

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
ROSE CARACAPPA AUDITORIUM of the
WILLIAM H. ROGERS LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
725 Veterans Memorial Highway
Smythtown, New York

January 6, 2010
12:00 p. m.

F I N A L

BEFORE:

DAVID CALONE, Chairman
Town of Babylon

REPORTED BY:

THERESA PAPE, Court Reporter/Notary Public

1
2

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S:

CONSTANTINE KONTOKOSTA, Vice Chairman
Commission Member
Village Under 5,000 Population

ADRIENNE ESPOSITO, Secretary,
Commission Member
Villages Over 5,000 Population

LINDA HOLMES, Commission Member
Town of Shelter Island

BARBARA ROBERTS, Commission Member
Town of Southampton

CHARLA BOLTON, Commission Member
At Large

VINCENT TALDONE, Commission Member
Town of Riverhead

JOB POTTER, Commission Member
Town of East Hampton

MICHAEL KELLY, Commission Member
Town of Brookhaven

MATTHEW CHARTRAND, Commission Member
Town of Islip

ABSENT MEMBERS:

THOMAS McADAM, Commission Member
Town of Southold

SARAH LANSDALE, Commission Member
At Large

JOSHUA HORTON, Commission Member
At Large

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

STAFF APPEARANCES:

THOMAS A. ISLES, Director of Planning

DANIEL GULIZIO, Deputy Director of
Suffolk County Planning Department

ANDREW P. FRELENG, Chief Planner

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
Suffolk County Planning Department
8
TED KLEIN, Senior Planner
9 Suffolk County Planning Department
10 PETER LAMBERT, Principal Planner
11 Suffolk County Planning Department
12 JOHN CORRAL,
Suffolk County Planning Department
13 LINDA SPAHR, County Attorney
14 DOTTY SONNICHSEN, Staff
15

16 G U E S T S:

17 SETH FORMAN, Ph. D., AICP, Chief Planner,
18 Suffolk County Department of Planning
19
20 JACK CAFFERTY, Legislative Aide to
Presiding Officer Lindsey
21
22
23
24
25

1 4
2 (WHEREUPON, this proceeding
3 convened at 12:00 p.m. Off-the-record
4 discussions ensued, after which the
5 following transpired:)
6 (Time noted: 12:10 p.m.)
7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Good afternoon,
8 and welcome to the January meeting of
9 the County Planning Commission, January
10 2010. I would note that we have a
11 quorum present, and I would ask the vice

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
chair to lead us in the pledge.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(Pledge of Allegiance)

CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you.

The first item on our agenda is the adoption of the minutes. The agenda speaks of the minutes for September and October. We actually, I notice, adopted the minutes last time for September, so we're ahead of ourselves. And so we'll, instead, just entertain the minutes for October.

I had only a few comments, which I shared --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Right.

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 5

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- with the

Editor-in-Chief, but do you have anything else?

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I have -- some of mine --

THE REPORTER: Linda --

CHAIRMAN CALONE: Oh, and let me -- let me -- let me -- just let me -- let me -- I'm sorry.

THE REPORTER: Teri's back.

CHAIRMAN CALONE: Everyone needs to, on Teri's command, push the button --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Some of mine overlapped with yours. But in 154 pages, I only found nine errors, which is quite

17 wonderful. And I have given the sheets, both
18 yours and mine, to Teri. So I am confident
19 she will make the changes.

20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Excellent.

21 And mine were all very minor, and I
22 expect yours were as well.

23 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

25 Well, any other comments or thoughts on

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 6

2 the minutes from October 2009?

3 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

4 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, I would
5 entertain a motion to adopt the minutes as
6 amended.

7 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I would move that.

8 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Moved by
9 Commissioner Holmes.

10 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: (Indicating)

11 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seconded by
12 Commissioner Roberts.

13 All in favor of adopting the October
14 2009 minutes, please raise your hand.

15 (WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: And opposed?

17 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

18 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Abstentions.

19 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: That passes 9-0.

21 Next up is the swearing in of our new
22 members. We have -- four of our members
23 are -- I guess I shouldn't have used the word
24 "new."
25 We have four returning members who have

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 7
2 been reappointed by the county executive and
3 reconfirmed by the legislator -- legislature,
4 and those are Adrienne Esposito, Barbara
5 Roberts, Linda Holmes, and Sarah Lansdale.
6 Sarah is -- is back -- is up in Albany today,
7 but I wanted to do the swearing in for the
8 new term with the folks who are here,
9 Adrienne, Barbara, and Linda. So if you
10 would stand up and raise your hands, please.

11 (WHEREUPON, Commissioners Esposito,
12 Holmes, and Roberts complied.)

13 (WHEREUPON, Commissioners Esposito,
14 Holmes, and Roberts were sworn in.)

15 CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right, great.
16 Thank you, and welcome back.

17 (Applause)

18 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Congratulations.
19 Welcome back.

20 It's also good to have -- first of all,
21 Happy New Year to everyone.

22 And it's great to have Vince back with
23 us.

24 Vince, it's good to see you doing well
25 and in good spirits. So welcome back.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 8
2 It's also good to have Constantine here
3 with us, despite the lack of sleep he's
4 getting as a result of his three-week-old
5 son.
6 So congratulations, Constantine.
7 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Do we have photos?
8 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: No.
9 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: You didn't bring
10 photos?
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: I didn't
12 bring photos.
13 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Oh --
14 CHAIRMAN CALONE: We'll pass around
15 Constantine's phone.
16 Just a brief update for this month,
17 which we're still coming out of the holidays.
18 We did have a few things to move forward.
19 The comprehensive plan is moving
20 forward. We'll have a presentation by Seth
21 Forman in a little bit on the next aspect of
22 that.
23 We also have just a couple FYIs.
24 As some of you -- as I think I e-mailed
25 around, Islip took the commercial energy

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 9
2 efficiency standards that we had included in

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 our 2009 Guidelines and made them the new
4 standards in Islip town effective March 1st.
5 And I was able to attend the Town Board
6 meeting with that where Supervisor Nolan
7 publicly thanked the Commission for its work
8 in that regard, so -- so that was a nice
9 thing to get accomplished before the New
10 Year.

11 Also, yesterday, Constantine, and
12 Director Isles, and Deputy Director Gulizio
13 and I met with County Executive Levy. He's
14 excited about the work the Planning
15 Commission is doing.

16 He wants to be involved in some public
17 events regarding the comprehensive plan this
18 coming year.

19 He also wants to do a Sewer Summit 2
20 some time in the next few months. It's an
21 idea that we have been talking about a little
22 bit. The general idea of that is to focus on
23 optimizing sewer revenues, and that would be
24 a companion effort to the new sewer needs
25 assessment that is being undertaken by the

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 10
2 Legislature.

3 So that was certainly good to meet with
4 the county executive and get his support and
5 positive comments about some things going on
6 here.

7 On our -- in terms of our task forces,
Page 8

8 Sarah isn't here today, she's up in Albany.
9 But just briefly, we expect to have a -- on
10 the Energy and Environment -- I'm sorry -- we
11 expect to have a follow-up working group
12 meeting on solar, which LIPA has now kind of
13 taken it over and is coordinating, as well as
14 a follow-up meeting on wind this month.

15 Adrienne is coordinating the stormwater
16 runoff and native vegetation effort.
17 There's --

18 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Yes. It was slow
19 to start, but we are moving along now.

20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right. And there's
21 a -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.

22 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: I was just
23 mentioning that the meeting, as requested by
24 our committee members and others, with the
25 DEC, has been scheduled. And a couple of

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 11
2 other entities have been invited to attend,
3 including the Pine Barrens Commission,
4 DEC representatives, Andy from our Planning
5 Commission, the Nature Conservancy, and the
6 Suffolk County Water Authority, and then
7 we're moving along to have a review of the
8 stormwater runoff and also the native
9 vegetation proposal that has come out of that
10 committee as well.

11 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Adrienne.

12 Next, Constantine has been heading up
13 housing -- the Housing task force. He and I
14 actually were going to present to the Long
15 Island Association later this month, and
16 that's gotten postponed due to a conflict on
17 our -- our part, and so he's going to
18 reschedule that for February.

19 But anything else, Constantine, you
20 wanted to add on to the housing part?

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Sure.

22 Just briefly, we have completed an
23 affordable housing policy memorandum which
24 will serve as the basis for a model code. We
25 have received input and comments from a wide

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 12
2 range of stakeholders on the task force. We
3 will be scheduling another meeting of the
4 task force in the coming weeks, at which
5 point we will develop a strategy to
6 disseminate the group's work to the
7 individual towns and villages.

8 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you,
9 Constantine.

10 On Accessible Design and Smart Growth,
11 we reviewed the -- the universal design
12 incentive plan that Vince and Charla and
13 others have been working on. We did that
14 last month. And we're hoping to get that
15 out -- get a little more feedback and get
16 that out to the electeds who are on the task

17 force in a couple weeks.

18 Vince, I don't know if there's anything
19 else you want to add on that, but --

20 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: That's it.

21 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- you know,
22 certainly, thank you for your leadership, and
23 things are moving forward, so thank you for
24 that.

25 Public Safety, Tom McAdam, as you know,

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 13
2 is heading that up. He unfortunately had a
3 last-minute -- a family issue he had to deal
4 with. So I don't really have an update on
5 Public Safety today, but we'll -- we'll get
6 feedback on that next time.

7 Lastly, as you all may recall, I -- in
8 the beginning of the last two years, I tried
9 to meet with each commission member
10 individually to discuss some ideas and goals
11 for the coming year. I'd like to do that
12 again over the next few weeks, and
13 Constantine may join me in some of those
14 meetings as his schedule allows.

15 I'm also hoping to start making the
16 annual rounds with the supervisors. So I'll
17 try to coordinate that with each of you for
18 your respective towns, and I'll try to reach
19 to you on that over the next couple of weeks.

20 Lastly, a couple last housekeeping

21 01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
notes.

22 Next month is our annual meeting where
23 we elect officers, adopt rules, and set our
24 meeting schedule for 2010. As is required
25 under the county law, our Nominating

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 14
2 Committee can make this report with regard to
3 officers today.

4 Lastly, with regard to our annual report
5 that we are required under the county law to
6 issue, I need about two or three more people
7 to help work with staff on that. It's going
8 to be a short-term thing. We should be
9 finishing by March. I doubt that -- it'll be
10 yeoman's work on it, but we need some folks
11 to be able to help review it and provide a
12 little guidance on that. So if you are
13 interested in that, please let me know.

14 Does anyone have any comments or
15 questions at this point?

16 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

17 CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, I -- I'm so
18 excited to see Vince, and we talked about
19 Constantine's son, that I skipped the public
20 portion. And --

21 (Laughter)

22 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah, well -- so we'll
23 move on.

24 The first card is from Steve Kaplan with
25 regard to the Sanctuary at Ruland Road.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 15
2 Mr. Kaplan, you have three minutes. If
3 you would please come up and use the
4 microphone here, and if you would spell your
5 last name for the record, that would be
6 appreciated.
7 MR. KAPLAN: My name is Steve Kaplan --
8 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Push the button --
9 MR. KAPLAN: Oh, push the button.
10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: It's a very --
11 COMMISSIONER KELLY: -- and hold it.
12 CHAIRMAN CALONE: It's a very speaker
13 unfriendly -- perhaps, to cut down on all of
14 our dialogue.
15 Please --
16 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: That doesn't work.
17 CHAIRMAN CALONE: That doesn't work with
18 Adrienne, though.
19 Mr. Kaplan.
20 MR. KAPLAN: My name is Steven Kaplan,
21 S-T-E-V-E-N, K-A-P-L-A-N, and I'm going to
22 allow my attorney to speak first in my stead.
23 CHAIRMAN CALONE: That'd be fine. You
24 have three minutes, you can -- you can --
25 MR. KAPLAN: I see.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 16
2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- you can give that

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 up to Mr. -- is it Mr. Harras? I can't read
4 the handwriting.

5 MR. HARRAS: Yes, Mr. Harras.

6 CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right, Mr. Harras,
7 you're recognized for six minutes with regard
8 to the Ruland Road application.

9 MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 Again, my name is John Harras, and
11 Harras Bloom & Archer are representing the
12 applicant, Ruland Road, LLC, in connection
13 with their proposed project in the Town of
14 Huntington for workforce housing located on
15 Ruland Road.

