

The Board Meeting of the Board of Trustees met in the Municipal Building, 14 Baker Street, Patchogue, New York on Monday, May 24, 2021 with the public viewing through video streaming.

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mayor Pontieri with Deputy Mayor Krieger and Trustees Brinkman, Felice, Ferb, Keyes, McHeffey, Village Attorney Egan, and Deputy Village Clerk Braile present. Village Treasurer Krawczyk and Village Clerk Devlin were absent.

The flag salute was made, and the safety message was given.

Deputy Village Clerk Braile asked the Board to approve Board Meeting minutes from May 11, 2021.

Upon a motion by Trustee Ferb, seconded by Trustee McHeffey, and unanimously carried, the Board approved the Board meeting minutes from May 11, 2021.

Deputy Village Clerk Braile stated the total bills for the period ending May 24, 2021 were \$605,521.22. The five largest bills were as follows: \$166,008.04 for NYS Health Insurance.; \$39,503.05 for Town of Brookhaven; \$32,270.70 for Russell Reid; \$24,839.82 for PSEGLI; and \$17,642.85 for Egan and Golden.

General	\$ 474,110.47
Trust & Agency	\$ 10,621.89
Cap Projects	\$ 106.11
Sewer Fund	\$ 98,447.67
B.I.D. Fund	\$ 4,566.59
Housing Fund	\$ 0.00
CDA Fund	\$ 4,773.49
General Bills	\$ 2,895.00
Totals	\$ 605,521.22

Upon a motion by Trustee Ferb, seconded by Trustee Felice, and unanimously carried, the Board approved payment of the bills as presented.

Deputy Village Clerk Braile reviewed the cash balances as of April 30, 2021 as follows:

General Fund	\$5,942,219.52
Trust & Agency	\$ 214,313.41
Sewer Fund	\$1,416,890.68
BID Fund	\$ 77,598.76
	<hr/>
	\$7,651,022.37

Mayor Pontieri stated that the next order of business would be a public hearing for the Cornerstone project. The reason that the public needed to view and comment at this hearing through Zoom/YouTube was that this was how the public notice had listed the meeting as being held. Changing it would have involved rescheduling the hearing, and he did not want to have to take such action. Mayor Pontieri then asked Village Attorney Egan to discuss the process that would be followed.

Village Attorney Egan stated that the Board would be hearing the application for a special permit for residential use in an E-Industrial zone. A lot of questions had been raised about the process to be followed, what the applicant’s goal was for tonight’s hearing, the actions that the Board would need to take under the Village Code, and the next step in the process. Village Attorney Egan noted that much of the confusion was based on the extensive number of hearings and time the project had spent before the Planning Board. He felt that the Planning Board had done an excellent job in its referral to this Board, and the Board owed them a debt of gratitude for their hard work and professionalism. Village Attorney Egan stated that the property in question was primarily located in the E-Industrial zone as defined by Village Code 435-25. Residential use was permitted in this zone when authorized by the Board of Trustee by a Special Permit. The applicant had submitted an application requesting a Special Permit which had then been referred to the Planning Board for their recommendations.. All of the members of the Board had received the Planning Board’s approval which had included some detailed comments, as well as all associated information, in

their packets for this hearing. In considering a Special Use Permit, the Board would be referencing the Special Use Permit criteria included in Section 435-66 of the Village Code. According to the Code, the Board of Trustees could authorize such use based on the following criteria which he was sure would be addressed by the applicant and the Board should keep these items in mind while listening to the presentation:

- (1) That the use will not prevent the orderly and reasonable use of adjacent properties or of the properties in adjacent use districts.
- (2) That the use will not prevent the orderly and reasonable use of permitted or legally established use in the district wherein the proposed use is to be located or of permitted or legally established uses in adjacent use districts.
- (3) That the safety, the health, the welfare, the comfort, the convenience or the order of the Village will not be adversely affected by the proposed use and its location.
- (4) That the use will be in harmony with and promote the general purpose and intent of this chapter.

Some other elements to be considered were listed in the Code and contained in the handout which had been distributed to the Board. These included the following:

- The character of the existing and probable development of uses in the district and the peculiar suitability of such district for the location of any such permissive uses.
- The conservation of property values and the encouragement of the most appropriate uses of land.
- The effect that the location of the proposed use may have upon the creation or undue increase of vehicular traffic congestion on public streets or highways.
- The availability of adequate and proper public or private facilities for treatment, removal, or discharge of sewage.
- Whether the use or materials incidental thereto or produced thereby may give off obnoxious gases, odors, or noise.
- Whether the operations in pursuance of the use will cause undue interference with the orderly enjoyment by the public of parking or of recreational facilities.
- Whether there is need for bituminous-surfaced space for the purpose of off street parking of vehicles.
- Whether a hazard to life, limb or property because of fire, flood, erosion or panic may be created by reason or as a result of the use.
- Whether the use or the structures to be used therefor will cause an overcrowding of land or undue concentration of population.
- Whether the plot area is sufficient, appropriate or adequate for the use and the reasonably anticipated operation and expansion thereof.
- Whether the use to be operated is unreasonably near to a church, school, theater, recreational area or other place of public assembly.

Village Attorney Egan stated that the Board should keep these elements in mind during the public hearing. He noted that the procedure to be followed would be for the applicant to make their presentation. The Board would be able to ask questions during and after the presentation was completed. Then, comments from the public would be heard. No vote on the application would be taken tonight since under General Municipal Law 239-M the Board was required to refer the application to the Suffolk County Planning Commission for comments. Village Attorney Egan stated that he would recommend at the end of hearing this evening that the Board vote to close the public hearing and refer it the Suffolk County Planning Commission for their determination, comments, and recommendations. Once those were received by the Board, the Board would then have the opportunity to vote on the application, and adopt, integrate or make changes should they be recommended. Should the application be approved, the project would be referred back to the Planning Board for the finer details of the site plan to be reviewed.

Trustee Keyes asked for confirmation that the Village Board would vote on the application prior to the Planning Board review of the site plan. Village Attorney Egan stated that this was correct,

Trustee Felice inquired as to how long the Suffolk County Planning Commission had to review the application. Village Attorney Egan stated that they generally took 30 to 45 days to do so.

