#### SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

## MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Suffolk County Planning Commission was held in the conference room of the Planning Department, 4th Floor of the H. Lee Dennison Building located in Hauppauge, New York on October 3, 2001.

#### PRESENT:

Robert Martin - (Smithtown) Vice-Chairman
Edward Rosavitch - (Brookhaven)
Thomas Thorsen - (East Hampton)
Linda Petersen - (At Large)
Frank Tantone - (Islip)
Louis Dietz - (Babylon)
William Cremers - (Southold)
Michael Macco - (Huntington)
Richard London - (Village 5000 & Under)
Ronald Parr - (At Large)
Richard O'Dea - (Riverhead)
Laure Nolan - (Village 5000 & Under)
Thomas Isles - Director
Harold Withers - Deputy Director

## NOT PRESENT:

Donald Eversoll - Chairman (At Large) George Dickerson - (Shelter Island)

## ALSO PRESENT:

Gerald Newman - Chief Planner Andy Freleng - Principal Planner Kathleen Rigano - Principal Stenographer Claire Chorny - Sr. Clerk Typist

# MINUTES TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer Donna Barrett - Court Stenographer

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:05 P.M.]

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

We're going to call the meeting to order. And where is the agenda? I don't have an agenda.

# MR. ISLES:

You don't have agenda.

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

We'll approve the minutes of September 5th meeting, 2001. Approving the minutes. Well, we have to hold them over, because they're the ones that we have -- we didn't get a chance to weigh them. Why are they put on the agenda?

#### MR. ISLES:

It's an option of the Board. I think what Mr. Barton explained at the last meeting is that minutes prepared under this method do not require acceptance by the Commission, it's at the option of the Commission. If they take no action based on the way they were prepared, they're considered to be adopted, as I understand it.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Is that -- everybody wants to do it that way ?

## MR. ISLES:

That's verbatim minutes .

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Okay. That's what we'll do then from now on. That's the action we'll take. We won't take any action on the minutes, we'll take them as submitted, okay? That doesn't stop any member that sees something that's has a question about it. Number two, is correspondence. Mr. Isles.

## MR. ISLES:

Okay. We have one piece of correspondence to bring to your attention this month and that is a memorandum received from Mr. Barton, the Clerk of the Legislature. And I provided copies to everyone on this, and what Mr. Barton has brought up is that under our new method of the requirement for verbatim minutes, there have been problems on his end in terms of providing that service to the Commission with some of the problems in this room of acoustics and some of the -- some logistical problems. So he has offered some suggestions for alternatives that he would like the Commission to consider. One would be to conduct the Planning Commission meetings in the Legislative room in -- across the street in Hauppauge. The other option would be to have the meetings downstairs in

the media room and the third option would be to keep the meetings here but see if we can improve this in some manner with better acoustics, amplification, whatever might be involved with that. The memorandum is addressed to the Chairman, who's not able to join us today, so I just want to bring it to your attention, and perhaps by the next meeting we can respond to Mr. Barton at that point .

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Well, I think everything should be done to have the meeting here, because through the years we used to meet across the street. When you need something, you don't have it. You know, it's so inconvenient for the staff to bring everything there and to bring everything back again. So if there's any way possible to do it in here -

## MR. ISLES:

right. So we'd have to look at methods of improving amplification so they can hear when they're transcribing the minutes and so forth.

# MR. LONDON:

Would it be appropriate for a motion to that affect at this time from the Board .

## MR. DIETZ:

You want to wait until Don comes in next month, right?

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Yeah. What we'll do is we'll have him prepare everything on the three items he mentioned, give us the pros and cons at the next regular meeting or meeting thereafter, and at that point, we'll decide. I think that will be the easiest way.

## MR. LONDON:

Okay.

## MR. ISLES:

Okay. Okay. That's fine. Okay. Just a few brief items from the Department. Number one is we have prepared a proclamation for David Casciotti, who has, you know resigned, from the Commission recently, and we would ask the members to please sign the proclamation before you leave today. We are awaiting a resubmission of a name for the Town of Southampton. I believe Mr. Murphy was going to join us today.

# MS. RIGANO:

no. He's not here .

# MR. ISLES:

He's not here? Okay. That will be forthcoming to the Legislature at some point. Just a couple of other very brief items. Our Smart Growth Conference that we had scheduled is set for this evening right here in the Dennison Building in the media room. This was an outcome of the Smart Growth Plan that was prepared by Steve Jones last year and the Department, and the idea of the conference is to provide a training mechanism, a training opportunity for not only County Planning Board members and staff members, as well as town and village representatives as well. I'll point out we have had a very good response to the conference. We have over 80 people registered at this point, and so we're looking forward to it this evening.