16 What I'd like to do for the commission
17 is to update them as to where we are today.

18 The board -- the commission issued a
19 decision back in June in connection with this
20 application, and we're here again today --
21 I'm not quite sure how it got here again, I
22 assume the Town of Huntington issued yet
23 another referral to the board.

24 Back in June of 2009, the commission
25 issued a discussion which generally indicated

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 17
2 that it preferred that the density of the
3 project adhered to the town code of the Town
4 of Huntington, and also made some
5 recommendations with respect to some shuttle
6 bus service and in -- in connection with
7 shopping and the like. And in reviewing that

8 original decision, it seemed that there may
9 have been a misapprehension by the commission
10 that this was a project for seniors, when, in
11 fact, what we are proposing is workforce
12 housing. This project was part of our
13 application with Greens of Half Hollow. It's
14 a large project. And it's part of our SEQRA
15 mitigation, we agreed to, in fact, take a
16 market rate project and convert it into
17 workforce housing for young people, and we're
18 obviously working on the 110 corridor, and
19 that's what the genesis of the project is.

20 Since the board issued --
21 (WHEREUPON, there was an interruption in
22 the proceeding, after which the following
23 transpired:)

24 MR. HARRAS: As I was saying, the board
25 initiated -- the commission to the original

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 18
2 project -- original decision with respect to
3 the project, and as I said before, there were
4 certain indications that -- that the referral
5 may not have clearly indicated that this was
6 workforce housing as opposed to a senior-type
7 project or something of that nature.

8 So, with that in mind, we now -- we now
9 have another referral -- and as I indicated
10 before, I'm not quite sure how that occurred
11 because I do not get any notice from the Town

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 of Huntington that, in fact, they were going
13 to make a second referral. We are still in
14 the site plan review process. But with
15 respect to the commission's points in the
16 original June 2009 decision, I think there
17 are some facts that have changed that will be
18 important for the commission to -- to bring
19 you up to speed.

20 Since the -- June, we've been working
21 with the town, a couple things have happened.

22 Number one, we have obtained additional
23 land contiguous with our parcel. So our site
24 is now about -- about 1,200, 1,500 square
25 feet -- feet larger. That was the result of

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 19
2 the fact the town abandoned an adjoining road
3 to our property. We not only took, as a
4 matter of law, the -- to the center line, but
5 we also purchased the other half of the
6 property. So the site is now larger, and
7 therefore, of course, we are entitled to --
8 to more -- more measure density.

9 And I really want to focus on really the
10 question of density, because I think that the
11 board focused on that -- the commission
12 focused on that in their -- in their last
13 decision.

14 If addition to the -- our -- our
15 expanded area upon which the project has been
16 built, there is also -- enacted early last

17 year, was the Long Island Workforce Housing
18 Act. That act allows us, as a matter of
19 state law, to get a 10 percent density bonus
20 over that which would be otherwise allowed
21 under the applicable zoning code.

22 And in light of that fact, we would like
23 the -- the commission to -- in issuing its
24 next decision, to allow us, or at least not
25 to recommend against, number one, the maximum

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 20
2 density; and, also, in no way inhibit the
3 operation of the state law which, of course,
4 controls not only local zoning but county and
5 other zoning assistance. So we are asking
6 for that.

7 And based upon this new property, we
8 believe our density is at 122 workforce
9 housing units, and with the Long Island
10 Workforce Housing Act, we're up to
11 132 workforce housing projects. Which, in
12 fact, as everyone knows on Long Island, is a
13 critical need for that type of housing, and
14 we would ask the commission to not recommend
15 any reduction in our as-of-right density
16 regarding the state law or the Town of
17 Huntington zoning law.

18 And with respect to the recommendation
19 for the shuttle bus, I -- again, I think that
20 was, again, a -- perhaps, generated from the

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 notion that it was a senior project. This is
22 going to be workforce housing. We are going
23 to be -- not have age describing at all.
24 And, obviously, along 110 corridor, we're
25 only, probably, 200 yards from 110. There is

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 21
2 ample bus service that runs up and down,
3 Suffolk County covers 110 as -- as it's a
4 heavily-used bus route, so I don't think
5 there's any need for recommendations for a
6 shuttle in connection with this project.

7 And we're just hoping to, finally --
8 we've been in this process for eight years --
9 eight long years. There has been -- the town
10 has taken a great deal of time in connection
11 with their views of variance generation for a
12 plan. We would like to get this done. We --
13 we had expected that this project would have
14 been already online. We've had eight years
15 of carry on this project, although we -- we
16 dislike the fact that we have diligently
17 pursued this application.

18 So we would ask that the board -- that
19 the commission give us a rousing endorsement
20 for this project and not subject it to any
21 restriction, because any restriction that
22 this board -- this commission places on it
23 will, I believe, be difficult to convince the
24 town to do otherwise. So I -- I think this
25 commission has a very, very critical role in

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 22
2 connection with determining how this project
3 would move forward and the amount of units
4 that we have as-of-right, but under the town
5 code and the new state law.

6 And I'm here to answer any questions, if
7 anyone has -- if any board member has any
8 questions.

9 CHAIRMAN CALONE: You know, we generally
10 try not to ask too many -- too many -- get
11 too fact-specific, but --

12 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: (Indicating)

13 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I just wondered if
14 you could define workforce housing as it is
15 defined in this act you mentioned.

16 MR. HARRAS: Well, the -- the workforce
17 housing is nonage-restricted housing that
18 will be sold at a price that is deemed to be
19 affordable, to people starting out in the --
20 in -- in the -- in -- in the workforce.
21 Obviously, on Long Island, we have that
22 problem where young people would like to stay
23 but they can't because they can't find
24 housing.

25 And thank you for that question because

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 23
2 I did omit, I think, what is -- is a very

3 important factor, which is that the pricing
4 of these units will be at 120 percent of
5 means. Affordable for people making
6 120 percent of the means per Suffolk County,
7 which is the standard, or, in fact, the goal
8 standard that's used by the Long Island
9 Housing Partnership. And we are committed to
10 ensuring those price points so that the units
11 are, in fact, affordable and available to
12 younger people on Long Island who want to
13 stay, work, and live on Long Island.

14 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you.
15 Barbara, I think you were --

16 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Actually, my
17 question was answered already.

18 I was interested, was it a condo or a
19 rental project, but you --

20 MR. HARRAS: Another excellent question,
21 and another omission in my presentation.
22 Thank you.

23 The units will be "for sale" units, and
24 that's -- that's -- the 120 percent of the
25 means will be based upon that (inaudible)

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 24
2 will be calculating the purchase price. So
3 we're trying to give the young people equity,
4 have them stay in -- stay here, build up some
5 equity, work on the 110 corridor, get Suffolk
6 County buses down the street. And we think
7 it's -- it's -- it's a great project with

8 respect to satisfying the smart growth
9 principals, satisfying the -- provide
10 inexpensive housing, equity housing to young
11 people on Long Island.

12 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Mr. Harras.
13 Your time has expired, and we appreciate your
14 being here. Thank you.

15 MR. HARRAS: Thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Unless there's any
17 other public comments, we'll close the public
18 portion, and move on to the Director's
19 report.

20 Director Isles.

21 DIRECTOR ISLES: Thank you,
22 Mr. Chairman.

23 Several items I'd like to bring you all
24 up-to-date on regarding all the department's
25 activities.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 25

2 The Sagtikos corridor project, which is
3 a project that was subject to (inaudible) by
4 transportation and land use issues, and has
5 been identified as a growth center in Suffolk
6 County; one of at least six that we have.
7 This is the site, of course, of the Pilgrim
8 State Hospital. It has been downsized, and
9 (inaudible) developer, and will be the
10 subject of a referral to this commission at
11 some point in the future. It's also the area

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 that has the Venture in the Town of
13 Smithtown; if you remember, (inaudible) as
14 well as the Tanger mall in Deer Park. This
15 study is funded principally through NYMTC,
16 (inaudible) that process, and we are
17 expecting to begin making a selection very
18 shortly, within a week or so upon signing of
19 the contract.

20 Next item, in no particular order, is
21 we've kept you informed periodically on the
22 Robinson Duck Farm matter. And what this
23 concern is, it's a county park, about
24 80 acres, in the hamlet of Brookhaven on the
25 Carmans River, north of the Wertheim National

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 26
2 Wildlife Refuge. And this is property that
3 was formally a duck farm. We did receive
4 funding through the county legislature to do
5 a feasibility study for restoring that site.
6 It's obviously attempting the site
7 modifications that occurred in constructing
8 commercial duck farms years ago. We've had a
9 plan underway for the past ten months, and
10 that project is set to be completed in March.
11 However, we've had a number of public
12 meetings, and our next one is -- we believe
13 final public meeting will be on January 28th.
14 We'll just keep you informed on that. We
15 will then produce a plan -- a feasibility
16 plan for the restoration of bringing that

17 forward, and, hopefully, move forward with
18 implementation of changes in that --
19 (inaudible) that restoration.

20 Just, parenthetically, I will note that
21 the county (inaudible) also a duck farm. We
22 were the capital of duck farming in the
23 United States for many years. We have two
24 duck farms left at this point; we had at
25 least 19 at one point. But a number of

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 27
2 county parks were former duck farms;
3 including Carol's River, Indian Island Golf
4 Course, which was a county park, which was
5 the largest duck farm in the United States at
6 one point. We're in the process of now
7 purchasing the Hubbard Duck Farm, which is
8 across the street from Indian Island County
9 Park. And, here again -- so we've looked at
10 Robinson's, and we hope it can be used as a
11 model in restorational activities
12 (inaudible).

13 Also, here again, in no particular
14 order, we do administer the county's farmland
15 program through the department. It's nice to
16 let you know that once a year the county's
17 agricultural districts program is opened up,
18 being that (inaudible) petitions to enter the
19 district on an annual basis. The districts
20 are up for renewal every eight years. So

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 this is a relatively new change to state law
22 so that if a property owner wants to join,
23 they don't have to wait eight years or less
24 to get into the district, they can do it on
25 an annual basis. So we open it up in the

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 28
2 month of January only, so anyone that does
3 want to get into the district should file the
4 application through the Department of
5 Planning on their own.

6 Related to farming, I have put in for an
7 amendment for the purpose of the development
8 rights program. This is the program that has
9 preserved 9,700 acres of farmland, that's
10 close to 92,000 acres this year. And the --
11 it has become apparent that the program that
12 was put into effect 30 years ago must be --
13 needs to be updated. So we've worked very
14 extensively with the County Department of Law
15 and the Department of Environment and Energy
16 on an update, and the next thing is the
17 legislature to meet those changes, and we
18 will then be going through the legislative
19 process to seek approval of those amendments
20 about the -- very important, it's important
21 knowledge, it's important -- modernizing the
22 programs and the definitions and enforcement.

23 Also related to farmland, I did indicate
24 that we have received a grant that the
25 department prepared to New York State for a

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 29
2 trans-purchase (inaudible) Eastport and
3 Eastport properties. This is a highly
4 visible farm site at County Road 51 and
5 Sunrise Highway. We did get the grant for
6 about \$1.5 million. We've had conversations
7 and, of course, problems with the state in
8 terms of the requirements they were putting
9 on the grant potentially being in conflict
10 with county programs. For example, allowing
11 cell towers on county farmland, we don't
12 normally allow those, bypassing the farmland
13 for (inaudible) structures. We have, we
14 believe, worked out satisfactory language
15 with the state at this point, so we -- we
16 will proceed then with hopefully securing the
17 grant and acquiring that property in the near
18 future.

19 We are also pursuing a federal grant.
20 We are finalizing the review of that program
21 for county programs, and we are expecting to
22 make an application for a federal grant
23 within the next month as well.

24 Another farm item, a little bit
25 different, but, here again, we talked about,

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 30
2 and that's the aquaculture program which was

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 approved by the legislature last summer. The
4 commission did support that program. The
5 legislature did approve it. So we are now in
6 the implementation phase and we have an
7 application period for the first cycle of the
8 program, that actually expires this Friday.
9 We will then start, about a week after that,
10 a 60-day comment period on all the
11 applications we have received, and the
12 aquaculture lease board will be meeting
13 probably in April to then review those
14 applications, and then actually put through
15 those leases at that point. So any
16 information any of the commission members
17 would like (inaudible), certainly, we'll be
18 happy to provide that.

