

SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Suffolk County Planning Commission was held at the Evans K. Griffing County Center in the Maxine S. Postal Legislative Auditorium at 300 Center Drive, Riverhead, New York on February 1, 2006 at 12 P.M.

PRESENT:

Robert Martin (Smithtown) - Acting Chairman
Charla Bolton (At Large)
Mary Daum (At Large)
Jesse Goodale, III (Riverhead)
Linda Holmes (Shelter Island)
John Caracciolo (Huntington)
Donald Fiore (Islip)
Constantine Kontokosta (Village 5000 & Under)
Sarah Lansdale (At Large)

ABSENT:

Louis Dietz (Babylon)
Laure Nolan (Village 5000 & Over)
Edward Pruitt (Brookhaven)

ALSO PRESENT:

Thomas Isles - Suffolk County Director of Planning
Andy Freleng - Suffolk County Chief Planner
Claire Chorny - Suffolk County Planning Department
Chris Wrede - Suffolk County Planning Department
Christina Farrell - Suffolk County Attorney
Peter Lambert - Suffolk County Planning Department
Ted Klein - Suffolk County Planning Department

Minutes taken by:

Eileen Schmidt - Secretary

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:10 P.M.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Good morning ladies and gentlemen Suffolk County Planning Commission is now in session. Will you please rise and join us in the salute to the flag, John please.

SALUTATION

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

We thank you. Members of the board have you seen the copy of the minutes of January 4th and noticed any errors or omissions?

MS. DAUM:

Yes, I saw a couple of errors I think even though I wasn't there; I think they're just typo's, but let me see what they are now. On page 21 at the bottom I think it's Ms. Holmes not Mr.

MS. HOLMES:

Oh yes, thank you.

MS. DAUM:

And again this is just a typo, but on the very last page I believe Acting Chairman Martin said everything is nice and quiet not quite. It's just a typo.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Anyone else? A motion's in order.

MR. CARACCILOLO:

A motion to accept the minutes.

MS. HOLMES:

Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Second. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. So accepted.
(Vote: 9-0-0-3 Absent: Dietz, Nolan, Pruitt) Thank you.

MR. ISLES:

Mr. Chairman, the next item on the agenda item #2 is required by the County Charter to be considered by you in February which is the organizational meeting of the Commission which is for the purpose of electing the officers to the County Planning Commission which you do as a group; and also to adopt the rules and proceedings. In view of the fact that there are a number of changes proposed within the Commission membership and in view of the fact that the County Attorney had issued an opinion officers must have terms of office and not be on

hold over terms. It would be suggested that we table -- that you table this at this time.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Board members have any problems with that? Anybody want to be heard on this issue? None? A motion's in order to adjourn.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Motion to table the --

MR. FIORE:

Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. So adjourned. **(Vote: 9-0-0-0 Absent: Dietz, Nolan, Pruitt)**

MR. ISLES:

Okay, we do have a public portion of the meeting, but I don't see anyone from the public present so we can dispense with that. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the Director's Report a couple of things I'd like to bring to your attention that relate to the Commission and affect the Commission in no particular order. But let me just begin with a resolution that is before the Legislature right now; it was the subject of a public hearing about two weeks ago. This resolution is identified as resolution 1065-2006 and it's entitled adopting a Local Law to promote non-political professional diverse County Planning Commission.

The County Executive has submitted this bill along with a number of legislative co-sponsors and it does affect the composition requirements of the County Planning Commission so to bring this to your attention. Right now there are 15 members to the County Planning Commission; that is not changing. The requirement geographically is that there be one member from each of the ten towns; that also is not changing as well as two representatives from villages and the three at large representatives. What will be different are a couple of things. One is that the legislation would require if approved by the Legislature that there also be an occupational or a knowledge requirement in terms of at least six of the positions must be from particular professional backgrounds.

So for example there is a position allocated for an environmental or civic representative in position allocated for municipal planning or land use law position or someone having that kind of background. A position from the real estate industry or from the business community; a position from the labor organization. A position from someone with a background in the field of transportation and then lastly a position from someone with a background in expertise or expertise in workforce housing. There's a final position that is identified specifically as being a representative or a recommendation from the

Suffolk County Association of Town Supervisors. So here again, the Commission would remain at 15 members; there would be representation from all the ten towns and at least two villages and there would be -- then this occupational criteria that would also apply as well.

The second major change in the new Charter proposal is that members of political parties in terms of being a political party officer would be prohibited from serving on the County Planning Commission. In addition, elected or appointed officials of any government in New York State would be prohibited from serving. Currently the Charter prohibits elected officials from being on the County Planning Commission; that's the same, but what would change is that appointed officials would not be able to serve as well. So if someone had a Civil Service position in governmental unit, a village or a town they could be appointed to the County Planning Commission. If they had an appointed position they could not be appointed. So that is applied broadly would include membership in planning boards, zoning boards, assessment boards as well as staff positions such as Commissioner of Planning and so forth. The idea behind that is to, here again, based on the title of the legislation is to provide for a non-political diverse professional planning board.

I think many of the members of the board as presently exist would fit into obviously, geographical as well as many of the occupational requirements. Let me just make sure; the terms of office would still remain the same which is a four year term depending on the -- when that term takes effect any existing member of the Commission. So this is approved by the Legislature. All members currently sitting on the Commission your term of office would come to an end at December 31, 2006. Obviously, before then the Legislature would then and the County Executive would presumably act to either reappoint members or appoint new members. So there would be this transition time where anybody who does not meet these requirements could stay on till the end of the year depending on what action is taken by the County Executive or the Legislature.

So this bill has been filed; it is going before the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee tomorrow and then next week it will be if it comes out of committee tomorrow it would be eligible for a vote by the Legislature next Tuesday. Obviously, if they choose to deliberate further on it it would go into March or potentially subsequent months. Certainly, if you want more information on that and certainly if you would like copies of the bill we can make them available to you.

In terms of some other items of business before the Commission let me just begin with greeting the newest member of our Commission who was appointed at the end of last year and that is Constantine Kontokosta who is with us today at the far end of the table there. Mr. Kontokosta represents villages less than 5,000 population. He's a resident of -- he's from Greenport and we welcome him to the Commission today. There are other appointments to the Commission that are

pending in the Legislature. The re-appointment of Commissioner Lansdale is pending. You probably had the shortest tenure of anybody; she came on the Commission in the Fall and her term expired at the end of December. We have two new appointments to the Commission one representing the Town of Smithtown and one representing an at large position from a resident, let me make sure no pardon me, it's villages greater than 5,000. So that's Adrienne Esposito representing the Village of Patchogue. So there are three pending appointments, one reappointment, two new appointments; those are currently in the legislative cycle. Those were scheduled for committee as well.

