. KIMACK: We have it subject to getting the Trustees permit. Which is always the case. We already have the DEC non-jurisdiction permit, primarily, which was submitted in there, primarily. The design was done. Mark Schwartz did the design as a standard system and submitted it as a standard system to that added setback 100 feet plus from the bulkhead. Out of your jurisdiction. I apologize. It was my error.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: As you know we have been requiring IA systems here for quite a bit, even if that said system falls outside of 100 feet. It's beneficial to the rest of the project.

MR. KIMACK: Even if it's been filed with the Health Department?

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: If you previously have approval, I think we've considered it, but nothing that was pending, as far as my recollection, unless the Board has anything to add to that.

MR. HAGAN: I believe what he is saying is that he has Health Department approval but they are waiting for the file.

MR. KIMACK: But you can't get the file until you actually submit whatever requirement may be, whether it's Trustees or Zoning or DEC. But the plan that was submitted was the standard, it was shown on the architect, it's the standard. It was my error when I put down the OWTS.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: This is just one Trustee, I would be inclined to want to see an IA.

MR. KIMACK: Let me ask you this. Has it been your policy to not consider the 100-foot setback?

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: That's correct.

MR. HAGAN: If I can just answer that. I believe that the Board
has conditioned approvals for projects occurring within Trustee jurisdiction to be connected to IA systems. So as a condition of being able to build a house within Trustee jurisdiction they have conditioned that that structure be connected to an IA system.

MR. KIMACK: So irrespective of whether or not I have the OWTS or standard system there, from your perspective you were going to basically require an OWTS system. Even if it had been a standard system shown on the drawing, which it is.

MR. HAGAN: They have been reviewing these projects on a case-by-case basis. Predominantly the Board has voted for conditions of IA systems. There have been a few individual cases where a traditional system has been connected, and they continue to review these on a case-by-case basis.

MR. KIMACK: The only other thing that I might be able to add is I'm not sure, given how tight it is in there, whether we can actually even get an IA system in there. Because right now it's a standard system, I'm not quite sure if we can fit the IA into the space we have to work with.

Can I bring up James? This is James Clous, the applicant.

MR. CLOUS: Good evening.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Good evening.

Do you have a question or statement?

MR. CLOUS: I guess my only statement is we had applied months ago to the Department of Health for a regular permit. We got back a few questions, I submitted the answers back. Pretty much everything I think has been resolved except for the pending Trustees approval. That has already been done already. It's a really tight situation space-wise in terms of the ability to fit this in. So that's where we are. I don't know if the septic tank could be replaced. I think the IA septic is bigger. I don't know that now.

MR. KIMACK: I mean in essence if it would be helpful from our particular perspective, if we did get to you an architect letter indicating that we can't get an IA system in the space that we have.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: I mean, we understand that the county's new procedures have all new IAs after July 1st, and this is a prior filing and we do these on a case-by-case. I don't personally have an issue with it given the fact that you are constrained heavily space-wise, it may be a one off now that almost, I mean everything else will be IA from here forward, and it's not an enclosed creek. I mean, it would be nice to have an IA fitting in, but given the fact you already made application to the county, I don't, it's not problematic with myself.

MR. KIMACK: I can add something to that, Jay. The county also basically gives you a caveat. If it's a brand new lot, it's no question, IA system. If you demolish the house primarily, it's IA. But in this particular case, even if you were coming in with an existing home, if you have three bedrooms, they allow you to go to five on a standard system, assuming you don't need any
other condition from the Board. So even the Health Department basicall has not completely given over to IA system.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Part of my concern here as well is we are not just talking about the house. By these plans it looks like the garage is also getting bathrooms and showers and half baths.

MR. KIMACK: That's existing with C of O's. TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: But that's all going to tie into the same system.

MR. KIMACK: That's all going to tie into the same system.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: So we have the bedrooms in the house as well as the proposed bedrooms in the proposed garage.

