



# INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF PORT JEFFERSON

88 North Country Road  
Port Jefferson, NY 11777  
Tel. (631) 473-4744 Fax (631) 473-2049  
www.portjeff.com

## PLANNING BOARD

Chair  
James Burke  
  
Members  
Phil Schiavone  
Jennifer Sigler  
Ray DiBiase  
Mark Brosnan  
  
Secretary  
Cindy Suarez

---

### MINUTES

November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. - Village Hall - 121 West Broadway

#### PRESENT:

Jim Burke  
Phil Schiavone  
Jennifer Sigler  
Ray DiBiase  
Mark Brosnan  
Village Planner, Will Rau

#### ABSENT:

Trustee, Barbara Ransome

#### APPOINTMENTS:

##### 1. VILLAGE'S CONSERVATION ADVISORY COUNCIL

The board and Virginia Capon discussed concerns the council has regarding the pending Liberty Meadows major subdivision application (# 027-04) for a 43-unit cluster design.

#### DISCUSSION:

2. LIBERTY MEADOWS LLC - (# 027-04) Discuss environmental issues for the 43-unit cluster subdivision located on 18.5 acres in the Single-Family Residence R-B2 District on the east side of Liberty Ave (SCTM No. 206-016-08 008.001, 008.002, 009.000 018.000 024.000).

Will Rau: Suggested that the board request a yield map for the project. He states that the original map shows 38 units.

Mark Brosnan: Requested the application be resubmitted with updates.

Phil Schiavone: I think that's been done already. We've received quite a few versions. The applicant hasn't given enough information. People are looking at numbers, not acreage.

Virginia Capon: We wrote the CAC. The compliance with the tree clearing should be the main concern here. There should be a 22-foot wall height.

PS: Type I may have adverse impact. EI statement the Planning Board may not be qualified and we don't have sufficient time to adequately go through it.

VC: We should have expertise look at this.

MB: Tommy Kramer is the former commissioner, I recommend him.

PS: We should get two bids to get someone to review it. Shoot on site grades. There were many specimen trees spotted. I walked it with Jennifer.

VC: Planning Board should walk the site. Detail is important. There are some specimen trees. Focus on huge buffers around trees.

PS: The Brook Road subdivision they gave up on.

VC: "I thought the point of clustering was to save the tress." Was a quote from Dr. W. Trees that weren't even going to be taken down, die from excessive abuse. There should be preservation of historic trees and larger trees.

JS: The trustees could be approached about subsidizing the cost to the homeowners for maintaining large trees that are designated historic.

VC: We don't want to be tree police. We can try for a partnership policy.

WR: We still have to do SEQRA II & III. The applicant submits EIS and then goes to consultant.

PS: The applicant was informed at the last meeting about the tree concern. Chic Voorhis. is aware there is a separate section in the code that requires a plan to list the existing trees, their species, etc... A survey crew should shoot the grades for accuracy. Ariel surveys are inaccurate.

JS: Chapter 241 lists everything.

Jim Tsunis: I thought we were going to mark the trees after the subdivision approval?

VC: Should we get part III if we didn't do part II?

PS: Applicant does I and we do II

WR: The planning board needs more information before we go to part II

VC: Get a better map and inventory before we can give better comments.

JS: CAC and Planning Board should walk thru together.

JT: We'll mark the tress first.

WR: The property is zoned RB\_2, 15,000 square feet.

Jim Burke: There are 22 structures, 43 units; we preferred that the applicant sight the structures away from the slopes.

WR: The plan evaluated way overboard. We need more information, once we get it we'll do part II.

3. INVESCO AFFILIATES, LTD (# 005-04) Discuss plan to construct 53 residential units and 4,200 sq. ft. of commercial/office space. The property is located in the Central Commercial C-1 District on the south side of West Broadway (SCTM No. 206-012-06-004.001).

Will Rau updated the board members. He read part III and discussed the depth of the water. He explained to the board that staff suggests reducing the surface where the water is the highest. Redesign the site and put as much parking underneath as possible. We don't have a whole area for parking. Keep the office separate from the parking. There is a calculation of 3" rainfall.

Is there anything else to be done to the site plan? We have a deadline for approval.

PS: 62 days to grant approval. We can do it with conditions.

Fran Campani showed the modified plan to the board. She stated that she knows that drainage is an issue.

The board discussed possible changes.

