

Planning Board Minutes – April 20, 2017
Planning Board
Town of Riverhead
Suffolk County
Riverhead, New York

Minutes of April 20, 2017 of the Town of Riverhead Planning Board, held at the Town of Riverhead Town Hall, Riverhead, New York.

Chairman Stanley Carey called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Pledge to the Flag

PRESENT:

Stanley Carey, Chairman
Edward Densieski, Vice Chair
Joseph Baier
George Nunnaro
Richard O'Dea

ALSO PRESENT:

Jefferson Murphree, AICP
Jeffrey Seeman
Richard Ehlers, Esq
Vincent Gaudiello
Greg Bergman

3:00 PM MEETING

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Stoneleigh Woods, Section IV-Discussion of the status of the landscaping and the ponding area being surfaced with stone instead of the plantings shown on the approved plans at the condominium complex in the Retirement Center Zoning District on Middle Road in Riverhead identified as SCTM No.0600-64-2-11. (Karin Gluth)

Charles Cuddy, attorney for the applicant, as well as Grant Havasy of Stoneleigh Woods LLC were present. Mr. Cuddy stated we put up a bond to be sure the landscaping would be done. Karin went out to look at it and had discussions as things were put in place that were not on the plan but were actually an improvement. Mr. Havasy said typically in these sumps the planting that was designed years ago was a tall wild grass so years ago the residents of the community decided that they didn't like the look aesthetically and they decided their concerns were nesting and ticks. They pulled it out and put in decent sized stones for an aesthetically pleasing dry riverbed look. We saw their concerns and as a far more expensive alternative we did the same with the other sumps and the overall longevity of maintenance was improved and the issues would dissipate. Mr. Nunnaro asked how long have you had them in? Mr. Havasy replied eight months maybe. But the community overall maybe 10 years. The first basin has been in for at least 8-9 years. Mr.

Baier asked are weeds and things growing between? Mr. Havasy replied there is general maintenance involved.

Ms. Gluth said I had been out there at the end of March and did a memo dated March 27. There are still issues with dead buffer vegetation that wasn't corrected from the first visit and there's some erosion behind some units where there's a slope. One thing I brought up in the memo is there's areas of erosion going down to this basin. As far as the vegetation I only went out to check Section 4 but when I noticed on the second visit this was done with all basins, I looked at the others and included that in my memo. Mr. Carey asked so they've all been done this way? Mr. Havasy said the residents did. Mr. Baier said the others have already been approved. Mr. Havasy replied yes it's just this phase, it's nominal. Mr. Nunnaro said I agree with Joe, my concern would be it getting overgrown but if it's done properly then it's nice. Mr. Havasy said there's sand underneath for drainage. Mr. Densieski asked if Vinnie had any objection to which Ms. Gluth replied no. Mr. Havasy said our installer is the same one they were using so they will be all done and maintained the same.

Mr. Densieski asked what about the plantings that are failing? Mr. Havasy replied they'll replace the plants that died and fix the tilting ones. We are looking to put sod where there's been erosion where the seed didn't take. Mr. Cuddy stated one of the concerns is that we had to do an as-built survey that we gave to Mr. Gaudiello. He approved that and the Town is holding \$62,000 in escrow. We are now done with the survey part and we just need the landscaping part. Mr. Carey asked if we can get a letter from the HOA saying it's acceptable to them. Mr. Havasy replied sure. Mr. Carey asked do you agree to replace dead shrubs and sod the eroded areas? Mr. Havasy replied yes.

2. Van de Wetering Lot Line Modification – Discussion of a minor subdivision/lot line modification and land transference between two properties located at 2509 & 2294 Sound Avenue, Calverton, more particularly described as SCTM Nos. 600-40-1-3.1 and 600-40-1-3.2. Both properties are partially located within the RA40 and RA80 zoning use districts. (Greg Bergman)