19 We do have a study the department
20 completed, working in conjunction with the
21 health department, that was looking at the
22 land development, (inaudible) development,
23 and population analysis in western Suffolk,
24 the five western towns. We had done
25 something similar to this in the eastern

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 31
2 towns a number of years ago. This is -- here
3 again, we did this as a subcontract to the
4 health department's comprehensive water
5 resource management plan that that agency is
6 doing. It does have some interesting
7 information in this, build-out potential in

8 the western towns, which, as you might have
9 guessed, is not a lot overall.

10 Peter Lambert and our Cartographic Unit
11 have identified approximately 21,000 acres of
12 land that could be developed, mostly that is
13 in the Town of Brookhaven. What I would like
14 to do on this is at a future meeting,
15 perhaps, have Peter Lambert provide a
16 presentation and a summary of the report,
17 going through town by town, with the
18 information revealed. He'll also break it
19 down by groundwater management zones,
20 (inaudible). So I think that's a useful
21 document, certainly directed help with the
22 health department, but also for other
23 planning activities both at the county and
24 local level.

25 And then lastly, we do have in your

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 32
2 package today a copy of the report that was
3 provided to us by the Long Island Housing
4 Partnerships which is providing
5 multiple-family housing on Long Island, and
6 we appreciate that the partnership shared
7 this report with us. It's by Pearl Kramer,
8 who was formally a member of the -- staff
9 member of the Long Island Regional Planning
10 Board at that time. So the report is -- is
11 very important in terms of specifically

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 Looking into the impact of sewer school
13 district finances. We've certainly heard a
14 lot about that. Due to multiple-family
15 housing developments (inaudible) impact on
16 schools -- burden to school populations and
17 so forth.

18 We have provided -- we think the report
19 has many important benefits for it -- and
20 information, we've (inaudible) database that
21 Peter Lambert maintains. We did, however,
22 have some comments on the report that I did
23 share back to the Long Island Housing
24 Partnership, and I do have a memo that I'd
25 like to circulate to you today to summarize

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 33
2 in terms, here again, some departmental
3 comments.

4 And I'll just briefly go through the
5 (inaudible) which is -- you know, one of the
6 things they make a point on is that Suffolk
7 County has a much smaller -- multi-family
8 housing units than other suburban counties in
9 the New York Metropolitan region. They
10 compare us to Westchester, which I understand
11 that's done frequently, but Westchester has
12 some different pattern developments. They
13 have the city, which we don't have. They
14 have 10,000 people per square mile in
15 Yonkers, which we have nothing that
16 approaches that in Suffolk. We just wanted

17 to point out that the more comparable
18 suburban-type counties are probably Monmouth
19 County and Fairfield in Connecticut and
20 Putnam in New York.

21 The other thing I'd like to point to is
22 (inaudible) largely mistaken belief
23 (inaudible). What we wanted was to get the
24 information to the partnership on that one
25 was that in terms of the -- the building of

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 34
2 multiple-family housing (inaudible). We did
3 look at it from a decade basis and, in fact,
4 half of the building permits issued during
5 the 2000s, which was the decade in which the
6 report was completed, half of those were
7 multiple-family units. So it's not quite in
8 the sense of a failure level, (inaudible).
9 Whether that's enough and whether there
10 should be a great proportion of
11 multiple-family housing is certainly a valid
12 planning question, but we just felt the
13 characterizations were really off on that
14 one.

15 They also make the point that the
16 failure of rental units is going to make it
17 back into the planning of multiple zoning
18 residents in which the planning process will
19 be for. You know, just to point out that
20 that age cohort, which starts in 1970, 1985,

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 that's the baby bust. So from the 1970s, we
22 have 140,000 for which were born in Suffolk
23 County than we did in the 1960s. So even
24 though that age cohort now is 25- to
25 40-year-olds is down to 122,000, we think

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 35
2 most of that is due to the fact that they
3 weren't born a number of years ago.

4 Now, here again, we're not -- this is
5 (inaudible). The concern for brain drain, as
6 (inaudible) said. We have an increasing
7 young population, ages 16 to 29 were born in
8 Suffolk County. If the baby boomers had
9 kids, those kids are now aging into adulthood
10 at this point. So the planning issue still
11 remains that -- you know, serving that
12 population is important, and that's a
13 significant planning question, but just
14 that -- that cohort of 25 to 44 is just an
15 explanation which we -- we think we ought to
16 provide.

17 We also make the point, too, that they
18 surveyed 159 multiple-family housing
19 complexes in the county, which is now, by the
20 way, at least 530 complexes. So it is
21 representative, but it's not, you know, a
22 universal survey. And we do point out that
23 the ratio of (inaudible) is .18 for however
24 overall. But for single-family residential,
25 it's .58. Just to make the point that --

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 36
2 although you can compare .58 to .18 and say
3 well, .18 is less, but you also have to
4 factor in (inaudible) units per acre. If you
5 get above 3.2 acres per unit -- units per
6 acre, potentially you'll be generating more
7 (inaudible).

8 So those are some of the summaries.

9 We also point out that the data
10 (inaudible) complexes and multiple-family
11 complexes on this report are not analyzed.
12 We think that they may have potentially more
13 school-age children because of the units, but
14 that's a data cap. And, here again, we think
15 the report is an important report, and we
16 certainly will be accessing this report and
17 the (inaudible) plan updates that we're
18 working on, but we did want the commission to
19 be aware of some of our concerns so that it's
20 (inaudible).

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Tom.

23 Have you shared your letter to us with
24 the -- or are your concerns that are in there
25 with the housing partnership?

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 37

2 DIRECTOR ISLES: I have as well.

3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Sounds like I had that
4 coming; right?
5 Let me try this one.
6 (Laughter)
7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: We had talked about
8 having an update from the health department
9 on the water study at some point this year,
10 or actually, probably, within the next month
11 or two.
12 Has that study been completed?
13 DIRECTOR ISLES: To my knowledge, it has
14 not been completed. We did make a request
15 through (inaudible), which is --
16 (WHEREUPON, there was an interruption in
17 the proceeding, after which the following
18 transpired:)
19 DIRECTOR ISLES: So we did contact
20 (inaudible). He was not able to make this
21 meeting. We will certainly try to get him at
22 a future meeting.
23 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you,
24 Director Isles.
25 Any other comments or questions?

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 38
2 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: (Indicating)
3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes.
4 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Is there any update
5 on the sewage plan that the county's putting
6 together?
7 DIRECTOR ISLES: I don't have a specific

8 update now. I can certainly get one and
9 provide it to you by e-mail, together with
10 the commission.

11 My understanding is -- the last I heard,
12 and don't quote me on this, is that the
13 schedule (inaudible) the report. But let me
14 check on the exact status and give you
15 (inaudible).

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Is this the one that's
17 following up from the RFP?

18 MS. SPAHR: (Indicating)

19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Ms. Spahr.

20 MS. SPAHR: The RFP had been issued, and
21 then legislature put more money into it and
22 changed some of the parameters to the RFP.
23 So the new RFP has not yet been issued. It's
24 due -- it's due this month.

25 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Yes, thanks.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 39

2 That's exactly what I was wondering.

3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. Great.

4 Any other comments or questions?

5 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

6 CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, I'd like to,
7 without objection, just hop around the agenda
8 for a minute and -- and move to the
9 Nominating Committee report, just to get that
10 done with.

11 On behalf of the Nominating Committee,

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 Michael Kelly is going to be presenting.

13 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Thank you,
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 Well, thank you to Tom McAdam and Sarah
16 Lansdale for spending a lot of time putting
17 a -- a brief report together. Neither of
18 them are here.

19 Thank you all -- all the commissioners
20 as well for your input.

21 At this point in time, the Nominating
22 Committee would put forth a recommendation on
23 the officers slate for this coming year.
24 Both officers being as follows:

25 As chairman, Dave Calone;

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 40

2 As vice chair, Constantine Kontokosta;

3 And as secretary, Adrienne Esposito.

4 We also have suggestions on the rules
5 that we are currently compiling, and there's
6 a few more tweaks that we have to make. We
7 will go ahead and send out an e-mail on the
8 rules later this week and we can go ahead and
9 vote on that at the next session.

10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Michael.

11 Any questions from anyone on the
12 commission?

13 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

14 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you to you and
15 to Sarah and Tom.

16 Just so everyone knows, under county
Page 34

17 law, the Nominating Committee is required to
18 make a formal recommendation to the
19 commission with regard to officers. It
20 doesn't, however, preclude anyone else who
21 wishes to nominate themselves or anyone else
22 to do so at our annual meeting next month.
23 So that is a possibility if anyone is
24 interested in going that route.

25 Also, at our next meeting, as I

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 41
2 mentioned, we'll do our schedule for the
3 year, as well as the rules as Michael
4 indicated. And -- and we can certainly --
5 yeah, the sooner, the better probably on
6 that.

7 I know there are a couple of ideas. I
8 just want to make sure everyone has a chance
9 to see those rules and -- before -- you know,
10 well before the next meeting, and you can
11 respond by e-mail or something like that.

12 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: (Indicating)

13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Commissioner Holmes.

14 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I just wanted to
15 ask.

16 Did the committee address the issue of
17 term limits in your report?

18 COMMISSIONER KELLY: There's some
19 dialogue within the report, so you will see
20 some dialogue on it. We did not necessarily

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 make a recommendation one way or the other at
22 this point, but that will come with dialogue
23 after.

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. Any other
25 comments or questions?

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 42

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Mr. Chair --

3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Deputy Director
4 Gulizio.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: I apologize.
6 Maybe we could take a short break --

7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Sure. Sure.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: -- before we
9 lose our court reporter.

10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Let's take a break.

11 (WHEREUPON, a brief recess was taken,
12 after which the following transpired:)

13 (WHEREUPON, the following portion of the
14 minutes are from stenographic notes taken by
15 Court Reporter Alison Mahoney.)

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. We return
17 from half-time and we're back.

18 Everyone please be sure to use your
19 mikes and to press down on the button.

20 We're going to move on to the --

21 Okay. We finished the Nominating
22 Committee. I don't believe there are any
23 other further questions about that. So we'll
24 move on now to the regulatory agenda. The
25 first item on our agenda is the Portion

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 43
2 Road --
3 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: What's happening
4 with Seth?
5 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seth is still here,
6 but we're going to -- sorry, I'm just --
7 without objection, we'll move on to the
8 administrative portion of the meeting first,
9 just because I know there's some time
10 sensitivities here, and then we'll have Seth
11 afterwards.
12 We also have a brief update from Andy on
13 the Pine Barrens Credits, as well. Something
14 that several members had expressed an
15 interest in understanding a little bit
16 better. So we'll do that after as well. So
17 we have the two regulatory items, and then
18 we'll have the two presentations.
19 So Portion Road, and we have Dan
20 presenting on that.
21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Mr. Chairman,
22 perhaps, with your permission, Mr. Freleng
23 could go first on the Sanctuary at Ruland
24 Road since we actually have people here on
25 that item.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 44
2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Sure. That's a good

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 suggesti on.

4 Wi thout objecti on, we' ll move forward on
5 Rul and Road.

6 Andy.

7 MR. FRELENG: Thank you, Mr. Chair man.

8 COMMI SSI ONER BOLTON: Mr. Chair man --

9 CHAI RMAN CALONE: Yes.

10 COMMI SSI ONER BOLTON: -- I --

11 CHAI RMAN CALONE: Commi ssi oner Bol ton.

12 COMMI SSI ONER BOLTON: I worked on the
13 Sanctuary project as a planner for the
14 Town of Hunting ton. And currently there's
15 ongoing liti gati on on that project, and I may
16 be involved in that liti gati on. Therefore,
17 I' m required to recuse myself.

18 CHAI RMAN CALONE: Thank you,
19 Commi ssi oner Bol ton. So noted, and we' ll
20 make sure that' s in the record. And if you
21 want to step off the dais, that would be
22 appropri ate.

23 (WHEREUPON, Commi ssi oner Bol ton stepped
24 off the dais and left the audi tori um.)