The next item is that, as I think I mentioned at the last meeting, the Planning Department is involved with a study and a public hearing process on aquaculture in the East End. held our first public hearing last week, and it was attended by about 75 people, and fairly productive in terms of the information we received. We'll have one more hearing in December and then complete the process by June of 2002, with a report back to the Legislature at that point. And just the last item I was going to mention is I'm going to be contacting the Planning Boards at the town and village level over the next couple of months to arrange a time to go out and visit with the boards and get introduced to the boards. So those of you that are on boards will be getting a letter from me. I just want to have the chance to get out and actually meet the boards individually over the next X number of months. There are forty-one boards, so we'll see how long it takes. that's it for the Director 's Report.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Now, we'll go to the round table.

## MR. THORSEN:

There are three -- three items in East Hampton, which may be of some interest to the Commission. The first is that they're extending their moratoria that they established about six months ago. They're continuing it for another three -- another six months, and that's commercial development along the Montauk Highway. Subdivisions of more than ten acres, and commercial development on lots larger than two acres in the water recharge area, the marine of East Hampton.

The second item would be that they are proposing a new zone in the Springs Fire Place Road area south of the recycling center, and that is to assist trades people, contractors,

landscapers, plumbers and so forth, where they'd have a split You could have a house on as small as a half acre and have your business conducted from that site. It's something that's been talked about for a longtime in both East Hampton and Southampton, but there was no place for contractors. seems like in the normal upscale villages that it's a problem to have a plumbing yard right amongst normal residential property. So this is something they're going to try. And the third thing is they're commissioning a new study of North Main Street, an area lying just north of the Village of East Hampton. It's an area that the village itself has been concerned that there be both town and village consideration of zoning problems, land use, and traffic conflicts. So that's being kicked off, and they're looking for consultants now. That one -- there could eventually be a conflict in this area between municipalities, because they may have different ideas, and if that happens, you'll see it on a broader scale for consideration.

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

That's it ?

# MR. THORSEN:

Yeah .

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Frank.

## MR. TANTONE:

Not much going on in Islip right now. I don't have much a report so I'll pass.

#### MR. CREMERS:

In Southold, we have five affordable housing projects up for consideration. One is for 160 unit affordable housing rental units, and that was just rejected by the Town Board as being too large, so we are left with four, and they have the backing of the supervisor, but we're still waiting for the Town Board to approve those. On a personal nature, I was going to Egypt in two weeks, and needless to say, I cancelled my trip.

## MR. O'DEA:

Riverhead passed a resolution to hold a referendum on airport use at the Grumman site, see what the public's input was. Yesterday, the Board of Elections on either the local or state level or whatever disallowed the resolution to be on the November ballot, reasoning being poorly constructed in the wording. So that's not going to be on the November ballot.

It's still a possibility to get it on another ballot in another month, perhaps. And there was -- they set a date October 16th, for a public hearing on a moratorium on a building development in the agricultural area, AOZ, that's about it.

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Mr. Parr.

#### MR. PARR:

I think we're in for some drastic changes in our economy, and there are many signs out there that I see as a developer, and it might be a time to reflect on where we've been and where we're going as planners. I think indications at all segments of the market is we'll see significant decreases in demand, and it might be a time for all of us to catch up a bit and take a harder look at where we're going for the future.

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Linda.

#### MS. PETERSEN:

From the Town of Brookhaven. The Town Board is going to be taking a second look at our old master plan. And last night, at the Town Board hearing they set a public hearing to look at rezoning 35 parcels on their own motion, most of them will be going in an upzoning pattern, so as we get more information on the parcels and whatever, I'll let you know, but I think it's a step that shows that the Town Board, as we presently -- as it's configured presently is looking to be sure that the land use patterns in Brookhaven Town will be something that will work well into this new century, as we go forward. And they're trying to look at parcels which are presently zoned commercially that may not be appropriately zoned at this point. So it would be interesting to see how this goes.

## MR. MACCO:

Linda, how old is your master plan ?

# MS. PETERSEN:

It's not that old.

## MR. MACCO:

I could have sworn that we looked at it --

## MS. PETERSEN:

it's a few years ago.

#### MR. NEWMAN:

five, six years.

#### MS. PETERSEN:

Five, six years. It's basically six years old.

## MR. ROSAVITCH:

with the events of September 11th, I'd like to make a motion that we have a moment of silence for those that perished in the buildings in the city.

## MR. LONDON:

Second.

## MOMENT OF SILENCE

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Okay. Anything else to add?