MR. KIMACK: And that's what makes it really tight, Glenn, basically with the house basically being in the position it's in with that we really don't have really much space. Primarily we utilized all of it up.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just my opinion, I'm not sure why you would want to have a waterfront home at low elevation like this with essentially two houses connected to it and want to swim in the water in front of your house, without having an IA system. Might as well just swim in the septic tank.

MR. KIMACK: Well, I think, I have made these arguments, primarily, to the other Boards without much success, primarily. Each body of water differs in terms of its objective content.

Long Island Sound from Southold all the way out, you are in the seven milligrams per liter. Your requirement is a minimum of five milligrams per liter in order to support crustaceous life and stuff like that. The more you move into Long Island Sound toward New York City, it gets into hypoxia, it goes down to one-and-one-half to three, you can't support anything. In this particular case, this is Shelter Island Sound, it's a much more healthier body of water. In essence, basically, yes, there would be a little bit of nitrogen from a standard system depending on the type of soil. If it's more granular it doesn't take the nitrogen out. If it's more clay like or silt like, it does have potential to be treatable and begins to treat some of the nitrogen levels.

The difficulty with nitrogen as much as phosphorus, which is probably the next thing, is if it does get there it proliferates plant growth to the extent. That's not the issue, is when the plant die they take the oxygen out of the water. But Shelter Island Sound for the most part is fairly healthy. It doesn't have any floating algae or anything like that.

MR. CLOUS: No. And I was going to add that the significant currents, every tidal flow, we do have significant currents coming out. We are swimming now, with the current system, this will be a huge improvement over the current system, going to septic over what's right now, it would be a huge improvement.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: You said you have Suffolk County Department of Health approval pending on --

MR. KIMACK: We are just pending Trustee approval. That's generally the way it works, primarily. The DEC's wrote all the
non-jurisdiction. There is no zoning involved with this.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Based on everything you said, I would be
inclined to agree with you on this particular case.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Circling back, where is the four-hundred
cubic yards of fill going?
MR. CLOUS: I believe it's going toward the front and a little
bit in the rear, there is a wall in the rear, it was going to
raise the house up like a foot-and-a-half, the foundation up a
foot-and-a-half. I think that's where it's going, adding a
little bit of gradient, very low, but it would be front yard and
right behind the structure --
MR. KIMACK: If you look at the drawing, the architect has, he's
got the flood zone on the foundation right in the front there.
And that, one of the reasons, and I'm glad you brought it up,
one of the reasons we moved it back is to get out of the flood
zone. Because the original building, was, a portion of it was in
the flood zone, so we pulled it back six feet and get it out of
the flood zone, then raise it up in order to avoid any type of
flooding.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: The fact you are so close to the flood zone
re-emphasizes fact of the need for an IA system, in my opinion.
I for one am not necessarily comfortable going with a
traditional system in this location. I can't remember when we
have approved one for a construction like this. We did have ones
that were approved prior to our, you know, the policy prior to
Suffolk County requiring it, and their permits expired, they
already had a Health Department approval for the traditional
system and then they came back to this Board looking for the
permit to build the house.
So if you could provide us with, whether an engineer or
whomever, saying how an IA system will not fit or work on this
property, you know, for me, I would potentially consider it at
that point. But I would definitely like to see an IA system in
this location due to the proximity of the water due to the
elevation and just, it's what we have been doing as of July, I
thought it was a requirement from the county, so --
MR. KIMACK: No, the county basically has not really, I mean they
did invoke new -- but they set up a whole different system when
it comes to adding on an existing --
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: This says demolish.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Yes. So to me this is a new construction of a
house as well as a livable garage.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Honestly, is there a reason you don't want to
do an IA system, beside, I mean --
MR. CLOUS: I mean, we have gone ahead already, and it's just a
preference for the mechanics of the IA system, ongoing
maintenance of an IA system and the fact that this is a huge
improvement over what we have now, and I'm looking forward to
getting rid of the old.
TRUSTEE DOMINO: We heard that argument before.
TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: The request of the Chairman seems to be a
reasonable one, that insofar as we also have the time, another structure and garage, and at this time, it's additional effort, but I think if it's an engineering possibility and just beyond all means, then I guess I would like to see something on the order of Trustee Goldsmith requested and then revisit this.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Any other questions or comments?