25 CHAI RMAN CALONE: Okay. Andy.

1 Suffolk County Pl anni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 45

2 MR. FRELENG: Thank you, Mr. Chair man,
3 Members of the Board.

4 As i ndicated, the fi rst regul atory
5 matter before the commi ssi on thi s date i s the
6 Sanctuary at Rul and Road. Thi s i s referred
7 to us from the Town of Hunting ton.

8 The jurisdiction of the commission is
9 that the subject property is within 500 feet
10 of an agricultural district, that being
11 District Number 3.

12 The Town of Huntington has submitted to
13 the Suffolk County Planning Commission a
14 resubmitted and amended site plan for this
15 application, Sanctuary at Ruland Road. The
16 change in the plan is reflected in the loss
17 of the playground area and the addition of
18 another residential building, bringing the
19 total number of one-bedroom garden apartments
20 requested for approval to be 132.

21 As you may know, the subject site was
22 approved by the Town of Huntington for
23 affordable housing as an off-site mitigation
24 to the development project known as the
25 Greens at Half Hollow. The Town Board change

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 46
2 of zone approval for the subject site to R3M
3 recognize the, quote, potential for the site
4 to develop 122 one-bedroom affordable housing
5 units. The resolution further stated that
6 the adverse impact of the development of the
7 Sanctuary site could be mitigated by, quote,
8 plan design and reviewed by the planning
9 board in accordance with applicable, quote,
10 standards, regulations, and mitigations.

11 On June 3rd, 2009 the Suffolk County

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 Planning Commission resolved to conditionally
13 approve the first site plan referral for the
14 Sanctuary. Among the conditions was a
15 limitation to a maximum of 115 one-bedroom
16 units.

17 For the amended application referred,
18 the project sponsor has invoked the Long
19 Island Workforce Housing Act and has added
20 approximately 10 percent to the original
21 requested density of the site. The Long
22 Island Workforce Housing Act is applicable to
23 a, quote, subdivision plat or site plan for
24 five or more residential units or a mixed-use
25 development that incorporates five or more

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 47
2 residential units. However, the act took
3 effect January 1, 2009, and the provisions of
4 the act do not apply to, quote, any
5 development or project for which a valid
6 application has been filed with the
7 appropriate municipal entity before such
8 effective date.

9 It's the belief of the staff that the
10 subject application has been a valid
11 application and has been filed since at least
12 the change of zone application to the Town of
13 Huntington Board. It is important to note
14 that the sanctuary project was an off-site
15 mitigation to the Greens of Half Hollow
16 project approved in 2000 before the enactment

17 of the Long Island Workforce Housing Act.
18 Moreover, it is the belief of the staff that
19 132 residential units on the subject
20 property, which is 16 units to the acre,
21 would constitute a further
22 over-intensification of use of the premises
23 beyond the original request for 122 units.
24 And just as a reminder, the commission did
25 limit that to 115 units. And maybe we should

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 48
2 take a look at some of the graphics that we
3 have.

4 This would be the subject property from
5 the air (indicating). As you can see, it
6 is -- it is on the north side of Ruland Road.
7 This would be Ruland Road (indicating).

8 Next slide, John.

9 MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)

10 MR. FRELENG: This is just a further
11 elaboration of the site (indicating). You
12 can see the site is predominantly vacant.

13 This would be the zoning on the property
14 (indicating). The property is currently
15 zoned R3M, and there's a mix of zoning in the
16 area.

17 This is all in the previous staff
18 reports, so I'm just going real quick through
19 this.

20 Go ahead.

21
22
23
24
25

MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)

MR. FRELENG: There was some questi on by
commissioners on the availabili ty of
seven-acre sites in and around transit
stations or downtowns. We asked Cartography

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Suffol k County Pl anni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 49

to take a look at thi s, and as you can see,
the green is the availabl e seven acre sites
withi n the Town of Hunti ngton that is
reasonably approxi mate to train stations or
downtown areas as -- as defi ned by staff.
The concl usi on bei ng is that there' s a very
l imi ted number of seven-acre parcels in the
Town of Hunti ngton, peri od.

Next sl ide.

MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)

MR. FRELENG: Thi s woul d be the proposed
si te pl an (i ndi cati ng). Ri ght now, thi s is
the new bui ldi ng as proposed. If you take a
look at the pri or si te pl an, you coul d see
that thi s was a playgroun d area.

Go i ng back a second, John.

MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)

MR. FRELENG: I j ust wanted to poi nt out
that thi s is the ri ght-of-way of the
purported abandoned road (i ndi cati ng). There
are -- it' s hard to see here. You can see in
the -- in the si te pl an in the staff report a
number of l and-banked parki ng spaces here, as
well as l and-banked spaces over here and here

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 50
2 (indicating). So I wanted to point that out
3 on the plan.
4 Go ahead, John.
5 MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)
6 MR. FRELENG: Go ahead.
7 MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)
8 MR. FRELENG: Okay. Again, we have some
9 slides of the site from when we were there in
10 the summer.
11 Go ahead.
12 MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)
13 MR. FRELENG: This is looking -- would
14 that be east?
15 That's east. That would be Rul and
16 (indicating).
17 Go ahead.
18 MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)
19 MR. FRELENG: That's the subject
20 property looking west (indicating).
21 This is when we were there the other day
22 (indicating). It's just important to note
23 that in prior reviews of the staff report, we
24 had indicated that there is no shopping in
25 the vicinity of the subject property. There

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 51
2 is a proposal for a strip shopping project,

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 if you will, not too far from the subject
4 property. It's diagonal and across the
5 street from the subject property. We did
6 have this referred. It was -- came to us as
7 a variance application. Staff deemed it
8 incomplete for various reasons and sent it
9 back. So we do not know the future
10 disposition of this property and where it
11 might wind up.

12 Next slide.

13 MR. CORRAL: (Compl ying)

14 MR. FRELENG: This is, again, looking at
15 the -- at the -- Rul and Road looking east
16 (i ndi cti ng).

17 And that's it?

18 MR. CORRAL: (Head gesture)

19 MR. FRELENG: Okay. So that's the
20 overview of the project and slides.

21 Staff is recommending to the commission
22 that the subject application as referred be
23 approved subject to the following conditions
24 deemed necessary for good planning and land
25 use.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 52

2 Staff still believes that the proposal
3 of 132 units is an over-intensification of
4 the use of the premises, as would be evident
5 by the loss of recreational open space for
6 the new building, and the need to land-bank
7 required off-street parking stalls in order

8 to provide buffer and green space.

9 So it's the belief of the staff that if
10 this was not an over-intensification, the
11 required parking could be accommodated on
12 site and would not have to be land-banked in
13 order to provide buffering and screening.

14 Again, staff did recommend the
15 limitation of the subject property to
16 115 one-bedroom units. Staff is still
17 recommending that the appropriate density for
18 that site would be 115 units. So staff is
19 recommending to the commission that the first
20 condition be a limitation of 115 units.

21 The second condition that staff is
22 recommending to the commission is that all
23 the units be designated as workforce
24 affordable housing units in accordance with
25 Town of Huntington and Suffolk County

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 53
2 guidelines on affordable housing. It is
3 staff's understanding that the entire project
4 is an affordable housing project. We just
5 want to make sure that those affordable units
6 are marketed and sold in accordance with the
7 current guidelines for affordable housing, so
8 we put that condition in there.

9 The third condition staff is
10 recommending to the commission is that the
11 applicant be directed to incorporate a

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 shuttle service. We understand that this is
13 a workforce housing project, it is also
14 limited to one-bedroom units, which I guess
15 presumably would have a limited number of
16 cars, so there may be a need for
17 transportation to other service areas.
18 Especially if the strip shopping center
19 across the street is not developed in the
20 future, there would still be need potentially
21 for some residents of the area to have an
22 alternate means of transportation.

23 It's the opinion of staff that the
24 distance of the subject property to Route 110
25 is not a reasonably convenient distance.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 54
2 Although, one could walk there, you might not
3 want to do it like a day today where there's
4 snow on the ground or something like that,
5 but understanding what was said, staff still
6 believes that that's not a reasonably
7 convenient distance and some other means of
8 transportation should be provided to the
9 site.

10 We believe another recommendation to the
11 commission is that the applicant be directed
12 to consult the Suffolk County Planning
13 Commission guidelines on public safety.
14 There's nothing in the referral materials
15 that indicate that the project sponsors have
16 considered public safety in their design of

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

the site.
Recommendation number five to the commission is that the applicant shall be directed to consult the Suffolk County Planning Commission guidelines on energy efficiency. Again, there was nothing in the referral materials. Although it may be premature in the review and design process, but it -- there was nothing indicated that

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 55

the applicants took a look at energy efficiency in their design.
The last condition recommended to the commission is that the applicant be directed to construct an ADA-compliant sidewalk from Ruland Road to the interior of the proposed parking lot.

And, again, staff is recommending that a comment from the commission to the town be included, and that includes the consideration for Ruland Road as Ruland Road develops, there should be an overall consideration of the congestion management issues that would develop as the road starts to accept more traffic.

That is the recommendation of staff to the commission.

CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you. Thank you, Andy.

21 There's -- that's right, Charla had to
22 step out, so I'll open it up. If anyone has
23 any comments or questions.

24 I guess, if -- if I can, I just want to
25 ask one first one, which is just, my

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 56
2 understanding is the site plan has changed,
3 you know, with the second version with the
4 increase of a strip along the left -- the
5 left-hand side. I guess that's the west side
6 of the property.

7 Does that in any way change the
8 calculation in terms of the number of -- you
9 know, the allowable units in terms of the
10 density?

11 MR. FRELENG: Well, to answer your
12 question directly, we believe that even with
13 the addition of the purported road
14 right-of-way that it would still be an
15 over-intensification of the use of the
16 premises.

17 Staff's conversation with the Town of
18 Huntington staff was that it was still
19 undetermined whether or not that dedication
20 was perfected. So in calculating the lot
21 area, it's questionable what exactly the lot
22 area is at the time it was referred to
23 commission staff.

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: And if it is
25 perfected, how does that impact the units?

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 57
2 Did we do that calculation or --
3 MR. FRELENG: Well, if it is -- if it is
4 perfected, the 8.47 -- I'm sorry -- the
5 8.47 acres with the abandoned road would
6 yield 122 units at 14.4 to the acre.
7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. So it's -- it's
8 not 132, it's somewhere -- it's in between.
9 Okay.
10 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)
11 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Commissioner Tal done.
12 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Thank you,
13 Mr. Chairman.
14 Quick question, Andy. Actually, a
15 couple of questions.
16 One is --
17 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Just be sure to speak
18 into the mike, Vince.
19 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Sorry.
20 Okay. Is that better?
21 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes. Thank you.
22 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Can you hear me
23 now?
24 Andy, the 122 units, if this is, in
25 fact, a deed restricted development which

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 58
2 remains affordable in perpetuity, wouldn't

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 that qualify for the extra 10 percent under
4 the county's guidelines for affordable
5 housing developments?

6 And, if so, then wouldn't the
7 132 actually come in under that?

8 MR. FRELENG: The county doesn't have a
9 bonus guideline.

10 You're talking about those Long Island
11 Workforce Housing Act bonus?

12 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Yes.

13 MR. FRELENG: It's staff's position that
14 the Long Island Workforce Housing Act does
15 not apply to the Sanctuary at Ruland Road.
16 The Sanctuary at Ruland Road was filed with
17 the Town of Huntington long before the act
18 went into effect.

19 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Hold on.

21 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: You know, that's
22 unfortunate. The law has been changed now to
23 actually provide for that.

24 In any case, I don't want to get stuck
25 on that one item because there are other ways

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 59

2 to meet the density. And there's -- there's
3 other lands that can be sterilized, credits
4 that can be transferred, extinguished, maybe
5 there are other ways to -- to meet that need.

6 My concern in this is that in order for
7 development to occur for affordability, one

8 needs more density than perhaps some -- some
9 folks would like in order to achieve the
10 economies of scale.

11 So my -- my real question here is, one,
12 is this deed restricted to remain affordable
13 in perpetuity -- I've heard a reference to it
14 being a workforce/affordable, first-time home
15 buyer -- what happens after that first-time
16 home buyer; do we -- do we know?