## MR. ROSAVITCH:

just -- I was given a copy of a flier about the Veteran's Day Gala Event for 2001. It's a fund raising being sponsored by Veteran's Emergency Transportation and Vet Incorporated, and the Suffolk County Veteran's Services. It's going to be held in Villa Lombardi's November 8th. If there's anybody interested in this, I'll give it to the girls, they can make it part of the minutes. That's all I've got.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

It's up to you, Dick.

# MR. LONDON:

From the Villages, I could only agree 100% with what chairman -- Commissioner Parr just reiterated about the economy. know speaking on my end on the horse business it already, you know, is affected. It's a luxury industry which will be hard hit, and basically, the economists that are involved with the stock market of which I get certain income from myself have already been told to expect right across the board a 20% reduction in your income on investments immediately, just based on where the stock market is going pursuant to the things that happened on September 11th. And as planners, I think it will probably take, you know -- and developers, it will take a long-range approach and a rethinking of the economy for Long Island, not only for the whole country, but being so close to the Manhattan Island as we are, I'm sure there's not a town on Long Island in both counties that has not suffered some grievous loss as a result of that through

taxpayers and others. So ultimately, you know, we will certainly feel a heavy weight on our shoulders for that, and have to be guided accordingly by the conditions that prevail currently. That's all I have.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Thank you. Michael?

## MR. MACCO:

A 20% change in my investments is not going to change my life at all.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

That's about a dollar ninety-nine cents.

#### MR. MACCO:

Buy high, sell low. I'm up here in the big boys table .

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I noticed. That's why you're at a loss for words .

# MR. MACCO:

No. This weakened is the Huntington Fair. It pretty much closes down the entire town. I welcome everybody to come to Huntington Fair, use my name and everything will be free. Use my partner's name, everything will be twice the price. It's a great fair to come, it's great for the kids, a lot of walking, a lot to see. Make a day of it. It's a great -- Huntington's the best town on Long Island, including Smithtown, certainly the best town in my Long Island. I hope to see everybody this weekend.

# MS. PETERSEN:

Is it in the Village, Michael ?

#### MR. MACCO:

It's in the Village, but it spans out in most directions. If you can get close enough to my office at 164 Main Street, use the parking lot. Please, leave the money in the little slip in the hallway there and then I'll make -- that will be my investment. But -- no. Please feel free to come to Huntington, and really, use my parking lot. If you can get into Main Street, it's the best place to walk from. I'm right across the street from Hecksher Park.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Second best town, if you want to be called on at the next meeting especially. Well, we're all ready now right?

## MR. ISLES:

Go to the Subdivisions.

# S-RH-01-07 North side of County Road (CR58) approximately 526' east of Harrison Avenue

## MR. FRELENG:

Okay. The first regulatory matter before the Commission is the subdivision application of Serota and Sons, this being referred to us from the Town of Riverhead. Jurisdiction for the Commission is that the application is adjacent to County Road 58 and known locally as Old Country Road. The applicants are proposing the subdivision of approximately 22 acres of land into two lots in the Business B, otherwise known as the Shopping Center Zoning District in the Hamlet of Riverhead. There is no minimum lot size in the zoning category for business uses, however, a special permit requirement for the creation of residential dwelling lots does exist and that requirement the minimum lot size for that one acre zoning —for that category is one acre zoning minimum lot size.

The map is not being processed pursuant for 278 cluster provisions of Town Law, and the two lots range in size from 2.4 acres, which would be the smaller lot to the larger lot, 19.3 acres. There is no indication of the future disposition of either parcels, so we are processing the map as if it is either a subdivision for residential purposes or for commercial purposes. The subject parcel is bound on the north by cultivated agricultural land. To the east, the property abuts commercial businesses and an attached housing complex, this is Fairfield Apartments, it's a quote luxury garden apartment complex. This is -- well, you can't see it off the map -- there's parking for the hospital, and this is a strip shopping center, an abandoned farm stand use over here and some other mixed commercial uses.

The character of the area -- I'm sorry, did I -- to the east, the property abuts commercial business and attached housing. To the west, the site is adjacent to residential dwellings and some commercial uses. And to the south, the property abuts County Road 58. The character of the area is essentially commercial strip development and sporadic residential dwellings along Old Country Road. Access to the proposed subdivision is intended via County Road 58. Parcel A, a flag lot, includes the creation of a 1170 foot long access pole or access strip to the main portion of the lot. Creation of a

flag lot with an access pole in excess 300 feet is contrary to Commission policy.