Peter Danowski, attorney for the applicant, was present. Mr. Bergman said we have a pretty straightforward lot line modification. It involves two parcels. Parcel one is located on Sound Ave and is 23.9 acres. Parcel 2 is 2.7 acres located behind it. Parcel 1 is improved with greenhouses and an office. They're basically looking to transfer 1.53 acres to the residential parcel in the back. The property line currently goes through a pond that the residents created. The purpose is to maintain their landscaped area and pond on the residential parcel. Mr. Carey asked which lot would have the pond. Mr. Danowski replied the shaded area would be added from the farm to the residential parcel. They're trying to do some estate planning so this is a part of it for practicality. Mr. Carey asked what is the explanation with the covenant? Mr. Bergman replied that was back from the original subdivision which involved the lot in the back I think it's called 3.3. The covenant established the access to the two parcels, it's really irrelevant. Mr. Baier asked if it's single and separate to which Mr. Danowski replied yes, we are really just trying to do some estate planning. Mr. Baier asked what the zoning is. Mr. Bergman replied minimum 2 acre, both lots would be conforming. The northern end of the parcels are in RA40 and the other portion is RA80. They'll both be well over the requirements. Mr. Carey asked how many acres will this be now? Mr. Bergman replied 22.4 after the transfer. Mr. Baier asked does the back parcel hook up to public water? Mr. Bergman replied I believe it actually does. On the survey it shows a water line coming in from the north.

3. Bank of America ADA Compliance - Discussion of a site plan application to construct ADA accessibility improvements at the Bank of America site at the 499 Old Country Road, Riverhead, with said parcel being more particularly described as SCTM #109-1-19.4 located within the Shopping Center (SC) zoning use district. The improvements consist of adding a 5 ft. wide accessible concrete walkway from the

sidewalk from CR 58, relocating two handicap parking spots, resurfacing a portion of the asphalt parking lot, and replacing concrete ramps and walkways in front of the building. (Greg Bergman)

James Kinoshian, site design engineer, was present. Mr. Kinoshian said the scope has two goals, first to bring the exterior up to 2010 ADA regulations. Bank of America has been making upgrades in the Northeast for 6-7 years. We have been doing hundreds over the Northeast. It includes reconstructing the ADA crosswalks and parking areas which connects the accessible features on site to the parking area. Bank of America is also required to offer an accessible path from the sidewalk. The second objective is to perform maintenance in the parking lot. There's been wear overtime so they're looking to do some maintenance repair on the asphalt. The whole parking lot will be milled at least 2". Anywhere with larger areas are full depth reconstruction. Since we received comments from the Town we also incorporated a restriping plan to comply with minimum parking space requirements which reduced the total amount from 31 to 27 but we are still well over the minimum. We originally prepared a response letter saying we received dark skies comments. There is a similar program Bank of America runs which we get involved and they remove older light fixtures and install newer LED fixtures. Originally we replied that we would pass it along to see if we can incorporate this. Just today they actually got back with us and decided to include it as part of this project. We will prepare a full lighting design. Mr. Densieski asked you've done hundreds of these? Mr. Kinoshian replied yes. Mr. Densieski said tell them next time to do us first not last. Mr. Bergman said I haven't seen the lighting plans so we appreciate the fact that they will address it now. Mr. Carey asked if the Board can determine this to be administrative to which Mr. Murphree replied yes, if the Board agrees they can proceed administratively. Mr. Baier asked if because of the lighting change, you will submit new plans? Mr. Kinoshian replied correct, we will submit new plans.

4. Twin Forks Beer – Discussion of a site plan application to construct a new 11,480 sq. ft. brewery with tasting room and related site improvements, including lighting, landscaping, as well as stormwater management systems on a vacant 2.097 acre parcel located on Raynor Avenue within the Industrial C (Ind C) zoning use district, with said parcel being particularly identified as SCTM #600-108-2-12. (Greg Bergman)

Greg Bergman opened the discussion by stating we have a site plan application to construct an 11,480 square foot brewery with an associated tasting room on vacant property located on the west side of Raynor Ave, 400 feet south of Raynor and Osborn. The site is located in Industrial C zoning. The lot is presently undeveloped and the surrounding uses are mixed. It's a good site plan with some parking issues. I spoke with Rob earlier. The parking to the west we originally looked at as being land banked. We recommend it being paved. Since then I recommend we can actually push it back. We don't want parking to spill over during peak periods onto Raynor Avenue. Anything we can do to increase parking on site would be great. Robert Gruber, architect for the applicant, was present. Mr. Gruber asked you don't think we have enough? Mr. Bergman replied I really think it would be necessary. Mr. Baier asked if parking allowed on Raynor to which Mr. Bergman replied I'll look into that. Mr. Gruber said we are three spaces over the requirement. Do you think you'll need more? Dan Chekijian, applicant, was present. Mr. Chekijian said if anything, on the weekend the loading bays won't be active so we can add some parking there. There's a lot of paved area which won't be utilized on the weekends. Mr. Baier said the popularity of these facilities is growing exponentially. Your neighbors wouldn't be happy with the parking on the road. Mr. Bergman said because there are residences across the street anything you can do to contain parking on site would be great. Mr. Chekijian asked how many do you really think you can add by pushing it back? Mr. Bergman replied just move it back about 20 feet and you can add some spots.