Deputy Village Clerk Braile read notice of the public hearing as follows:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that on May 24, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., by video conference, the Board of Trustees of the Village of Patchogue, Suffolk County, N.Y., pursuant to Sections 435-25(A) and 435-82(H) of the Village of Patchogue Code and Section 7-725-B of the New York State Village Law shall consider: THE APPLICATION OF TERWILLIGER BARTONE PROPERTIES LLC FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A THREE-STORY, 50-UNIT APARTMENT COMPLEX WITH CLUBHOUSE (“THE CORNERSTONE WATERFRONT AT PATCHOGUE”) AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MULFORD STREET AND WEST AVENUE. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY LIES IN THE E-INDUSTRIAL AND C-RESIDENTIAL ZONES ON THE PARCELS IDENTIFIED BY SUFFOLK COUNTY TAX MAP NUMBERS 0204-016.00-06.00-001.002, 0204-016.00-06.00-001.003, 0204-016.00-06.00-001.005, 0204-016.00-06.00-001.006, 0204-016.00-06.00-002.001, AND 0204-016.00-03.00-007.000. Documents relating to the application are on file at the Office of the Village Clerk, Village Hall, 14 Baker Street, Patchogue, NY and may be accessed at the following link:

<https://patchogue.novusagenda.com/agendapublic/> . Members of the public may view the public hearing live on the Village’s YouTube Channel located at

https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCi4ied6ovcIjay2uBK-1a7w?view_as=subscriber

Members of the public may participate in the live meeting and ask questions by registering as an “Attendee” for the Zoom Webinar. Please visit www.patchoguevoillage.org for specific directions.

Mayor Pontieri stated that the applicant would now make their formal presentation to the Board. He noted that the Board had received some correspondence and emails from residents. Letters from the following individuals would be included in the record which would be forwarded to the Suffolk County Planning Commission: Kimberly Kennedy, Cedar Avenue; Katelyn Jackson, 19 Grenville Ave; David Bowman, 38 Grenville Avenue, Patchogue; Raymond Glynn, 20 Wiggins Avenue; and Claire Davidson Siegel, 204 Rider Avenue.

Kathleen Deegan Dickson of Forchelli, Deegan, Terranna, 333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 1010, Uniondale, stated that she had been the representative for this project since the first application was made to the Planning Board in 2018 and might be familiar to those watching online. Ms. Dickson stated that she had three additional certified mail cards to submit and noted that the rest had been sent to the Village Clerk. If she received any after this hearing, she would mail them to the clerk. Ms. Dickson continued by noting that the hearing tonight was for the special permit aspect of this project. As had been noted, a special permit from the Board of Trustees was required for residential use in the E-Industrial zone. Typically, this was obtained at the beginning of the planning process, but the Board had requested an in depth site plan review by the Planning Board prior to their hearing this application. The Planning Board had made it very clear to them that they were very concerned about how the applicant planned to handle drainage and stormwater retention due to its location near the river. They had also wanted to insure that adjacent properties would not be negatively impacted. This had been a focus of the applicant from the beginning of the project and continued today. Ms. Dickson proceeded to describe the project noting that she was sure most of the Board was familiar with the details but wanted to be sure this was included for this record as well as addressing the criteria included in Section 435-66 of the Code. She noted that the property in question was located on the corner of West Avenue and Mulford Street and comprised approximately 2.15 acres. It was primarily located in an E-Industrial Zone with a portion of the property located within a C-Residence zone on the east side of the Patchogue River. Uses of the neighboring properties included a restaurant, industrial uses, and residential uses. Ms. Dickson indicated that multi-family residential use was permitted in the E-Industrial zone with a special permit of the Board of Trustees. The proposed project would be new construction and include 50 apartments, 55 boat slips, marina offices, and 156 parking stalls. Improvements to be made included new sidewalks, plantings, and a plaza at the water’s edge which would be available to the public. Ms. Dickson stated that she had appeared before the Planning Board several times over the last three years to review this project with numerous changes being made as a result of comments, suggestions, and recommendations from the public and the Planning Board. She noted that variances which would have been necessary for the height of the building and setbacks and parking had been eliminated. The Planning Board had issued recommendations to the Board dated April 15, 2021, and all of the Board members should have a copy. They had recommended approval of the special permit subject to certain conditions. Should the Board of Trustees grant the special permit, the applicant would be returning to the Planning Board for site plan review. Depending on the decision rendered regarding parking, the applicant might need to apply to the Zoning Board for a small variance.

Ms. Dickson proceeded to describe the proposed use of the property. She noted that the proposed project would be providing residential use within a residential area that surrounded an industrial zone. Taking a property from industrial zoning to residential zoning was the ultimate in up zoning. Ms. Dickson noted that the existing boat slips would be kept in place as this was an active working waterfront, and the applicant wished to keep this use. While boat slips would be available to residents of the apartments, they would also be available to the public as well. Additional public access which currently did not exist would be added by the project including new sidewalks and the waterfront plaza. She continued by notice that, under New York State law, specially permitted uses were akin to permitted use and were assumed to be permitted unless certain items could not be proven. This was different from a use variance as the use was assumed to be permitted unless certain criteria could not be met. This criteria was found in Section 435-66 of Patchogue Code provided the Board with broad determinations to consider the special use request. When considering the adjacent uses and whether or not the proposed use is in harmony with the purposes of the zoning code and the health, safety, and welfare of the Village as a whole, the Board needed to take into account the existing and probable development of the district. Ms. Dickson proceeded to review the criteria for a special use permit as already outlined by Village Attorney Egan. She then stated that this Board had already determined that this property was suitable for residential use when it granted a special permit for condos to be built on the site in May 2008. The Board would be ruling with regard to use of the site as opposed to details of the site plan. Twelve years ago, this body had found that residential use was appropriate for the site. In addition, after many hearings, the Planning Board had recommended approval of the special permit with conditions attached that the applicant was prepared to comply with. Ms. Dickson reiterated that residential use was generally a higher class use with regard to zoning. Compared to the potential commercial and industrial uses which were permitted in this zone, this would be the ultimate up zoning. Ms. Dickson indicated that experts had been retained during the course of the application to make sure the plans complied with the special permit criteria, especially to be sure that the residential use was harmonious with the area. Traditionally, this was a working waterfront area which turned toward water enhanced uses such as restaurants and residential neighborhoods. She then reviewed several renderings of the project with the Board. The architect for the project, Glen Cherveney, had worked hard and modified the design several times to be sure that the style of the project was consistent with the aesthetics in the area, was compatible with the waterfront, and provided pleasing views from the east side of the property and across the river. The building was also designed to provide full fire department access to the building, and the parking and landscaping were reconfigured to be sure that this was provided so there would be no danger to life, the safety of the building or the immediate area. A beautiful plaza was planned for the end of Mulford Street with paving, benches, and places for people to sit and fish. This would be quite a difference from what was there now. In addition to aesthetics, styling, and fire safety, Ms. Dickson noted that her client was serious about ecological concerns. Frank Piccininni of SMPIL Consulting, Ltd. had been retained as an environmental consultant to assist with the design process. Nature had been integrated into the design plans and lush landscaping had been proposed for the site which would encompass primarily native species which would have the lowest ecological impact, be drought resistant, and require less irrigation. Her client was sensitive to the public's concerns and had proposed a green, sustainable development. Ms. Dickinson indicated that the engineering team had designed the site to support all required parking and would not require a variance as designed and planned to connect the project to the existing sewer and water infrastructure. Confirmation had been obtained that these had adequate capacity to handle the project's proposed use. Mr. Piccininni had designed a creative and robust stormwater management system which would prevent negative impacts to surrounding properties. R&M Engineering had performed a traffic impact study and parking study that had been included in the Board's packet. This included a detailed investigation which reviewed existing traffic volumes and compared them to the projected volume for the proposed use as well as to projected volumes for other permitted uses for this property such as a warehouse, medical office building, or restaurant. Those other uses were projected to cause the same or more vehicular or truck traffic than this project, not less. Ms. Dickson noted that these counts had been done pre-COVID in both winter and summer months. The conclusions reached at both times of year were no different. There would be no negative impact on traffic or parking in the area based on this use. She indicated that a parking study had been submitted to the Board which showed 156 parking spaces being provided on site. There were 154 required under Village Code if the apartment and marina uses were considered separately. Of these 156 parking spaces, 22 were located the second floor of a proposed parking structure to be located on the north side of the property. The Planning Board had asked her client to reconsider and eliminate this structure. Her client was willing to do so if the Board were in favor of such action and would then request a 22 space variance from the Zoning Board. Ms. Dickson also noted