Moreover, there are two right angles or dog legs in the access strip. These are also contrary to good planning practices and contrary to Commission policy. There is no emergency access proposed, but for the two lot division none is deemed necessary. The parcel is located within Hydrogeologic Zone Potable water is intended to be supplied to the lots, sanitary waste is to be collected and disposed of on site. The property itself can be characterized as generally level, being an active agricultural field, I believe this summer it was active at the time of the site inspection it was fallow. the subject property are considered prime The site is not located within an Ag agricultural soils. District, and again, in the submittal material there was no information as to the -- whether there'd be an agricultural set-aside or whether development rights were intended to be encumbered on the site. Essentially, it's a two-lot division.

Other issues related to the proposed subdivision stem from the Commission's policy and creation of subdivisions with excessively long flag lot access and issues related to good subdivision and lot design. Staff is recommending disapproval for the principle reason that the flag strip is way too long. In addition, there's a comment there that in combination with the 1175 foot long access strip, the two dog legs also make it problematic for emergency vehicles to reach the bulk of the lot. A couple of other things; the map name was not in Commission format, and there was some transmittal of paperwork that the dates did not match in the text as to the map date that was provided the Commission. So that's the staff report.

## MR. MACCO:

Motion to adopt staff report.

# MR. ROSAVITCH:

second.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

all in favor, signify by saying aye. Contrary minded? Any abstentions?

## MR. O'DEA:

I abstain.

DISAPPROVED (VOTE:10-0-1) (ABSTENTION; MR. O'DEA)

# HU-01-04 Silver Huntington Realty LLC.

#### MR. NEWMAN:

Okay. Today I have one application on the agenda. It's a rather significant one, it's in the Town of Huntington. This is an application to rezone two parcels of land from an R-5 Category, permitted single family residences on 5,000 square foot lots. Also, part of the lands are in a C-6 Business Category, which permits general business uses with no minimum lot area. The intent is to rezone them from a C-10 Motel/Hotel District permitting 29 units per acre, as well as a C-6 Category. These lands are situated on south side of Jericho Turnpike, east and west of Ackerly Court in Huntington Station.

Now, the proposal is to rezone two parcels of land comprising 6.14 acres. That is the easterly parcel and the westerly parcel. The breakdown is set forth in this staff report. On the easterly parcel we have a total of 3.49 acres currently zoned R-5 in the back. And the frontage, about 150 foot deep, is zoned C-6. The intent is to rezone that to C-10 Category with an overall depth of 250 feet. Currently existing on the property is 355 parking spaces. Proposed is a hotel, you can see it on the site plan here, four stories with 230 rooms with 196 parking spaces, including 80 in a basement garage. There's an asterisk on the 230 that indicates in accordance with Town Zoning requirements. At 29 to the acre, the subject property can legally only accommodate 101 units, hotel units. The second parcel to be rezoned is the westerly parcel, comprising 2.65 acres. The back portion comprising 1.55 acres is in an R-5 Category. The frontage to a depth of 150 comprising 1.1 acres is zoned C-6. The intent is to rezone that entire piece to a C-6 Category with an overall depth of 385 feet. Currently existing on that portion of the property is 223 parking spaces and some vacant land. The proposal is to provide for 300 parking spaces on that westerly parcel. That will be an increase of 77 spaces.

Now, the remaining portion of the lands, namely this piece here, including the Huntington Town House, comprises 14.93 acres. Those lands are zoned C-6 for a depth of about 150 feet comprised 1.48 acres -- I'm sorry -- 4.58 acres. And significant back portion of that property is zoned R-5. The back portion is occupied buy two residences, and the Huntington Town House is in that section of the property. There's no change to be taking place on the portion of the property that's occupied by the Huntington Town House. That is occupied by the four-story Town House with 154 parking spaces and that's the remain.

Again, the back portion is zoned R-5 is also to remain as two residences. The bottom line for this 21.07 acre parcel is the result in the diminishment in the number of park spaces from 733 existing to 650. Now, the preliminary site plan calls for the direction of the hotel just comprising 152,750 square feet which would be situated just east. This is the Town House and this is the proposed hotel. There'll be one new point of vehicular ingress and egress on the easterly portion of the subject property in this area here; namely, in this area. There will be interconnected vehicular access as well as shared parking throughout the entire property, and there will be a connection to the Southwest Sewer District.

A previous application to the Zoning Board of Appeals for variances to exceed the number of building stories and parking structure coverage in connection with the issuance of a special permit for a business zoning depth extension for building parking purposes in connection with the erection of a two and four story conference center comprising 178,000 square feet as a part. As the point of that proposal, they wanted 230 guest rooms and 905 parking spaces. This site plan was previously -- part of the previous application the proposed the conference center, as well as the existing Town House and that was to be connected. As a part of that proposal, there was 905 parking spaces, and of the 905, there's was a portion of the parking that was to be situated in the parking structure just to the west of the existing Huntington Town House building. Within there there will be structure, which will be one grade below, one at grade and one above, so we'll have a low scale or a low profile.