Mr. Baier asked what's the 10x10 structure by the land banked stalls? Mr. Gruber replied that's the dumpster. Mr. Baier asked for the process water tanks, those were put in by the sewer district? Mr. Gruber replied that'll be inside the building and just a manhole outside. Mr. Carey asked do we have a letter from

them stating that? Mr. Gruber replied yes we will get it to you. Mr. Carey said there's a silo there. Mr. Chekijian said that'll be for the grains we can bring in. Mr. Carey asked what the height is. Mr. Chekijian replied some are 30 feet. They're lower than the top of the building. Mr. Chekijian showed a rendering from the ARB. They reviewed it twice and approved it. They spoke about the location of the fence. Mr. Bergman said I got an email from March 20 and they recommended approval.

Mr. Densieski said the main entrance is in the front and the parking is all in the back? Mr. Bergman replied the rear part is the brewery and warehouse operation. We don't want foot traffic in the loading bays and brewery area. Mr. O'Dea asked are they OK with the March 20 ARB comments? Mr. Bergman replied yes. Mr. Carey asked what are your proposed hours of operation? Mr. Chekijian replied Friday through Sunday, all 12pm to 6pm except open until 7pm on Saturday. We might see if Thursday works out also in the future. Mr. Carey said but the tasting room would be open at the latest 7pm? No special events? Mr. Chekijian replied no, that's not part of our immediate plans. Mr. O'Dea said the Fire Marshal wants a fire sprinkler? Mr. Densieski stated we should condition no outdoor music. Mr. Bergman replied yes maybe since its mixed use they might want a sprinkler. Mr. Baier asked what percentage is the tasting area. Mr. Chekijian replied 10% or so.

Mr. Carey said the lot is mostly wooded right now, right? What can we do to save as many trees as possible? Mr. Gruber replied we are leaving a thick natural buffer in the back. There's over 50,000 square feet of natural vegetation being left alone. We have landscaping and street trees in the front. Mr. Bergman said Jefferson and I did a site visit and the trees aren't really that substantive. Mr. Carey asked where the test hole is to which Mr. Gruber replied it's up front. Mr. Carey asked what is the elevation of the front compared to the back? Mr. Gruber said 32 inches in the front to 26 in the back. Pretty much following the grade as it pitches about 4 feet from front to back. The loading dock will be down about 4 feet which works great. Mr. Carey asked how deep will the drainage be in the back? Vinnie Gaudiello said 6 feet. I haven't put written comments to it. But the depth to water, they have groundwater in the neighborhood of 20. Structures in the loading bay, they probably don't meet that 2 foot separation from groundwater. Groundwater is at 14 so those structures would have necessary separation. Based on the grading plan, the clearing limits aren't consistent with the grading plan. The proposed grades go beyond the limits of clearing. Mr. Gruber said that can be done, that's a good point.

Mr. Baier asked if there is going to be abasement to which Mr. Chekijian replied no. Mr. Bergman said the only other question, because it's been an issue with other breweries in town, what's the plan for food service? Mr. Chekijian replied it would be a food truck, we have no onsite food preparation intentions. Mr. Carey said the water and sewer availability would be important to have in writing to us. Mr. Baier asked will you have irrigation on site? Mr. Gruber replied yes. Mr. Baier said ok, because one of the things is to not use the town water. Mr. Chekijian said we are looking into well water. Mr. Baier suggested they stay under 45 gpm. Mr. Chekijian replied most of the irrigation won't require a lot of water. Mr. Carey asked when the public hearing to will to which Mr. Bergman replied probably the first meeting in June.