that her client was planning to provide 26 land banked spaces. This land would not be developed at the present time but would be available for future use should these spaces become necessary. In the meant time, the area would be kept in a pristine state which would add additional green space to the project and soften the street view. She did not believe these spaces would be necessary, but they would be available in the future if they were. Ms. Dickson also noted that her client was not taking any credit for the expected shared usage of the marina by residents. Marina slips would be available to residents but also accessible to the public. Her client expected that people in the neighborhood would take advantage of the slips as well. The 55 slips in the marina required 38 spaces which would all be provided; however, her client did not anticipate that these would all be needed by the marina. Ms. Dickson stated that the Planning Board recommendations had also expressed concern about parking under the building. She noted that the 2018 plan for the project had provided for parking under the building. At that time, the Village was not in favor of placing the building on stilts and allowing for parking underneath the structure as this was not the aesthetic the Board wanted. As a result, the building and parcel had been redesigned with additional land purchased in order to eliminate the need for parking underneath the building and to reduce the height of the structure. With this redesign, the mechanicals and environmental systems had been placed under the building and rainwater recapture cisterns had been added to the plan as well. There was no opportunity now to place parking under the building based on these changes. Ms. Dickson stated that Wayne Muller of R&M Engineering and Frank Piccininni of SMPIL Consulting Ltd., were available to answer any questions. She asked Mr. Piccininni to step forward to review the design aspects which would make the project environmentally, neighborhood, and Village friendly.

Frank Piccininni stated that he was co-founder of SMPIL Consulting and noted that he often worked in opposition to applications such as these. However, this project was not one where unused land would be cleared of trees to create tract housing, rather this would involve repurposing a site that already had environmental concerns. Mr. Piccininni indicated that the applicant wanted to deal with concerns expressed by the public and had met with 20 representatives from various environmental groups in trying to come away with a better view of how this property could be developed more sustainably and conscientiously. He had felt that it was important to be part of the solution in making this property more sustainable. Mr. Piccininni then reviewed a prepared slide show. He noted that there were three major steps to follow in sustainable property development. The first was to restore habitat whenever possible. Next, work to integrate nature into the living space created, and last, manage stormwater impacts. Taking these steps would also reduce the level of chemical maintenance required on the property. Mr. Piccininni reviewed the current state of the property noting that it was hardly an ecological wonderland as there was hard packed surface area on the site which prevented good drainage and many invasive species such as kudzu, tree of heaven, oriental bittersweet, and autumn olive were present. He noted that he was proud to have worked with a design team that was willing to push development in the right direction from an ecological standpoint. The proposed landscaping plan would include all native species and pack nature into the entire development. Habitat would be restored wherever possible so that those walking through the area would get a sense of the ecological value created and feel how well nature was integrated into the project. While other aesthetics to the plan such as building height and traffic concerns were important, it was also important for the natural aspects of the project to integrate nature into the community. Spaces for birds, bees, and butterflies would be established, and the root system created by native plants and trees would provide additional ecological value by promoting infiltration which would reducing flooding and retaining stormwater on site. The root structure of these plants and trees would create soil porosity and make it less dense and improve drainage while the canopy created would help to reduce physical erosion on the site versus what the existing condition did. Mr. Piccininni stressed that the more nature was restored into the living spaces, the more stormwater would stay on the site, and the more integrated the development would be in the community. Though plans needed to be fleshed out through the site plan review process, it was intended that stormwater be captured on site in bioswales, cisterns or some type of chambers, so that this water could then be used to irrigate the property and for other sustainable uses. The initial surge of stormwater would be captured and could then be used at a later time. Utilizing native species would reduce the need for fertilizes or pesticides and reduce the nitrogen footprint of the project. In addition, some of this nitrogen would be assimilated into the plant tissues themselves. Mr. Piccininni indicated that he was proud to be a part of this team and would be happy to answer any questions the Board might have.

Mayor Pontieri inquired if project would be using permeable pavers. Mr. Piccininni stated that parking areas would be constructed with permeable materials. Mayor Pontieri then asked for

verification that water would be retained on site in some way. Mr. Piccininni reiterated that details needed to be worked out, but the plan was to use permeable materials and some type of system to capture stormwater runoff from the buildings through bioswales and underground systems. Trustee Ferb expressed concern about the potential use of cisterns. He noted that he lived in the neighborhood and questioned how big these would be. Mr. Piccininni stated that they would be sized according to the available surface area. Trustee Ferb inquired if there would be sufficient vertical space between the groundwater level and this construction. Mr. Piccininni stated that the cisterns would most provide above ground storage. The groundwater level was also why native plants would be incorporated into the landscaping plans. These types of plants would draw up groundwater and lower the water table in that the soil column would build over time. The groundwater level would drop due to subsurface flow and the soil column becoming more spongy and able to handle more stormwater. Mr. Piccininni indicated that the below ground systems put in place would increase in capacity over time. He stressed that the developer would be conscientious about nature during the building process. Trustee McHeffey question whether the groundwater depth was known yet. Mr. Piccininni indicated that soil borings had been done, but R & M Engineering would have more detailed information during the site plan review process. Matthew Aylward of R & M Engineering, 50 Elm Street, Huntington, stated that his firm would be designing a process to store stormwater prior to it entering the ground. He believed that the groundwater level was approximately two feet below the surface near the bulkhead with that distance increasing to three to three and a half feet closer to the proposed building. Mr. Aylward stated that the cisterns would be above ground tanks and not leaching structures. Trustee Ferb questioned this groundwater level as he believed that it was only ten inches below the surface near his home which was very close to the proposed project site.