At this point in time we have 12 seats on the Commission filled out of the 15. If these appointments happen we would be maintaining our same number actually, so we still have three vacant positions beyond that.

A couple of other items of business for the Commission we do have for you today for your consideration proclamations from the Commission for some of the members that have left the Commission recently. And I'd just like to just pass this to the Chairman for your consideration. We have drafted suggested proclamations for, here again, four members of the Commission who did resign from the Commission and were replaced recently. And we would ask all the members to consider signing this as being standing members of the Commission presently even though you might not have known the members, but they did serve the public in Suffolk County. And we appreciate that and would like to recognize. We would typically invite these members back to the Commission to present the proclamations probably at the March meeting.

We, here again, just for informational purposes for the Commission the Planning Department's staff along with the Real Estate staff has engaged a process of meeting with all the towns in Suffolk County. We actually met here yesterday with the five east end towns individually on one hour meetings back to back and we'll be meeting Friday with the west end all regarding the County's open space program and farmland protection program. The purpose of these meeting is to make sure that the towns understand our programs and have as much information as they need to be able to work with us as closely as possible to partner with us on land acquisition matters. To coordinate which parcels the County's pursuing and which parcels the towns or villages are pursuing and perhaps where we can not step on each others feet and either work together or acknowledge which ones we're doing and which they're doing.

The land acquisition programs are very active; the County completed the acquisition of 1200 acres this past year in 2005 including 600 acres of farmland. We are proceeding to spend down the SOS money which was approved last year for \$75 million and I think we have close to \$90 million either in contract or accepted offers at this point. So that's been going very well. Related to this in some extent and let me just make this point is that the County Executive presented his State of the County message last week. Some of you may have

heard it, but one of the things he talked about that will affect the Commission and certainly will affect the County Planning Department is the -- noting the fact that the regional planning board the Long Island Regional Planning Board is in the process of completing what Dr. Koppelman identified as the third regional plan.

The Regional Board has the intention to complete that plan in the next several months as I gather it; they have completed drafts of numerous chapters of the plan. What the County Executive would like the County Planning Commission and Planning Department to do is to take an active role in working with both the Regional Board as well as with the towns in Suffolk County to mesh the two together to identify where there are aspects of perhaps the regional plan or the County plan that may affect the towns and we can provide support in that sense. And vice versa where the feedback from the towns as relates to the regional plan could be something that the County Planning Department could assist in implementing the plan.

The key point is that the ideas that the regional plan not be something that sits on a shelf that it not be a document that's not made aware to the towns and villages in Suffolk County. Here again, the County Executive feels that the Commission as well as the Department should engage this year in that process of serving as a liaison between the Regional Planning Board and their efforts as well as the towns and villages. We will be working on a work program on a suggested method for accomplishing that over the next approximately six weeks as we put that together. So that will be something that may require that the Commission become more active in and may require the Commission to have perhaps a special meeting on to get more into that; here again, the process is now started. There has been a strong stated by the County Executive of the importance of planning on the County level and there's an expectation on both the Commission and the Department to follow through on that. I'll get more information to the Commission as we define that specific project.

So I think that completes the items of business Mr. Chairman and certainly if there's --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

One question I have.

MR. ISLES:

Sure.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I heard that Laure Nolan has been replaced?

MR. ISLES:

Laure Nolan has not been replaced, but she has -- there is a resolution pending that would replace her. So she is still a member of the Commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Oh, that's what I meant.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

She's still a member?

MR. ISLES:

She's still a member as of today; one of the positions that is proposed to be replaced is her position representing villages greater than 5,000. That is an appointment that is being scheduled to the Environment Committee tomorrow. So hypothetically she could be replaced on next week, but here again, it's the decision of the committee to decide on that one.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Yeah, because she never misses two meeting in a row that's why I was surprised.

MR. ISLES:

Right. She didn't call to say she wouldn't be here, right Claire?

MS. CHORNY:

No.

MR. ISLES:

So she may be here she just might be running a little late possibly.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Well, if she comes around this time. Okay, next is Commissioner's Roundtable, right?

MR. ISLES:

Right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Anything new in Riverhead?

MR. GOODALE:

Not at this time I believe.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

We have a brand new member 5,000 and under, anything new?

MR. KONTOKOSTA:

No, not at this time.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Okay, nice to have you aboard I'm sure you're going to enjoy it.

MR. KONTOKOSTA:

Thank you. It's an honor to be here.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Thank you. Charla.

MS. BOLTON:

Even though I'm not from the Town of Riverhead I did want to mention one thing. There is a historic district that's being proposed they're a large historic district in the downtown of Riverhead. And that recently had a town board public hearing it hasn't been approved yet, but it looks very positive and it would really be the first downtown district that's been created. And expressly among other things for the purpose of revitalizing the downtown and there's over 220 buildings involved.

MR. ISLES:

That's proposed by the town board then?

MS. BOLTON:

Yes. It's been heard by the town board; it was proposed by the Landmarks Commission and there was little if any opposition at the public hearing and it does look very positive for approval. It hasn't been approved yet by the town board.

MR. ISLES:

The town did a request for expressions of interest in qualifications last year for redevelopment a part of the town downtown. Does it include that or exclude that?

MS. BOLTON:

I generally, I can tell you roughly - **microphone problem** -- anyway it's between the Peconic River and Railroad Street and then it goes up along Osborne I believe and then up over to I think it's called Pulaski Road. I wouldn't swear to that.

MR. GOODALE:

Yeah, Pulaski Street, yes. Yeah, I would say that the -- this is a separate thing from the request for -- not proposal, but a request for expression of interest. There are three being considered for downtown redevelopment by the town board still under consideration. There was a meeting about a week ago on this issue. The town board has not made a determination of which ones of these if

any of them will be ones that they wish to adopt as a kind of a planning document. But that is still an open item at the town board. The historic district is separate from that; I would say that the degree of opposition which is not substantial is basically as you would imagine from professional and land owners who are concerned that making changes in their building or additions or whatever will have to go through an additional regulated regulatory process. And I'm thinking their working hard to convince them that that will not be the case, but I think that's been the major rather than objections to the idea is the concern that this will add additional regulation to the process of getting approvals for changes, additions whatever for a particular building.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Thank you. Don.

MR. FIORE:

Nothing at this time.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Linda.