That was conditionally approved by Zoning Board of Appeals on The conference center rooms as a part of that application were restricted for registered guests Huntington Town House events. Any transit use would require a change of zone to C-10. That application was considered by the Planning Commission in '94, but the Commission was unable to obtain the necessary votes to carry a resolution for or against that proposal. As a part of this project, the zoning -- the previous Zoning Board of Appeals approvals for that conference center remain in effect. Appended here to the staff report is the comparison of both proposals. So the next question comes up as to why this application is being I believe there are three reasons; number one, considered. there's a new owner of the Huntington Town House; number two, there's a restriction on the rooms in the conference center for nontransient purposes only; and three, probably the most significant reason is the cost of putting in that parking

structure immediately to the west of the Town House Structure.

Now, the catering hall is a preexisting nonconforming use. Until the 1989 expansion, there were no code requirements for parking. With the 1989 expansion of the Huntington Town House by 20,911 square feet, there was a requirement for 279 parking spaces. With the hotel as proposed for 230 rooms and a lobby breakfast area, there's a requirement for 331 parking spaces. So, legally, a requirement exists for those two uses of 610 parking spaces. However, under current laws, if they were to develop this property today, they would require 1861 parking spaces or approximately two-thirds more than currently exists. Now, the current site plan proposes, as I mentioned before, 650 spaces, 82 less than the current 732. The Commission, as a consultant, has determined that a maximum number of cars utilizing the property is approximately 600, and that is with the understanding there'll be significant valet use and also that the catering hall quests will be using the majority of the rooms in the hotel and the parking will allegedly not pose a serious problem.

As a part of this application petition that I believe recognizes there might be some instances when there'll be shortage of parking, he's entered into an agreement or will enter into an agreement with the owners of Walt Whitman Mall immediately to the west it's -- I think you can see it on a portion of the aerial here, the northeast corner of the property, where it will be entered to reserve 300 spaces for supplementary and emergency valet parking use. To get to that valet parking area, they will obviously, either go on Jericho down 110 or they would cut through the back area to utilize that property.

In conjunction with this request, there'll be a number of variances associated with it; namely, to increase the number of rooms on this C-10 piece from 101 to 230. They were going to increase the building height from two to four stories, and they were also going to provide for two buildings on a parcel of land where the code only allows one. There's also a number of area variances associated this request, mainly, for setbacks for the building. Okay. With the rezoning -- while the rezoning for hotel and parking purposes provide complimentary uses to the existing Huntington Town House facility, which is harmonious and reasonably consistent with the prevailing pattern of zoning and character of the surrounding area, the staff is concerned about the development patterns that are associated therewith.

We consider them to be inappropriate for two reasons, and two reasons only. Number one, available on site parking appears inadequate to reasonably accommodate optimal usage of hotel facilities. And number two, the density development of the lands to be rezoned on C-10 significantly exceeds zoning ordinance requirements for the C-10 District. We're recommending disapproval. However, we are offering an option for consideration by the Commission; namely, if it is approved, that there will be a diminishment in the number of units on the C-10 zoned piece. It will be in conformance with zoning ordinance requirements; namely, one 101 units. Number two, we believe that additional parking should be provided on the lands that are not only in the existing business zone but the proposed zoning depth extension lands would be reasonably commensurate with the previous approval of Zoning Board of Appeals. In that case, for 905 parking spaces.

However, that should be considering that there will be a diminishment in the number of units, in this case 129 less units if they approve it with the 101 that's allowed legally under the C-10 Zone. Number three, the supplementary emergency valet accommodations should be available. believe no matter what they do here they should have a backup area and that's a reasonable request. Number four, the traffic improvements will be provided consistent with a traffic analysis acceptable to the State DOT, particularly as it relates to a consolidated and realigned signal controlled access via Route 25, and that is mainly in this section right here in the aerial. Number five, that the applicant owner shall maintain a vehicular cross access and share parking agreement for the duration of operation of the hotel and the banquet facility. Number six, in accordance with Smart Growth policies of Suffolk County, we believe there should be a connecting pedestrian walkway between the hotel and the Town House building. We're recommending disapproval; however, we're offering an option for approval subject to certain conditions .

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

The 300 parking spaces that are on the mall ground across the street, has that mall got 300 spaces more than they need?

#### MR. NEWMAN:

That mall's developed in accordance with code requirements .

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

But if it's constructed with code requirement, they must have the minimum, right? How can you take --

## MR. NEWMAN:

They had whatever's required in the code and nothing more. Now, the argument here being that this would be an off-peak use based on the mall use .