5. Eagle Auto Mall Warehouse Addition – Discussion of a site plan application to construct a one story, 20,800 sq. ft. warehouse with an attached 1,800 sq. ft. area to be used as office space at the Eagle Auto Mall site, located at 1320 Old Country Road, Riverhead within the Business Center (BC) zoning use district, with said parcel more particularly identified as SCTM #600-108-1-10.1. (Greg Bergman)

Greg Bergman opened the discussion by stating we have a site plan application to construct about a 21,000 square foot warehouse with an 18,000 square foot office space located on the northeast corner of Route 58 and Osborn. The site is improved with structures used for an auto sales business. There is a 15,000 square foot metal warehouse towards the rear which the new building will be next to. I did a site visit in November and noted a few things, one of which was parking. Most of the parking lot is not striped throughout the

site. One condition from approval of the original is that striping was supposed to be redone. I'm not sure if it faded or if it was not done but I noted it should be updated. Another thing I noticed was on page 4 of the staff report you can see residential properties to the east located on Woodcrest Ave. There's a chain link fence and a clear view from the back yards to the parking lot of the business. Staff recommends some kind of fence to create a visual screen, especially with another large warehouse you'd anticipate increased traffic. Mr. Carey said it looks like a retaining wall there. Mr. Bergman said it's up further on the property. I didn't take up the issues with the front but the back end. I received a lighting plan which seems to be compliant. Mr. Carey said the fence by the front of the property, the fence is just horrible. It's hardly even there. Why put a new fence in the back and leave it horrible in the front. Jeff Zahn architect for the applicant, and Mark Calisi, applicant, were present. Mr. Calisi said the chain link fence in the front is Lolly's Hut which isn't our property. Mr. Carey said so there's no buffer there? Mr. Calisi replied there's just some low arborvitae. Mr. Bergman said landscaping was noticed, there's really none along the front. We recommend to plant some trees along Route 58. I called out a bohall maple which grows vertically. I understand it's an auto sale business but these trees would work for that.

Mr. Baier said the setbacks are ok? Mr. Bergman replied yes. It's not increasing the impervious coverage either. Mr. Baier asked what the present building is being used for. Mr. Calisi replied storage for parts. Mr. Baier questioned the use of the new building to which Mr. Calisi replied parts and accessories. Mr. Bergman asked if he will remove some of the stuff from the existing warehouse to this one. There were some Fire Marshal issues on the initial review. Mr. Calisi replied what's in this warehouse will increase and the inventory from across the street will come in here. Mr. Bergman said the warehouse on the property now that this one is going next to, the Building Department noted the Fire Marshal had high combustible storage. Mr. Calisi replied all parts are metal in cardboard boxes. Mr. Baier asked what he meant by 'moving things across the street'. On the south side? Mr. Calisi replied yes. Mr. Bergman said that was the FKA 317 site plan application. It's a used car dealership now. Mr. Carey questioned why nothing ever came about with that. Mr. Bergman replied I received a plan from Doug Adams recently.

Mr. Bergman stated I wanted to talk to the Board about Jeff Seeman's recommendation of the traffic impact study. They recommended a study be done. Due to the proposed parking and onsite traffic flows during peak vehicle deliveries I wanted to know if a study is appropriate. Mr. Densieski stated I don't. Mr. Baier questioned whether it will really be bringing more cars to the property. Mr. Nunnaro said I believe it was just for storage. Mr. Carey said the front will be an office, right? Will people be relocated? Mr. Calisi replied the people in the trailer would be relocated. Mr. Nunnaro asked if this would be a separate business venture. A building this size, the business must be so good. Mr. Calisi said we need the purchasing power. We deliver parts and accessories to the GM dealerships. We are trying to make it more efficient. Mr. Carey asked Mr. Seeman to talk about the request for the traffic study. Mr. Seeman asked where the new vehicle transport takes place. Mr. Calisi replied when you come up the alleyway, there's a 40 foot wide area where the stripes used to be so they just pull the truck to the side and there's new car storage there. Anything in the back is for wholesale parts. If you're there at night the trucks are there but then they leave to go on deliveries so we stagger them. Mr. Carey asked if there were cars currently stored in that area. Mr. Calisi replied on the proposed side of where we want to put the building is where we store our trucks and we have customer parking. When the building goes in we will move it around. Mr. Carey asked where it will be stored during construction when you move that space. Mr. Calisi replied the customer parking and used car lots and we plan on holding back a bit of inventory. We want to cut it down to about half which is what we are at about now. Mr. Zahn stated I think what I see over there is more of a reorganization. There's a lot of empty spaces in certain areas so we can reorganize. Mr. Calisi said at the end of the year there's not a lot of inventory so we will just hold back on inventory during construction.

Mr. Bergman said one other question which didn't make it to staff report, I went out and saw a large number of shipping containers toward the rear. What's the plan for them? Will that stuff go into the warehouse?

