

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 January 9, 2002.

PRESENT:

Donald Eversoll (At-Large) Chairman
Robert Martin (Smithtown) Vice-Chairman
Louis Dietz (Babylon)
Edward Rosavitch (Brookhaven)
George Dickerson (Shelter Island)
Thomas Thorsen (East Hampton)
Frank Tantone (Islip)
Richard O'Dea (Riverhead)
Linda Petersen - (At Large)
Thomas Isles - Director/Suffolk County Planning Department
Harold Withers - Deputy Director/Suffolk County Planning Department
William Cremers - (Southold)
Michael Macco - (Huntington)
Ronald Parr (At Large)

ALSO PRESENT:

Basia Braddish - Counsel/County Attorney's Office
Gerald Newman - Chief Planner/Suffolk County Planning Department
Kathleen Rigano - Suffolk County Planning Department Claire Chorny - Suffolk County Planning Department
Marian Zucker - Citizen Advisory Committee/Town of East Hampton Gene Cross - Planning Consultant, Incorporated Village of East Hampton
Donald L. Hunting - Chairman/Planning Board/Town of East Hampton
All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 12:14 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

With that, I'd like to call the meeting to order and wish everyone a Happy New Year. Tom, I didn't receive the verbatim minutes. Were they sent out?

MR. ISLES:

No. They're in the process of being prepared, so we'll have them to you at the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Is it then appropriate -- I guess we can -- we'll hold off, we'll table the adoption until the February meeting. Any correspondence?

MR. ISLES:

One piece of correspondence to bring to your attention which has been handed out today, and that is a letter from the Town of Brookhaven from Councilman Edward Hennessy, a copy of which was sent to me. And I would like to bring to your attention that what Brookhaven has forwarded to us is a resolution of the Brookhaven Town Board wherein they have requested of this commission, the Planning Commission, the authorization to utilize the services of the County Planning Department for a project that is supposed to take place in the Mastic/Shirley area along County Road 80.

The Suffolk County Department of Public Works is in the planning stages of the project to rebuild that roadway. What the Town of Brookhaven would like to do is to work with the County Planning Department, along with the Town of Brookhaven Planning Department, to look at some of the issues of that, to look at methods of upgrading some of the private sector development along County Road 80, it's a strip commercial location in Mastic/Shirley, and to look at ideas that perhaps could be implemented to work in conjunction with the County highway project to upgrade that location.

I have reviewed this, I have discussed this with Brookhaven officials. From a staff standpoint and from the timing that they have spoken to me about, I believe that we can provide these services in the department. A lot of it would be mapping and some inventory work, but to report to this commission that from a staff standpoint, we can perform the function and I would like to recommend that the commission adopt a resolution to authorize the department to conduct this activity with them.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

With that being said, we'll --

MR. ROSAVITCH:

I talked to Councilman Hennessy about that and I would like to make that motion.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Do I hear a second?

MS. PETERSON:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

It's appropriate that Brookhaven -- residents from Brookhaven make that motion. All those in favor? Any opposition? It's unanimous. Approved (VOTE: 12-0-0-0). Any -- the Director's report, Tom?

MR. ISLES:

Just a couple of things, three or four items. Number one is that the Legislature has formed a Smart Growth Committee at the request of the County Executive, I think I brought that up at the previous meeting. The intent on this is to look at the opportunities the County would have to implement Smart Growth in the County. Just to let you know, we are a little bit on a holding pattern on that due to the change that's occurred in the Legislature. A number of the appointments are required to be confirmed by the Legislature and with the transition with the year-end and the new Legislature now forming, we expect that going into February and March to have those appointments completed. So it does hold us back a little bit, but once we get those appointments we'll convene the committee and get going on the smart growth implementation.

One big project we have in the department, just to give you a little update on, is a North Shore Land Use Study that we're doing. This is part of the Long Island Sound Study, I believe {Dewitt Davis} gave a presentation on this some time ago. But it's a rather extensive land use inventory population projection for the entire north shore of Long Island going out to the east end, so it involves Suffolk County -- pardon me -- Huntington, Smithtown, Town of Brookhaven and all the Incorporated Villages in that area. It's been an enormous effort in this department but we are doing well on it and we'll have this probably completed by the summer time, and obviously I'll report back to you at that time. This will then feed back into a larger study that's being done through the Suffolk County Department of Health Services.

Another item is the County Affordable Housing Program had two milestones in the month of December to report to you. This is a relatively new program that began last year. And the two events that happened is that the Legislature did appropriate the first round of capital funds for the program, so it does enable us to now go out and purchase property for the purpose of providing affordable housing. This is something we will do in conjunction with the towns and villages, it is something that's done on an intermunicipal basis only. So that program can now move forward for this coming year.

The second item related to that is the first project was granted planning steps approval by the Legislature in December as well which is a project in the Town of Huntington known as Millennium hills. So we are now going into the documentation phase on that one and expect to bring it back to the Legislature probably in March or April for final authorization purchase, and that includes 84 affordable housing units.

This is the last time I just want to mention a little bit is the County Real Estate Acquisition Program has been the subject of some discussion in media reports. It's something that we take very seriously. The County of Suffolk has had probably the most outstanding land acquisition program in the country. We spend more and acquire more open space than 45 out of the 50 states and probably more than any other County. The County has been doing this for the past 40 years. The actual amount of acreage we have acquired exceeds the size of the Town of Riverhead if you add it all up, and clearly exceeds the size of the Towns of Smithtown and Babylon and Shelter Island. It's enormous, it's 68 square miles we have acquired. It's a phenomenal accomplishment in terms of protection of drinking water resources, of wetlands and water courses, and I think it's something this County should be very proud of.

There are some issues that have come up, and I think perhaps in some of the media reports perhaps they have been exaggerated a little bit, but the truth be known that there are some issues that will be addressed that the County Executive has put together a panel consisting of both the Legislative and Executive Branch. And I feel fully confident that the issues, the few issues that have generated will be resolved and I think it's important that we not lose site of the benefits of this program and that the program continue to move forward. So that's something that we're spending a lot of time on and working hard on. So just to give you an update on that one.

MR. DICKERSON:
Can I ask one question?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Thank you for that.

MR. ISLES:
Sure.

MR. DICKERSON:
How much property was that, square miles you said?

MR. ISLES:
About 68 square miles, it's 44,000 acres that we have purchased. It's a phenomenal accomplishment.

MR. DICKERSON:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Tom, does that include the agricultural land as well?

MR. ISLES:
Yeah, we have about 6,800 acres of farmland that we have purchased the development rights to. So it includes groundwater -- drinking water protection, parks and farmland.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
It truly is a remarkable accomplishment.

MR. DICKERSON:

That is Smithtown, Riverhead and Shelter Island combined?

MR. ISLES:

Not combined. But if you're to say the entire of Town of Babylon, we have purchased more land for open space in that entire town; or the entire town of Smithtown, we have more open space in the entire town of Smithtown. So to put it into perspective what it is, it's quite significant. And keep in mind, too, the County of Suffolk, the voters of the County of Suffolk approved in 1998 a referendum on a portion of the quarter percent sales tax which is dedicated to additional open space acquisitions and farmland development rights acquisitions for the next 12 years. And there's still going to be a funding stream estimated probably to be 150 to \$200 million, so we will have the ability to continue to buy land.

One of the critical factors we're facing is that Suffolk is predominantly developed, about 15% of our land area remains to be developed, or preserved as the case may be, so there's really not a heck of lot left. And in terms of the rate of development, especially on the east end, my concern is that if we wait too long in terms of reactivating the program then obviously opportunities will be lost and preservation of those parcels will be lost. The whole idea of smart growth is to find a balance between development and preservation of natural resources. And so certainly we're not suggesting that we stop development, but we feel that there needs to be a balance, that this program is an important part of that balance and combined with redevelopment of downtowns and existing centers, redevelopment of institutional properties such as Kings Park and so forth, proper manner according to the town and so forth. Open space is one component of a smart growth strategy in Suffolk County.

MR. MARTIN:

Why doesn't the County make an effort to buy Kings Park Hospital, buy the hospital in Kings Park? Why don't they make an effort to buy that or have the State give it -- really, the State should really give it to us, you know, give it to the County. Why are you laughing? Riverhead got Grumman.

MR. ISLES:

Yes, they did.

MR. WITHERS:

From the Feds.

MR. MARTIN:

Well, I'm saying, so it's our dollar no matter where it comes from. I don't understand why the Legislators aren't making an effort to take that land over. I mean, that would be an ideal thing. I mean, then you don't have to develop it the way a developer would have to develop it.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

MR. MARTIN:
(Inaudible).

MR. ISLES:

Recently, yeah. Well, that hasn't been put on an open space acquisition list. One of the things that I think is going to happen on the review of the program is that -- and I think it's very much needed at this point in time, is to review the proposed acquisitions that are coming up and to -- this had been done periodically by the County at a number of times in the past and I think it's time for an update to our open space acquisitions. Look at it in a proactive way versus a reactive way when applications come in for development. That would be the time I think to look through the whole thing, rank, parcels, and decide based on size --

MR. MARTIN:

Yeah, by that time it's going to be sold. I mean, there's fifty sold in the hour now, right? If one person wants to put 1,800 senior citizen apartments in there --

MR. ISLES:

But the town zoning would not allow that, correct?