Ms. Dickson indicated that she wanted the Board to know how seriously her client takes these issues. She noted that the groundwater issue would remain the same no what was built on this site. The planned actions would resolve some existing issues within the community with regard to flooding and stormwater runoff. Right now, there was no stormwater management on the site. Ms. Dickson stated that she believed the proposed project met all of the criteria for a special permit outlined in Section 435-66 of the Village Code. The proposed development would clean up the property both physically and aesthetically; drainage conditions would be improved; and any water generated from the site would be handled on site. This would be a residential use in a residential area and be consistent with the Village Code. Residents would be welcomed onsite to use and enjoy the waterfront where currently there were inhospitable vacant lots which were not in the best condition and no sidewalks. The area would be beautified and improved, and she urged the Board to look with favor on this application so that the application could move onto the site plan review process with the Planning Board where a deeper dive into questions could be done. She stressed that the applicant would take seriously and address any concerns that were raised. Ms. Dickson noted that the rest of the team was present and would like to have the opportunity to address any questions or concerns that were raised.

Trustee Keyes inquired if there were any photos of the proposed project that the Board could review. Ms. Dickson then reviewed slides of the proposed project noting that some changes had been made to the project that might not be reflected on these slides. She indicated that this view was from the corner of West Avenue and Mulford Street and noted that the house shown on one side of the proposed project would be eliminated. This was where the land banked parking would be created. Mayor Pontieri noted that the having the house in the photo provided the Board with the perspective of the proposed height of the project. Trustee Keyes inquired if the house on the north side was an existing building. Ms. Dickson stated that this was an existing home. Trustee Ferb noted that there was no sidewalk on the north side of the drawing. Mr. Aylward indicated that this sidewalk had been added. Ms. Dickson indicated that this was one of the items that had changed and noted that it was difficult to change the rendering every time a change was made to the plan, but there would be a sidewalk on the north side. The site plan did show this sidewalk. Trustee McHeffey inquired as to any other changes that were not shown. Ms. Dickson stated that the building would be moved about ten feet further south to comply with the front yard setback requirement with this area then containing plantings. Trustee McHeffey observed that these architectural changes had occurred as a result of the multiple application processes. Ms. Dickson stated that the same process had been followed, but there had been several hearings during which the plan had evolved. It was all part of same application for this special permit. The process had taken a long time due to the feedback received over the past three years.

Mayor Pontieri asked that anyone wishing to comment on this application not repeat the same comments of a prior speaker. The Board were smart people and minutes were being taken of everything that was said. Repetition was not needed. Mayor Pontieri also asked that comments be kept to under three minutes. Trustee Brinkman stated that some individuals were trying to make comments through the chat feature, and this could not be done. People would need to request to make comments by raising their hands.

Anna Masone, 278 West Avenue, stated that unfortunately, she and many others were forced to stand outside because the Board refused to listen to their concerns. She questioned how many years residents had to come out to these hearings and asked to be heard. Ms. Masone also asked if this was the legacy that Mayor Pontieri wanted to leave. She felt that this project was inappropriate and did not fit into the community. It was not that the neighbors did not want the property developed, it was that they did not want 50 rental units in their community. She questioned how planting trees and the type of paving to be used would help this situation, and how 50 rental units would help the young families living here to survive. There was a housing crisis in this community and throughout the country, and people wanted to purchase their own homes or condos. She also questioned where the parking for The Oar was going to go. It was ridiculous that this process had been going on for three years, and people's concerns were still not being heard. Since the Mayor had said he hated repetition, there would be no need for people to repeat their concerns if the Board would simply listen to them.

Kaitlyn Jackson, 19 Grenville Avenue, stated that over the past few years she had written over 16 pages or over 6,132 words which was more than a typical college essay expressing her concerns about the proposed Cornerstone overdevelopment. Dozens of other community representatives had shared hundreds of pages stating their concerns as well and dedicated an extensive amount of time discussing, arguing, contemplating and offering solutions both amongst themselves, with the Planning Board, and in meetings with the Mayor and various Village trustees. Ms. Jackson noted that topics of concern had included flooding, ad hoc riverfront planning, no analysis of cumulative impacts or adequate environmental compliance, and much more. Despite these efforts and the concerns that had been thoughtfully articulated by the community repeatedly, the current Cornerstone proposal did not address them in their designs. It was now the Board's job to weigh the concerns of the community versus those of the stubborn and unmovable developer's bottom line. If built as proposed with two people occupying approximately 800 sq. ft. one bedroom apartments and with all of these individuals moving to Patchogue, there would be at least 100 new residents living on approximately 1.5 acres of land. This would be the equivalent of six family lots in the area. An average of four people per household would result in 24 people living on those 1.5 acres. Fitting 100 people in the same type of space as residences that currently existed did not fit the character of the community. The fear of the community was that those 100 potential new residents were more important than the hundreds of people already living in this neighborhood that had shared their substantive concerns and were going to be directly impacted by this development. Ms. Jackson indicated that she expected the Board to state that they cared about all of the residents of the Village, and she challenged them to prove it with their actions. Since the application was finally before the Village Board, she would like to submit the 16 pages she had previously submitted to the Planning Board since they were still relevant. In addition, she had attached 81 signatures from the community collected in the last few months expressing opposition to this project and reiterating their concerns. She also noted that she had resubmitted a petition against the Cornerstone Project from 2019 which contained 396 signatures of which 254 individuals identified as living in Patchogue. Ms. Jackson then thanked the Board for their time.

Casey Stewart, 216 West Avenue, stated that she and her husband had two young children. She was strongly opposed to the current application. Ms. Stewart noted that she had lived in the Village for thirty years and had become a homeowner five years ago. She and her husband had been residing in White Plains when they were contemplating where to purchase a home in which to grow their family. They had opted not to stay in White Plains due to the downtown high rise apartments, road congestion, and overcrowded grocery stores. Ms. Stewart indicated that they had wanted to find a home which had access to waterways and a strong community feel. This why they had settled on Patchogue since it had access to the waterfront with an up and coming Main Street and was a diverse community. They had never dreamed that they would be dealing with this proposed four story apartment building in a predominantly single family residence neighborhood. After watching the January 14th Planning Board meeting, she felt that it was insulting that this was the revised project. According to the Cornerstone web site, "feedback from the community was important to ensure that Cornerstone was a good neighbor". After all the Board

meetings and so many attendees that the Middle School had to be used for a meeting, the proposed project still consisted of three to four stories of apartments. Ms. Stewart questioned why this would be fitting on the waterfront in a residential neighborhood. She also noted that the renderings shown by the applicant did not appear to be accurate unless it was planned to have double parking on the north side of Mulford Street as that was a private road that cars would not be able to access. Also, the issue that the current lot was being used as overflow parking for The Oar restaurant had not been addressed. Ms. Stewart noted that this was not the responsibility of the developer but questioned where these cars would go as on street parking was a huge concern for residents. She also expressed concern for the environmental impacts on the river. This past weekend, she had observed large numbers of dead fish floating there. Ms. Stewart questioned how 50 apartments and approximately 100 more people would impact the river and its environment. She stressed that she was not opposed to development but felt that it should fit the allocated space and character of the community. Ms. Stewart inquired if the developer had considered condos instead of apartments as there was more value and commitment from someone who owned his or her home versus renting. Homeowners also tended to be more invested in the community. Ms. Stewart continued by noting that the infrastructure for any project should comfortably fit parking space for multiple cars and guests per unit. She then closed by asking the Board if they would approve such a monstrous project if it were in their own backyard. Ms. Stewart thanked the Board members for hearing her and for their consideration.