MR. KIMACK: The only question you have on that, what about is there anything dealing with what we said about not being able to set the house back to the 50-foot line and that whole --

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I mean it would all come into play, if you can redesign a septic system that may be smaller and work --

MR. KIMACK: It could not be smaller, Glenn, because irrespective of that you are really looking at replacing a standard septic tank with the IA tank in terms of size. But all the other DPs and expansions are the same. That's not changed.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I guess if we are going to go back to look at septic stem, if you could revisit that as well. You know, if we are going to -- if you have somebody to say, look you can't put anything there or somebody may say you can put something there. And if you can put something there it might be the possibility of moving the whole structure maybe just a little bit landward to get that 50 foot.

Um, so, I mean, I would like to see --

MR. KIMACK: I don't see it but then again that's, because I don't see the DPs being moved around at all. They are what they are. I mean the only thing is the septic tank being replaced with an IA, if in fact it fits, we don't think it does, but the DPs, the configuration of the DPs would be the same, whether it's this or the other.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: This is less problematic for me, but I understand what the Chairman is suggesting and perhaps if you can honor his wish, come back with an engineer's report --

MR. KIMACK: Or an architect? Mark has the capability of understanding what the IA system and so he would certainly -- normally it would be an architect or engineer would answer these questions.

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Architect or engineer would suffice, right?

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Licensed. I'm speaking for myself.

MR. KIMACK: Yes. Health Department accepts either architect or engineer to design an IA system where the surveyor can design a standard system. They can't design an IA stem.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Anyone else

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Yes. I have less a problem with the setback and more of a problem with the, with the septic system, having done extensive restoration projects in that area, in the water, and, you know, pretty familiar with what is going on there and what is growing there. You have some really nice eel grass beds which are becoming more and more rare in the area. They are very close to the property. Um, more so it's the septic for me than the setback to the house.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: If you are going to go look at it, just, so.
Is there anyone else here wishing to speaking?
MS. CANTRELL: The person named Jean. You had your hand raised
for some time and then lowered it. Do you have any questions
regarding the application of James and Nancy Clous? If so,
please raise your hand.
   Okay, if you wish to un-mute yourself and ask the questions
you might have to the Board regarding the application.
MS. BETIOS: Jean Betios. I changed my mind at this time. I
have no questions.
MS. CANTRELL: Thank you, very much.
MR. CLOUS: Just one more point. You are talking about the tear
down as being a new build. We are keeping the existing garage
as it is. It does have a bathroom facility, so that would not
be a new build. That would be existing. I don't know if that
matters. It's a minor point.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: At this time I'll make a motion to table the
application for the applicant to get us an engineer or architect
licensed professional to make a determination on whether an IA
septic system can fit at this location.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Number 10, David Bergen on behalf of
NEIL T. & AMY MCGOLDRICK requests a Wetland Permit to
replace in place existing ±162 feet of bulkhead; existing ±68 feet
of jetty; existing ±12 foot northern return and associated ±10 foot
return with reclamation dredging to a depth of 4' along bulkhead on
western side of entrance into Halls Creek.
Located: 1671 Meadow Beach Lane, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-116-4-16.4
The Trustees have been to this property, actually, I spent
the time, met multiple times, the most recent review is the 10th
of August when they noted hold for New York State DEC permit
pertaining to vinyl jetty. It should be noted that I'm in
receipt of, that we have received a DEC permit for said jetty
from a Mr. Dave Bergen.
The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent, noting
that turbidity controls are required.

And the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support
the application, noting, the Conservation Advisory Council
supports the application however asks the applicant to consider
rip rap in place of a bulkhead.

Is there anyone here to speak regarding the application?
MR. BERGEN: Good evening, Dave Bergen, on behalf of the
McGoldrick's, the applicant.