17 MR. FRELENG: Staff has no knowledge of
18 that, but staff did recommend to the
19 commission that you condition the application
20 on Suffolk County's guidelines, which would
21 incorporate that concern.

22 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Okay. Excellent.
23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Others?

25 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: (Indicating)

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 60

2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: The Vice Chairman.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Thanks, Andy.

4 So just to be clear, this is an off-site
5 mitigation for another project. So this is
6 in lieu of providing the affordable housing
7 on-site for the previous project; is that
8 correct?

9 MR. FRELENG: I can say it's an off-site
10 mitigation to the proposed Greens of Half
11 Hollow. We're not privy to the discussions

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 that went on, but one could presume that the
13 affordable units at this project were to be
14 done at the Long Island developmental center
15 site, Greens of Half Hollow.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Okay.

17 Well, a broad policy issue and then more
18 specific questions.

19 One, I mean, obviously, it's great to
20 see affordable housing being built. The
21 downside of this and why our policy
22 guidelines of the commission talks against --
23 strongly against off-site affordable housing
24 mitigation measures is to avoid these kind
25 of concentrations of affordable housing

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 61
2 within one development. I mean, this
3 completely avoids or eliminates any
4 possibility, some of the positive effects, of
5 mixing incomes or mixing housing types and
6 getting a range of housing types. So it is
7 unfortunate on that level that the project
8 is -- is so homogeneous from that
9 perspective.

10 More questions, though, about the Town
11 of Huntington policy on affordable housing.
12 What is their -- do you have a sense in terms
13 of the price requirements and the -- and
14 the -- the lengths of restrictions?

15 MR. FRELENG: Mr. Vice Chairman, I did
16 review it, I don't recall it offhand, so I

17 really can't answer the question. It is, I
18 think, somewhat akin to the county guidelines
19 that you have adopted, but I couldn't speak
20 exactly to that.

21 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Okay. So
22 maybe it's possible to make conditions, too,
23 stronger that they refer to our guidelines,
24 which require at least a minimum of 30 years
25 for afford- -- for "for sale" units.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 62

2 And, also, our guidelines and what is
3 the gold standard, actually? It's not the
4 120, but it's -- half of the units are
5 80 percent and half of the units at
6 120 percent area median income adjusted for
7 household size. So given these are
8 one-bedroom units, obviously, the price is
9 not going to be based on the 100 percent area
10 median income.

11 Another consideration that I'd like to
12 throw out perhaps as a condition or a
13 comment, given that this project is still in
14 the site plan review stage, would be to
15 consider this as a rental. Given the target
16 market, given surrounding workforce and
17 employment opportunities, and given the need
18 for rental housing, this would seem an ideal
19 location. Or, perhaps, not ideal location,
20 but a good candidate for a rental housing

21 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
development. So I would like to throw that
22 out there as a possible condition or comment.
23 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you,
24 Constantine.
25 Thoughts, comments, questions?

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 63

2 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)

3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Vince.

4 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: One little quick
5 question.

6 Andy, what is the distance to 110 from
7 this site?

8 MR. FRELENG: I can't -- can't tell you
9 off the top of my head. I know we took a
10 look at it way back, but -- a couple hundred
11 yards, but I'm not quite sure. Maybe -- it's
12 more than a quarter of a mile.

13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: And where is -- 110 is
14 to the left; right?

15 MR. FRELENG: The left side of the
16 screen.

17 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: It's certainly
18 less than half a mile. So ten blocks.

19 MR. FRELENG: (Head gesture)

20 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Okay. Only
21 because I would -- I would -- I would
22 recommend that we change the condition to a
23 recommendation regarding the shuttle.
24 Because it is, in fact, for lots of people, a
25 walking distance to what will soon have a

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 64
2 very rapid frequency shuttle service up and
3 down 110 to shopping and work locations. So
4 I'm -- I'm not --
5 You know, I'd be the first one to
6 recommend shuttles from -- from developments
7 that are pretty far off the beaten trail, but
8 this one doesn't really seem to me to be that
9 far away. And particularly because 110 will
10 have -- you know, and it does have now, but
11 will have even better shuttle service running
12 on it within the next year or two. I don't
13 think it's a terrible location for such a
14 facility, particularly, if it's rentals.
15 Those are the folks most likely to have fewer
16 vehicles per household where one might be
17 able to walk ten blocks, get on the bus, and
18 go to work.
19 So, you know, I think this is fairly
20 acceptable. And I did -- I was the one who
21 asked the question regarding how many other
22 large sites there are in Huntington, because
23 the pickings are pretty slim and, you know,
24 where else can we put them? Ideally they'd
25 be in hamlet centers, but if those sized

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 65
2 properties are not available, this seems like

3 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
the second best alternative.

4 So, again, I just want to repeat my --
5 my support for the higher density if that can
6 be justified either through -- I -- I
7 understand because it came out -- it was
8 submitted before the law was changed, there
9 are still alternatives to bring in or
10 extinguish development rights from other
11 locations in order to raise the density and
12 make it affordable to build this here.

13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, perhaps what we
14 can do -- and I heard a couple of suggestions
15 here and I want to kind of wrap this, is --
16 is you can include in the -- the condition
17 number one, what you're saying, Vince, which
18 is to look at other plans of increasing
19 density. In other words, you know, the
20 recommendation of staff is that because of
21 the timing of it, there can -- 115 is
22 appropriate. But -- but also including,
23 perhaps as a comment, that the commission
24 urges the applicant to look at other means of
25 increasing density; in other words, TDR or

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 66
2 whatever.

3 Does that make sense?

4 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: If I may, just
5 one quick point?

6 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Sure.

7 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Okay. I mean,
Page 56

8 just as in terms of the recommendation for
9 rentals, I mean, the -- the county has a bank
10 of development rights, there are other
11 alternatives for transfers. I mean, that
12 might be a very sweet incentive to increase
13 in the density if the -- if the development
14 is provided as rental units, the county could
15 make a contribution of -- of those rights to
16 make this happen. This is many alternatives,
17 but the higher density can be achieved
18 through other means that are -- that are
19 affordable. And given that there are few
20 other locations of this size around the
21 hamlet center or downtown, I think we
22 should -- we should be looking to that -- the
23 local planners to come up with a mechanism to
24 allow the -- allow the higher density so that
25 we can truly get those economies of scale and

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 67
2 bring in affordable, ideally, rentals, you
3 know, less, to a first-time home buyer. But
4 either case, we still easily could support
5 the 16 -- 16 units per acre or more through
6 development right transfers.

7 DIRECTOR ISLES: (Indicating)
8 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah, Director Isles.
9 DIRECTOR ISLES: Just two comments.
10 Number one, the county's TDR program is
11 for wastewater credits only. So it doesn't

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 allow a zoning transfer that's entered by the
13 locality. This development, as I understand
14 it, will be connected to a public wastewater
15 treatment plant. So, therefore, the county's
16 program wouldn't apply.

17 As far as the question of rental or
18 ownership, please keep in mind that the
19 matter before you is a site plan referral.
20 The zoning matter was considered, I think,
21 back in 2002 -- around there -- and so the
22 project was approved. Whether it permitted
23 rentals, you know, certainly we -- you could
24 pass that along as a comment, in my opinion,
25 but we're past the stage at this point in

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 68
2 terms of, I think, that kind of radical
3 change.

4 Here again, I think it could be a
5 suggestion, but this is really a site plan,
6 it's not a basic land use question we
7 typically get during the zoning phase.

8 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Thank you --

9 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Just one -- one
10 final -- final comment, if I can.

11 Just naming the wrong program, there's
12 also the 72-h program that the county -- that
13 has been turning over many of the tax
14 proposed properties back to the
15 municipalities. And they can, in fact, apply
16 those units -- those properties, which are

17 restricted for affordable housing purposes,
18 sterilize them and transfer some town-wide
19 densities, remaining consistent.

20 DIRECTOR ISLES: Right. So that would
21 have to be somehow allowed through the Town
22 of Huntington, whether by variance or by
23 program or something. The idea is a great
24 idea, we certainly don't quarrel with it.
25 So, you know, I think maybe if you do want to

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 69

2 do that comment, it would be appropriate. I
3 think to lock it in as a covenant --

4 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Right.

5 DIRECTOR ISLES: -- at this time would
6 difficult.

7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: I certainly agree with
8 that.

9 MR. FRELENG: If I can just add that the
10 Town of Huntington also has developed a TDR
11 program as well.

12 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: (Indicating)

13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes,
14 Commissioner Holmes.

15 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I -- I just wanted
16 to say I do agree with Constantine that it
17 would be -- it would make more sense in these
18 economic times to have these as rental units.
19 And that would be an appropriate comment,
20 I -- I think.

21 CHAIRMAN CALONE: And, sure, as
22 Director Isles just mentioned, that would
23 be -- it couldn't be anything other than a
24 comment at this point in the process.
25 The other thing that Constantine

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 70
2 mentioned I want to get feedback on is the --
3 is -- is explicitly referencing the Planning
4 Commission guidelines with respect to number
5 two, which is the condition with respect to
6 workforce and affordable housing units. I
7 certainly think that makes sense, but if
8 anyone else -- any thoughts on that?

9 Our guidelines are just -- I don't know
10 how you characterized them compared to the
11 other guidelines that are out there,
12 Constantine.

13 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Well, it's
14 hard to say. I mean, obviously, you would
15 assume that the project would -- would be
16 subject to the Town of Huntington standards
17 anyway, so I think it would be more important
18 or -- or more applicable for -- for us to
19 enforce our guidelines -- or at least some
20 accordance or -- or reference to our
21 guidelines in that condition.

22 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.
23 Any thoughts or --

24 MR. FRELENG: Mr. Chairman?

25 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah -- yes, Andy.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 71

2 MR. FRELENG: Just one final note from
3 staff.

4 With regard to density, understanding
5 the need for density for affordable housing,
6 the site still needs -- still has to work.
7 With regard to this site, there are already
8 land-banking required parking for one-bedroom
9 units. That's not like a two- or
10 three-bedroom units where there's maybe two
11 or three cars or two cars per units. So
12 they're land-banking the required parking.
13 So in staff's opinion, the density is pretty
14 much there. Any more density brought to this
15 site is going to have overflow parking or
16 parking in the -- in the street
17 right-of-ways. And, you know, anecdotally,
18 if there's a snowstorm, you've got to plow;
19 if there's a lot of parking on the street and
20 you have to get an emergency vehicle in, that
21 could become problematic. So staff looked at
22 this site plan, and if you will, it didn't
23 pass the sniff test, they were already
24 land-banking the required parking, which is
25 one of the reasons why staff is strongly

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 72

2 recommending the 115-unit density. The

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 project's not in a downtown, there is no
4 municipal parking, there are no options for
5 parking here except the overflow onto Ruland
6 Road right-of-way, possibly.

7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Andy.

8 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)

9 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes,
10 Commissioner Taldone.

11 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: So, in fact, what
12 is the -- the actual number of spots actually
13 to be built, not banked, per -- per unit
14 under the 132 --

15 MR. FRELENG: I would have to pull that
16 out of the file to see. They are providing
17 the required parking, they're just
18 land-banking a lot of it. The -- the
19 scenario that could play out is if the town
20 finds that they need that parking on-site,
21 for whatever reason the parking's overflowing
22 and it's causing congestion in the area. If
23 they go to build out those parking spots, if
24 you take a good look at that time site plan,
25 a lot of those parking spot are even

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 73
2 problematic. So if they even go and build
3 those parking spots, there will still be
4 congestion issues on the -- on the -- and
5 circulation issues on the subject property.

6 If you want to give me a couple of
7 minutes, I can look and see --

8 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- a third of the
9 parking stalls were land-banked.

10 DIRECTOR ISLES: Right. And I think as
11 you look at the site plan that's attached to
12 the staff report, you can see the broken
13 lines that indicate the land-banked parking.

14 And maybe, Andy, if you could just point
15 it out on the laser point.

16 So to the -- to the -- close to the --
17 Ruland Road, there's a big open area there
18 with -- it would be -- right there
19 (indicating). And then behind those units to
20 the west parking lot, it's a -- it's a long
21 dead-end aisle of potential parking. So the
22 backyard, so to speak, would be lost.