MS. HOLMES:

Well, yes. I don't know whether our supervisor mentioned to you yesterday Tom, but the town board is working very hard on the affordable housing initiative and senior housing. They are very excited to be really making progress on implementing the regulations that's been on the books for four -- five years now implementing it for the first time where special use districts are created for affordable or senior housing. And they're working very hard to come up with a plan that pleases everybody and you can appreciate how hard that is, but they're very grateful for impute from staff. Some material that Andy sent me and very, very appreciative of the sample regulations from the Town of Huntington that Craig Turner sent me at Charla's suggestion; that's been very helpful to our supervisor. So we are pleased, the whole town is pleased to think that we are moving ahead on this. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Thank you Linda. Mary.

MS. DAUM:

Nothing at this time.

MS. LANSDALE:

Nothing at this time.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

John.

MR. CARACCILO:

No, Mr. Chairman nothing.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I only have one thing to say; at the next regular meeting I'm hoping we can resolve the officers. There's three positions, you know, there's going to be the Chairman, there's going to be the Vice Chairman and there is no Secretary at this time. It's my recollection that I know will not be running and I don't think Lou Dietz can run either. I think he's on a planning board. So there'll be no incumbents.

MR. ISLES:

(inaudible)

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

So anybody that's interested in one of the sits should give us some thought so next week if am here next month or whoever handles it will be able to go on with the business. You can't be looking for a Chairman and a Vice Chairman and a Secretary at the last minute. Yes, Charla.

MS. BOLTON:

I can understand the positions of Chairman and Vice Chairman, but where does the Secretary fit in?

MR. ISLES:

Well, that is the position that's in the County Charter so.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

That's in the Charter.

MS. BOLTON:

Really.

MR. ISLES:

In terms of the actual duties and obligations it's not too demanding, but there may be occasional certifications, but it's very rare.

MS. BOLTON:

I was just curious.

MR. ISLES:

So it's probably not a bad position to get actually in some ways.

MR. GOODALE:

Nice title with no work.

MS. HOLMES:

I'll apply for that.

MS. BOLTON:

I never get those.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

It's a little hard when you're a man and you're their secretary that's harder to explain, but a woman you can explain it. Okay.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Can you strike that from the record please?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Okay, so I'll leave it up to you to come up with a slate, but what we use to do years ago every moved up a step, but we use to have a slate pretty much that was put up and seemed to work easier and this way do everything on the side --

MS. HOLMES:

Do we have a slate?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

We have no slate now because there's no incumbents.

MS. HOLMES:

Yes, everybody was hold over that's what I thought.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

We have no incumbents at all because we all fell into future legislation. And so we don't want to cause a problem so we just let it go as it is, but I think now it's settled. I don't see any problem of them passing those resolutions. They never had the majority that's why they could never pass it, but now they're the majority and I don't see any problem with that at all. Okay. So we know where we're going for the next week, next month not next week. Okay. Now the next regular business is Tim, right?

MR. ISLES:

No, Peter Lambert. The next item is number six which is -- this is something that has been before the Commission on a couple of occasions and it's in accordance with General Municipal Law in New York State, but as we've talked about as you know the State of New York has a planned project to reconstruct SR 347 Nesconset Highway that extend through a small portion of the Town of Islip, a significant portion of the Town of Smithtown and well into the Town of Brookhaven. Peter Lambert our principal planner in the Planning Department has been assisting the Commission with this and has written up a review. At a meeting that was held in December we did have representatives from the Town

of Smithtown as well as Brookhaven here to present information to the Commission. What we've done with that is Peter's evaluated the information of the letter that came in and has revised his report to reflect those comments. So I'd like to ask Peter then to provide the Commission with just a run through on your report and the recommendations.

Just so you know too the -- under General Municipal Law both the State and County any State or County highway projects are required to be referred to the County Planning Commission. Your role is to then have the option of providing suggestions and the language in the legislation is suggestions. So you don't have the final stamp of approval or disapproval, but it is compulsory that the referral be made to the Commission and that's what DOT has done in this case; and here again, you may offer back suggestions if you choose to do so.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Mr. Lambert.

MR. LAMBERT:

Okay, I'm just going to go through these suggestions that came which are similar to our recommendations in the past. Based on existing conditions and growth expectations the traffic carrying capacity of Route 347 should be expanded, but we do acknowledge that the improvements as proposed may not go far enough to allow for the roadway to adequately support traffic volumes and traffic growth.

MS. SCHMIDT:

Something is going on with this.

MR. LAMBERT:

It's going on and off.

MR. ISLES:

Peter why don't you just describe in that first recommendation a little bit about the significance of 347 in terms of the and I know you talk about this in the past, but I think it's important to point out too retail centers, office, multi-family and increase growth possibilities east in Brookhaven.

MR. LAMBERT:

Right. Well, the whole Route 347 corridor which touches on Smithtown and Brookhaven as Tom said and also it borders on the Town of Islip as well. So it serves a very large area; the entire north central section of the County and it attracts traffic from an even wider area. It's sort of unique in that it's diagonal. It's not an east-west or north-south route like many of major arterials are; and it also has an overwhelming amount of retail and housing. In terms of retail there are 3.7 million sq. ft. of shopping center space directly on Route 347; that doesn't include nearby Route 25 or other areas nearby that have quite a bit of shopping

center space. And in fact the Lake Grove area has the most shopping center space of any particular community in Suffolk County.

As far as housing I think we have several thousand multi-unit housing complexes directly on Route 347 and quite a bit more has been proposed and built in recent years. As far east as Mount Sinai and Miller Place we have more than a thousand units of new housing that have been built in the past five years. So all of these factors contribute to the fact that we have increasing congestion, increasing use of Route 347 and the level of service has declined accordingly over the past 20-30 years. So we tried to come up with some comments and suggestions that were more regional in scope and not in particular to the specific engineering details of the State's plans.

Since we are very long into the planning process of upgrading the roadway we feel that the current favored plan for improving Route 347 should go forward hopefully with some modifications as I'll describe in the suggestions.

More limited access features should be incorporated into the design. Multiple access points to individual properties should be reduced and the number of new driveways on to Route 347 should be severely limited. Unsignalized street intersections should be eliminated as well and new signalized intersections which there are a couple of them in the design they should not be created. At the same time upgrading and widening of residential side streets near Route 347 should be limited to maintain the residential nature of these roads.

Impacts to nearby residences should be adequately mitigated through measures such as sufficient landscaping and if necessary as a last resort noise barriers which tend to be unsightly. The aesthetics of the highway itself should be improved by attractive bridge design and adding landscaping to medians and along the highway to create a parkway effect. The needs of pedestrians and bicyclists should be considered thoroughly and they should be included in the final design. And as a final comment New York State should coordinate it with the Towns of Smithtown, Islip and especially Brookhaven regarding the existing and proposed comprehensive plans for each town in order to coordinate land use recommendations within the 347 corridor. Those are our suggestions.