Francis Salazar, 50 Lee Avenue, inquired if this project was considered residential or commercial. He believed that anything over four units was considered commercial, but this was being described as residential. Mr. Salazar stated that he was opposed to this application as it would not be a restoration of habitat but would be a large apartment complex that would be a strain on infrastructure, schools, and the general lifestyle of Village residents.

Tiffany Bowman, 38 Grenville Avenue, thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. She noted that the many issues with this project had already been discussed at length over the past hour, days, months and years. It was clear that the residents of the community, the Board's neighbors and constituents, did not want a development of this size built in their neighborhood. Over the past few years, they had attended numerous meetings and reached out personally, both in person and virtually, to voice their concerns, and tonight were gathered outside Village Hall to demonstrate their opposition to this project. Ms. Bowman indicated that none of their concerns seemed to be being heard. She noted that if she had \$1 for every time that she had been told that this proposal was a "done deal", she would have been able to purchase the property herself and put something of benefit to the community there. Ms. Bowman questioned why so many people thought this was a done deal and wondered whether there were side deals, personal relationships, or wallets to be fattened. She indicated that this was how it looked to Village residents whose voices were being largely ignored. Ms. Bowman noted that it was not a secret that there were a great deal of personal relationships and history involved in how Village government operated; however, the community was changing and was a community of young, hardworking, educated people who were building their lives and families here. They were not interested in being manipulated by deeply rooted issues of the past and were looking towards the future and the Board for honesty and integrity in government and seeking to be heard concerning the future of their community. Ms. Bowman urged the Board to truly listen to them as they would not stop until they were heard. She noted that she expected to hear from the Board that they had already approved a special permit for this property in the past and had no choice but to approve this one. However, that was a different proposal with a significantly different potential impact on the neighborhood. Ms. Bowman stated that the Board had a choice to consider this proposal independent of past ones; and the choice to listen to the community rather than the developers and their wallets. She implored the Board to make their decision wisely and carefully since, as their representatives, they owed it to the community.

Steve Masciopinto, 15 Grenville Avenue, stated that he had lived in the Village for 36 years and had his first Christmas tree planted outside of his house. Mr. Masciopinto stated that he had purchased his parents' home and had no plans of leaving the community. For as long as he could remember, Patchogue had been a great place. He was a member of the local Fire Department and Police Department, and enjoyed serving the community. Mr. Masciopinto indicated that a couple of the previous speakers had brought up some good points. He was not against development but felt that apartments would not be a good fit for this area. When people owned their homes, they had a greater investment in the community. Mr. Masciopinto continued by noting that over the last few years, many homes had been sold on Grenville, and all the new residents, including

himself, were making tremendous improvements to their properties. While the developer's representatives were trying to sell the beauty aspect of the project, it would not be a good fit for this neighborhood. He asked the Board to consider that once apartments were built, they could not be taken away and would be there forever. There would be no control over who came and went from them. Mr. Masciopinto noted that Patchogue already had a lot of apartments; some good and some not so good. During his patrols, he had seen many apartments which were not great places. He asked that the Board keep this in mind when making a decision and reiterated that he did not believe that apartments were right for this area. Mr. Masciopinto thanked the Board for their time and expressed hope that the developers would consider revising their plans to construct condos instead.

Regina Bykov, 11 Mulford Street, indicated that she appreciated the opportunity to make a statement. She noted that the developers were proposing a 50 unit, four story apartment building that would be over 50 feet tall and include a two story parking garage. There was no structure on this side of the river that was even close to this magnitude in size even without the parking garage. She indicated that it was clear from the latest version of this site plan that the developer was not listening to the community. Ms. Bykov continued by noting that it was her understanding that certain criteria needed to be met in order for a special permit to be issued, and there was no such thing as carte blanche in terms of this type of approval. She indicated that this was not a reasonable use of this land. While the developer had indicated that traffic would not increase, it certainly would increase vehicular traffic on Village streets related to this development as well as the overflow parking for The Oar which was currently housed on this property. Ms. Bykov indicated that there were limiting conditions on this project for this property other than the developers bottom line. She noted that the Village Code required that the Board consider that all buildings in their locations be in harmony with their surrounding environment. If approved, this development would create conditions which were distinctly different from the surrounding area by increasing the density and altering the essential character of the neighborhood. Ms. Bykov continued that the Mayor had stated to some individuals that this development was the only way to control what was built on this site and that the Code allowed the Board to vote for or against projects based on what the Board believed was best for the community and often cited the Tritec project on Main Street as an example. She indicated that this area was not Main Street, and while that project might have suited the Board's vision to revitalize Main Street, this proposed use was inconsistent with the single and two family homes which made up this neighborhood. Ms. Bykov stressed that this was their neighborhood, and they were here to defend it. As proposed, this project was bad for their neighborhood. She questioned how allowing this project to move forward would be controlling what would be built here in in this area and asked if the Board honestly believed that this was what was best for the community. Ms. Bykov indicated that if the Board could do something to control this situation, then they should do it. She stated that the Board owed their loyalty to the residents to do so, not the developer, not one property owner, and not Main Street businesses. Ms. Bykov questioned if this was allowed, where would development stop and what was the Board's plan for the riverfront. She inquired if residents had any say in shaping what that vision was. Ms. Bykov indicated that there were rumors of other developers waiting in the wings to see if this project was approved in order to submit their own applications. Approval of this project could have cumulative impacts on riverfront development for years to come as granting this special use permit as proposed would open a dangerous development precedence that could not be undone. She reiterated that the Board owed their loyalty to the Village residents and not only to Main Street businesses, one developer or one property owner. Ms. Bykov concluded by stating that she was hopeful that careful consideration would be made regarding the impacts of this potential approval when rendering a decision and truly consider the Board's constituents' ferocious opposition to this project and recognize the serious environmental concerns outlined in what she felt was the Planning Board's halfhearted recommendation to this Board.