23 Then I guess the last thing, Andy, is
24 that cross as you go down toward the center
25 of the property --

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 74

2 MR. FRELENG: (Indicating)

3 DIRECTOR ISLES: -- right here, that's
4 all land-bank parking because that open space
5 would be lost. So it just seems that this is
6 at the max in terms of site utilization.

7 So, the density, we understand your
8 point in terms of trying to maximize the
9 benefit of affordable housing, but this seems
10 to be getting to a limit based on a two-story
11 oblique configuration in terms of service

12 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
parking of working.

13 MR. FRELENG: From staff's perspective,
14 these are the most problematic spots
15 (indicating).

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Andy.

17 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: I just have
18 some quick --

19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes, Constantine.

20 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Tom or Andy,
21 the zoning that stands on this property, does
22 it allow for rental housing; do you know?

23 MR. FRELENG: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

25 Any other ideas or suggestions? If not,

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 75
2 I've got to clarify some things we've talked
3 about.

4 COMMISSIONER POTTER: (Indicating)

5 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes, Job.

6 COMMISSIONER POTTER: I just wanted to
7 add one more voice to the resale question.

8 If this was going to be covered by the
9 guidelines from the Town of Huntington, if
10 this was a "for sale" project, there would be
11 a significant time period so that any resales
12 were still -- properties stay in the program.

13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: And, certainly, if
14 we -- if we have that in our -- that's in our
15 guidelines, so if we make an explicit
16 reference to, you know, making that a

17 condition, that should -- that should, I
18 think, cover that. But I think it's an
19 important point, for sure.

20 Other thoughts, questions?

21 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: (Indicating)

22 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Commissioner Roberts.

23 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: David, I'm
24 feeling that that particular phrase should be
25 a separate condition.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 76

2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Which one is that?

3 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: The perpetuity or
4 the length of time, taking that specifically
5 out. Because our newer guidelines carry such
6 issues that if there was an override, it
7 could be swept, and that is -- I think it's
8 kind of critical in this.

9 The second point, I would also like to
10 back Vince's suggestion that the shuttle be
11 changed to a comment, not a condition. If
12 we're going after affordability, somebody has
13 to pay for the shuttle and this seems like a
14 county demand that the condo association
15 would have to work out.

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Other thoughts
17 on that?

18 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Sorry, Tom, what was
20 that?

21 DIRECTOR ISLES: That's not a problem.
22 CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's not a problem
23 according to Director Isles.
24 COMMISSIONER POTTER: (Indicating)
25 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Commissioner Potter.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 77

2 COMMISSIONER POTTER: Just for the sake
3 of clarity, since the parking is such an
4 issue, on the 115-unit proposal, how many
5 parking places are being provided?

6 MR. FRELENG: Again, I would have to
7 look that up. If you want to give me a
8 couple of minutes, I can give you all the --

9 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, in the staff
10 report it says there are 200-some-odd.
11 Unless it's changed, it says 366 parking
12 stalls required, and 122 are being provided
13 by land bank. I read that as the balance
14 were actually provided. But either way, it's
15 two-thirds of the parking.

16 MR. FRELENG: Mr. Chairman, in the first
17 submittal, the required parking was 366. The
18 applicant provided 366. The land-banked
19 spaces were 122. In the revised referral,
20 the required parking was 410. The applicants
21 provided 410, and of that, 168 are
22 land-banked.

23 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: That's
24 ridiculous.

25 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: And it's

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 78
2 three -- three parking spaces per one-bedroom
3 uni t?

4 (Laughter)

5 MR. FRELENG: That is the current
6 requi rement.

7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, that would seem
8 to be absurd.

9 COMMI SSIONER ROBERTS: But I think
10 that's critical, David, because I think
11 we're -- there's a sense that this should be
12 as dense as possible, and if the main
13 argument is the parking, and it's three to
14 four spots, going back to Mike Kelly's great
15 quote of last meeting, maybe it's time to be
16 a little practical.

17 MR. FRELENG: Well, I guess you should
18 keep in mind that these design standards
19 don't materialize out of thin air. I think
20 the town, out of experience, has come up with
21 their parking requirements, and perhaps it is
22 visitor parking that they've included in
23 their calculations or some other
24 considerations. I wouldn't just cavalierly
25 di smi ss the local parking requirement. I

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 79
2 thi nk there shoul d be some di scussi on about

3 01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
that.

4 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, there's really
5 no one here from the town to voice the
6 opposite -- opposed view, but it would seem
7 to me to be at the upper limit of what --
8 what we would be required for those living in
9 that kind of a space with that number of
10 units.

11 All right. Let's see where we are here.
12 Unless anyone has anything else they want to
13 raise?

14 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

15 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, let's see
16 where we are.

17 We have -- the staff recommendation is
18 approval with condition one being that the
19 appropriate density is 115 units. We
20 haven't -- I haven't heard anything on that.

21 Number two, the recommendation --

22 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Did Vince want to
23 add --

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, I'll include the
25 comments later.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 80

2 (WHEREUPON, the following portion of the
3 minutes are a compilation of stenographic
4 notes taken by Court Reporters Theresa Pape
5 and Alison Mahoney.)

6 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: -- a comment? The
7 alternative methods are not part of number

8 one.

9 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes. Okay. So
10 that's -- we'll save that for comments, so
11 let's hold that for a second.

12 Number two is all units shall be
13 designated as workforce/affordable and
14 according to the Town of Huntington and
15 Suffolk County guidelines. The suggestion
16 was that we eliminate the Town of Huntington
17 because that would be required anyway, but
18 that we -- we add specifically that it be in
19 accordance with Suffolk County Planning
20 Commission guidelines on affordable housing.

21 Was there any objection to that
22 suggestion?

23 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none --

25 The next suggestion from -- from Job and

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 81

2 Barbara was that there be a separate
3 condition specifying that the -- to the
4 extent that it is housing -- the purchased
5 housing, that it be in perpetuity; right?

6 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Is that our
7 current guideline?

8 CHAIRMAN CALONE: As a separate
9 condition.

10 Say it again.

11 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Is that our

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 current guideline?
13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: The guideline is
14 30 years?
15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: (Head gesture)
16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.
17 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)
18 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Go ahead, Vince.
19 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Why not rental
20 or --
21 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, why don't we
22 just reflect what the guidelines say which
23 is -- in that regard with respect to the
24 perpetuity requirement --
25 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Yup.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 82
2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- and that would
3 be -- I think it's 30 years for a purchase,
4 and I forget what it is for -- for a rental,
5 but it's --
6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Perpetuity.
7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: It's in perpetuity for
8 a rental.
9 Okay. So that was the suggestion.
10 Any comments or objections to that?
11 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
12 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, we'll add
13 that.
14 The old number three was the shuttle
15 service. The suggestion, as we mentioned
16 around this table, was that we make that a

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

comment.
Are there any objections to that, making
that a comment?
(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Seeing none.
Four and five -- old four and old five,
public safety and energy efficiency I think
remain. I didn't see or hear anything on
that.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 83
I didn't think there was any objection
to the ADA sidewalks.
There were two suggested comments in
addition to the comment that's already there.
One was that the applicant explore other
means of permitting higher density on- --
on-site, whether through 72-h, a local TDR
program, or -- or other means.
Okay. Are there any objections to that?
(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none.
And the final comment was that this --
there be consideration given to making some
portion of the -- of the units, rental
units -- affordable, of course, rental units.
Any objection to that?
COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Only some portion,
not the whole thing?
CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, I don't know

21 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
that it was specified.

22 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Oh, I thought
23 Constantine --

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well, let's -- let --
25 I'll let Constantine --

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 84

2 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- respond on that.

4 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: I think since
5 it's a comment, it's going to be pretty vague
6 anyway, but I would leave it generally to --
7 that they be considered rental -- the project
8 be considered for rental housing in any
9 proportion that's deemed appropriate.

10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

11 Okay. So now we have one, two -- we
12 still have six -- six conditions, and we now
13 have three comments.

14 Anyone else want to add anything?

15 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: No --

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: We do, because we
17 added one and subtracted one.

18 I'm sorry, we have four comments.

19 MR. FRELENG: Four comments.

20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Four comments, because
21 the shuttle service was moved to a comment.

22 MR. FRELENG: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN CALONE: So six -- six
24 conditions, four comments.

25 Any other comments or questions?

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 85
2 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: From commi ssi oners?
3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: From commi ssi oners.
4 COMMI SSI ONER TALDONE: I 'm sorry --
5 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes.
6 COMMI SSI ONER TALDONE: I apol ogi ze, but
7 I 'm still stuck on thi s parki ng requi rement.
8 And, you know, it's not that I 'm -- I 'm
9 acting on thi s willy-nilly. It's just in an
10 affordabl e housi ng devel opment, three cars
11 per si ngl e bedroom apartm ent seems excessi ve.
12 I understand that's the -- the town's
13 requi rement, I -- I can't do anythi ng about
14 that, but -- but when it comes up to us for
15 our opi ni on or our thoug ht s on thi s topi c, I
16 thi nk that i s excessi ve. And -- and I don't
17 see how that makes sense other than to -- you
18 know, to actual ly precl ude the devel opment of
19 affordabl e housi ng by requi ri ng a whol e l arge
20 number of parki ng spaces that woul d never
21 real ly be -- be requi red, or at l east
22 necessary. And as you sai d, some of the
23 spaces are banked.
24 If, in fact, we're all wrong and they do
25 need more parki ng, they actual ly can meet the

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 86
2 mi ni mum requi rement, al though through the

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
less than desirable mechanism. So I --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Well, could we add that as a comment, Vince? Is that appropriate for you?

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I mean, that would be fine with me. I -- I don't know how to address it. It's just I don't -- I don't --

CHAIRMAN CALONE: Let me say this.

In my mind, what -- I was a little skeptical about the comment that you initially raised, which was the density one. I'm less concerned about that given the potential that there may be a little bit of an over estimation from the department. So, in my mind, we kind of in some ways cover that density issue with the comment. And I don't know that we're in a position -- I mean, I agree that it seems like a lot, but I think the bottom line is that we can probably allow -- that if there's other ways of obtaining density, that that can be obtained, and there is room on that site plan for that,

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 87
perhaps because of the -- perhaps not so many parking spaces are needed.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN CALONE: So, yes, I understand.

So, for me, I don't know if there needs to be a comment about the parking, or maybe

8 it's just including another sentence to the
9 means of higher density with the notion that,
10 you know, we think that there may be other
11 means -- that they should explore other means
12 of obtaining higher density and parking --
13 yeah -- perhaps, the township look at the
14 parking requirements.

15 MR. FRELENG: Mr. Chairman, staff would
16 recommend that we just include that as
17 another comment. That the town should
18 reanalyze the R3M parking requirements, it
19 seems excessive. And we can word that
20 properly, but I think that would be an
21 appropriate comment.

22 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

23 MS. SPAHR: (Indicating)

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Let's hold on that
25 just for a second.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 88

2 Linda.

3 MS. SPAHR: I'm not sure that the R3M
4 zoning limits these garden-style apartments
5 or -- or multi-family dwellings to
6 one-bedroom apartments. And it's my
7 understanding that there is litigation
8 underway with respect to whether this is
9 limited to one-bedroom or whether it might be
10 one- and two-bedroom apartments. So to
11 whatever extent that's helpful information, I

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 thought you probably should be aware of that.
13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Linda.
14 That is useful to know and might explain
15 why --
16 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: That changes the
17 picture.
18 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right. Thank you,
19 Linda. As always, illuminating and useful.
20 Thank you very much.
21 And does that change where we want to go
22 with that then?
23 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Yes.
24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes. Okay.
25 I mean, I think my rec- -- what I would

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 89
2 suggest, then, is we just leave that alone.
3 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Okay.
4 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Unless anyone
5 still feels strongly to the contrary.
6 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Seeing none.
8 All right. We have a revised resolution
9 now, and I'll entertain a motion, unless
10 there's any further comments.
11 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
12 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none --
13 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I would move the
14 adoption of the staff report with the
15 conditions and comments as outlined.
16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you,
Page 76

17 Commissioner Holmes.
18 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Seconded.
19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seconded by
20 Commissioner Tal done.
21 All in favor of adopting the revised
22 resolution with the six conditions and
23 the four comments as we've discussed, please
24 raise your hand.
25 (WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 90
2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's eight.
3 Opposed?
4 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
5 CHAIRMAN CALONE: None. And no
6 abstentions. We have one recusal. So it's
7 eight to zero to one.
8 Thank you.
9 The next item on the agenda is the
10 Portion Road study.
11 Yeah, would someone get Charla?
12 (WHEREUPON, Commissioner Bolton
13 re-entered the auditorium and took her seat
14 on the dais.)
15 (Time noted: 1:52 p.m.)
16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. We're back on
17 the record.
18 The next item on our agenda is the
19 Portion Road Corridor Study, and that's Dan.
20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Good

21 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the
22 Commission.