MR. ISLES:

Somewhat generic in nature and some of them I think are probably really you can't dispute them, you know, you make it pretty or make it nicer and so forth. Fundamentally, there obviously are issues with the planning of 347 in terms of the fact that it bi-sects a number of communities. It has this conflict in terms of serving a regional transportation purpose, but also here again, affecting individual communities in neighborhoods. Fundamentally, we feel that some capacity enhancement of 347 is important not to the point of full blown arterial highway standards, but at least some capacity improvement. The highway volumes have gone up 50% since 1996 and also for safety purposes; so there

are three great separations, bridges that are proposed in the project we think those make sense. So really in meetings with Mr. Kontokosta recently and he pointed out as the word balance.

In some respects having this highway going through this part of Suffolk County is somewhat harsh; everybody thinks of 347 as being ugly to some extent congested. If we make it bigger is it going to make it worst; is it going to draw more traffic to it and really not solve problems. On the other hand as we look well into the future in terms of that part of Suffolk County and the Towns of Brookhaven and Smithtown unlike the south shore of the County and Islip and Babylon and so forth where you've got Montauk Highway, Sunrise Highway, Southern State Parkway all relatively close and parallel to one another. So you can have a hierarchy of highway access this is pretty much it; and the other affect then is the more congested Nesconset Highway becomes the more displacement of traffic to other roads, to neighborhoods, to 25A and so forth. So this is for your consideration.

MS. SCHMIDT:

Oh.

Sound system problems.

MR. ISLES:

I didn't do anything.

MS. SCHMIDT:

Just keep going.

MR. ISLES:

This is for your consideration. Here again, we understand the magnitude of the project, but trying to offer some suggestions and guidance to the State of New York. Your pleasure --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Do you want to vote?

MR. ISLES:

There's a question over there.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Yes.

MS. BOLTON:

I wanted to ask Peter a question. I drove out on 347 this morning between Veterans Highway and out to Route 112 and I drove out at what I thought would be a pretty much a peak hour which was a little bit before 9 o'clock. And it moved very well the whole way and it really didn't even look congested in either

direction. So I'm wondering these figures are they -- do you have peak figures that are -- is it sometime else that this is happening? I was a little mystified.

MR. LAMBERT:

I think the traffic figures that we have access to are average annual daily traffic. So it's the total account for the entire day and when you compare that it's going to bring in the afternoon and evening rush which could potentially be worst because people are doing other things besides journey to work trips. They're doing shopping trips, visiting trips and so forth, but yeah, I can't explain the day that you had which was pretty lucky.

MS. BOLTON:

Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

And when you drove, where did you go? Down all the way down on Veterans Highway?

MS. BOLTON:

Yeah.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Well, the heavier traffic part is on 347 side.

MS. BOLTON:

No, I was on 347. I was on 347.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

And you came through Smithtown? No, you went toward the airport.

MS. BOLTON:

I was on 347.

MR. ISLES:

Pass the mall and Moriches Road, Nichols Road.

MS. BOLTON:

Right, exactly.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Did you go that way?

MS. BOLTON:

Yeah.

MR. ISLES:

That's actually the most congested area.

MS. BOLTON:

All the way out passed --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

That's what I was saying, that's the most congested area on that road.

MS. BOLTON:

And I continued about four blocks passed Nichols Road.

MR. ISLES:

Okay.

MS. BOLTON:

Out to 112, actually, more than four blocks cause ultimately I went to 112. Yeah, I was surprised.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Four blocks passed Nichols Road where Home Depot is.

MS. BOLTON:

Yeah, in the morning, yeah.

MR. ISLES:

We have a question.

MS. DAUM:

Actually, just a comment that I add is having driven from the County offices in Hauppauge all the way to Shoreham sometimes when these meetings have been done are a little later in the afternoon the school when the school buses are running and people are going back and forth to school really adds a lot of traffic. So in my experience you actually have heavier traffic say around 3 o'clock in the afternoon than you do at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. So in the morning it may be equivalent.

MS. BOLTON:

Okay. I guess my bottom line question was is this really necessary.

MR. LAMBERT:

Right. I think the consensus is yes.

MR. ISLES:

Interestingly too, it's built as a bypass to 25A when it was originally built and then --

MR. LAMBERT:

25. yeah.

MR. ISLES:

25 - now it's become congested where the point is it pushes traffic up to 25 and 25A at time too. Do you remember the bypass?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Not to keep beating a dead horse, I live about four miles I guess from Hauppauge off this, okay.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I don't go that way much anymore; it use to take me sometimes longer to go those four miles than to come out here which is 30 miles that's how heavy and congested it gets. If there's ever an accident where that circle is and they stop the traffic Brookside Drive near the golf course and accident there you could spend an hour on that stretch of road. It's 65 or 70,000 cars a day; that's a lot of cars and the day is only like 12 hours really cause during the middle of the night it's not bad and I live about 500 ft. off it so I know when it's backed up. It backs up to my house.

MS. DAUM:

Could I ask another question? What is the ultimate disposition of these suggestions? When we've got suggestions and we've got recommendations in here and the recommendations are a little truncated from the comments and suggestions although you read them when you were speaking before. The reason that I ask specifically is that in the recommendation list at the end of this there's the comment about more limited access features should be incorporated, but the additional aspect of reduced access to individual properties isn't included in that and it just seems to be that that when those are taken together that you actually end up segregating the roadway from the communities and that's a good thing. Rather than having it kind of integrated so people are coming in and out all the time. The more you can segregate that highway from the communities that it's going through the better it is for the community. So depending on how this goes I for one would like to make sure that that aspect of your thing was in there.

MR. ISLES:

It's elaborated. Do you want to comment?

MR. LAMBERT:

Right. I think what happens is when we create a resolution only the recommendations go into that resolution. So we could incorporate what it says in the report into the recommendations to make sure that that goes to the state.

MR. ISLES:

Right. So what would happen is that we would prepare on behalf of the Commission a resolution of the Commission incorporating the suggestions and certainly as you said we can elaborate that particular point further.

MR. CARACCIOLO

Peter, you mentioned in the report Smithaven Mall, the largest shopping mall in Suffolk County. You know there's a lot of construction going on in Smithaven Mall right now? In the report it also mentioned that one of the recommendations is preplanning with the Town of Brookhaven and Smithtown and Islip. Is there any preplanning or any conversation planned to be dealing with the Simon people as they develop that mall? Are they being coordinated with different on ramps and off ramps on 347 into that mall?

MR. LAMBERT:

Not that I know of; they would be coordinating with the Town of Smithtown and --

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Because they're doing a lot of construction at that mall right now on the outskirts of -- right on the edge of 347.