This is a bulkhead that is on the western side of the
entrance to Halls Creek. Halls Creek is maintained by Suffolk
County DPW. When I say maintained, dredged by. The dredging
crew made the evaluation that the bulkhead had to be replaced
prior to dredging taking place again, so that's why the
McGoldrick's have taken this on. They have agreed to replace it.
Um, you received the permit from the DEC, and today I asked for a copy stamped plans, and they said, they replied saying they do not spend by e-mail stamped plans, and I forwarded that to your office. As you can see that came actually from the DEC via me.

I'm here to answer any questions you might have about the application.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Is this the same plans we have here, as far as length and everything, that have been submitted to the DEC?

MR. BERGEN: Identical, yes.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Just to address the Conservation Advisory Council’s concerns, I believe because of the nature of this project rip rap probably would not work here. Obviously the Board prefers that, but I don't think that works in this particular application.

MR. BERGEN: I agree with you.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: All right, is there anyone else here that wishes to speak regarding this application, or any comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

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

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: I make a motion to approve the application with the stipulation turbidity controls are required during construction.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: Second. All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Next application, number 11, David Bergen on behalf of NEW SUFFOLK PROPERTIES, LLC/NEW SUFFOLK MARINA, LLC requests a Wetland Permit to remove existing approximately 120' of failing retaining wall and bulkhead plus associated 12' western return and 10' eastern return; replace in place with a new vinyl bulkhead and vinyl returns, and raised nor more than 18" higher than existing with fall protection barrier; associated 10' eastern return to be below grade; existing catwalk and ramp to remain; reclamation dredge an area in front of new bulkhead (approx. 13 cubic yards); remove eastern travel lift retaining wall and bulkhead and replace eastern travel lift retaining wall and bulkhead in place with vinyl retaining wall and bulkhead; remove and replace pilings and timber support structure for eastern travel lift in place; existing steel travel lift I-beam to remain; dredge travel lift pit to depth of 6' Mean Low Tide and use material (approx. 40 cubic yards) to backfill behind new bulkheads on site.

Located: 6775 New Suffolk Road, New Suffolk. SCTM# 1000-117-5-29.

This project has been deemed to be consistent with the Town's LWRP, with the notation that turbidity controls should be employed.

The Conservation Advisory Council supports the application with a non-turf vegetated buffer to remain in place and with an increase in width, if possible.
Trustee Krupski reviewed this application on August 15th. And is there anyone here that wishes to speak to this application?

MR. BERGEN: Dave Bergen, on behalf of the applicant. This is a straightforward application for a commercial marina, Zoned M-1, M-2.

The Trustees had come out because of the failing bulkhead, and the owner decided that he needed to also replace the travel lift bulkhead because that was ready to go.

The retaining wall that is there will be removed, and there will be a barrier put in, a fall barrier.

This was a previously permitted bulkhead from permit number 1591 back in 1984, so there is a reclamation dredging here because of the dredging included with that permit for that back there in 1984.

And as far as the non-turf buffer, this is bordered by a pervious gravel parking lot that is well over 100 feet wide. There is no intention of changing that from anything other than gravel.

So I’m here to answer any questions you might have.

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: Thank you. You answered the gravel question for me. Thank you.

Any questions from the Board?

(Negative response).

Anyone else? Nobody Zooming?

Okay accordingly, I make a motion to close the hearing.

TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE BREDEMeyer: I make a motion to approve this application as submitted with the stipulation turbidity controls are employed and the application stamped received in the Trustee office June 29th. That’s my motion

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.

TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?

(ALL AYES).

MR. BERGEN: Thank you, very much.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Number 12, Eric Martz on behalf of MARY ANN HOWKINS requests a Wetland Permit to replant, revegetate and maintain the property post construction within preexisting established lawn area consisting of post construction soil remediation to a depth of 3”-6” in previous established lawn area; lay sod/grass seed in preexisting established lawn area; plant evergreen deciduous mix of plantings around home, deck and path; install irrigation for lawn and plantings; and to remove invasive plants (i.e. poison ivy, etc.), from bank between established lawn area and tidal wetland boundary, and revegetate with approved native plants.