MR. MARTIN:

I don't think the town would allow it. No, but those are the kind of things that come up.

MR. ISLES:

Absolutely.

MR. MARTIN:

It scares you when you hear it, 1,800 of them. My feeling is that anything along Route 25A, okay, you can develop that any way you want. If it's senior housing, I mean, that's in or near the bluff or near the water, preserve that. And it wouldn't be a losing proposition for the town, they could break even on the taxes.

MR. THORSEN:

That would be a good project for the County, County Planning to look at.

MR. ISLES:

Yeah, I think the Town of Smithtown is doing a plan on that site, too, isn't that right?

MR. MARTIN:

Well, they're trying to -- now they're trying to buy it the last time I talked to them. So I hope that don't happen, that it goes into somebody's hands in the process. MR. PARR:
I'm not so sure that any of those offers are real.

MR. MARTIN:

Oh no, I'm not saying they are, but where there's smoke there's fire.

MR. PARR:

The conditions are -- they're cleaning it up and I'm not so sure the County would want to own the site.

MR. MARTIN:

Well, everybody (inaudible).

MR. PARR:

And I think after, Tom, Central Islip was given to the town, the State did away with that policy of offering land to governmental agencies, respective areas. They found that they were going to be foolish because the land had some real value and certainly CI was a classic example of that. So I think those days are gone where the State will be --

MR. MARTIN:

Well, you still have got to keep looking, you can't just say it's gone. You know, if you were to told me 20 years ago that a building in Smithtown that I could have bought for \$500 or less is worth \$150,000 or more, I'd say it can't happen.

MR. MACCO:

Twenty years ago? Oh, come on.

MR. MARTIN:

Not even 20, not even. Well, 30 years maybe. It wasn't that long ago, my friend.

MR. MACCO:

Okay.

MR. PARR:

You are right.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Okay. With that, we'll start the round table. Tom, slow out in East Hampton, I suppose?

MR. THORSEN:

Nice and quiet.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Cornflake diet?

MR. DICKERSON:

Well, it's pretty quiet out there all winter. In fact, I'm heading to San Francisco to get some action in about a month or two.

MR. CREMERS:

It's kind of quiet in Southold. We have also a new administration and things are probably going to change as far as affordable housing direction. And the Supervisor-Elect just before Christmas wrote a letter to every member of the Planning Board, Zoning Board and every committee in the town asking them to resign because he thought he was voted in based on a reform in government.

The next day the town board said just ignore the letters which most people did and only eight people sent in their resignations so far. So that's where that stands.

MR. MACCO:
Out of how many?

MR. CREMERS:
Eight, out of a hundred about.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Rich?

MR. O'DEA:
Things are -- well, some things are happening in Riverhead. I would like to make a request of Planning in regards to -- I sit on the Farm Select Committee -- if they could provide us with an outline of all these programs, Greenways, Open Space --

MR. ISLES:
Sure.

MR. O'DEA:
-- Farm, Ground Water Protection and some description of them, because there's a lot of -- George Proios used to periodically give us some updates, but to have it in writing would be nice.

MR. ISLES:
We've got that.

MR. O'DEA:
The other thing which I presented to the Director is cell towers are a hot issue all over the County, I'm sure. The Department of State has a good publication and they'll give you a CD for handling those projects when they come to the town, and Tom has it and we'll go over it. And if the Planning Department could maybe construct something on that as a guide for members of this commission. A moratorium is in effect in Riverhead, a building, effective 12/12/01. What else is hot? Riverhead center applicant received a favorable ruling, it's brand new, I haven't seen it but it involves I guess the other part of it in Home Depot, Home Depot is about 90% completed on the exterior. There's an ag forum, it starts tomorrow, very well put together, it's a yearly function at Suffolk County Community College. And the County Executive kicks it off tomorrow at 9 A.M., all forms of agriculture. That's it.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Thank you. Linda?

MS. PETERSON:
Relatively quiet. I have not been at work for a while so things are undoubtedly happening. We have our administration in place that was elected in November and they're already making changes in the town and I assume we're going to see additional changes over the next month or two.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Just that the Town of Brookhaven is going to be having a special election on the 22nd of January for a road system and that's the hot item right now in the Town of Brookhaven. That's all I have.

MR. MACCO:

I have nothing.

MR. TANTONE:

The only thing I have, the Chairman is going to leave us, it's more concrete at this point, we believe February will be the last month of meetings that Mr. O'Connell will chair. And I guess at this point also we'll be adding another Planning Board member but there has been no word yet.

MR. DIETZ:

The two senior citizen projects on Sunrise Highway in Lindenhurst. One has broken down, the Narragansett Inn Property is totally cleared and cleaned out, so they're going to be moving forward on both of them.

MR. MACCO:

You can take those senior citizens from Smithtown (inaudible).

MR. MARTIN:

If you are under --

MR. MACCO:

And what do you consider a senior citizen Mr. Martin?

MR. MARTIN:

Over ninety. No, I've got to make it 95 because my mother is 93, so over a hundred.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

I have no comments. We'll start, Jerry.

MR. NEWMAN:

The first application is from the Town of Babylon. This is an application to rezone an 11.7 acre L-shaped parcel comprising 11.7 acres from an industrial category to a senior citizen category for the purpose of erecting 164 one-bedroom rental units, that's an overall site plan of 14 units to the acre. However, in this case, if you subtract out the portions of the property, the comprised wetlands in this case 2.63 acres situated to the north and east of the property landing in this area through here, you have a net density of 18 units to the acre. The site plan calls for the erection of 18 two-story resident buildings. There will be a recreation center, there will be one point of vehicular ingress and egress right on Wyandanch Avenue, there will be an emergency access point by one of the local streets to the west. There will be 217 parking spaces, there will be connection to the Southwest Sewer District. And also, which is unique to this application, there will be approximately 1,200 foot long sound wall. That sound wall will buffer the industrial uses immediately to the south and west of the subject property, the height of that will vary from 10 feet to 18 feet to buffer the surrounding industrial users. That will necessitate, by the way, a variance from the Board of Appeals.

Also as a part of this project, there are a number of paper streets as a part of this property, they have to file for abandonment to remove those paper streets. And also, because of the low lying nature of the property, approximately 37,000 cubic yards of fill will be necessary to provide for the development.

The previous applications to rezone this property as well as adjoining lands comprised of 18.6 acres to a multiple residence category as well as a senior citizen category for the purposes of erecting 296 condos at 16th of the acre as well as 420 senior units at 22.6 to the acre were denied by the Planning Commission in 1973 and '85. In both cases they were subsequently approved by the town board. However, on the last enactment by the town board in '85, the applicant failed to comply with all the covenants and restrictions, therefore that approval was voided.

The property is bounded on the north and east by lands of the County of Suffolk in this area here acquired for Greenbelt or open space purposes. For those of you who go way back, John Klein had a mini-center proposed in here many, many years ago and that, of course, was withdrawn. To the south of the property you can see industrial uses in this area here, as well as some residential to the west.

It is the belief of the staff that this proposal appears inappropriate as it's remotely situated and possesses few amenities desired for intensified residence purposes. It's incongruous with the surrounding industrial uses, it is potentially injurious to the integrity of the wetlands to the north and east of the property, it would establish a precedent for further such development patterns throughout the Town of Babylon, that is the placement of multi-family residences in industrial areas, and it's inconsistent with their plan which designates this area for land conservation or open space purposes. We're recommending disapproval.

MR. MACCO:

I move to adopt staff report.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Any discussion?

MS. PETERSON:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Yes.

MS. PETERSON:

Because of its proximity to the open space the County owns, have they looked into acquiring this through all the wetlands that are running through the property so that they have a whole area that would be contiguous?

MR. ISLES:

Has the County looked into acquiring it? The only thing that I'm aware of thus far is there was discussion of a possible land exchange earlier this year affecting part of this parcel which has not moved forward. There were certain issues per swap that were classified of park lands that would require legislative approval. Beyond that, there is an acquisition list for Planning, Legislative resolutions set forth by the Legislature as we discussed previously with Kings Park. I'm anticipating that the County will be embarking upon new open space review of the parcels, but at the present time there's nothing that I'm aware of. Keep in mind, too, that the wetlands are regulated by local and State regulations. Beyond that, it would have to be reviewed as part of an overall plan.

MS. PETERSON:

Thank you.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

This parcel looks like it contributes greatly to the head waters of Belmont Lake State Park. Any development in there could have some adverse effect on that.

MR. WITHERS:

Years ago they talked about that site being a recharge area for Southwest Sewer District and it just fell through.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Tom?

MR. THORSEN:

My concern is that what do we mean by land conservation purposes?

MR. NEWMAN:

Open space. I would imply that would meet clustering in accordance with existing zoning.