MR. LAMBERT:

Right. Part of the plan calls for changes I think to Alexander Avenue, but I'm not specifically -- I don't recall specifically what they are, but I guess they would have to coordinate with the Town of Smithtown on that.

MR. ISLES:

Right and I think maybe Brookhaven and also the Village of Lake Grove depending on exactly --

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Half of that, right half of that mall is in the Village of Lake Grove and half of it is in Smithtown?

MR. ISLES:

Smithtown, right?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Smithtown and Brookhaven Town.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

And Brookhaven, that's a lot of coordination.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Well, the last I heard about the improvements at the mall that the (inaudible) had been sitting with the owners. He's changed where the transportation will come in; outside buses -- they changed the loading docks and still made it accessible to the mall because we're trying to get as many people on the buses as we can especially the seniors they have no way to get to the mall.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

They're changing the entrance as you enter the mall the lanes, so that they'll move in faster and easier, but whatever you do the traffic is the traffic.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Right, no I just hate to see this project go to develop 347 and then have the mall do something on their own.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

And this must be the third or fourth plan that they had; they never fulfilled the other three. I guess this will die --

MR. CARACCIOLO:

That's the mall or the roadway?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

No, the road itself 347.

MR. ISLES:

At least.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

It must be the third or fourth they talked everything and they never done anything outside of cleaning up a little bit and widening it and if you ask them how much money is allotted there probably isn't any yet. There's no plans made up so this is a long way off. It's a shame, but the traffic there is just impossible.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLES:

Just to answer your question too, I mean, in terms of specific site work and access to the state highway that would be permit requirement through New York

State DOT. So if they're working with the town on reconfiguring access, but if they're touching the state highway they do need state permits for that. And secondly, Simon Properties would be able to come in the SEQRA process. The State of New York has held a number of public meetings on this, you know, formal public meetings, but also through the SEQRA process they can provide comments. It's another example though of the fragmentation of a lot of these decisions where the mall is in three municipal jurisdictions.

MS. HOLMES:

May I ask question? Don't I remember from the last time that there was hope that this project could move forward because there had been finally some state funding allocated, what was that?

MR. ISLES:

The last I heard I'm not sure of the funding and I can never quite map, you know, keep track of exactly when they come in and out, but the -- my understanding is that the intent was to start this project in 2008; now that was back in the middle of last summer. So that would definitely be a phased project where they do pieces at a time so that's the most optimistic scenario. It could then be delayed by design decisions and planning decisions and then actually engineering this; buying the land that might be needed for any widening for bridges and so forth and then preparing contracts and letting contracts. So it's certainly not eminent, but optimistically they could start doing some work in 2008.

MS. HOLMES:

But I thought there was some statement that there had finally been some funding allocated to -- because in the past plans were drawn up, but they weren't funded by state so the plans never went anywhere? What I'm I, what I'm I --

MR. LAMBERT:

I imagine the Transportation Bond Act that was just approved in November included --

MS. HOLMES:

I think it did include that -- that's what I --

MR. LAMBERT:

-- some funding that if it had been voted down there would have been probably a five year delay.

MS. HOLMES:

Yes.

MR. LAMBERT:

Right.

MS. HOLMES:

Okay. So it was --

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Right now they are doing some work; they're cleaning up a little bit if you go down there. They're talking about Brookside Drive that's a bad intersection, but I think the overall funding is not there not for what was described. I think the state's always been working on there. What we did we widen with in the right-of-way if you notice if you ride down you'll see the lanes a little wider and that helps, but still the cars are there. So I don't know where the funding will come from, but if it comes we'll welcome it.

MR. ISLES:

I mean, the state is definitely moving on this; this is an active project whether they're going to get all the funding they need is hard to say at this point.

MS. HOLMES:

But there is some provided in the Transportation Bond Act that was approved. Yeah, that's what I'm remembering.

MR. LAMBERT:

I believe so not for the entire project.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Clean up of the road.

MR. LAMBERT:

Right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Not this.

MR. LAMBERT:

Piecemeal intersection funding that kind of thing.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Right. So we'll see what happens. Three years they'll be another Governor; maybe he'll like Long Island who knows what happens, but right now it's a problem. Okay. Anything else, Mr. Lambert?

MR. LAMBERT:

No, that's all.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Any other board members? A motion's in order.

MS. HOLMES:

I move to adopt the staff recommendations with the amplification you suggested.

MR. ISLES:

Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Second?

MR. GOODALE:

Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. I abstain.

MR. ISLES:

We will prepare the resolution with the motion that was just adopted and we will provide a copy to you for the next meeting too.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Eight and one abstention. **(Vote: 8-0-1-3 Abstain: Martin, Absent: Dietz, Nolan, Pruitt)** Andy.

MR. FRELENG:

Good afternoon members of the Commission. With regard to General Municipal Law 239 LM and N. This is the regulatory part of the Commission meeting with respect to subdivisions we did not have any subdivisions that rose to a level of Inter-Municipal or Regional significance. Let me check that, we did have one, but we deemed it incomplete; we're waiting for additional information so there wouldn't be any subdivisions this month. Therefore, the first regulatory matter related to municipal zoning actions -- this would be coming from the Town of Babylon. This is the application of Oak Grove; jurisdiction for the Commission is that the subject application is adjacent to Oak Street which is CR 12.

The applicants are seeking Town Board Change of Zone approval from G Industry to MR for a 1.9 acre portion of a 2.6 acre parcel in order to construct 38 attached units. The subject parcel is located at the south east corner of Pine Street which is a town road and Railroad Avenue which is also a town road. The parcel fronts on Oak Street as mentioned which is CR 12 and that's to the south. A separate lot also part of this application fronts on Oak Street. The subject properties are situated in the hamlet of Copiague. So you can see up on the aerial the subject property is in two lots. We'll get into a little more detail, but the application is to split this part of the lot and change the zone to MR leaving this existing structure here and the associated parking for the structure would be here.

Analysis of the character of the land use and zoning pattern in the vicinity indicates that the subject parcel is in a corridor of industrial and business zoning. If we could see the zoning map a sec; the zoning map is a little bit fuzzy, but I think you can make it out. To the west the subject zone change site to the west of that site are zoned industrial and they have a mix of non-conforming residential dwellings and as-of-right commercial and industrial uses. South and east of the subject site a commercial and light industrial uses. The Long Island Railroad right-of-way runs east-west north of Railroad Avenue and the subject zone change property fronts on Railroad Avenue to the north. Railroad Avenue this is the subject zone change; this is the County Road Oak Street. Okay, you can see that there's a bunch of non-conforming homes. There's some businesses adjacent to the site on either side and this strip here is a mix of single family homes and then some home business type uses as well as some strip retail. So this is a real mix in reality.