23 In light of the hour and the declining
24 health of our court reporter, I'll try to be
25 brief.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 91

2 This referral should be familiar to the
3 commission. It was considered, I believe, at
4 the last commission meeting. It is entitled
5 the 2009 Portion Road Corridor Study and Land
6 Use Plan for Lake Ronkonkoma and
7 Farmingville.

8 As the commission may recall, it was
9 previously considered, and at that time, the
10 staff recommended that the matter be deemed
11 incomplete until the time -- have --
12 opportunity to consider some of the comments
13 of staff, and in particular, the discrepancy
14 between the goals of the Corridor Study and
15 Land Use Plan and the actual recommendation
16 with respect to zoning within the corridor.

17 By way of reference, this corridor,
18 Portion Road, runs between the Towns of
19 Brookhaven and Smithtown, a distance of
20 approximately 15.2 miles. The geographic
21 boundary of the study, however, is limited to
22 3.7 miles of Portion Road, running roughly
23 east of Lake Ronkonkoma to the vicinity of
24 Nichols Road within the Town of Brookhaven in
25 the communities of Farmingville and Lake

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 92

2 Ronkonkoma.

3 I'm going to try to very briefly
4 summarize the study, summarize our comments
5 from previous consideration of the matter,
6 the town's response to our comments, and then
7 comments to the town's comments, to be clear.

8 At the outset, I will state that once we
9 receive comments from the town in response to
10 the commission's determination to deem the
11 matter incomplete, which we received I
12 believe on December 28th, we requested a
13 meeting with the town. We were concerned
14 about the comments, once again, we were
15 candidly confused with some of the responses,
16 and we felt that that approach would be to
17 simply sit down with staff from the town,
18 consider our concerns, clarify some of the
19 issues, and then hopefully move forward in a
20 more positive direction.

21 Unfortunately, the response from the
22 town was that -- and I'll quote from the
23 correspondence that we received from the
24 commissioner.

25 "We appreciate the interest Suffolk

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 93

2 County Planni ng Staff has shown in our

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 planning efforts, however, we don't believe a
4 meeting is necessary to clarify our efforts,"
5 and then going on to succinctly clarify what
6 their responses are.

7 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Who signed that
8 letter?

9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: That was
10 Commissioner Bertoli.

11 To be clear, the Corridor Study and Land
12 Use Plan has involved the creation of four
13 community centers located at Hawkins Avenue,
14 referred to as the Hawkins Avenue, Main
15 Street -- John has it there on the screen --
16 in the vicinity of Portion Road and Hawkins
17 Avenue; hence the name.

18 The next town center was on Portion
19 Road, immediately adjacent to the
20 Hawkins Avenue Center, both east and west of
21 the Hawkins Avenue Center along Portion
22 Avenue -- or Portion Road, excuse me.

23 The next center would be Morris Avenue
24 Neighborhood Center at the eastern end of the
25 corridor. This is in close proximity of

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 94
2 Nichols Road.

3 And, finally, there was another center
4 known as the Highland -- Highpoint Regional
5 Center, which is a strip commercial center --
6 actually, three centers located in the center
7 of that diagram that John has up for you on

8 that screen.

9 The Land Use Plan also included -- or
10 proposed the creation of a new J-1
11 transitional zoning district. It was a
12 non-retail commercial rezoning district in
13 lieu of some strip commercial zoning. There
14 are also a number of opportunity sites
15 recommended for consideration within the plan
16 for a rezoning for additional commercial
17 consideration, and a residential transitional
18 zoning district also recommended for some of
19 the property.

20 The Corridor Study and Land Use Plan
21 also significantly included a retail market
22 analysis which found at the time, the
23 commission will recall, that there was
24 approximately 207,000 square foot of surplus
25 retail supply within the corridor. Again,

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 95

2 I'm being very clear and careful with my
3 words. It was 207,000 square foot of surplus
4 retail supply. Not retail potential, which
5 will be discussed later, but the existing
6 retail development within the corridor.

7 Finally, the study also found that there
8 was a deficit with respect to open space and
9 parkland on a per capita basis within the
10 corridor, based upon an analysis of existing
11 conditions.

12 Staff concerns in connection with the
13 original submission of the Corridor Study was
14 that the recommendations were inconsistent
15 with the actual goals; that the expansion of
16 the Downtown Main Street Business District as
17 envisioned within the Portion Road area, the
18 Hawkins Avenue area, and the Morris
19 Neighborhood Center significantly increased
20 the amount of potential retail development,
21 inconsistent with the identified concern over
22 the excess retail supply within the corridor
23 through the market study.

24 Very briefly, J-2 Business District,
25 which is a standard strip commercial zoning

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 96
2 district, allows for a floor area ratio of a
3 maximum of 35 percent. Meaning, for every
4 10,000 square foot of land area, you could
5 have 3,500 square foot of building area at a
6 maximum.

7 J-6 Main Street Business District, which
8 is being expanded as part of the zoning
9 recommendations, allows for a maximum floor
10 area ratio of 60 percent. Meaning, you would
11 be entitled to 6,000 square foot of
12 commercial space for every 10,000 square foot
13 of land area, assuming other conditions in
14 terms of parking and setbacks could be met.
15 So for every J-2 parcel or every acre of J-2
16 that gets rezoned to J-6, here, in effect,

17 increasing the amount of retail potential by
18 almost doubling it within the corridor.

19 The Corridor Study also recommended at
20 the Highpoint Center that the town consider
21 path sites or additional retail development
22 within those shopping centers in the central
23 portion of the corridor. And, again,
24 increasing, not decreasing, the amount of
25 retail within the -- within the Corridor

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 97
2 Study.

3 Finally, there are a number of rezonings
4 who were referenced at the time of the
5 meeting here before the commission last month
6 which were not included in the actual
7 original plan. They were referenced in the
8 plan, but actual listing or listing of those
9 rezonings was not included. The town has
10 since submitted that list, and we'll discuss
11 that in a minute.

12 So again, broadly speaking, the Corridor
13 Study recommended for its downtown community
14 centers. We were concerned with the amount
15 of retail that was found within the center.

16 The town's response to our concerns and
17 the commission's comments at the last meeting
18 was -- there were four or five basic
19 comments.

20 Number one, they indicated that they are

21 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
22 proposi ng rezoni ngs i n the vi ci ni ty of
23 Hawkins and Ronkonkoma Avenues that would
24 rezone or reduce the potential of retail
25 develo pment by 120,000 square feet.
They also i ndi cate that addi ti onal

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 98
2 rezoni ngs al ong Porti on Road would reduce the
3 potential for addi ti onal retail develo pment
4 by 206,000 square feet.

5 They also comment that the amount of
6 retail expansi on that would be permi tted wi th
7 the J-6 rezoni ng would be li mi ted to
8 34,000 square feet i n the downtown.

9 I'd poi nt out that the letter we
10 received from the commi ssi oner also notes an
11 addi ti onal 20,000 square feet of retail
12 capaci ty bei ng added at the Highpoi nt
13 Commercial Center, that's that regional strip
14 center, i n the central porti on of the
15 corri dor. Unfortunatel y, that reference of
16 20,000, we coul dn't fi nd wi thi n the land use
17 plan or wi thi n the FDIS that was submi tted as
18 part of the town's documentati on.

19 The town also states that i n l ooki ng at
20 the retail wi thi n the corri dor, the potential
21 retail , that a maximum of 16 percent lot
22 occupanc y would be consi dered based upon
23 thei r anal ysi s for the J-2 areas, and a
24 maximum lot occupanc y of between 20 and
25 30 percent would be consi dered wi thi n the

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 99

2 J-6 areas.

3 Overall, the town states that it would
4 be a reduction in the retail potential by
5 292,000 square feet when you subtract out the
6 34,000 square feet from the 300- -- excuse
7 me, the -- the 34,000 square feet from the
8 206,000 square feet being added and the
9 120,000 square feet being added.

10 Our comments in response to that -- and
11 again, this is why I felt -- why we felt that
12 the staff's standpoint at a meeting would
13 really be most appropriate, is that, number
14 one, the retail market study indicated that
15 there was an existing supply of -- surplus
16 supply of 207,000 square foot of retail
17 development within the corridor. And so that
18 was reflected by the vacancy rates within the
19 corridor, and the poor quality of retail uses
20 who exist along the corridor, and the
21 redundancy of retail uses within the
22 corridor.

23 The zoning changes, even if we assume
24 all of what the town has indicated to be
25 correct, reduce the amount of increases

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 100

2 potentially available within the corridor.

3 It does absolutely nothing to actually
4 address the surplus that already exists
5 within the corridor. And, in fact, even if
6 we assume all numbers to be true, it's still
7 adding additional retail to a corridor that
8 already has a couple hundred thousand square
9 foot of excess retail, as indicated by their
10 own market study.

11 Our second comment: The town
12 consistently makes reference to a lot
13 occupancy standard within the code;
14 16 percent lot occupancy within the
15 J-2 district, and 20 to 30 percent lot
16 occupancy within the J-6 district. The main
17 concern we have with that is that their code
18 does not contain a lot occupancy standard, it
19 contains a floor-area-ratio standard. And so
20 we're kind of comparing apples to oranges. A
21 lot occupancy standard just looks at the
22 footprint, whereas a floor-area-ratio
23 standard would look at the total amount left
24 for development on the property including
25 multiple floors, accessories, structures,

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 101
2 et cetera. So if we're going to do an
3 accurate analysis, it should really be based
4 upon floor-area-ratio and not a lot occupancy
5 standard just within the codes.

6 The second -- the third concern we would
7 have is that the assumption in terms of

8 maximum lot occupancy of 16 percent or 20 to
9 30 percent within the J-6 district don't have
10 significant proportions within the study, or
11 even in looking at existing conditions.
12 Looking at the downtown district, which we
13 have an aerial of, and it's hard to see from
14 this graphic, but it doesn't look that the
15 majority of development within this
16 corridor -- within the downtown along Hawkins
17 Avenue, is anything close to 20 to 30 percent
18 of the floor-area-ratio or lot occupancy. It
19 looks like a number of the parcels are
20 nearing 80 or 90 percent lot occupancy or a
21 floor-area-ratio, not the 20 to 30 percent
22 estimated. So we have concerns over the
23 accuracy of that number.

24 Next, when we look at all the areas of
25 J-6 that are being added to the subject

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 102
2 area -- to the study area, the 3.7 miles,
3 it's hard to understand how a maximum
4 34,000 square foot of retail capacity would
5 be considered when we're adding J-6. It
6 doesn't exist to the entirety of the area
7 within the Hawkins Avenue retail center, the
8 Portion Road retail center, and to half of
9 the Morris Avenue Neighborhood center. It's
10 just -- and, again, I think it would have
11 been helpful to sit down and actually discuss

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 these numbers with the town, but in the
13 absence of that, we can only look at it and
14 question the accuracy of the numbers.

15 Finally, the town submitted a litany of
16 rezonings that they indicate would reduce the
17 amount of retail potential by over
18 300,000 square feet. And they indicate that
19 they are proposing to rezone 127 parcels
20 within the corridor in order to reduce retail
21 potential within the corridor.

22 We looked at the list. The first time
23 we -- out of -- that there aren't 127 parcels
24 on the list, there are 95 parcels on the
25 list. So that's about a 25 percent reduction

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 103
2 in terms of the total parcels that are
3 actually included within the list.

4 When we looked at the types of
5 properties that are included within the list,
6 from the 95, based upon our estimate, 21 are
7 already held in public ownership. It would
8 include -- such as the Suffolk County Park on
9 the adjacent Ronkonkoma Avenue, as well as a
10 number of other public entities, including
11 free utilities.