Mr. Calisi replied yes. Mr. Bergman said the plan notes an outdoor storage area. If we could note to contain it to that area so it doesn't extend. Mr. Calisi replied there's a possibility to keep some of the containers. We also deal with performance engines and the space to store them in there is pretty valuable. We had to move a couple during one time and they just didn't put them back.

Mr. Carey said I know the cross access doesn't come into play but where is that on here? Mr. Bergman said it's up on the front end of the property. Mr. Carey asked if it can be shown on the revised plan. Mr. Bergman pointed out where it is shown on the next page. Mr. O'Dea asked if there is a call for the buffering in the back? Mr. Carey stated that's where the fence will go. Mr. O'Dea asked how high it will be. Mr. Bergman replied just a basic 6 foot stockade. Mr. Calisi asked if they can do slats in the existing chain link? Mr. Carey asked what the condition of it is. Mr. Zahn said there is foliage there that needs to be cleared. We have an arborist coming to do some clearing. He felt the fence was in a condition that's suitable to maintain. If it's suitable we can put some slats in. Mr. Calisi said there's arborvitae back there if I cut down other trees that should come back to life. Mr. Baier said we will see what the residents have to say at the public hearing. Mr. Zahn stated the owner is motivated to clean it up and put a slat in there rather than a stockade fence. Mr. Nunnaro asked if they are hooking up to the existing sewer to which Mr. Calisi replied yes. Mr. Zahn stated this building will actually be an addition, not next to. So it'll be fully compliant with sprinklers. Mr. Baier asked if it is serviced by gravity or the pump station. Mr. Zahn said gravity, our elevation/grade helped. Mr. Carey asked what the consensus about the traffic study is to which Mr. Seeman replied I'm satisfied with the applicant's description.

6. Calverton Distribution PODS – Continued discussion of a site plan application to construct a 45,212 sq. ft. single story warehouse with related site improvements on a 32.16 acre parcel located within the Industrial A (Ind A) zoning use district at 3651 Middle Country Road (SR 25), Calverton, further described as SCTM No. 600-117-2-9.2. (Greg Bergman)

Discussion specifically to address Town Consulting Engineer comments regarding fence around recharge basin.

Gary Krupnick, applicant, was present. Greg Bergman said we are kind of in the final stages here. I just wanted to bring up a comment by Vinnie about securing the recharge basin in the front. You have the school here and his concerns were if kids wandered over and the liability involved. The question is what's acceptable to the Board. Gary isn't opposed to do a chain link fence along the property line. He has plans to dump snow into the basin. Mr. Krupnick said the most recent test showed it drains as fast as you put water in it, it'll be dry forever and there's plenty of setback. Mr. Carey asked how deep the basin is. Mr. Krupnick replied 6-8 feet. We have about 50% riprap. Mr. Carey said the fence in the back would create a border for the school. Mr. Bergman replied right, if he did a chain link fence along the side it would work. Mr. Krupnick said I'm happy to run a chain link fence if that makes a difference. The Board collectively agreed that it would be acceptable. Mr. Krupnick said we have a condition of approval to deal with all the dead vegetation. Mr. Carey stated you can start this now. Mr. Krupnick replied I believe I'd have a final approval at the next meeting. I'm not concerned about missing the season. I'll be doing the work and they will have to pay me back. Mr. Carey replied ok. Mr. Bergman said so a chain link fence on the side of the school is acceptable to the Board? Mr. Carey replied yes, how high? 8 feet? Mr. Gaudiello said I think the Board may consider a covenant that requires they maintain that basin. Every recharge that's built has a sand bottom. The concern is over time the bottom silts up and the percolation rate is compromised. We have standards that talk about how to properly secure them. Although this isn't dedicated to the Town but due to proximity the Board may consider something about annual maintenance. Mr. Krupnick proposed a condition that states "annual maintenance as necessary". The Board agreed.