As mentioned the applicants are seeking a Town Board Change of Zone approval from G Industry to MR which is Multi-Residence for 1.9 acre portion of a 2.6 acre parcel in order to construct 38 attached units with related parking, drainage and landscaping improvements. The proposal involves the partial demolition of 61,388 sq. ft. of an existing 83,409 sq. ft. industrial building. This is the site of the proposed units. In addition there's a subdivision of the parent 2.6 acres into two lots; 1.9 acres for the MR zone change and 0.7 acres for the remainder of the existing building and this facility is suppose to continue operation. The 1.76 acres of off-site parking is part of the application and is to provide parking for the remainder 22,071 sq. ft. existing industrial operation. This is the business of Federation Employment and Guidance Services. So just to recap they're going to, go back to the air photo a second, they're going to demolish the top half -- all sorts of technical difficulties today.

Needed to get a new pointer.

Okay, they're going to demolish this huge industrial building and they're going to break it apart in half -- oh I'm sorry, they're going to demolish this top half. This is where they want to construct the multiple family units. It involves a subdivision; this is actually a shadow I believe. It involves a subdivision of the lot into two parcels and again there's this extra parcel here for parking. Now the proposed site of the MR development is substandard for this district. The MR zone requires two acres for a minimum lot area. The proposal is to create only 1.9 acres and that is referred to as Parcel A. The lot would be 5% deficient in lot area. There appears to be no reason to subdivide the parent parcel into a non-conforming situation with a minimum lot size in the adjacent E Business District is 10,000 sq. ft. The proposed 0.7 acre or 33,492 sq. ft. E Business lot which is Parcel B has sufficient excess area to subdivide the parcel into two conforming lots. This may require the reduction in square footage of the proposed remnant industrial building however. So they're proposing to split the lots as I mentioned

for whatever reason they cut the parcel here which makes them about 5% deficient in the required lot area for MR zone. They could've brought this line right across which probably would have given them that extra couple of extra thousand square feet to meet the zone, but that would have resulted in the reduction in the industrial building. We didn't get inside the industrial building; I don't know if they're a critical operations back there if there's a reason why they chose not to break off that small amount of space. But in any event they did create a substandard parcel for the top lot.

The proposed dwelling unit density also is significantly in excess of the maximum ten units per acre for the MR District. The 1.9 acre should yield 19 one-bedroom units maximum pursuant to the regulations of the district. The request is approximately 50% greater than the permitted amount. The excess unit density creates the need for front, side, rear and building separation variances from the town. There appears to be no substantial public benefit for the change of zone and excess density; any contemplated increase in multi-family -- in multi-residence density should only be affected through enacted amendments to the zoning ordinance with standards for affordable workforce housing purposes. There is no element in this application for workforce or next generation housing.

The 1998 Town of Babylon Comprehensive Plan recommends "Ultralight Industry" for the subject zone change parcel. The request then would be inconsistent with the recommendations of the Town Comprehensive Plan.

Issues related to the subject application stem from the Commissions policies regarding the over-intensification of land use and good site planning. It is the belief of the staff that the proposed change of zone and the construction of 38 units on 1.9 acres is an unwarranted over-intensification of the use of the premises. In addition, the resultant zone change would be inconsistent with the pattern of zoning in the surrounding area and therefore may be considered as a spot zoning. The zone change would constitute a non-comprehensive alteration of the pattern of zoning in the area and is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan of the Town of Babylon which calls for "Ultralight Industry" at this location.

Staff is recommending disapproval for the following reasons. The first reason being that it's an over-intensification of the use. The second reason being that it is a spot zoning. The third reason being that it is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the comment and paragraph which follows is the rationale derived from the staff report. That is the recommendations of staff.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Thank you. Board members?

MS. BOLTON:

I'll move the staff recommendations.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

John second. All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. So recommending staff report for disapproval. **(Vote: 9-0-0-3 Absent: Dietz, Nolan, Pruitt)**

MR. FRELENG:

Thank you.

MR. WREDE:

Good afternoon. The next zoning application for your consideration is Seaview Marine Corp. The applicant seeks a special exception to continue the use of property for the storage, display and sales of new and used cars and to maintain two residential houses.

The subject parcel is located on the south side of Montauk Highway, 220 ft. west of Buchanan Avenue. Our jurisdiction for the application is adjacent Montauk Highway and within 500 ft. of the Village of Amityville which is right across the way from Ketchome's Creek. An analysis of the character of the area indicates the property is in a corridor of E Business zoning on both sides of Montauk Highway and residential down both north and south of the E Business zoning. Here's the E Business corridor E Business and Residential on both sides.

The subject property is 17,460 sq. ft. in area and improved with a one-story frame building utilized as offices associated with automobile sales and two two-family dwellings at the southern portion of the property. This is the automobile building and the two residential houses down on the creek there. A special exception is sought by the applicant to continue the sale, display and storage of both new and used motor vehicles. This use is only permitted by special exception from the Board of Appeals. The applicant also wishes to maintain the two residential houses which are not permitted in the E Business zone. I did have conversations with town ZBA staff; they indicated that these houses were constructed in the 1950's and they are legally existing with current certificates of occupancy.

The required parking for the application is 17 stalls which are provided for as indicated on the site plan. They are haphazard to say the least and the required amount of parking is 17 stalls, but staff feels that at least four spaces are problematic. One and two are located up here; if they're permitting the storage of cars here we find that if parking is going to occur there they're going to have to all the way around and we feel that these are problematic. And spots 10 and 11 down here because they are back to back with these spots here. In addition, staff feels that a greater effort is needed to separate the residential and

commercial uses. Staff is recommending that a landscape buffer of at least 30 ft. which is the minimum front yard requirement of the residential C District be provided to help preserve the residential amenities by reducing noise levels and minimizing visual intrusion. And providing this buffer may further lead to a diminishment in parking. If we extend the buffer between the existing houses and the automobile operation we may cut into parking up in these spots as well.

So staff is recommending disapproval. Granting the special exception for the sales of automobiles on the property will exacerbate parking problems on the subject property and may result in conflicts with the non-conforming residential use. And approval of the variance may necessitate the use of Montauk Highway for parking purposes diminishing the safety and traffic capacity of the state road. That is the staff report.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Thank you.

MR. GOODALE:

I'm a little bit -- this is an application to continue something that's going on now?

MR. WREDE:

That's correct.

MR. GOODALE:

Was it not being done legally? Why would they need something to continue doing it legally?