MR. PARR:

The applicant by the way has indicated a willingness, if this rezone is approved, to dedicate and give to the County of Suffolk the 2.63 acres of wetlands as part of the property. However, as far as the sale of the remaining portion, he's indicated unwillingness to sell that part of the property.

MR. THORSEN:

I remember in other applications before this, whenever the County wanted to buy -- has a plan for open space on a parcel, that we decided we shouldn't really recommend that in our approval. I feel uncomfortable about having that last line in there. It's inconsistent with the {90 A Conference} plan of Babylon which designates this area for land conservation. Should that be a reason why we deny it?

MR. NEWMAN:

Well, obviously it implies that this land should be entirely preserved open space purposes according to Ed's observation. However, when the staff sees an open space designation on a master plan, we look at it as employing either open space entirety or if not, cluster in accordance with existing zoning.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Counsel, does this --

MS. DEREN BRADDISH:

I mean, he's just actually stating a fact of what's in the town plan. So I don't have a problem with it.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Okay, so we don't have a problem with that. Any other discussion? All those in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? Unanimous.

(VOTE: 12-0-0-0).

MR. NEWMAN:

Okay, application No. 2 is from the Town of Brookhaven. This is an application to rezone a 6.41 acre parcel of land from a light industrial category to a PRC, Plan Retirement Category, allowing subsidized senior citizen housing units at eleven units to the acre. The intent here is to erect 70 senior citizen units at eleven units to the acre, so that's the maximum permitted in accordance with this district. This affects land situated on the south side of the railroad right-of-way between Seatuck Avenue and East Moriches Boulevard at Eastport. The proposal submitted by the applicant includes ten -- indicates ten two-story resident buildings, a community building, one point of ingress and egress by East Moriches Road, 96 parking spaces, a sanitary sewer disposal facility in the corner of the property, the northwest corner of the property. The property is currently occupied by industrial buildings and obviously intends to remove them if this rezone is approved.

On 11/28 of last year, the end of last year, the Town Board convened a public hearing to rezone this land as well as nearby industrial zoned lands to Residence A as part of a series of townwide upzonings. Also, the Town Master Plan designates this area for industrial purposes. It is the belief of the staff that this proposal is conditionally appropriate as a suitable non-industrial use alternative considering the prevailing pattern of zoning and character of the surrounding area. However, we believe that if it is approved, it should be limited to three conditions. Number one, the staff believes there should be a diminution of the number of units to five per acre or a total of 32, and the reason we arrived -- how we arrived at that is the commission policy over the years has been when there's a trade-off in industrial to multi, the commission has accepted a density in the area of five units to the acre. Number two, there should be an alternate point of ingress and egress to the property, there's only one. And number three, these dwelling units shall be appropriately encumbered to insure long-term affordability.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Do I hear a motion?

MR. ROSAVITCH:

I'll make a motion but I wanted to --

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Why don't we make a motion and then we can discuss it.

MR. ROSAVITCH:
I will make a motion to accept.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Do we have a second?

MR. O'DEA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Yes, Ed?

MR. ROSAVITCH:
In the past when we've done things alongside the railroad you've called for, I believe in our policy, an increase in the sound attenuation of the building structure.

MR. NEWMAN:
You mean to maximize the distance between the ground units and the railroad?

MS. PETERSON:
Right.

MR. ROSAVITCH:
And the building construction itself, to minimize the noise from the railroad trains.

MR. NEWMAN:
There is room obviously to move it further to the south, but it's pretty constrained based on configuration of the property, unless they modify the site plan. So that could be added as a condition, that they maximize the distance and provide screening throughout the railroad right-of-way.

MR. ROSAVITCH:
Also, we required screening along the railroad tracks --

MR. NEWMAN:
Uh-huh.

MR. ROSAVITCH:
-- which I'd like to make as part of the approval.

MR. NEWMAN:
Sure.

MS. PETERSON:
If they go along with reducing the density, then you could rearrange the building.

MR. NEWMAN:
That's fine.

MS. PETERSON:

You wouldn't have a setback from the railroad.

MR. MACCO:

I'm interested in knowing -- I am not familiar with this area. If this is light industrial now, where are the senior citizens doing their shopping?

MR. NEWMAN:

Well, there's a bus route immediately to the north on Montauk Highway and there's shopping --

MS. PETERSON:

There are few little neighborhood shops on Montauk Highway.

MR. NEWMAN:

-- right up to the north. You can see it right here. You see that black area? That's all commercial zoning and that's Montauk Highway, there's a bus route along there and there's some commercial uses in that area as well.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Also, I believe according to the map, I think there's a railroad station and a platform there, I don't know where exactly.

MR. NEWMAN:

That I don't know.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Which would be part -- if they did something it would be great for a smart growth type center.

MS. PETERSON:

I believe the last stop is Speonk and I don't think it stops (inaudible).

MR. O'DEA:

Has anything been done after the public hearing?

MR. NEWMAN:

No. There was a whole series of -- I don't know, maybe Ed or Linda know more about this. They entertained a number of --

MS. PETERSON:

Thirty.

MR. NEWMAN:

Thirty, 35, and to date no action has been forthcoming.

MS. PETERSON:

It's on the town board's own motion.

MR. NEWMAN:

Right.

MS. PETERSON:

But this site has been a problem site for years. DEC has been in there, it's been an industrial site but presently not used in that capacity. So changing the zone and cleaning up the site would be advantageous to the community. I am not thrilled with putting seniors next to the railroad, I think they deserve peace and quiet in their old age, but I guess if you balance it all off from the smart growth prospective and the proximity to the shopping and that you could walk there, that would be helpful.

MR. O'DEA:

The idea of recommending 32 and the zoning is 70, and you have the footnote accepted by the Planning Commission on past such rezonings; has there been any follow ups of past rezonings, have they overridden us?

MR. NEWMAN:

I think generally Brookhaven has accepted those, but I don't have a running record of it. There hasn't been a lot of those.

MR. O'DEA:

It's supportive of 70 or 32.

MS. PETERSON:

The town has not done a lot of this senior citizen PRC-3 zoning. It's subsidized and it's heavy density and they haven't done a lot of that that I'm aware of or probably that you are. Not to say it isn't needed because certainly we have a lot of senior citizen who are in need of affordable housing, but it would be up to them. I don't think -- I think the density they're asking for is too heavy on that particular site, personally, but I will call the Town Board. I would go along with the recommendation fine. They might even go up to 70, you know, if it was deemed totally affordable, that's their call.

MR. O'DEA:

Okay.

MR. NEWMAN:

We have no information, by the way, on what kind of subsidies are available as far as the units are concerned.

MR. DICKERSON:

I would like to follow-up on Linda's last statement, totally affordable. Number three, to ensure long-term affordability; what ensures that?

MR. NEWMAN:

It would have to be covenant and restrictions and the town would have to enforce them, so one guy doesn't buy it cheaper and then make a killing and sell it a year or two down the road. There would have to be restrictions put in place, it would be associated with improvements and cost of living on an annual basis.

MR. DICKERSON:

They would be in place in writing.

MR. NEWMAN:

That's right, they'd have to put those in place.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

George, typically they related to the median income of the town, of say a two person family if it's seniors, a one or two person family in the town and it relates to a percentage of that as to affordability. One of the concerns I have is that by reducing the density from 70 to 32, you take away some of the critical mass, if you will, that's necessary in order to create a rental property with amenities and in order to spread it over 32 units as opposed to 70 or 50 units or something other than 32, what happens is the fixed cost tend to overwhelm it as it gets lower. I think that was Richard's comment.

MR. O'DEA:

Because if you feel that 70 is the number, that we can play with maybe we should readjust the 32 and make it more likely that they will approve it.

MS. PETERSON:

When they formed subsidized housing for seniors in the town in the past, I know they have tied it in with community development and they have worked a program out where they qualify the people and they keep the rents, as you say, at a certain level. So maybe seven would be a compromise, five might be too low, what do you think, Don?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

I think seven would be more appropriate. It seems to me you have certain fixed costs in it and then leave it up to the town board, they can --

MS. PETERSON:

We're not sure if these are going to be rentals or acquisitions?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

I thought it was rentals.

MR. NEWMAN:

We don't know.

MS. PETERSON:

It didn't spell it out.

MR. NEWMAN:

We don't have any information on whether they're rentals or acquisitions.

MR. MARTIN:

Why don't we do this? Being that we can't change it and the application calls for 70, why don't we deny it saying that the site won't be suitable with a lesser yield and let the town board decide the yield. I don't think it's right for us to decide the yield.

MS. PETERSON:

I hate to deny it when we know we need affordable housing.

MR. MARTIN:

Well, then you've got to agree to 70.

MS. PETERSON:

Oh, I think we can make a recommendation that the density is too high being that a compromise should be worked out.

MR. MARTIN:

Now the town board gets it, they need four votes if they want to make it 33. See what you're causing? You'll actually disapprove it, if the town board wants to work it out later, 50 units or -- you know what it's like to 70, chances are you could chop it. But if you said 32, now you've done what you don't want to do, you have denied it.