Dan Penberg, 45 Cedar Avenue, apologized that he was being forced to stand in the street to make a comment. He felt that it was an injustice that statements could not be made inside the building. Mr. Penberg stated that an apartment complex would not fit on this property as proposed. He indicated that he felt it was ridiculous that the developer could not update a photo of the proposed plan even though they realized that many unhappy individuals would be watching this hearing. They had months to prepare for this which made him question what to expect from them going forward. He asked the Mayor and Board what the residents could expect from them going forward. This was not just about Cornerstone. It was about the entire river, and all of the residents lives in this area would be impacted.

Angela McCallister, 114 Oak Street, indicated that she had moved from Williston Park into the Village some time ago. When she came here, the Village had not been in the best of shape, but she knew that progress was coming. She felt that the Mayor and Board had done a great job in revitalizing the community, but a four story apartment complex on the water with boat slips which was on a river that already had issues was not in the best interest of the Village or those who lived here. Ms. McCallister suggested that the developer take their proposal and go somewhere else that was seeking to be developed with a four story building of that nature. If the plants and invasive species were a problem on that property, they should get some goats to eat all of the weeds and overgrowth as had been done in Central Park. Ms. McCallister also noted that the developer had hired that company to do an inspection of the property and determine that it would be environmentally okay to move forward with this project. This inspection had not been done privately. She indicated that the river had many issues and adding a four story building on its shores would not help the residents or the Village long term.

Jillian Werkelman, 220 West Avenue, indicated that this project would be constructed in her backyard. She proceeded to show the Board the view of her backyard and what her view would be if this was approved. This would be a very large project. She indicated that she and her boyfriend had moved into this home two years ago and were never told that this would be happening. Her boyfriend had worked very hard to afford this house at 25 years old and realized his dream of home ownership only to see those dreams be potentially crushed. They would never get their money back out of this house if this project went through. It would have deterred them from moving here if they had known about this project then. Ms. Werkelman indicated that she thought that the Village was trying to bring young families into the area. Those families were seeking to buy houses, not rent apartments. She proceeded to show the Board the 40 foot telephone pole located behind her house and indicated that this was as high as the proposed building would be. This structure would be looking into her backyard and the yards of all of her neighbors. She questioned why the Board would think this belonged in this area as there were no apartments now, only houses. If this was something that was needed, why not put more houses or condos there and something that would not obstruct the view or be looking into her backyard. Ms. Werkelman indicated that they had hoped to live here forever, but this development would not keep them here. It was frustrating because they loved Patchogue, but this would draw them and others away. Everyone was banding together in front of Village Hall because they all wanted to live here, but this would not continue if this was constructed. Another issue was the new drive through Starbucks that was going to be built at the end of West Avenue. She questioned how many more people would be coming here just so that they did not have to get out of their cars. There was already increased traffic due to the new traffic circle, more traffic would be added as a result of the addition of Starbucks, and then there would be the potential for another 100 cars all coming from this same block. Ms. Werkelman asked the Board to think about the potential project from her backyard's point of view and what it would be like for her and everyone else around her.

Kathleen Biggs, 18 Mulford Street, asked if she could read a letter into the record that had been submitted by Claire Siegel, 204 Rider Avenue, since was unable to attend the hearing. Mayor Pontieri stated that the letter had already been put into the record. Ms. Biggs stated that Ms. Siegel had specifically requested that it be read into the record. Mayor Pontieri indicated that she could do so. Ms. Biggs read Ms. Siegel's letter as follows:

"It is a fact that in the 2.2 square miles that comprise the Village of Patchogue, there are currently 2,109 units of apartments, condominiums and senior residences. We do not need 50 more units which could house approximately 100 or more residents.

These renters at the proposed Cornerstone site could also add as many as 100 (or more) cars to the residential areas, thereby bringing a traffic invasion. This complex would also require daily deliveries, such as fuel oil, newspapers, food, health services, mail, as well as landscapers, maintenance people and guests. Such traffic would be highly disruptive to this quiet residential area.

Regarding sewers: 50 additional toilets, bathroom and kitchen sinks, showers, bathtubs, dishwashers and washing machines are expected to hook into the Village sewer system. Why should this complex be allowed to stress current sewer facilities when 50 individual homeowners who already live in the Village do not have a hook-up? Do not allow Cornerstone to be granted this sewer connection.

Regarding schools: this complex will include one and two-bedroom units. How many children might be added to our currently overcrowded schools?

The proposal currently includes 50 docking slips for the yacht club. The Army Corps of Engineers are in control of the Patchogue River. If Cornerstone acquires existing docks, they will not need approval from the Army Corp of Engineers, but they must provide 38 parking spaces for the yacht club members. Has this matter been explored?

The "Special Use" permit granted by the Planning Board gives the developers permission to build housing in this current industrial zone. I request that the Village Board and other public authorities reject this approval by the Patchogue Village Planning Board.

Regarding DEC: How will this building comply with DEC water table and flood zone regulations? Has the DEC consultant already inspected and prepared a report to the Village regarding this issue? Cornerstone will need to comply with federal regulations.

In conclusion, if this project is allowed to proceed, will it set a precedent for changing what remains of the rural/suburban ambience that gives Patchogue Village its charm? Is Patchogue destined to become a densely packed, high-rise community along its waterfronts? Patchogue has been progressive in its inclusion of multifamily units. We are reaching a tipping point of becoming an extension of the five boroughs. You can stop this! At previous Planning Board meetings, resident after resident opposed this project. Listen to them.

You were elected by them to protect their interests; not those of out-of-town developers. Do the job of supporting those who elected you."

Ms. Biggs indicated that she would like to make a quick comment. She noted that she had lived at 18 Mulford Street and took great pride in having been born and raised here. This was where she and her husband wanted to raise their family. If the proposal went through, it would make them question staying here. She wanted to live here and wanted her daughter to go to the same school district and live in the same neighborhood that she had. This development would put all of this in question. Ms. Biggs indicated that this was not against development, but she could not even fathom driving down her block and seeing a five story apartment complex. She noted that residents kept being told that this project would be good for the environment, but she questioned why nothing else could go here. Ms. Biggs asked why a more creative, out-of-the-box development could not be considered which would give her daughter and future generations something to be proud of. She was proud to be from Patchogue, but this type of project made her question and fear the future that was to come. Ms. Biggs asked the Board to consider those who live here and take great pride in their homes. She loved Patchogue, and she hoped not to have to think twice about the future here. Ms. Biggs then thanked the Board for taking the time to listen to them this evening.

Ken Jansik, 280 West Avenue, stated that he had moved here 10 years ago. It was a great community which was beautiful with a lot of good camaraderie. He noted that he walked his dogs in the neighborhood and questioned what the developer was calling a derelict parking lot. Mr. Jansik indicated that he did not think it was that bad. He noted that everything he had heard was a good slick marketing speech. A professional photographer could make any picture look good and appealing, but this would not be the truth. Mr. Jansik stated that he did marketing for a living and could recognize a good sales pitch and a glossy public relations speech. This project did not fit into this neighborhood. The building would be taller than the telephone pole shown by his neighbor and be clearly visible from residents' backyards. He was strongly against this project.