MR. WREDE:

Perhaps they maybe selling the property and they need to have it legalized. I went out there and the aerial photograph indicates and this is 2004 that the operation was going on, but going out recently it was vacant.

MR. GOODALE:

Okay. So it maybe discontinued and now they want to pick it up again.

MR. WREDE:

Right.

MR. GOODALE:

Thank you.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

I have a question.

MR. WREDE:

Sure.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Because you're recommending disapproval yet we're also recommending a landscape buffer in narrative. What are you thinking?

MR. WREDE:

Right. Well, they're not going to move the houses so if they were to continue you this even though we're recommending denial at least if the town overrides, you know, maybe they will take into consideration to provide the buffer to separate the two uses.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

I understand thanks.

MS. HOLMES:

In other words, the buffer is recommended because they're may be somebody else coming in to use the property and the town should insist that anybody using the property should create more of a buffer than is there now?

MR. WREDE:

Right, for visual intrusion and, you know, they may, you know, if I'm going to shop for a car here I might use their parking space and then they're not going to have no place to park

MS. HOLMES:

Yeah. Is there a buffer at all now between the business and the residential?

MR. WREDE:

There is it's very hard to see on aerial, but there is some trees here and actually again, this is 2004, going out to the site I didn't notice this anymore. So this may have been removed.

MS. HOLMES:

Oh dear.

MR. WREDE:

Yes, so we feel that at least, you know, separate the two uses at least 30 ft. and again, that's the minimum Residential C front yard setback.

MS. HOLMES:

It looks, you mean, other words it looks as if the tree have already been cleared away?

MR. WREDE:

That's correct.

MS. HOLMES:

So a fait accompli has happened here.

MR. WREDE:

Mmmm.

MS. HOLMES:

Yeah, typical.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Any other questions? A motion's in order.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

A motion to accept the staff report.

MS. HOLMES:

Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. So adopted staff report.

(Vote: 9-0-0-3 Absent: Dietz, Nolan, Pruitt)

MR. WREDE:

Okay. The last application for your consideration is the Town of Riverhead. The applicant is Osborne Associates. The applicant seeks variances for an existing 5,045 sq. ft. building for retail use. The subject property is located on the northwest corner of Osborne Avenue and the Long Island Railroad. Our jurisdiction for the application is that it is within 500 ft. of County owned land. This building here is the Cornell Cooperative Extension. This is the Riverhead Library and this is the Polish Hall and we're approximately down here off the map.

An analysis of the character of the area indicates that the subject parcel is located in a concentration of Village Center zoned property. To the north the property abuts single family residences. To the west undeveloped residentially zoned property and to the south the Long Island Railroad and to the east the property abuts Osborne Avenue.

The subject property is 13,713 sq. ft. in size and improved with an existing 5,045 sq. ft. building. The applicant seeks parking and landscaping variances for the proposed retail use. This building was a hardware store back in the 1940's. They totally renovated it and they're seeking to do retail use. The requested variances associated with the application is as follows: to reduce the minimum parking spaces from 27 to 5 and to reduce the minimum required landscaping from 15% to 0. With regard to the parking deficiency the Town of Riverhead's Village Center Zoning Code allows for a 20% reduction in off street parking where credible evidence is provided by traffic counts or data by a licensed traffic

engineer. No such data was forwarded to staff. In addition, there is no available on street parking on Osborne Avenue. Staff does note the restraints of the size of the property basically prohibits a lot of uses especially retail and they are to be commended, you know, to utilizing the existing structure sort of an adapted reuse. But we feel that retail might be a little too intense for the size of the property.

We're recommending disapproval. The proposed request for the variances constitute the unwarranted over-intensification of the use of the premises. They're providing only 19% of the required parking and approval of the variance may necessitate the use of the town roads and the Long Island Railroad property for parking purposes. And that's the recommendation of the staff.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

What kind of retail is this going to be where only five people are going to park?

MR. WREDE:

You know I don't know. All I know it was a retail; the premise is currently vacant it's renovated, but I don't know what kind of retail.

MR. GOODALE:

If I might this being the first application that has reached the desk here from Riverhead since I've been here for the past month; I inquired a bit about it. Historically, this was the, out there a very famous Golding's Hardware Store which has been dilapidated for many years even though it was opened until a few years ago. First of all, it's unclear to me why we would even bother having this little thing here, but it's only because it's within 500 ft. --

MR. WREDE:

Correct.

MR. GOODALE:

Just for my own purposes and I have other reasons for it not for this which I think personally that it's ridiculous. The -- we would -- the County would receive this application before there were any hearings in Riverhead or decisions in Riverhead to say from the Board of Appeals and so forth, right? And this report should be of their consideration of the appeal process?

MR. WREDE:

It should be however, I can tell you that I believe the hearing for this property has already been heard even --

MR. GOODALE:

Yeah, go ahead, but not a decision reached?

MR. WREDE:

I don't know the decision; I didn't follow-up. We -- as you know we only meet once a month and generally, you know, it's my experience that municipalities do not, you know, give enough time for us to act. You know sometimes we'll get it on a day and then the hearing will be three weeks later and, you know, I don't -- we only have the meetings once a month.

MR. GOODALE:

Also there would be no -- in general would be the case that when you got this you would generally not -- you wouldn't discussed this matter with the local town planning department would that be normal or no?

MR. WREDE:

No, that's common; as a matter of fact I did, his name was Bob Goldman from the Zoning Board of Appeals staff of Riverhead. I inquired about the, you know, the historical nature of the store, you know, what existed. So I was in contact, but I generally don't ask them, you know, are you going to approve or disapprove or anything like that I'm kind of looking at it and staff is looking at it, you know, what we have.

MR. GOODALE:

Okay. Just again this is just for my general information not for this particular. And finally, and this is the -- couple more things -- I know there's one should be coming forward involving formally naming Central Suffolk Hospital which just had its name changed.

MR. WREDE:

Okay.

MR. GOODALE:

And I presume that's in the staff working because that I know had a hearing before the Zone Board of Appeals.

MR. WREDE:

You mean they were basically extending the hospital?

MR. GOODALE:

They had -- they got 17 different variances on there right on Rte 58 it's a County road.

MR. WREDE:

I recall that; I believe I sent it back for local determination.

MR. GOODALE:

Right, because of the use.

MR. WREDE:

Right and the size constraints.

MR. GOODALE:

Okay. That's what I was concerned --

MR. WREDE:

I believe they --

MR. GOODALE:

Funny, there's one more thing and then I'll shut up. On this particular one I spoke to Mr. Hanley our planning director for a few minutes on this matter and he thought well, maybe what should've been done here not necessarily from us, but from the planning processor is that because they are right next to the parking district of the Town of Riverhead which is just south of the railroad and they're just north of it.