MR. O'DEA:

But we go through this approval, disapproval --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. O'DEA:

They're within their number in their code.

MR. MARTIN:

When I make (inaudible), I never never set the yield. If we feel it's too much we just say that the town should look at it according to all those other things. On this piece of land, I mean, I don't know how many railroad trains stop there, if that's the Montauk line, there's probably two trips a day, one in the morning and one at night.

MS. PETERSON:

But remember when we met out in Shelter Island and that group Seeds came and they said they're going to be pushing to get more usage of the railroad and other means of transportation to help with their traffic jams?

MR. MARTIN:

I don't think there's -- I'm just saying, there's a lot of other things that will come into this. That should be a town board call, not ours. I can say we can say it's a good site and let the town board set the yield. If we set the yield, we're disapproving it really.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Perhaps it would be more appropriate if we -- my understanding is there's a greater demand for rental housing than for sale housing; is that right?

MR. ISLES:

There's a greater need.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Oh, a greater need, okay. That being the case, it disturbs me less to give them eleven units an acre, if you will, for rental housing. It disturbs me -- it would disturb me more to make that for sale housing. So if we want to give them a range, we could say that if it were rental housing it would be per their application, under guidelines it would restrict it to ensure long-term affordability, or if they were going to have for sale housing then it would be a lesser density. Is that --

MR. MACCO:

Can you explain that to me, why you feel that the density should be decreased on a sale as compared to a rental? You'd rather have more rental units than privately owned units.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Typically rental units are smaller than for sale units. And what happens is there is a tendency when you have -- if it's for sale units, it is more difficult to enforce the affordability of it over a long-term period of time as opposed to having one owner and there are various agencies that can ensure rental incomes and guarantee rental incomes. If we deem that there's a greater demand, or greater need if you will, for rental housing, then we should encourage rental housing, and if you are going to encourage it you do that by density.

MR. ISLES:

Jerry, on the five units to an acre that's referred to in your report, typical density we would recommend, does that make any difference between developed land or undeveloped land or it's just basically a generic number at this point?

MR. NEWMAN:

That's a generic number that was used by the commission when you have nonresidential zoning changes. But multi resident, the general acceptance is generally five per acre.

MR. ISLES:

Right. But there could be an argument made here that since it's a redevelopment in cleaning up this site, that it's within a hamlet center that it might argue for a higher density.

MR. NEWMAN:

I think that's reasonable to suggest a higher density. The question is how much higher.

MS. PETERSON:

Maybe we should leave that to the discretion of the town board and endorse the concept.

MR. MARTIN:

That's what I said.

MS. PETERSON:

Endorse the change of zone and endorse the concept of what they're doing but without any specifics on their part stating whether it is for sale, for rent, whatever, leave that aspect up to the discretion of the town board.

MR. O'DEA:

Or move it to a comment, put it in the comments part.

MR. MARTIN:

How about the fact that the town board -- for instance, you're saying move them away from the Long Island Railroad, they might not be able to get something but they might get 55 (inaudible), yet if we said 32 they need four votes, because you're not approving what they really want. If you let them negotiate it and say the site is beautiful and let them negotiate, they're going to negotiate it anyway. I mean, that's the site plan review, we're not the site plan review. So let them do it under their law, or whatever, the railroad and everything else, you know. I wouldn't even know where the Board of Health is coming in here, if there's no plans in the area they've got to build some kind of a sewage treatment plant.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

No.

MR. MARTIN:

No, there's no sewers down there, right?

MS. PETERSON:

There is no plant there.

MR. MARTIN:

Well, sometimes these little towns have their own. I mean, that's what they have to look at.

MR. THORSEN:

Jerry, I assume here that everything is at grade, the railroad is at grade?

MR. NEWMAN:

I believe so, yes.

MR. THORSEN:

All right. So a train going through there, it's going to blow its whistle?

MR. NEWMAN:

When it hits the crossing.

MR. THORSEN:

Okay, so it's going to be a rather noisy -- you're going to have track noise and you're going to have a whistle. If you are going to allow additional density there, why not put in a recommendation for some sort of screening?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Screening or --

MR. THORSEN:

It could be a wall or, you know, in this case if there's not much space

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

You're going to have some -- it's still going to be elevated. In some way you'd have a wall that would have to be built, too. The store unit should have a substantial wall or some noise attenuation in construction of the units to reduce it to an appropriate --

MR. ROSAVITCH:

That was what I originally wanted. I wanted some sort of noise reduction in the construction of the unit and some sort of screening along the railroad track. The screening along the railroad track, a fence or something so that the --

MR. MARTIN:

So they don't walk out on it.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Yeah, and the kids don't come across.

MR. THORSEN:

I think that would be a good idea.

MR. NEWMAN:

That's a good idea.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

With any density, I think with any density.

MS. PETERSON:

To put anyone there you have to really think of folks who are going to live their ultimately.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Why don't we go back then and draft a resolution. Is there a consensus --

MR. O'DEA:

Put his comments in the recommendations.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

That's correct.

MR. O'DEA:

Take one out and put "be accepted by" -- a general phrase would be "accepted by what has been accepted in the past as far as the density by the Planning Commission" and your comments. Put it as a rental and/or sales. A general paragraph in the comment end of it. MR. DICKERSON: You want to put in there that if it's a rental you will go for more units rather than it it's a sale?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

That would be --

MR. MACCO:

A comment.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

That would be a comment, yes. I think that's more appropriate.

MR. DICKERSON:

A rental has the option of leaving, you know, it's easier for him to leave if he doesn't like the situation.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Ron?

MR. PARR:

Just one note here, that I don't see how they could meet Health Department requirements without a sewer treatment facility. And given the required distances from the property line for their sewer plant, I don't think it's physically possible to get 70 units on the site.

MS. PETERSON:

It's too small.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Chromoglass or --

MR. PARR:

Even with that, you need 150 feet from the property line, you don't make it.

MS. PETERSON:

It's pretty much over densification.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

But that's their problem. I mean, they can acquire another site or they could -- it just seems to me that rather -- you're right, I mean, it's going to be a problem they're going to have to deal with, but let them deal with that problem rather than to -- they may have some solution that we're not aware of. It would seem me that it's more -- that it's appropriate, if we're going to make the determinations, to deal with the sound attenuation, to deal with the preference of rental affordable housing versus sale affording housing vis-a-vis the density, and then emergency access which has already been addressed.

MR. WITHERS:

They have been before the Sanitation Commission.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Yeah, they're going to have to do that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

And they may have an arrangement with them nearby.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Okay, that being said.

MR. MACCO:

You have all that, Jerry?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Okay, if I can run this by you. Number one would be deleted. Number two would become number one, number three would become number two, then number three would be construction -- it would take into consideration reduction of noise vis-a-vis a wall of triple glazing and sound transmission coefficients to reduce noise impacts. And then the comment that the density would be set by the town board to reflect greater density for rental and lesser densities for sale.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

One more. Based on the number three that you just came up with, would that also include pulling it back from the railroad tracks?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

They could do any or all of the above. It seems to me that we want to put the onus on the developer to be as creative as possible in conjunction with putting a solid barrier and/or say a six inch or eight inch wall with sound transmission, insulation, STC boards, triple glazing, etcetera, which will tend to reduce the noise level.

MR. O'DEA:

What's the comment again?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

The comment would be that the density would be set by the town board to reflect a greater density for rental use and lesser density for sales.

MR. O'DEA:

And you are going to put the commission has accepted what they have accepted in the past. That's not really telling them you want less.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

No, we would not. We would leave this up to their jurisdiction. Okay. I guess we -- we will need a withdrawal of the second and the motion in order to --

MR. ROSAVITCH:

I can amend my motion?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Yes, you can.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

I'll amend my motion to what the Chairman has just laid out to us.

MR. O'DEA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Any further discussion? All those in favor? Any opposed? Any abstained? It's unanimous. (VOTE: 12-0-0-0).

We're now going to go to Afghanistan and we can be one of the collective rulers.

MR. NEWMAN:

Application three is from the Town of Islip, this is an application to rezone a 20 acre parcel of land from a light industrial category to an apartment category for the purpose of erecting 180 rental units at a density of nine to the acre affecting land situated at the southeast corner of the Sunrise Highway South Service Road and Church Street at Bayport. The preliminary site plan calls for one point of vehicular ingress and egress via the service road on the corner here. There's 340 parking spaces and there will be building setbacks of 50 to 100 feet throughout the periphery of the property and a sewage treatment plant in the corner of the property, northeast corner of the property. In this case also, significant numbers of old file map streets exist on this property and they will have to be abandoned. It is the belief of the staff that this proposal appears inappropriate as the property possesses few amenities desired for multi-residence purposes. It appears incongruous with future development patterns on surrounding industrially zoned lands. The property can be reasonably developed in accordance with existing zoning. It's inconsistent with the Town of Islip Community Identity Plan for Bayport which designates this area for industrial purposes. It's inconsistent with the Town of Islip Sunrise Highway Corridor Study which calls for industrial use in this area. And finally, it's inconsistent with the Town of Islip Overall Economic Development Plan which calls for the maintenance of an adequate inventory of developable land for industrial purposes at appropriate locations. So the staff is recommending disapproval and this was denied by the Town Planning Board.