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

What's the difference what's the use? You mean, I could come in have 300 less spaces because it's an off-peak use. That's what you're saying. I don't think that's right.

## MR. NEWMAN:

They're essentially using this as backup. They're also alleging if they're using valet accommodations, even though they're providing for 650 spaces, they can increase that almost 20% more. So they feel that would be an absolutely emergency situation when they would use those spaces .

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Supposes the mall isn't there five years down the line and there's no more 300 spaces, what are they going do then?

#### MR. NEWMAN:

well, we would suggest that there would be a perpetual agreement as long as this thing's operational, that those spaces be available for emergency purposes only.

# MS. PETERSEN:

Jerry?

# MR. NEWMAN:

yes.

## MS. PETERSEN:

Could they construct additional parking on the Huntington Town House site? It looks like --

# MR. NEWMAN:

again, they had that before on the original proposal with 905 spaces. I don't know how many of those were in the parking structure, which is to be located just west of the Town House. Right in this area here there was going to be a structure that had one below grade parking area, one at grade and one above so that they could provide some in this area here. But I think that's one of the reasons why they're requesting to change this request, because the expense associated with it.

## MS. PETERSEN:

What about in the area over by the hotel, proposed hotel, where it looks like it's all woods now ?

#### MR. NEWMAN:

Well, there's currently 355 spaces there. They're going to provide -- with the hotel, they're going to provide 196. So there's going to be a reduction of parking.

## MS. PETERSEN:

If they were going to go into the Huntington Town House piece, there's two houses back there --

## MR. NEWMAN:

right.

#### MS. PETERSEN:

you sa id.

## MR. NEWMAN:

Oh, you mean in the back here.

#### MS. PETERSEN:

yeah .

## MR. NEWMAN:

There's -- the land goes up. There's a grade differential in this area here, and that's all zoned C-5. I suppose the another argument could be that if this C-10 proposed piece has a development pattern that exceeds C-10 requirements over 29 to the acre, they could take this district and run it through here and around here, take the yield from this and put it all hear to meet the 230 that they want to put on the C-10 Zoned piece. But they're not asking for that. They want to increase the density on the C-10 Zoned piece that significantly exceeds the 29 per acre.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

michael wants something.

## MR. MACCO:

I have -- I have a few problems with this. I think what they're attempting to create is two very dangerous situations here. First off, the last time we had this application on, one of the major reasons we rejected it was because traffic on Jericho Turnpike associated with this catering hall is just horrendous. And we all commented on how bad the traffic was and how it backs up to New York Avenue, to 110, and here we

have another application to expand it further, and we still don't have a traffic analysis. That bend on Jericho Turnpike is a very dangerous intersection. People go -- this is where the whole road opens up, and it's completely blind from the edge of their property until practically the entrance of Huntington Town House. As to usage of the Walt Whitman Mall, by using the back roads, it's crazy. You're going to have a situation where you're going to have valet parkers shooting through that neighborhood on the bottom left hand corner of the picture to park in that parking lot. You're not going to be able to control that. That's a residential area back So what you're trying -- and my recollection, I've been to Huntington Town house hundreds of times. That entire parcel that they're trying to develop on the right-hand portion of the screen as I face is used for parking right now. It's all grassy, they park all the cars up, there's not enough parking in Huntington Town House today the way it exists. To expand it further to get even 101 hotel units is not going to make sense. So far, and once again my recollection is every time someone comes in here from the Huntington Town House, we've denied it, and they've taken it back to the Town.

## MS. NOLAN:

no. That's not true. We didn't take any position the last time .

## MR. NEWMAN:

We did not deny it. However, Mike is right. We focus a lot on the parking -- on the traffic ramifications of that proposal. There were not enough votes to carry a resolution

## MR. MACCO:

It goes back to the Town, and we have no control over what the Town does. But based on the lack of a traffic analysis, and the fact that the property doesn't meet the zoning density requirements, I think we should disapprove the thing as it exists, and if the Town wants to approve it, let the Town do it. Let's not get involved in it. I think we should disapprove it as it exists.

# MS. NOLAN:

can I clarify one thing? Legally, they're only required to have 610 parking spaces, which is what they're providing; is that correct?

## MR. NEWMAN:

That's right. They're providing -- that's right. They're providing a total of 650. They're legally required to have 610.

## MS. NOLAN:

okay .

#### MR. NEWMAN:

However, they have 732 today, and they're going to reduce that by 82 to 650.

## MS. NOLAN:

all right. And then the other thing is presently they have the right to build a conference center with 230 rooms; is that correct?

## MR. NEWMAN:

that's right. That's mentioned in the report.