Located: 3245 Wells Road, Peconic. SCTM# 1000-86-2-7

The Trustees conducted a field inspection on this site on August 10th. All were present. Notes read ten-foot non-turf buffer landward from the top of bank and seaward from the top of the bank to be non-disturbance zone.
The LWRP coordinator found this to be consistent. The consistency though hinges upon the provisions, the provisions that native species occurring on the bank are not to be removed. Native species to be planted along the bank are supplemental. And third, that sod or turf is minimized adjacent to the wetlands and vegetated non-turf buffer be considered.

The Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support this application on August 9th, 2021.

Is there anyone here to speak to this application?

MS. CANTRELL: There is, I'm not sure who exactly is going to speak, but they are from Salty Roots. So whomever is on the line, when you un-mute yourself, if you can please state and spell your name for the record before you ask any questions.

MR. RILEY: My name is Andrew Riley, of Salty Roots, on behalf of the applicant. Just here to answer any questions you may have.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Yes. Thank you, Andrew. If you heard my description of the Trustees field notes, and the LWRP coordinator's concerns, we would like to stipulate that there be a ten-foot non-turf buffer landward from the top of the bank, and all land seaward of the top of the bank be designated as a non-disturbance buffer. Is that amenable to you?

MR. RILEY: Yes, it is. We have no plans on re-vegetating the bank. The only thing we are asking for is removal of some invasive species, vines, poison ivy, that were kind of choking out the native plantings that were there. But we can definitely consider a buffer between the turf and the bank.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Thank you. (Perusing). Question for our attorney. The 10-foot buffer is not shown on the planting plans. (Perusing).

Okay, Andrew, the plans stamped received July 2nd, 2021, clearly show the top of bank. And the area shaded in brown seaward of that passes muster for review by the Town attorney's office as a non-disturbance zone, however we will need new plans showing the ten-foot non-turf buffer that will be landward of the top of bank. In other words, the line scaled ten-foot back and parallel to what you have on here showing this top of bank.

MR. HAGAN: While that change is being made, the area that is seaward of the top of the bank should also be delineated as a non-disturbance buffer, in accordance with the Trustees' request.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: All right, understanding that, I'm going to suggest that at the applicant's request we table this for receipt of those plans. Do you understand, Mr. Riley?

MR. RILEY: Yes. I have taken all those notes.

TRUSTEE DOMINO: Okay. Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else who wish to speak to this application?

(Negative response).

Any other questions or comments from the Board?

(Negative response).

Hearing none, I make a motion to table this at the applicant's request, subject to new plans showing a non-turf buffer and the non-disturbance buffer.
TRUSTEE KRUPSKI: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Number 13, Eastern End Pools, Inc. on behalf of MARK ALBERICI requests a Wetland Permit to install a 16’x26’ gunite swimming pool with 12” bluestone coping and raised patio off shallow end (10’x18’), and raised patio off deep end (5’x18’), total patio approximately 270.0 sq. ft.
Located: 115 East Side Avenue, Mattituck. SCTM# 1000-99-3-19
The Trustees visited the site on 8/10/2021. All Trustees present. Field notes stating the project is straightforward.
The LWRP program coordinator found this proposed action to be consistent.
And the Conservation Advisory Council resolved to support the application.
Is there anybody here that wishes to speak to this application?
MS. CANTRELL: We have Jennifer Del Vaglio in regard to the application from the pool company. Jennifer, if you want to un-mute yourself and please speak to the Board.
MS. DEL VAGLIO: Good evening, Board of Trustees. I’m here. I know you are all anxious to adjourn and end the meeting. I’m here to answer any quick questions that you might have in reference to this application.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you. Is there anybody else here that wishes to speak to this application?
(Negative response).
Are there any questions or comments from the Board?
(Negative response).
I make a motion to close this public hearing.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
Trustee WILLIAMS: I make a motion to approve the application as submitted.
TRUSTEE BREDEMEYER: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: I make a motion for adjournment.
TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second.
TRUSTEE GOLDSMITH: All in favor?
(ALL AYES).

Respectfully submitted by,

Glenn Goldsmith, President
Board of Trustees