MR. DICKERSON:

I recommend staff.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

There's a motion and we have a second. Any further discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? I abstain.

MR. TANTONE:

I abstain, too.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Approved (VOTE: 10-0-2-0 Abstentions: Don Eversoll & Frank Tantone).

MR. NEWMAN:

Okay, Application No. 4 is from the Town of Southampton. This is an application on the Town Board's own motion. This property comprises the Westhampton Drag Strip. The town officials had numerous meetings over the past three years with civic associations and members of the surrounding area and they have come up with this as a developmental alternative to remove the drag strip. And if this rezoning is approved, this property would be acquired for \$8 million by a Nassau County company and the development would proceed.

The proposal before you today is the town board's own motion to amend the zoning ordinance and map, first to create a new Westhampton Senior Citizen Planned Development District; a copy of that of is attached to the staff report. Within that district there's a maximum of 230 units on a 52 acre portion of the property, that portion within the Compatible Growth Area of the

Central Pine Barrens. In conjunction with this request, there will be a rezoning of a portion of the property, the southerly portion of the property in the Compatible Growth Area and a five acre category to a Residence Category and in that residence district, the Residence Planned Development Category there will be a maximum of two units to the acre unless there's public water and sewage facilities available and approved by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services.

The land is situated on the north side of Old Country Road between Summit Avenue and Fifth Avenue at Westhampton. The purpose of this request, as I had mentioned previously, is to eliminate the drag strip property where there have been numerous, numerous complaints and numerous and excessive fines levied by the Town of Southampton against the owners of this property. The Town of Southampton currently has five Planned Development Districts. The proposal before you today is a component of the Residential Districts, these are floating districts meaning that they are provided for in the text of the zone ordinance but not map and they're mapped as determined appropriate by town officials. These PDD's were an outgrowth of the Town Board 1995 action as an outgrowth of the Central Pine Barrens Plan.

As previously mentioned, the proposal -- and this is a concept plan that was submitted with the application, this gives you an idea of what they intend to develop the property. 230 senior citizen units on a 52 acre portion of the property, that portion within the Compatible Growth Area, the northerly portion of the property is in the core area of the Central Pine Barrens. The front -- the density here is 4.4 to the acre, there will be 170 feet of frontage on Old Country Road and extends northerly 4,400 feet. Included as a part of this, there will be a clubhouse on the southerly portion of the property along the road, there will be a sewage treatment plant and there will be recreational amenities including a swimming pool and tennis courts. There will be one point of vehicular ingress and egress via Old Country Road, there will be 115 one and two -- one to three bedroom two-family buildings, you can see them scattered throughout the site. Again, this is a concept plan, this is not an engineered site plan. In conjunction with that, there will be the restoration and rehabilitation of the northerly portion of the property which is currently used now for go-cart and motor cross racing.

The property, again, as previously mentioned, is to be rezoned as in the Compatible Growth Area under existing zoning. The subject property as well as a 14.2 acre portion is in the core area, can accommodate under existing zoning a maximum of 14 single-family residences. The property is bounded on the north by that 14.2 acre parcel of land situated in core area, again, used for go-cart and motor cross racing. East of the property is the County BOMARC site, it's used for numerous and a variety of government operation facilities, that's on a five acre single-family district. And to the south across Old Country Road west by unimproved lands in Residence Districts.

You can see on this map here, all land in the immediate vicinity of the subject property are all zoned for single-family residence purposes. As a part of this request, the staff made an analysis to determine waste water flow, to determine how many credits would be appropriate to purchase in conjunction with this request. We took the 14 single-family residence units that were permitted under existing zoning, multiplied it by a waste water flow of 300 and we came up with a total of 4,200 gallons per day. If you equate that to the 225 gallons a day for attached housing, that is equivalent to 18.7 units of attached housing. If this property is rezoned to the PPD at two to the acre, you can get a total of 133 units. So if you subject 133 from the 18.7, there will be a total of 114. By the way, the staff report is erroneous, it's not 124.5, it's 114.5. Those additional 114 units would accommodate the public benefits associated not only with the removal of this race track and all the noise problems, but it would provide for the public benefit of providing the senior affordable housing units that are desperately needed in the Town of Southampton. Therefore, if you take the 230 units that he's proposing and 133 that can be accommodated, the balance of 75 constitutes the number of Pine Barrens credits that should be purchased or an equivalent amount of land within the core area of the Pine Barrens.

It's the belief of the staff that this proposal appears conditionally appropriate in facilitating the provision of much needed affordable senior citizen housing accommodations through the reclamation and reuse of this disturbed noise-generating parcel. It's reasonably consistent with the pattern of zoning and character of the surrounding area. It's in conformance with the goals and objectives of the Town Master Plan which calls for the elimination of nonconforming uses. And as previously mentioned, this was developed through a series of meetings with civic groups and citizens in the surrounding area over a three year period.

So we're recommending approval subject to eleven conditions, this is probably the most number of conditions I've ever recommended. The first one is that there shall be no more than 230 single-family units as part of this property utilizing the Pine Barrens Credits. Number two, there shall be 97 Pine Barrens Credits purchased or an open space equivalent in the core area. However, the staff realizes that that might not be possible based on the situation of available land and credits in the Westhampton School District, therefore we gave them a provision that if they provide cash in lieu thereof consistent with requirements of the Westhampton Senior Citizen Development District, that appears on page number seven, Item G which provides that the Town Board will establish a fund and they will determine the value of these credits and provide monies to the town and the town will use those monies to purchase land within the Westhampton School District. Number three, the commission's criteria of 20% affordable component. Number four, that they will be encumbered for long-term affordability.

Number five, that the lands in the core area shall be rehabilitated and stored and they should remain in open space purposes in perpetuity. Number six, that there will be 35% of the site, including the acreage in the core, in a natural or revegetated state, that's part of the district that they're applying for. There will be no more than 15% fertilized vegetation. Number eight, there shall be an alternate point of emergency vehicle accessibility available to the premises, there's

only one point of vehicular ingress and egress. Number nine, the access easement and access road to the adjoining property, you can see it on the tax map as part of the staff report, to get to the County property you've got to traverse the subject property. We recommend they take this out of here, relocate it to the County owned lands immediately to the south, I think in this area here you can see that on the tax map as part of the staff report.

Number ten, we believe that there should be -- the residence units should be erected with noise attenuation construction materials. And number eleven, in accordance with smart growth policies of Suffolk County, we're recommending that a shuttle bus system be provided for the Senior Citizen Complex. We're recommending approval subject to those conditions and this project was approved by the Southampton Town Planning Board.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Do we have a motion?

MR. O'DEA:

I will make a motion.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Do we have a second?

MR. CREMERS:

I will second.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Do we have any discussion?

MR. ROSAVITCH:

I would like another item in here put down that some sort of evacuation plan be prepared and instituted because when we had the fires out there, the fires were almost all the way down to Old Country Road and that whole area was inundated with smoke. And if you're going to put this many people, especially senior citizens out here, you're going to have one hell of a nightmare if those woods go on fire. I don't know how many people were out there when that fire was -- that fire was heading right for this place. I'm looking for some sort of evacuation plan in case of a fire.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

As a comment?

MR. ROSAVITCH:

No, write it in as a condition. Also, we have the Suffolk County Airport which is to the east of there, usually we put on the site plans the comment that the airport's located within the vicinity. If you have senior citizens coming out here looking at this and they're going to be purchasing, they may not even know where the airport is relative to this site. And it's not being used that much now but I think it should be on the site plan.

HAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Okay. Yes?

MR. MACCO:

The replanting, what does that entail? Because, I mean, that whole site --

MR. NEWMAN:

It's all disturbed, all improved. You can see, they're going to clean it all out up here, on the northerly part, and then they're going to revegetate. They're going to remove everything.

MR. MACCO:

What does that mean, revegetate? Because I mean there's pretty mature areas around the end of the race track.

MR. NEWMAN:

They're going to put in plantings that are consistent with the Town of Southampton.

MR. MACCO:

Is that mature plantings? I mean, how does that work? When you say you are going to replant.

MR. MARTIN:

The town has a site plan.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

It would require certain sizes and a mix.

MR. MACCO:

The town will be doing that.

MR. NEWMAN:

Yes, that's right.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Is there a hospital or a medical facility close to this unit? Are there any --

MR. MARTIN:

There's a dog shelter.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Is there provisions for any sort of ambulance? I just see these people being put out there and if they need hospitalization, medical facilities or an ambulance, you're going to have problems.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Typically, what you really have, you're talking about in the hierarchy of aging they're called go-go's which are the 55 to 65, 70 people, you have the slow-go's that need more intensive care and then you have the no-gos. And this seems me that this is if you are looking at the go-go's, these are the people who are active adults, some may still work and they may have homes in Florida, they travel. And certainly medical care has to be covered and I believe if you are in West

ampton I guess you would go across the canal to Southampton Village, the hospital there. But there are certainly facilities, you know, within five to eight miles of this area.