Adrienne Esposito, Riverwalk in Patchogue Village, noted that she had previously resided right across the street from the proposed development. She had lived in the Village for the last 40 years. Ms. Esposito stated that she would not be commenting specifically on the proposal as she currently served on the Suffolk County Planning Commission, and this proposal would come before that body. However, she wished to set the record straight with regard to potential impacts on the river. The suggestion that the river was not an ecological gem was false and insulting to Patchogue. It was an ecological gem and was one of the heartbeats of the Village. Ms. Esposito indicated that even if plantings were used that produced less nitrogen, there would still be an additive of nitrogen going into the river. Fewer pesticides used would still cause some impact on the river. Adding pesticides to a property one foot from the river would still cause pesticides to be added to the river. Ms. Esposito indicated that she thought she had heard that the depth to groundwater was unknown.

However, this was false as it was well known that the depth to groundwater in that area was between zero and two feet. This was a very significantly fragile area with respect to preservation of the river, and the environmental assessment of this project needed to be based on good science not good marketing. Sometimes projects were painted as green or “green washed”, but it was important to know the facts about the environmental impacts from large scale proposals. Ms. Esposito stated that she was eager to look at and assess this particular project.

Nancy Holliday, 27 Schroeder Lane, stated that she was opposed to this project even though she did not reside in the immediate area. She felt that this proposal was not in line with the vision of Patchogue Village. This should be a residential community, and the neighbors did not believe that the proposal fit into their neighborhood.

Mayor Pontieri inquired if anyone else wished to speak at the public hearing. He was informed that there were no other participants in the meeting wishing to speak or ask questions on Zoom or YouTube. Mayor Pontieri then asked for resolutions from the Board.

Trustee Brinkman asked the Board to approve a resolution for undertaking coordinated review pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act for the Cornerstone Waterfront at Patchogue application for a 50-unit apartment building and marina building at 102 Mulford Street, Patchogue NY.

Upon a motion by Trustee Brinkman, seconded by Trustee Ferb, and unanimously carried the Board approved a resolution for undertaking coordinated review pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act for the Cornerstone Waterfront at Patchogue application for a 50-unit apartment building and marina building at 102 Mulford Street, Patchogue NY.

Trustee Keyes asked the Board for a resolution closing the public hearing and authorizing the referral to the Suffolk County Planning Commission of the application for a special use permit for the Cornerstone development.

Upon a motion by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee Felice, and unanimously carried, the Board resolved to close the public hearing and authorized the referral to the Suffolk County Planning Commission of the application for a special use permit for the Cornerstone development.

Dennis Smith reviewed the BID and special projects report. He noted that there had been a lot of comments already made this evening, so he would keep his remarks brief. Mr. Smith indicated that the BID’s annual vegetation control application had been done this past weekend. This application had been successful for the last ten years, and he was looking forward to similar success this year. He noted that the hanging baskets were looking beautiful and were scheduled to be displayed this Thursday and Friday, May 27th and 28th. Watering personnel were in place, and he hoped that the baskets would look as good this year as they had for the past five years. Mr. Smith indicated that there had been thirty-three vendors participating in this past Sunday’s market. In spite of the ninety degree heat, there had been a lot of foot traffic for these vendors. The official kick-off of the market was scheduled for June 6th, and he anticipated fifty to sixty vendors to attend. It was a very exciting event to look forward to. He continued by noting that he had met with Paula Murphy and Highway Superintendent Dean to review relandscaping the 9-11 Memorial Park. Mr. Smith indicated that the park had been put together three or four years ago, and unfortunately, many of the plants did not survive the various storms which had come through since then. A good plan had been developed to make sure the park was improved prior to the 20th anniversary of 9-11. Mr. Smith indicated that the Johnson Controls project was moving forward. He noted that they had met this past Tuesday and would continue to meet every third Tuesday of the month to provide an update on progress being made. Mr. Smith stated that they were experiencing the same problems occurring throughout the country with regard to difficulties in obtaining materials. Every effort was being made to try not to have to push back work and remain pretty much on target. However, a new schedule had been submitted. This would involve doing the Theatre roof from July into August which was later than they had originally wanted to do this work, but they would be working with the Theatre moving forward. Even though there was some difficulty now, he was sure that in eighteen months, they would be looking back on a great completed project.

David Kennedy reviewed the Chamber of Commerce report. He indicated that as a resident of south Patchogue for his whole life he commended all of the residents who had spoken on the earlier Cornerstone application. Mr. Kennedy stated that he appreciated those who lived here and cared

about the community taking the time to speak about this issue. He then congratulated Trustee McHeffey on his new position with the Village Board and indicated that he was looking forward to working with him. Mr. Kennedy noted that if he needed anything from the Chamber to please let him know. He continued by indicating that he was sure that all were aware that things were changing rapidly when it came to openings, and it was close to being beyond the pandemic and back to a new normal world. Mr. Kennedy noted that this placed a lot of pressure on the Chamber with regard to scheduling upcoming events. Many communities were announcing events such as Riverhead with their Alive on 25 and Smithtown with a June 6th street festival. He indicated that he was monitoring the approvals that those communities received in order to determine what Patchogue might be able to implement moving forward. The Village Board had set aside four dates previously for Alive After Five, and discussions had been ongoing with the Mayor to perhaps do other activities on those dates as it was questionable as to whether accommodations could be made for the approximate 20,000 people that generally attended those events in the past. Mr. Kennedy indicated that a meeting would be held on Wednesday with event planning leaders of the community to discuss possibilities and formulate a plan to be presented at the next Village Board meeting. One possibility was to do family events for this year on those dates and hold off on resuming Alive After Five until next year. The targeted dates for these would be July 8th, July 22nd, August 5th, and August 19th. Right now, the plan was to start with outdoor dining and perhaps add some other events such as a farmer's market, art activities sponsored by the Arts Council, and special dining by the Theatre. More ideas would be discussed at the Wednesday meeting which would be held at 6:00 p.m. on Zoom. Mr. Kennedy indicated that the upcoming Memorial Day weekend was the official kick off of the summer season. There would not be a parade this year like last year, but the United Veterans organization would be holding an in-person ceremony on May 31st in the morning. The ceremony would be held outdoors so individuals could gather in person, and the ceremony would be displayed virtually as well. Mr. Kennedy continued by noting that the Chamber would be holding a membership meeting the next day. It would be in person and held at outdoor venues for the next few months. The meeting the next day would be held at the Tap Room's outside area beginning at 5:30 p.m. with a presentation to be made by Health First. He indicated that one of the biggest struggles being felt now, especially by the restaurants, was in hiring people to fill the available jobs. Though an important benefit had been provided by unemployment during the pandemic, it made it difficult for people to get back to the plentiful jobs when this benefit still continued. The Restaurant Committee would be sponsoring a Patchogue Job Crawl this upcoming Wednesday from noon to 4:00 p.m.. Any person looking for a job could bring their resume to five to six places in one afternoon. This would be especially helpful for college kids looking to be a part of an exciting community with meaningful employment. Mr. Kennedy then noted that a golf outing would be held on June 10th, and he had been selected as the honoree. This outing would help raise funds for the community, and he encouraged everyone who could to support them. Mr. Kennedy indicated that the Chamber had been happy to read the article in a recent edition of the Advance discussing the dumpster situation in the parking lots. The conditions of the dumpsters needed to be addressed, and hopefully, the installation of compactors could be considered. Many of the restaurants believed that residents were disposing of household items in the restaurant dumpsters and were hoping to see the carters held responsible for ensuring that gates were closed and repaired if necessary as well as cleaning up around the dumpsters. Adding compactors to the lots would help this situation and perhaps allow parking spaces to be added as well. Mr. Kennedy indicated that the Chamber would be willing to provide the Village with any support necessary to address this problem. He noted that the Greater Patchogue Foundation's Friends of Lakeview Cemeteries Committee was doing amazing work in restoring the historic cemeteries. The committee would be holding an event on June 12th beginning at 11:00 a.m. in the flagpole area dedicating a flag donated by Congressman Zeldin in commemoration of Flag Day which would be held on June 14th. All were invited to attend. Mr. Kennedy stated that the Chamber was beginning to sell tickets to their annual networking event, Power in Heels, which celebrated the leadership roles of business women in the community. The event would be held on June 15th at the Brickhouse Brewery beginning at noon and honor the following women: Kourtney Bevis, Michele Cayea, Beth Giacommo, and Michele Miller-McEvoy. All were invited to attend this event as well.