****3:15 PM REGULAR MEETING****

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTIONS

1.Resolution No. 2017-033 – Minor Subdivision of Henry Silverman - Resolution to approve a 90 day extension of time for the Chairman or Secretary of this Board to affix his or her signature to the final plat of the realty subdivision map prepared for the “Lot Modification Map Prepared for Henry Silverman” where the subject property is located at the north side of Sound Avenue and east side of Penny’s Lane, Riverhead, identified as SCTM #'s 600-19-01-16 and 600-19-01-17(Jefferson V. Murphree, AICP)

The following resolution was duly adopted at a meeting of the Town of Riverhead Planning Board held on April 20, 2017:

WHEREAS, by letter dated April 5, 2017, Peter S. Danowski, Attorney at Law, on behalf of his client, Henry Silverman, did request an extension of time for the Chairman or Secretary of this Board to affix his or her signature to the final plat of the realty subdivision map prepared for the “Lot Modification Map Prepared for Henry Silverman;” and

WHEREAS, the subject property is located at the north side of Sound Avenue and east side of Penny’s Lane, Riverhead, identified as SCTM #'s 600-19-01-16 and 600-19-01-17; and

WHEREAS, New York State Town Law, Section 276 allows for additional 90 day periods for submittal of a map for signature. Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that this Board approves the request of Peter S. Danowski, Esq.; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the time for the Chairman or Secretary of this Board to affix his or her signature to the final plat of the Lot Modification Map Prepared for Henry Silverman, shall expire on July 29, 2017.

A motion was made by Mr. Baier and seconded by Mr. Nunnaro that the aforementioned resolution be approved:

THE VOTE

BAIER X YES NO **O’DEA** X YES NO

NUNNARO X YES NO **DENSIESKI** X YES NO

CAREY X YES NO

THIS RESOLUTION X **WAS** **WAS NOT**
THEREFORE DULY ADOPTED

2. Resolution No. 2017-034 – Jamesport Farm Brewery – Resolution granting preliminary approval for a site plan application to convert a 3,200 sq. ft. barn into a brewery and tasting room and construct parking, lighting, and landscaping improvements on two parcels, particularly identified as SCTM No. 600-9-2-8 and 600-9-2-9, located at 5873 Sound Avenue within the Agricultural Protection (APZ) Zoning Use District. (Greg Bergman)

The following resolution was duly adopted at a meeting of the Town of Riverhead Planning Board held on April 20, 2017:

WHEREAS, the Riverhead Planning Board is in receipt of a site plan application to convert an existing 3,200 sq. ft. barn into a brewery and tasting room, construct a 323 sq. ft. addition for restrooms and the RPZ fixture, add a 200 sq. ft. storage container/refrigerator unit on the western side of the building, construct a ±26,240 sq. ft. gravel parking area with an additional ±1,740 sq. ft. paved area for handicapped parking, and install lighting, landscaping, and septic system improvements on two parcels, particularly identified as SCTM No. 600-9-2-8 and 600-9-2-9, located at 5873 Sound Avenue within the Agricultural Protection (APZ) Zoning Use District; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department has reviewed a property survey prepared and stamped by Nathan Taft Corwin III, LS, last dated November 29, 2016, a site plan prepared and stamped by Robert J. Gruber, RA, last dated April 4, 2017, a floor plan prepared and stamped by Robert J. Gruber, RA, last dated December 7, 2016, building elevations, prepared and stamped by Robert J. Gruber, RA, last dated December 7, 2016, a site lighting plan, prepared by Eric Perkins, LC, MIES, and stamped by Robert J. Gruber, RA, last dated November 2, 2016, as well as a Short Environmental Assessment Form, dated December 7, 2016; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated April 7, 2017, the Town's Consulting Engineer stated that the site plan drawings have been amended in a manner that satisfactorily addresses previous comments from a Site Plan Memo dated April 3, 2017, and further recommended engineering approval of the site plan; and

WHEREAS, by letter dated January 10, 2017, the Town of Riverhead Agricultural Advisory Committee, after considerable and thorough review of the application, found that the site plan application meets the criteria set forth by New York State Ag & Markets regarding the production standards necessary in order for the brewing of beer to be considered part of the farm operation, and recommended approval of the site plan and use designation by a majority 5-0 vote; and

WHEREAS, at the January 25, 2017 meeting of the Town of Riverhead Architectural Review Board, the Board reviewed floor plans dated December 7, 2016, site plan dated December 7, 2016, and elevations dated December 7, 2016, and recommended approval of the application as-is; and

WHEREAS, the site plan application was referred to the Suffolk County Planning Commission and by letter dated January 3, 2017, the Commission considered the matter to be of local determination; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board of the Town of Riverhead held a public hearing on April 6, 2017 to receive public input and comments on the site plan application; and

WHEREAS, the public hearing was closed on April 6, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board of the Town of Riverhead, by Resolution #2017-032 dated April 6, 2017, classified the application as an Unlisted Action, pursuant to SEQRA, declared itself to be Lead