MS. PETERSON:

There's Riverhead Hospital, too.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

And Riverhead as well. There are facilities, but I think these are more active folks that have less -- particularly looking at the size of the homes that they're proposing as well as the number of bedrooms.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

It's a concern I have. Yeah, because it seems like the project is being advocated because they're going to clean-up something that's in the Central Pine Barrens more than they're worried about the people living there. It's a shame it's being done that way.

MR. O'DEA:

Jerry, noise construction materials, there's still going to be racing out there?

MR. NEWMAN:

No. No, we're talking about the buffer from the operations of the County property to the east.

MR. O'DEA:

What's done on that property?

MR. NEWMAN:

Well, it's an impoundment yard and I believe there's also a shooting range in the northeast corner of the property. And we recognize that and we discussed this at length with the town officials and they said they're aware of all that and they discussed this at length and they feel that they could still make this property suitable and appropriate for senior citizen purposes. I have never been on the property, Commissioner Martin I believe might have been.

MR. MACCO:

I guess the go-go's have to be by the shooting range.

MR. MARTIN:

Even to qualify, okay, it has to go out to that range every so many months and they shoot there, they have regular stores built, guys hiding, they shoot at them; you know, it's a regular training range. I think the dogs would be more noisy than that.

MR. O'DEA:

Is there going to be buffered at all?

MR. NEWMAN:

This is a concept plan. There is not much land available for -- as you can see, you can move this over as much as you can, there's no vegetation there.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL: Linda?

MS. PETERSON:

I know that there's a skeet range in Yaphank near people's homes that has been a major bone of contention to the residents who built their houses near it. And when we did the subdivision approval, we put on the map, "You are near skeet range." So, I mean, if they read everything before they built their houses they knew it was there and they have done everything in their power to shut it down since moving there. So, I mean, I don't know how this would -- if this is a police facility, it's not open to the general public, just to the police?

MR. MARTIN: No.

MS. PETERSON:

Maybe they would limit the hours so it wouldn't be weekends or nights and they can just practice during the day.

MR. MARTIN:

Well, they have to do it on the off time to the officers. At one time they trained there, too, they have a big like round building and they used to have all the classes there, I don't know if they do that anymore but I know the firing range was there.

MS. PETERSON:

I would just think that could be a consideration. If the police officers are off and they're practicing at night or on weekends, I can imagine these people not being too thrilled with the noise that would be -- they use real bullets, right, it's not just --

MR. MARTIN:

No, guns, real guns.

MS. PETERSON:

Real noise.

MR. MARTIN:

Oh, yeah.

MS. PETERSON: Okay.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

I believe also the bomb squad uses the facility to detonate pyrotechnics out there that they have confiscated.

MR. MARTIN:

They do.

MR. MACCO:

And you'll have 230 senior citizens, they don't complain those people.

MR. O'DEA:

Do you want to expand on Item Number 10?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Are there any other comments, any other questions?

MR. THORSEN:

Jerry, does the County have the Pine Barrens plan for this location relative to this being a growth area?

MR. NEWMAN:

It's not a residential, it's not a critical resource area it's. Not in the RRAD, Residential Receiving Area District, it's not in the Residential Receiving Area District and it's not in the critical resource area.

MR. THORSEN:

This is only one parcel.

MR. NEWMAN:

That's correct.

MR. THORSEN:

I think, if I recall, the town probably put BOMARC --

MR. NEWMAN:

That's right, the town at one time was studying not only the subject property but adjoining land to the east and west and this general area here. However, at this time they only came in with this portion of the study area. Now maybe in the future they're going to come in with other requests.

MR. THORSEN:

I think there is a grand, long-range plan for this site here, and that one site may look horrendous. I would hope that there would be some grand improvement to the whole area to preserve all the Pine Barrens.

MR. NEWMAN:

They're planned by the requirements in the district. However, they're allowed a maximum of 230 units. And the developer has indicated if he doesn't get the survey he's not going to buy this property, that's 4.4 to the acre. Now, whether or not you can reconfigure the layout of the village, that would be addressed in the site plan review process by the Town of Southampton.

MR. DICKERSON:

Jerry, how far west from Westhampton Airport is this project? MR. NEWMAN:

That's another good question.

MR. DICKERSON:

Do you know how many miles?

MR. THORSEN:

It's over a mile.

MR. NEWMAN:

I don't know. It's not on the zoning map and it's not on this aerial. How far I don't know and I don't know the flight patterns.

MR. DICKERSON:

The flight patterns are northeast southwest. So if it's a couple of miles away, they don't go over that site.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

A good mile, two miles away.

MR. NEWMAN:

Yeah, a couple of miles.

MR. DICKERSON:

Well, the runway is four two two, so it would not go anywhere near that site. MR. NEWMAN: I don't think so.

MS. PETERSON:

Didn't the airport just receive funding to start some new projects out there, wasn't that announced last month in the paper?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

I believe so.

MS. PETERSON:

I believe it was.

MR. ISLES:

Two projects that I'm familiar with at the airport, one is a fence project to improve the fencing around the facility, I think it's a post 9/11 reason. Secondly is the lighting is in need of replacement, the wiring is decayed and so forth.

MS. PETERSON:

That's it? Nothing major.

MR. ISLES:

So those are two active ones that I'm aware of. There is an ongoing planning effort going on at the airport, too, as well as planning going on in the industrial park, up to six acres there, but that's still kind of preliminary at this point. There is a proposal by a consultant with the Town of Southampton for a (inaudible) transportation center there, but that's just a proposal at this point.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

There being no further discussion --

MR. O'DEA:

The fire issue I think is a very serious. Is it possible any fire retardant, roofing material or anything could be put in there?

MR. NEWMAN:

Well, we can put that in there.

MR. O'DEA:

I would recommend something like that. There is a disaster area.

MR. DICKERSON:

No wood shingles.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Any other discussion? All in favor of the resolution to approve with in 15 revisions, 14. All those in favor? All those opposed?

MR. MARTIN:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

One opposed. Any abstentions? Approved (VOTE: 11-1-0-0 Opposed: Robert Martin).

MR. MACCO:

No motorized wheelchairs.

MR. NEWMAN:

Okay, the last application is from the Town of Smithtown. This is an appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance to diminish parking from 463 spaces to 325 spaces, or a total of 138 representing a 30% reduction as well as providing for the maintenance of an accessory building adjoining a steep sloped area in the rear yard of the subject property. This is in connection with the expansion of an existing catering and restaurant facility on a 6.9 acre parcel of land situated at the southeast corner of Nesconset Highway and Terry Road. And the neighborhood businesses as well as the WSI, wholesale, service and industrial Districts at Smithtown.

Now, the proposal is to erect expansions to the existing building, the total expansions of 14,516 feet. They're situated in the northeast corner of the existing catering facility. These expansion areas will be utilized for weddings and parties. The existing building area comprises 28,487 square feet. They will be maintaining the one point of vehicular ingress and egress via the State roadway as well as Terry Road. As we mentioned previously, the western portion of the property zoned NB. The predominant easterly portion is zoned for WSI purposes. And in conjunction with this request, the application -- he's requesting to reserve a land bank -- I'm sorry, land bank 182 spaces, however the application before the Board of Appeals is the parking diminishment and parking diminishment only. If the ZBA accepts this diminishment it will go to the town board and the town board will entertain whether or not there should be an expansion of the building and the extent to which the parking would encroach in the rear yard steep slope area where they're going to land bank the 182 parking spaces. A previous application to rezone the southeast corner of the property where there's land bank parking is located, it was denied by the Planning Commission and subsequently approved by the Town Board. We're recommending

denial because of the magnitude of the parking diminishment. However, we believe that negotiations could take place to diminish the building additions as well as the parking encroachment. If the ZBA approves this, do not go into this rear yard steep sloped area and provide significant buffering for the houses that are located immediately to the south of the property. So we're recommending disapproval.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Is there a motion?

MR. MACCO:
Move to adopt staff report.

MR. ROSAVITCH:
I will second.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Any discussion? In favor? Opposed? Any abstentions?

MR. MARTIN:
I abstain.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
Approved (VOTE: 11-0-1-0 Abstention: Robert Martin).
We have the Village of East Hampton here and they're going to tell us the wonderful things they're doing out there.

MR. ISLES:
The Village of East Hampton has completed an update to the (inaudible). This is an action that requires review by the Suffolk County Planning Commission. We have two representatives from the Village here today to provide an update or a summary to the commission on the planning effort. It does require a resolution back to the Village at the end of this.

MR. CROSS:
Good afternoon. My name is Gene Cross, I'm Planning Consultant with the Incorporated Village of East Hampton. With me is Mr. Donald L. Hunting who is the Chairman of Planning Board in the Town of East Hampton.