Deputy Mayor Krieger asked the Board to approve a raise for all non-union employees.

Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Krieger, seconded by Trustee Brinkman, and unanimously carried, the Board approved all non-union employees to receive the 2% increase effective June 1st as set forth in the union contract.

Deputy Mayor Krieger asked the Board to approve hiring a part-time Public Safety Officer.

Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Krieger, seconded by Trustee Ferb, and unanimously carried, the Board approved hiring Zach Sapolin as a part-time Public Safety Officer at \$17.60 per hour starting May 27, 2021.

Trustee Keyes noted that long-time Parks and Recreation staff member, Lu Ann Lategano, would be retiring at the end of the month. She had spent thirty-seven years with the Village and had been a great employee and was a lovely person. He wished her the best of luck and encouraged any Village residents who might see her in the next few days to do the same.

Trustee Keyes asked the Board to approve hiring 2021 Recreation Summer Staff.

Upon a motion by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee Ferb, and unanimously carried, the Board granted approval to hire the 2021 Recreation Summer Staff.

Trustee Keyes asked the Board to approve the Patchogue Garden Club use of the Community Garden and the hanging of a banner to promote the 18th Garden Tour.

Upon a motion by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee Ferb, and unanimously carried, the Board granted approval for the Patchogue Garden Club to hang a banner on Main Street to promote the 18th Garden tour and to use the Community Garden for Garden Tour ticket sales on Saturday, July 10 from 9:00 a.m. to noon.

Trustee Keyes asked the Board to approve a Memorial Day Ceremony held by the UVO of Patchogue and related street closings.

Upon a motion by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee Brinkman, and unanimously carried, the Board granted approval for the UVO of Patchogue to hold a Memorial Day Ceremony in front of the American Legion Post 269 on Monday, May 31st at 11:00 a.m. with South Ocean Avenue from Division Street to Amity Street to be closed from 10:30 a.m. to the end of the ceremony.

Trustee Keyes asked the Board to approve an event hosted by Emanuel Lutheran Church.

Upon a motion by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee Ferb, and unanimously carried, the Board granted approval for Emanuel Lutheran Church to host the Hope Day event at 179 East Main Street on Saturday, June 5th from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Community services and free groceries will be provided to the local community throughout the duration of the event.

Trustee Keyes asked the Board to approve a fitness class at the Smith Street ballfield parking lot at Shorefront Park.

Upon a motion by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee Felice, and unanimously carried, the Board granted approval for Nicholas Crescimanni of Mobile Body Boutique to run a fitness class at the Smith Street ballfield parking lot at Shorefront Park every Sunday at 9:00 a.m. and Monday at 7:00 a.m. from June 13th through September.

Trustee Keyes asked the Board to approve a Boot Camp fitness class at Father Tortora Park.

Upon a motion by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee McHeffey, and unanimously carried, the Board granted approval for Katie Mucha to hold a Boot Camp fitness class at Father Tortora Park on Sundays at 10:00 a.m. from May 30th through August 29th.

Trustee Felice indicated that the DPW staff were busy repairing potholes and performing road repairs as best as possible prior to the start of the summer season. He noted that a priority list was being prepared to ensure that the worst roads were addressed first.

Trustee Felice requested approval for the abandonment/discontinuance of the southerly portion of Audubon Avenue, which action is pursuant to sections 6-612 and 6-614 of the Village Law of the State of New York. Village Attorney Egan indicated that a public hearing had to be held for this to be considered. Mayor Pontieri stated that he was surprised that this had not been scheduled at

the last meeting. Village Attorney Egan suggested that the public hearing be scheduled for the next Board meeting to be held on June 14th.

Upon a motion by Trustee Felice, seconded by Trustee Ferb, and unanimously carried, the Board set a public hearing for June 14, 2021 to consider approving the abandonment/discontinuance of the southerly portion of Audubon Avenue, which action is pursuant to sections 6-612 and 6-614 of the Village Law of the state of New York.

Trustee Brinkman indicated that the Planning and Zoning Boards were running nicely.

Trustee McHeffey indicated that the next CDA meeting was scheduled for June 3rd.

Trustee McHeffey reviewed the Building and Housing report for April noting that six summonses had been issued, seven plumbing permits, eleven building permits, three demolition permits, fourteen rental permits, seventeen notices of violation, and twelve complaints had been received. There had been three Planning Board applications, four Zoning Board applications, and five ARB applications submitted. He indicated that he would like to put this information into a graph format, so that changes over time could be more easily observed.

Trustee McHeffey stated that there would be a clean-up of the garden area near Copper Beach this Saturday. Details were still being finalized, so anyone in the public interested in attending should please email him for more information.

Mayor Pontieri inquired if anyone wished to speak at tonight's meeting. He was informed that there were no participants in the meeting wishing to speak or ask questions on Zoom or YouTube.

Mayor Pontieri then thanked all who had viewed the meeting online.

Upon a motion made by Trustee Keyes, seconded by Trustee Felice, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

vp

Signed _____
Valerie Braile, Deputy Village Clerk