Agency in the SEQRA process, without the need for coordinated review, and further issued a Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has carefully reviewed and considered the merits of applicant's site plan application, the SEQRA record to date, the comments received at the public hearing, the report of the Planning Department, as well as all other relevant Planning, Zoning and Environmental information; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has paid the site plan fee of \$4,700.40 in full; now

THEREFORE, BE IT

RESOLVED, that the preliminary site plan of Jamesport Farm Brewery, including a site plan prepared and stamped by Robert J. Gruber, RA, last dated April 4, 2016, is hereby approved by the Planning Board with the following conditions:

1. Prior to final site plan approval, the applicant shall submit a Title Report pursuant to Town Code §301-306A(5) deemed acceptable by the Town Attorney's office.
2. Prior to final site plan approval, the applicant shall submit a Covenants and Restrictions search which does not show any covenants or restrictions that would prohibit the proposed development.
3. That no site work shall begin nor shall Building Permits be issued until a Planning Board resolution granting Final Site Plan Approval is adopted and until all conditions of the Final Site Plan Approval Resolution are fulfilled.
4. There shall be no kitchen or food preparation conducted in operation of the brewery/tasting room.
5. If food trucks will be utilized at any point, said food trucks shall be located in such a way as to not be visible from Sound Avenue.
6. There will be no music played outside the building and the noise ordinance provisions of the Town Code of the Town of Riverhead shall, at all times, be complied with by the owner of the property and operator of the business covered by this site plan.
7. There will be no further expansion of the tasting room or public access areas, including outdoor seating areas, without further application and approval by the Planning Board of the Town of Riverhead.
8. The tasting room and all other public activities on the subject property shall close no later than 9:00 pm.
9. There shall be no more than five (5) special events per calendar year conducted on the subject property; and be it further

RESOLVED, that pursuant to section 301-305B(6)(b) of the Town Code of the Town of Riverhead, this preliminary approval shall be valid for one year from the date of approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Clerk of the Planning Board is hereby authorized to forward a copy of this resolution to Robert J. Gruber, Architect, 476 Expressway Drive South, Medford NY 11763, the Riverhead

Building Department; the Office of the Town Attorney; the Planning Board Attorney, and the Town Clerk;
and be it further

RESOLVED, that all Town Hall Departments may review and obtain a copy of this resolution from the electronic storage device and if needed, a certified copy of same may be obtained from the Office of the Town Clerk.

A motion was made by Mr. Densieski and seconded by Mr. Nunnaro that the aforementioned resolution be approved:

THE VOTE

BAIER X YES ___ NO O'DEA X YES ___ NO

NUNNARO X YES ___ NO DENSIESKI X YES ___ NO

CAREY X YES ___ NO

**THIS RESOLUTION X WAS ___ WAS NOT
THEREFORE DULY ADOPTED**

CHAPTER 219 RESOLUTIONS

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ALL MATTERS

MEETING MINUTES OF THE BOARD

1. Minutes of the April 6, 2017 Planning Board Meeting.

On April 20, 2017 a motion was made by Mr. Densieski and seconded by Mr. Baier that the minutes of April 6, 2017 be approved:

THE VOTE

BAIER X YES ___ NO O'DEA X YES ___ NO

NUNNARO X YES ___ NO DENSIESKI X YES ___ NO

CAREY X YES ___ NO

**THESE MINUTES X WERE ___ WERE NOT
THEREFORE DULY ADOPTED**

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NEXT MEETING DATE – May 4, 2017 at 7:00 PM

CORRESPONDENCE

A motion was made by Mr. Carey and seconded by Mr. Baier that the meeting be closed:

THE VOTE

BAIER YES ___ NO O'DEA YES ___ NO

NUNNARO YES ___ NO DENSIESKI YES ___ NO

CAREY YES ___ NO

THESE MINUTES WERE ___ WERE NOT
THEREFORE DULY ADOPTED

On May 4, 2017 a motion was made by Mr. Densieski and seconded by Mr. Nunnaro that the minutes of April 20, 2017 be approved:

THE VOTE

BAIER YES ___ NO O'DEA YES ___ NO

NUNNARO YES ___ NO DENSIESKI YES ___ NO

CAREY YES ___ NO

THESE MINUTES WERE ___ WERE NOT
THEREFORE DULY ADOPTED

Signed,
PLANNING BOARD


Stanley Carey
Chairman