Part of this process has involved two people who are in the room today, Marian Zucker who is a member of the Village's Citizens Advisory Committee and Tom Thorsen. Tom and I go back over this, I worked for Tom in the late 70's as a planning consultant for the Town of East Hampton. Excuse me, staff person. The Village goes back quite a ways. The Village was incorporated back in 1922 and adopted zoning in 1925. However, until recently the thought of a comprehensive plan, while it has come up on a number of occasions, just never came to fruition. There were several attempts, the Town of East Hampton did a comprehensive plan in 1967, the Village participated. While the Village acted on a number of recommendations of the plan, it did not adopt the plan. Later in 1978 the Village hired The Delta Group, Collins and company to prepare a commercial district comprehensive plan, that plan was prepared and filed in the circular basket.

The difficulty here I think is that the Village of East Hampton is a very apolitical community. Politics does not abound. Village residents entrust, individuals who were run elected or unopposed for election and it's a very quiet little community but it has its problems. When the Village sets out to do something, it needs the support of the populous to go ahead. So what the comprehensive plan had to accomplish, first and foremost, was it needed to educate the populous, the citizenry as to the issues that are facing the Village.

The Village and the town relationship is also very important. The AB had proposed to construct a fairly large complex in the town. The town undertook the study of 13 sites, three of which were willing to recommend that the (inaudible) be placed in the Village. Well, that was all well and good in the town own, but the village was a little bit dissatisfied with that recommendation. The reason for this is that the perception in the town I think is that the village is the town center, whereas the village perception is that the village is just one of the hamlets within the town. So there was a lot of work to be done, a lot of communication to be had.

And the first thing we did was to set about hiring a consultant. We started this process late in 1998 and it was probably August before the planning board made a decision. We had 12 consultants come to the village, we provided tours, two, three hour tours for each consultant and then we invited the consultant back for an interview with the Planning Board. The Planning Board chose the firm of Walsh, Roberts and Todd, a long established firm that I am sure you are familiar with that. They were chosen not only to be able to prepare a plan but to ensure that such a plan would have a very good chance of adoption.

To further the chances of success, the Village identified a number of organizations in the community, civic organizations that were all involved with village government in some way or another and chose representatives of all those organizations to participate on the Citizens Advisory Committee. This assured that through a series of charettes, through a series of public meetings, that as much public information about the comprehensive plan would get back to the citizenry as we could possibly muster. It must have worked. The plan has gone through extensive review, preparation by the committee. The Mayor, Board of Trustees appointed this Citizens Advisory Committee, handed them a consultant and said go to work. The committee, the village, the residents prepared this plan. This plan was then presented to the Planning Board, the Planning Board reviewed the plan at a public hearing on the plan and the GEIS which is attached on the back. The public hearing I think lasted 15 minutes, there was not a comment to be heard. I think the reason for this is that the charettes, the public involvement was successful. This is truly a plan prepared by the people, for the people. The Planning Board adopted a neg dec and is now recommending the plan's adoption by the Board of Trustees. A public hearing is set for the evening of the 25th of January.

For the most part, the plan identifies a lot of things that are already going on in the village. While the Village hasn't had a comprehensive plan, it has been quite successful in (inaudible). There are a number of historic additions which are subject to departmental review by the Design Review Board. Interestingly, the Village has two planning boards, one planning board has the responsibility for the review of subdivisions, and the other planning board is called the Design Review Board, it reviews commercial applications, site plans, architectural review and historic additions. And it's sort of one stop shopping, there's signs on a myriad of applications all related to the same subject matter.

The village has also had a wetland global, has a coastal wind erosion laws since the late 80's. It's been fairly progressive. What this plan does is essentially it identifies a lot of things that are already going on in the village and it provides the justification. It's not a dramatic departure, there are not any recommendations here which are deviated from the norm so to speak, but it's nevertheless an important document for the village because it provides the necessary basis to go on. More importantly, as I said before, this document has resulted -- already it's been a success because it's educated the public, educated the people as to what the issues are. And now when the issue comes up before the Board of Trustees, the public will be there to support the necessary action to move ahead. At this time, Mr. (Inaudible), if you have any comments.

MR. HUNTING:

No.

MR. CROSS:

Tom?

MR. THORSEN:

I'm going to have to abstain from voting on this, but it was a long and very successful effort I think on the part of the Citizen Advisory Committee to get together and to search out their hopes for the future. And basically based on the how the village has grown over the years and has still retained its colonial type identities.

MR. CROSS:

All right, two final points. One, when the planning, much of which you can accomplish is by example. Lots of times all you can do is set an example and see how it flies. The Town of East Hampton is also pursuing a comprehensive plan. I believe as a result of the village's process, the town opened up their comprehensive plan to residents as well, they have some 200 people participating on committees now providing input in their comprehensive plan and I think that can be attributed to the village.

Finally, I think process has a lot to do with substance. This plan has come about because of not only what the village wanted to acquire but how the village went about it, and that's because of people like Donald and Tom have been involved in this process. If you have any questions, I would be happy to take a shot at it.

MR. DICKERSON:

I was wondering in your comprehensive plan, was anything brought up about the ferries from Orient Point -- I mean to the south fork?

MR. CROSS:

No, but I can tell you that the village is an active -- Mr. Hunting and I just came from a meeting with the EETC, the East End Transportation Council, the Village is represented to those who are participating. That effort this morning was held in Northhaven. Northhaven, as you know, is the crossroads of the Shelter Island Ferry, traffic from north fork/south fork dilemma where people are now using the north fork to get to East Hampton via Shelter Island. The residents over there have made some improvements to 114, they have worked successfully with DOT implementing a traffic common, the traffic circle at 114, it has been a huge success. There is a separate issue, an effort relative to transportation that's going on, it's very exciting. There again, the process is more exciting than the substantive, so to speak. The five east end towns and nine villages are all participating in this under the East End Supervisors and Mayors. A number of charettes are being held with the public to gain input in April. A retreat is being planned so that the East End Transportation Council will meet with the Mayors and Supervisors to discuss progress to date. And it's about -- not bypass/no bypass, but how do we achieve consensus? How can we find solutions that we can agree upon and move forward? How planning is being done is really exciting, it's changing.

MR. DICKERSON:

I know when the Cross Island Ferry comes in, the cars hit Greenport, some of the residents who live on Shelter Island may have to wait two hours in line. They use Shelter Island as a bridge to go to the south fork and we're trying to come up with -- the ferry companies love it, they're making more money than they ever made, but it's very inconvenient to a small Island to use the bridge. I met with Perry Duryea several years ago and he said we certainly have the ferry facilities down at Montauk but it didn't go very far when it got to the town people.

MR. CROSS:

It became a political issue.

MR. DICKERSON:

Very political. There's some thought in our town just to increase the rates for non residents so high that they'll drive around, which is not a bad idea.

MR. MACCO:

I'm going to visit you, George, I'm not going to go through.

MR. DICKERSON:

It's going to get -- the problem is going to get worse.

MR. O'DEA:

The north fork probably would be happy with that also, they don't want it either.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

In the executive summary that was handed out for us to read, under the transportation needs there was an item in there, "The Village should not acquire any more land for construction of public parking." Could you explain to me the reasoning that went into that, why the village wouldn't want public parking, or is it they just don't want to own the land?

MR. CROSS:

Public parking has been a dilemma in the village for years. Essentially, there is enough public parking to provide parking for the employees or the customers but not both. In the winter time you can drive up in the village and you'll see all the parking along the street, all the parking in the parking lot closest to the stores to be served by people who are working in the village. In the summer the Village has instituted -- has acquired ten acres of land just outside the core area and constructed probably some 400 parking spaces off of Gingerbread Lane. And in the summer the village, through the Hampton Jitney, runs a shuttle from that long-term parking facility to the core. There's also an award at the end of the season for whoever has used the shuttle the most. It's slowly gaining success, it's picking up more and more ridership, more and more people are using it. The parking in the core in the summer season is restricted to a two hour time limit, so it's for customers to now park in the core but it's quite an ordeal for an employee to park there and move the cars. We have also installed ticket machines which simply dispense a ticket that's time stamp, so it will read the date and the time on the ticket and you place that on your dashboard, once that time has expired you get a ticket. So in order to get a new ticket you've got to go in and out of the parking lot. And people have started to use the long-term facility.

The first thing that Walsh, Roberts and Todd did was they met with 18 different groups of approximately five to six people over a three day period, it was probably ten, eleven hours a day, and talked to builders, talked to all kinds of people in the community. From this, one of the things that they identified early one was the fact that people come to East Hampton Village not to shop, not to work, just because it's there, it's become a destination. So a lot of the cars which -- and this isn't figured into our parking, a lot of the cars simply come there just to walk around the village. It's kind of a dilemma. And the position I think that the CSE took was the more parking you build the more they're going to come. The village is a residential -- the village doesn't feel obligated to provide a commercial center for the Town of East Hampton. The town has other commercial centers that can support themselves and the village decided that quite strongly. The CSE took the position that we've got enough parking.

One of the other conflicts we have was the railroad station. The town residents were using the long-term parking facility to park their car for three weeks at a time and they would get on the train and go to the city. There was a public hearing regarding that and that was quite heated. A lot of this has to do with working out a relationship with the town so that both the town and the village understand where each other is coming from and begin to fair share the burden.