WR: It doesn't fit within the environmental constraints in the village.

JS: Are 53 units negotiable?

FC: I don't know

PS: Could we do without the offices?

JS: If you stay within the general site plan. Have sheltered parking to minimize parking in the section with the high water table. Have green buffers to separate offices from visitors.

PS: How deep are the units?

FC: Fifty. Maybe we can gate the lot from parking. Sheltered parking would be a benefit.

WR: Make the units up somewhere else.

FC: We can access the parking from behind. Private yards were never in our vision. We planned on a big common lawn.

Fran Campani passed out the letter from Steve Levy c/o Dept of Public Works.

WR: We granted the use, we did SEQRA, and we had a public hearing, conclude the 62-day deadline. This is a phased project. We should see phase I plan.

FC: Can the certificate of occupancy be phased? Construction could be one phase.

JS: It would be built and empty for one year.

PS: Done and empty is better than a foundation just sitting there.

WR: The board needs to see the changes before they can move forward.

4. PJ OAKLAND PARTNERS LLC (# 029-04) Discuss environmental issues for site plan/change-of-use/conditional use permit to convert former nursing home to medical-office, construct an additional 66,000 square feet of medical office space and 3,600 square foot bank with drive thru located on three separate tax parcels totaling 9.67 acres in the Village's Professional-Office P-O District on the east side of Oakland Avenue and south of North Country Road (SCTM # 206-017-07-002.000 & 021-06-014.001 & 14.002).

Will showed the board the site plan.

WR: The Zoning board can't take action until the Planning Board concludes the SEQRA process. There is 90,000 square feet of medical office space. The parking is ugly, but this is an important project to the village. The pattern is terrible. The buildings should have a village look to them and they should look like they belong. They should try to hide the parking.

PS: They should do something with the drive around entrance.

WR: It shouldn't be kept as three separate parcels. We need parking structure. EAP part II .Big issue is traffic. The sites already cleared and disturbed. Jobs are being created.

JS: I don't like the parking in front of the building. We need a better road plan.

WR: Mike Verruto wants us to look at the Huntington code. Our code is for small structures.

JB: It's an easy "no" for the drive up bank area.

Mark Brosnan: This is being presented as a medical complex. But it is three individual properties.

PS: The project has been merged as we recommended but they are going to treat it as a three separate.

JS: Reduce parking structure or take away a building

PS: Not doing it as a single development. How do we send this back?

WR: We do it thru the SEQRA process. Use it as a tool.

MB: The preexisting building kills everything.

Will handed out a study from Norman Gerber Assoc. from 1997 study of intersection of North Country Road.

PS: Why do we do SEQRA on an incomplete drawing? I believe the Zoning Board can do SEQRA subject to the site plan approval.

WR: Take action if the planning board doesn't like it. You have EAF part I. Let's go thru EAF part II. (Handed out part II)

PS: I don't want to do SEQRA. I don't feel it is necessary. This plan is unacceptable.

WR: Follow state guidelines. Assumed lead agency three months ago. Take an action after declaring lead agency.

JB: We don't have enough information.

PS: In my opinion the zoning board could have handled this themselves. Grant the variance subject to the site plan approval.

WR: Type I actions have to be coordinated.

PS: It's a poor design, it's over stuffed, there's too much parking, and it's nothing but a sham. How do we turn it down?

JS: Tree clearing, traffic, village esthetics, these are reasons to reject.

JB: Will, what do you suggest we do? We don't want this site plan. Should we do a SEQRA at the same time as rejecting?

WR: It sounds like the planning board thinks the variance shouldn't be given. I think the planning board should write a letter to the zoning board.

PS: We do not support the request for a variance. Site campus has been designed as three separate parcels. It is not acceptable to the board. As soon as there are CO's they'll break them up.

JS: I want to see this merged as one lot. I don't think we should be in a position to massage this thing and make it work. I want them to come up with something imaginative. This site plan throws fragmented.

PS: Three parcels assembled, yet maintain the ability to be broken up at a later date.

JS: I see potential problems. No land bank parking in areas to be undisturbed.

PS: It all stems from over development in building square footage.

Ray DiBiase: There is too much on the site. There is too much building.

PS: I am against the parking and set back variances.

Jim Burke: We are recommending denial.

PS: We are not allowed to delegate.

The discussion ended with the understanding that Will Rau will draft a letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

***The meeting was closed***