MR. WREDE:

Right.

MR. GOODALE:

And he thought a good suggestion would be that for them to apply to get into the parking district and pay the fee, the tax to be in the parking district in return for their ability to have fewer parking spaces on the site itself since it was right in his -- right next where the parking district extends.

MR. WREDE:

Right.

MR. GOODALE:

So and I said well, now again, this is not really that important, but if it -- would that be something if it would be worthwhile for, for the County to suggest as a possible solution to part of the problem in this, would that be?

MR. WREDE:

Right. All I had indicated, you know, the Planning staff was looking for something, you know, 27 spaces --

MR. GOODALE:

Five it's just absurd.

MR. WREDE:

It's going to be tight and there was no available parking on Osborne; you would have to be on the shoulder and again, I think the code was written, you know, that they can decrease their amount of parking by 20% if they provided some, but so if they somehow are going to try and make the -- you know there's going

to be a parking shortage on this property no doubt about it, but it's not the 1940's anymore. So if they provided something, okay, we'll try and do this or, you know, we will we'll use municipal parking then we would probably okay it.

MR. GOODALE:

Okay.

MR. CARACCILOLO:

It that parking -- is that municipal parking lot right adjacent to the property

MR. GOODALE:

No, it's not a lot; it's in the district and the district has a lot of lots within it. The closest one would probably actually the closes one outside of the railroad which we have a problem I agree using those railroad parking lots would be the library parking lot I think.

MR. WREDE:

Right.

MR. GOODALE:

And which is in the parking district, but so I don't know if it's a good idea not to tell you the truth because there's not a lot like it sitting there waiting for parking. This is right close by the way to where there's going -- there is in the process of being parking created for the courts, the new courts out there too. It's all kind of a piece and that will all be within the parking district of the town. So again, I don't know this has not been worth the time frankly, but this is for my own interest. But there was a suggestion perhaps this could be fitted in with what they're doing with parking in terms of the courts and the parking district because it's right next door to it that was that.

MR. CARACCILOLO:

Right. It seems like it's a nice historical building that's its empty and vacant and it would make this downtown area really revitalized or start that.

MR. GOODALE:

Oh, it's much better; it was a dump and they've done a nice job as far as I can see on redoing the building. I think they're over reaching it frankly.

MR. WREDE:

It's zoned Village Center I'll just read what the purpose and intent is, is to transform Village Commercial nodes into vibrant main streets with small shops, restaurants and professional services following a to (inaudible) pattern of development and design in a compact pedestrian oriented setting. So presumably this use does fit that, but, you know, it's just a little too intense.

MR. GOODALE:

Thank you for indulging me, thank you.

MR. WREDE:

You're welcome.

MS. HOLMES:

Is that why they've reduced to zero that they expect everybody will walk there; that they --

MR. WREDE:

The landscaping you mean?

MS. HOLMES:

Well, no, the reduced parking is that they expect that this will be in a setting where most people will walk here? And is that --

MR. WREDE:

Well, I think I believe this Village Center zoning is fairly new when they I think the town redid their whole --

MR. GOODALE:

The master plan, yes.

MR. WREDE:

Master plan; I think this is a new zoning category so I think that's what they're trying to do.

MR. GOODALE:

As a matter of fact they will not be walking. No one's going to be walking to this store. I mean, outside of perhaps vagrants; there's not going to be people walking to the store I don't believe.

MS. HOLMES:

That's what I suspected.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Anybody else have anything to say? Anybody on this end have anything to add? A motion's in order.

MR. GOODALE:

I move to accept the staff report.

MS. BOLTON:

I'll second it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

All in favor signify by saying aye. Contrary minded. So approved, the staff report.
(Vote: 9-0-0-3 Absent: Dietz, Nolan, Pruitt)

MR. ISLES:

One other item I want to go back to. One item we normally take care of in the organizational meeting is the calendar for the year and we did circulate a calendar to the members which here again it's the first Wednesday of every month. And we do have locations on there that bounce back and forth between Riverhead and Hauppauge so assuming that that meets your approval we'll obviously can stay with that calendar. I think the next meeting then Claire would be in Hauppauge, right?

MS. CHORNY:

I don't have it in front of me.

MR. ISLES:

I don't have it in front of me either.

MS. HOLMES:

But Riverhead does not get equal time in this. You don't have another Riverhead meeting till June.

MR. ISLES:

But we also have some summer meetings that we try to do on the east end of the Island.

MS. HOLMES:

Right.

MR. ISLES:

And 90% of the population of Suffolk lives in western Suffolk.

MR. CARACCILO:

On that note.

MR. GOODALE:

It's a hard fact, but that's a fact. It is a fact exactly. Nice try though Linda I appreciate that.

MR. ISLES:

So it's demographically as well as geographically.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

That's how all the East Enders are; they're all like that.

MR. ISLES:

We recognize that.

MS. DAUM:

Can I ask a question?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Yes, Mary.

MS. DAUM:

I guess this question is for Tom and maybe it's for everybody. I see that there -- that the first Wednesday in July is July 5th and so I'm just curious. I don't know whether I'll be here or not, but I'm just curious whether we ever break with the schedule because it looks like we're not going to have enough people for a meeting or how is that handled or does it come up very often?

MR. ISLES:

Yeah, we did notice that sometimes we do run into those problems. Fourth of July then is on a Tuesday and the meeting would be on a Wednesday. We do like having meetings on a regular basis in the sense that as Chris pointed out earlier. The Commission has 45 days to act on a referral from municipality. So having somewhat of a steady calendar is helpful for that, but certainly it's your call if you want if the Commission wants to put it back a week and do it the -- when would that be? That's another option.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I'm here thirty-something years and we never changed a Wednesday because it becomes a ritual with the public, with the town with everything. If you go over you can't make it on the sixth I go away on the eleventh; he goes away on the 22nd then we've have changes on all the dates.

MS. DAUM:

Yeah.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

I say if you can't make it you don't come that's all because it's impossible to satisfy everybody with every date especially with vacations.

MR. ISLES:

Yeah and certainly if we don't have a quorum then we would let it lay you know and we would have to reschedule then at that point.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

If two people were out or didn't want to vote on something then nothing could pass and yet we have five members that are absent or three members we can't start moving all around because it doesn't really help.

MR. ISLES:

We do have the proclamations for the former members and we request that you all consider signing that before we leave today. Thank you.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Motion to adjourn.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MARTIN:

Second. It's 1:29.

(Having no further business the Planning Commission was adjourned at 1:29 p.m.)

{ } denotes spelled phonetically.