MR. MACCO:

Did you change the law, no more overnight parking at the train station? MR. CROSS:

No, I don't believe so.

MR. MACCO:

You can still park there for three weeks?

MS. ZUCKER:

It's two weeks.

MR. CROSS:

It was resolved.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

One of the things that I guess Roy Fedelem is working on right now because of the Village of Patchogue is the economic development study. And one of the things I talked to him about a month ago was, you know, there is a lot of parking in the village but there is really not enough parking. When I saw that, it's completely opposite of what they're finding in another village.

MR. CROSS:

You also have to understand, all the commercial properties in the village are already developed. If there's one or two vacant properties, I would be surprised, out of several hundred. There's probably 150 to 200 parcels in the Village that are commercial, they're already developed. One thing I should mention, in the process of doing this as a result of the town's recommendation that the village accommodate the EAP, the village adopted a moratorium and undertook a commercial district study; Walsh, Roberts and Todd was also participating in that. The document is of similar size and thickness and there was also a study of intersections by {Eisenbach} and Company. So a lot of work went into the recommendations that you're seeing here, there's a lot of background to support this position. I hope that answers your question. It's a unique situation, it's not something that I --

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Tedd, the other item you have here was some sort of limited bypass around the village. How would one structure that?

MR. CROSS:

The village simply wants to go on record that it would be supportive of that. We've got Montauk Highway, a long established artery, we're talking 350, 400 years now travel. It's being used for purposes other than it was originally intended, no one envisioned the cars, the speeds, the volume of traffic, the trucks and so on and so forth, that are presently relied upon. The unfortunate thing is that Montauk Highway goes through Watermill it goes through Wainscott, it goes through Bridgehampton, it goes through East Hampton, it goes right down the Main Street of all those communities. So you've got all this thru-traffic on the Main Street and it's a huge conflict between local traffic and thru-traffic and, therefore, the village is supportive of a some kind of a limited bypass.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

But they have no idea how they want to do it.

MR. CROSS:

It wouldn't happen within the Village, it would have to happen within the town.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

Right.

MR. CROSS:

This is one of these trade-offs.

MR. ROSAVITCH:

They put -- many years ago I remember when there was no bypass, they put that bypass through there. It doesn't seem to have effect any of the commercial interest on the Main Street in the community, but you still have a bypass through there.

MR. CROSS:

One of the major constraints is the fact that the railroad underpasses are of limited height, so trucks are required to go from north to south at particular locations, one of those locations happens to be in the village. There's another location just outside the village in the town, Stephen Hands Underpass by the airport which is very restrictive and the village would like to see the town make improvements to that and is agreeable to considering improvements to all the underpasses in order to alleviate the problem of trucks having to take certain routes through residential areas because of limited access on these underpasses.

MR. O'DEA:

Any school impacts in the village per se?

MR. CROSS:

The Village of East Hampton has the elementary school and the middle school which was the old high school located -- one is on Newtown Lane and one is by the long-term parking facility. The schools have pretty much carte blanche when they get ready to do something as far as expansion or as far as that nature. A fairly serious problem resulted up at the elementary schools. When parents were concerned about letting the children ride on the buses with older children, they began bringing their children to school deliberately and dropping them off. The school expanded, a fairly substantial addition but it didn't provide an appropriate parking facility to accommodate what was not foreseen, i.e. this delivery. So at eight o'clock in the morning on a fairly busy area, parents arrive one at a time with one child and drop them off at the front door of the school and it created quite a stir, it has been quite a problem for a long time. They have attempted to manage the property despite that. The fact that the school districts in the Town of East Hampton all have different tax bases also is problematic because they all come to the same high school which is just outside the village. The high school is going to be growing, it's going to need more and more room, so on and so forth, and there's just a lot of tension regarding that issue. A referendum to acquire additional space was just defeated. It's controversial.

MR. O'DEA:

Did you address anything in it, in this study?

MR. CROSS:

The village really doesn't have most of the problem again is between the town and the village. The town is supplying children to the high school, the village has a very small population, a very small school population. And the last attempt the village made to work with the school was unsuccessful. I think that's changed, I think things have changed with the students.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

We have before us a -- you have all received the summary of the comprehensive plan and we can either -- we could adopt it next month or we could adopt it today, depending on --

MR. MACCO:

I don't know if everybody received it. I just received my copy and I was able to look through it. Did everybody receive this?

MS. PETERSON:

I didn't get one.

MR. O'DEA:

I got it this morning.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Okay, why don't we then defer it until the next meeting?

MR. MARTIN:

We're not going to vote on it for or against?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Well, we'll read it.

MR. MARTIN:

The only thing I get out of this is that you don't want me to park in the village and I can't drive through either.

MR. MACCO:

And you can't stop and recreate.

MR. MARTIN:

Right.

MR. MACCO:

Unless you stop at George's house.

MR. MARTIN:

Anybody in the Village that wants to come to Smithtown, they're welcome, so park in my driveway.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Is there any other --

MR. THORSEN:

I would just like to say something. The citizens of the village are very concerned about attempts to tear down houses. You know, residences are right back up against the commercial village, and in the past a block was taken with houses to create a parking field. The main thing was that all the employees that parked in and take those very valuable spaces have now been given an outlying field in which they can park their cars and the village has provided a shuttle service to bring them down into the village, that has opened up the existing parking fields. I mean, it's a delight to shop in the village. Now, I'm outside the village, I'm in Amagansett, but I go into the village because I've got a bank there and a few other things, somehow I'll find a place to park. But come when they remove that system, on a Friday, a banking day or something, it's hard again to find a space because all the employees are back in the field. So there are ways of handling this not going into the residential areas to park. So if there's enough commercial there now and some proper adjustments of where the employees would park as well as customers, then they really don't need any more parking fields created. When a commercial -- I think, Gene, when a commercial establishment is created initially they have to provide certain parking, that's in the mix, that's still in the mix.

MR. CROSS:

The commercial development in the village is quite different. As I said, most of the commercial properties in the village are already developed. Also, in many instances those properties are preexisting, nonconforming, they far exceed the limits that presently exist. So the expansion of the existing facility is pretty much locked up. We're talking about a community that's been there for about 300 years, it's not something that arrived recently. So there really isn't a lot of change that takes place. The village is also acquiring some commercial properties, recently we have secured the acquisition of the Buick Dealership which would have -- it's a preexisting building, it would have required 85 parking spaces, 30 spaces on site available, it would have created a tremendous problem. But the village through the 2% land acquisition has been able to acquire that property and take that problem out of existence. So there's ample commercial uses in the village. The difficulty, if anything, is the fact that some of these commercial properties are now rental properties instead of being properties owned by storekeepers providing services to the local people, now they become rental properties -- we have Tiffany's moving in there, we have London Jewelers, we have stores that really aren't concerned with whether they sell anything or not, they have an address on Main Street. We have one jeweler that was advised in Sweden that the place to locate his business was Main Street, East Hampton, and that's tough. A rent for 1,500 square foot store on the corner of Main Street, \$200,000 a year. That's the dilemma, that's the issue that we need to address; how do we get more mom and pops that provide real goods and services.

MR. MACCO:

Send them all to Riverhead.

MR. MARTIN:

Isn't part of the concept to provide -- (inaudible, laughing going on in room.) I mean, it's good for Smithtown, it's good for Huntington, Islip, but when it comes to East Hampton it's different. We're not extending parking or make traffic flow through. I mean, we have a bypass that was designed that don't do Smithtown any good, it's to let the people from East Hampton go toward the west or the people from further that keep coming.

MR. THORSEN:

There's a sad thing about --

MR. MARTIN:

I mean, we're setting two different standards at this commission now, one for the east end, one for the --

MR. THORSEN:

There's a sad thing about bypasses.

MR. MARTIN:

It bothers me.

MR. THORSEN:

Route 39 was a bypass, it was built by DPW and it was originally -- the plan is all recommended limited access. But the politicians wanted retables along there for tax base, and so that's why we got the problem on Route 39. And the same thing happened along your Smithtown Bypass.

MR. ISLES:

Nesconset Highway.

MR. MARTIN:

I remember many, many things were made about going along the Long Island Railroad tracks, the towns and the villages came out in armor. It's not always done by somebody else. I mean, since I've been on here since 1960, whatever it was, 70, like that -- it was 70, I came here in 70 I think -- 30 years we always talked about extending Sunrise Highway. And to sum it up, what the reaction was, over our dead body. There wasn't any other thing but that, they wouldn't listen. When they wanted to take the right-of-way along the railroad, that was probably the way we should have went, but it was never done because the east end didn't want it.

MR. DIETZ:

Mr. Chairman, we're going to review the document?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Yes.

MR. DIETZ:

And then we'll bring it back and discuss it more at the next meeting?

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:

Yes, we'll make a recommendation.

MR. MACCO:
I move we adjourn.

CHAIRMAN EVERSOLL:
We have a second. All those in favor? Unanimous. Thank you. (*The meeting was adjourned at 2 P.M.*)