#### MS. NOLAN:

and the 101 is based on the density requirements of ?

#### MR. NEWMAN:

The Huntington Code, 29 to the acre.

## MS. NOLAN:

and what if they get the ZBA approval for increasing that ?  ${\bf MR.\ NEWMAN:}$ 

Well, they certainly have every right to go to the ZBA, if it's approved. What the staff is pointing out is that it's a significant increase in the yield over what the code requires, and we feel that's inappropriate.

## MS. NOLAN:

okay. Except they do have the right to build that many .

## MR. NEWMAN:

Yes, they do.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

what I don't understand is the traffic problem we have here, how an environmental impact statement isn't tried. I just can't believe you can put all the park -- all that --

## MR. MACCO:

The traffic .

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

The traffic .

#### MR. NEWMAN:

They did an environmental impact statement for the conference center.

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I'll tell you, if you go to the Town House, you could leave your car in Smithtown. I mean it goes back miles. It doesn't go back feet. It goes back past that other light.

## MR. ISLES:

I think Jerry had an environmental impact statement .

#### MR. NEWMAN:

That's correct. They did one for the conference center. They did -- and they also did a traffic analysis for this proposal. However, that's almost all contingent upon what the State DOT requires here. If this was approved, then they would address those matters through the State DOT.

#### MR. LONDON:

I know you mentioned it before, but can you mention it again? What was the pros and cons on the structure parking on the site?

## MR. NEWMAN:

it's expensive . That's exactly right, it's expensive.

## MR. LONDON:

Well, if they want this, it's going to be expensive .

## MR. NEWMAN:

There's a new owner, and it's expensive, and those are the three reasons I believe why this application -- there's a new owner, number two, there's a restriction on the conference rooms that they cannot be used for transient purposes only for occupants that use Huntington Town House for events, number three, probably the most important reason is that structure is extremely expensive to construct.

## MR. ISLES:

i think the fourth reason is the applicant expressed to us is that they believe that the parking would be adequate based on valet parking. Not something we necessarily agree with, but they furnished information that we feel backs that up .

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

You want my stand? Let him stand outside. I mean it. Honestly, truthfully, stand there look at the traffic and come in here and tell us that statement is adequate.

#### MR. ROSAVITCH:

Mr. Chairman, I move for disapproval .

#### MR. MACCO:

They've always had valet parking at the Huntington Town House, the parking's always been full with valet parking. I don't know how you're going to change the valet parking. As for the usage of the Walt Whitman Mall parking lot in the corner, that's the area of the mall that was expanded for Saxs Fifth Avenue. So that -- that part of the parking lot is being more used now than it's ever been before. So I second the move for -- second the motion to disapproval.

## MS. NOLAN:

could I just say one thing? That area of the Walt Whitman Mall is not used at all. If you go look at that, it's not by Saxs, it's the area to the north of Lord & Taylor parking lot. And it is so unused that it is being used on occasional basis for carnivals, if you go and look, because there's actually no cars parking there. It's several acres, and there's absolutely no parking usage over there by the mall.

#### MR. NEWMAN:

to give you some ideas as to the number of people attending events at the Huntington Town House, the staff has a summary list from a period of January 6th to September 15th of this year. And the maximum day was April 28th, where there was 1809 people attending functions at the Huntington Town House. So with three -- three per car, if you want to use that, that would be approximately 600 spaces. Two per car would be 900 spaces. The question is how many per car?

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I don't think you would have more than two people per car. I mean, who goes to Huntington Town House with three people.

## MR. ISLES:

weddings, maybe.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

maybe.

## MR. MACCO:

when did the ownership of the Huntington Town House property change hands?

#### MR. NEWMAN:

I don't know. I don't know that.

#### MR. LONDON:

'99. I think it was '99.

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

okay. Did everybody have a comment? Resolution on the floor now is for disapproval. Make sure we get the right count. Hold up your hands.

## MR. O'DEA:

so the alternates are out?

## MR. THORSEN:

Motion is for disapproval at this point .

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Yeah. Everything's going to be disapproved .

# MR. THORSEN:

We suggested an alternative.

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

we could have an alternative, then it has to come back, and we'll listen to it. That doesn't mean we're going to approve it, that's just the recommendation from the department saying that we could consider it again under these conditions.

#### MR. ISLES:

That's up to you.

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I don't know if these conditions are good .

## MR. THORSEN:

The resolution on the floor is for disapproval.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

disapproval with a lternatives. Everything.

## MR. LONDON:

No.

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Oh, okay. The first resolution we're going to vote on is the same disapproval, but including the --

# MR. ISLES:

No.

## MR. O'DEA:

They didn't make that motion .

#### MR. ISLES:

Mr. Rosavitch made the motion to disapprove, period.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

everything.

## MR. ISLES:

Period .

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Right. That's what we're going to do first, okay? We'll start on this side of the room for disapproval.

# MR. O'DEA:

Yes.

# MR. CREMERS:

yes.

# MS. NOLAN:

no .

# MR. TANTONE:

Yes. Yes.

# MR. LONDON:

Raise your hands , make it loud and clear.

# MR. THORSEN:

I'm still confused. Abstain .

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Abstain. Okay. I'm a yes .

# MR. DIETZ:

Yes .
MR. MACCO: Yes .
MR. LONDON: Yes.
MR. ROSAVITCH: Yes.
MS. PETERSEN: yes.
MR. PARR: yes.
CHAIRMAN MARTIN: It's everybody yes, except one no and an abstention.
DISAPPROVED (VOTE:10-1-1) (OPPOSED; MS. NOLAN) (ABSTENTION; MR.THORSEN)
MR. ISLES: Motion is carried .
CHAIRMAN MARTIN: Motion carried?
Motion carried? MR. NEWMAN:
MR. NEWMAN: It's denied.  MS. PETERSEN:
MR. NEWMAN: It's denied.  MS. PETERSEN: if they revised this CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

MS. PETERSEN:

-- and looked at things that we would have done, should we have looked at it alternately, they can come back, right?

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

well, I didn't look at the alternates, because that's not the application, and we should only look at the application.

#### MS. PETERSEN:

Right. They have the right to revise it and reflect some of the things we have as alternatives .

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

The Town is going to do whatever they want to do anyway. It's not to the town to either approve or disapprove.

#### MR. THORSEN:

I want to say one thing. This is a fairly large site, and if it was considered in toto even though it does have -- does have sloping land on it, which makes it very difficult to build on that site, but you could throw that open land into the mix and do some clustering on the site and consider Smart Growth and that sort of thing, I think there's a solution on this somehow.

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

well, I'm not saying there isn't. I don't think this is a solution. I'm not saying that something can't be built, but it's unheard of in today's day and age to take 300 spaces in a shopping center. Christmas, when there's no parking, then what do you do with the 300 cars out there? That's what I'm concerned about.

## MR. MACCO:

there's a lot of space behind Huntington Town House. You know, it's not zoned right, but there's a lot of space back there that's not being -- that should be considered.

# MS. PETERSEN:

why do you have housing on the same site of the Huntington Town House? Do the owners live there or is that something that could be eliminated?

#### MR. ISLES:

it is zoned residential .

## MR. MACCO:

Last 250 feet is zoned residential , I believe.

#### MS. PETERSEN:

It's separate? It looks like it was part of that parcel the way it's drawn out.

## MR. THORSEN:

a future plan could include a buffer of open space, wooded open space, along the residential perimeter as part of the mix.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

you know, they count -- there's is only going to be three people in a car, and if you go anyplace there's only one person in the car no matter where you go. The hotels -- the hotel, one person in an apartment, the same thing in a hotel. You go in front of a hotel, they're always full, the parking lot, the building is half full and all the parking lots are filled.

#### MR. MACCO:

If this wasn't a preexisting use, how many parking spots would they need if they were to build it today?

## MR. NEWMAN:

1800.

## MR. MACCO:

1800. And they got 600.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

and that's more like -- it's a normal thing.

## MR. MACCO:

They're not going to get away with further development without a traffic study and building a multi-tiered parking lot on that property then they're going to convince me. All you have to do is drive by there and try to go -- without going to Huntington Town House, just try to pass on Jericho Turnpike during the time of any event, and you shall see how far traffic is backed up and how treacherous it can be.

## CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

it's bad. Anybody lives in the area knows it's bad. Okay. Lets move on.

## MR. ISLES:

that's it .

#### MR. ROSAVITCH:

do we have to act on this ?

## MR. ISLES:

No .

#### MR. ROSAVITCH:

this is the schedule for 2002.

#### MR. ISLES:

We're providing that for your information so you're aware of the meetings for the next year. Typically, the Commissioner adopts the calender at the February meeting, as I understand it, at you're Organization meeting. But they're set up as the first Wednesday of each month. If any of the Commission members have concerns of those dates, maybe you can let us know at the next meeting, so we can adjust the calender.

#### CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

the only thing that I would be concerned with is September, if it's a Jewish holiday. We might not want to have a meeting on, you know, a Jewish holiday.

## MS. PETERSEN:

did we make a motion to close? Motion to adjourn.

## MR. LONDON:

second.

# CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

There is a second. All in favor? Contrary minded?

## [THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 12:50 P.M.]