12 In addition, there are a total of
13 71 properties who are either substandard in
14 size or split zones. Neither of which would
15 be permitted as-of-right to be developed for
16 retail purposes under the existing zoning.

17 So by saying that by eliminating that zoning
18 you're reducing retail potential, that would
19 have to be -- retail potential would have to
20 exist in order to eliminate it. So when we
21 look at total of the 127 properties, again,
22 there's only 95 listed, we take off 71 who
23 are either substandard or split zoned, which
24 couldn't be developed for commercial purposes
25 anyway, and 24 that are either held in public

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 104
2 ownership or owned by utilities, we're down
3 to 18 remaining properties, which represents
4 about 14 percent of the 127 that was
5 originally indicated to be rezoned.

6 In conclusion, while we appreciate the
7 town's response to our comments and the
8 prompt response, and while we again, once
9 again, give considerable praise to the town
10 for taking the initiative to address a
11 pattern of strip commercial zoning within the
12 corridor, we still struggle with concepts of
13 how the specific recommendations included
14 within the study are going to accomplish the
15 laudable and the state goals stated within
16 the land use plan.

17 That being said, there are a number
18 options. The commission could once again
19 recommend that the matter be deemed
20 incomplete and request an opportunity to

01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 discuss the data with the town. In fairness,
22 we don't want to appear from a staff
23 standpoint to be obstructionists to the
24 town's efforts. We applaud them on their
25 efforts. I think the intention is certainly

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 105
2 there, however, we still, I think, retain the
3 same concerns that we had when the
4 application was initially submitted.

5 That being said, the commission could --
6 we would respectfully recommend the
7 commission, at the very least, recommend
8 approval subject to the condition, which in
9 effect a comment, that the town address the
10 stated concerns this we've summarized here on
11 the record, and, once again, very carefully
12 consider the extent to which the positive
13 goals stated and enumerated within the study
14 can reasonably be anticipated to be
15 accomplished by the specific zoning
16 recommendations contained within the study.

17 Again, I apologize for the length of the
18 presentation and the complexity of it, but
19 we're just trying to give you as
20 comprehensive a presentation as possible.

21 If the commission members have any
22 questions, I'd be happy to try to address
23 them.

24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Dan. And,
25 you know, it is what it is, so we appreciate

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 106
2 the presentation.
3 This is a Brookhaven matter, and Michael
4 Kelly had to step away.
5 Adrienne, is there anything that you'd
6 like to add about the project and the area?
7 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: No. But as a
8 Brookhaven resident, I'd like to express my
9 disappointment that -- and concern that the
10 town would not meet with the county planni ng
11 staff upon that meeting request. I think
12 that that is a critical part of the
13 collaboration and information seeking that we
14 need as commission members to do our due
15 diligence and evaluation. And when the staff
16 has questions, those questions need to be
17 answered so that we can deliberate and
18 discuss and evaluate to the best of our
19 ability. And that did not happen here, which
20 leaves us in a very unfortunate situation.
21 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Adrienne.
22 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: I have --
23 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Charl a.
24 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: I have a questi on.
25 I'm concerned about the apparent

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 107
2 discrepancy between the fi ndi ngs vi s-à-vi s

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 the number of parcels involved in the
4 rezoning and their effect versus the position
5 at the Town of Brookhaven. And I'm having a
6 hard time thinking that this is a mistake on
7 their part; i.e., that somebody really
8 doesn't understand the effect of what they're
9 doing and what they're doing it to versus an
10 intentional -- an intentional sort of
11 obfuscation for just a blanket rezoning of
12 parcels that were preferred to be rezoned for
13 other reasons. And, you know, obviously,
14 this would have been something that could be
15 discussed in a personal meeting, but I'm
16 wondering, do you have any -- in any -- I
17 don't even know if you've had any discussions
18 on the phone with them, but in any sort of
19 exchange of information that you've had, has
20 there been some explanation of how those two
21 sets of facts could exist side by side.

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: I haven't
23 personally had any conversation with the
24 representative of the town, I know
25 Mr. Freleng did have a conversation with one

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 108
2 of the staff members. I don't know to what
3 level of detail it got into, but perhaps Andy
4 could speak to that.

5 MR. FRELENG: Well, I guess I could just
6 say that we agreed to disagree. Because when
7 they explained it to me, I didn't understand

8 what they were saying, and when I explained
9 our point to them, they didn't really
10 understand what we were saying. And that
11 precipitated the request that maybe we should
12 all get together, but they didn't agree with
13 our numbers.

14 CHAIRMAN CALONE: They didn't agree with
15 the request either, apparently, which is --
16 I -- I agree with Adrienne, extremely
17 troubling.

18 COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: (Indicating)

19 CHAIRMAN CALONE:
20 Commissioner Chartrand.

21 COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: Yes.

22 My question is, do you know where the
23 surplus is, that 207,000 square feet? Is
24 that like an area of the town that's not --
25 you know, might be off the beaten path and

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 109
2 they want to rezone that.

3 Do you know where that is?

4 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: The
5 207,000 square foot is a surplus retail
6 development their consultants found within
7 the corridor itself, in the 3.7 miles of the
8 corridor between Lake Ronkonkoma and the
9 hamlet of Farmingville in the vicinity of
10 Nichols Road. So it's that retail
11 development on Portion Road or on Hawkins

12 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
Avenue within the study area.

13 The properties that are proposed to be
14 rezoned, I don't have a listing of those by
15 tax map numbers, so I can research each and
16 every one of those.

17 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: It's dispersed
18 throughout that corridor is what you're
19 saying?

20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Yes. Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER POTTER: (Indicating)

22 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)

23 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Thank you,
24 Matt.
25 First, Commissioner Potter, and then

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 110
2 Vince.

3 COMMISSIONER POTTER: Excess, does that
4 mean that it's vacant?

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: It didn't
6 qualify it as vacant. And, again, I can only
7 go by the information contained within the
8 study. It indicated there was a redundancy
9 of retail uses and, I guess, multiple retail
10 categories being repeated, and that there was
11 a vacancy rate, as well as a question
12 regarding the quality of the retail
13 development that occurred. Again, I'm only
14 quoting the study itself, the market study,
15 not my opinion, but the quality as well as
16 the quantity of retail development in the
Page 94

17 study area. Again, not on a town-wide basis,
18 just within the 3.7 miles that was considered
19 as part of the study.

20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes, Job.

21 COMMISSIONER POTTER: It's very hard
22 without having more detail to know what's
23 going on there, but it's -- it's clearly
24 pretty disturbing to count in
25 government-owned properties as a reduction in

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 111
2 potential commercial use when those will
3 never be used for commercial. And that just
4 seems ridiculous.

5 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Yeah. Not
6 to -- to speak to motives, but one of the
7 concerns we had with the previous corridor
8 study, the Middle Country Road corridor study
9 involving the community of Coram, Middle
10 Island, and Ridge, there was a similar
11 representation made that 1,700 acres of
12 properties were being rezoned to more
13 restrictive categories in order to lessen the
14 amount of development potential within the
15 corridor. And we did look at the actual
16 listing of applications or sites that were
17 being rezoned, which wasn't included with the
18 study itself. Out of the 1,700 acres, more
19 than 1,500 acres were in public ownership.

20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Dan.

21
22
23
24
25

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Just quickly.

I actually followed all of what Dan was discussing, which is not always the case, but my concern here is that --

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 112

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: You're not alone.

(Laughter)

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: No, it was very -- very good. It was a lot easier than actually reading it.

(Laughter)

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: It's -- it's very confusing. I mean, clearly they -- they have an oversupply, they have surplus retail, which doesn't necessarily mean vacant. So I'm not -- you know, through that business, operating successfully in that storefront, I guess you wouldn't consider yourself surplus, but --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Nor would you want the town to.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Exactly. I'm -- I'm just so totally confused.

My real question here is just about our recommendation, or your recommendation, "the town shall address." To me, it almost sounds like they can skirt it by -- I mean, what does that mean; address it, they need to

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 113

2 speak to it?

3 I wish it were actually stronger. Not
4 that I know -- know how to make that
5 statement stronger.

6 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Let me -- let me speak
7 for myself.

8 I can't in good conscience vote to
9 approve something where they haven't given us
10 the information we've asked for. So my
11 personal opinion would be this is either
12 incomplete or this goes back. I would be
13 comfortable voting for a denial and
14 indicating that, you know, the action
15 suggested by the land use plan failed to
16 address the stated goal for producing the
17 oversupply of retail -- square footage in
18 this area. You know, and I don't want to --

19 Anyway, that's kind of my feeling on it.
20 And I think that was, of course, your
21 concern, Vince, but I think it also sends a
22 much stronger message.

23 I would also think that we should
24 consider sending a comment back saying
25 something along the lines of what Adrienne

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 114

2 said, which is, you know -- you know, this is

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 supposed to be a collaborative process, or we
4 recommend that the town board, you know, ask
5 the Department of Planning why they refused
6 to meet with our staff. I don't think this
7 is a trivial thing, in my mind.

8 So --

9 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: I agree.

10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- anyway, other
11 thoughts, comments, or questions?

12 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: (Indicating)

13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Barbara.

14 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I totally agree,
15 David.

16 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: I absolutely agree
17 with you.

18 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I agree, too.

19 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: And I feel that we
20 have to take a strong position on this for
21 the simple reason that they really had an
22 opportunity to work something out with us, or
23 at least be able to clarify their position
24 versus our position, and that opportunity
25 seems like a simple thing, and it wasn't

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 115
2 availed. So that's what I think we should
3 do, is deny it. I would be comfortable with
4 a denial.

5 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: I would prefer a
6 denial, because I think it is a critical part
7 of the process for us to have the information

8 we need. When the staff asks for a meeting
9 and when that meeting is denied, we can't do
10 due diligence, we can't do a meaningful
11 evaluation. And I think it deserves a denial
12 for that point. We cannot have this sit as a
13 precedent in any way, shape, or form. I
14 think that would be very unfortunate -- very
15 unfortunate situation.

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Adrienne.

17 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: I agree.

18 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)

19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Vince.

20 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Just quickly.

21 To me, it actually seems like -- that
22 Dan did a more thorough exam than their
23 examination or final editing of their --
24 their work than they did, and -- and I think
25 that -- you know, that's sad. I'm very

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 116
2 supportive of sending a stronger message
3 back.

4 I just wanted to suggest that possibly
5 adding a comment to, you know, commend them
6 for, you know, the overall effort, as Dan was
7 referring to earlier. I mean, their -- their
8 heart, perhaps, is in the right place, and we
9 support them, we want them to go further, but
10 they need to address this and send it back
11 if -- if they expect us to make a decision.

12 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Anyone else?
13 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
14 CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. There
15 seems to be a consensus on -- well -- is
16 there any objection to making this a denial?
17 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
18 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Seeing none.
19 And the way I just rephrased it was just
20 to -- we have to give a reason for denial,
21 and that would be that we -- you know, the
22 actions -- as far as we can tell, the reasons
23 Job pointed out and Dan pointed out, you
24 know, failed to address the stated goal. And
25 then I guess the question is what a comment

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 117
2 should be, how to phase that.
3 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I think Adrienne
4 articulated it very well. If we could get
5 her to say it again, but --
6 CHAIRMAN CALONE: From when it started?
7 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: -- but you
8 articulated it very well.
9 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Thank you.
10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Adrienne, and then --
11 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: (Indicating)
12 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- and then
13 Constantine.
14 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: The comment should
15 be that the Commission expresses concern and
16 disappointment that the request was not

17 fulfilled for the town to meet with the
18 county to provide clarification and
19 additional information that our commission
20 needed to provide a thorough and meaningful
21 evaluation of the proposal.

22 COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Due diligence.

23 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: And to make an
24 informed decision.

25 CHAIRMAN CALONE: I'm taking these notes

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 118
2 and I realize we actually have a court
3 reporter here.

4 Could we get that read back? And I want
5 to make that Andy or whoever -- Andy, Dotty,
6 whoever's taking the notes of the
7 resolution --

8 MR. FRELENG: We all are. Staff will do
9 it.

10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Could you read that
11 back, just what Adrienne said. Just so -- I
12 want to make sure everyone's comfortable with
13 it.

14 (WHEREUPON, the requested portion of the
15 testimony was read by Alison Mahoney.)

16 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: And to make an
17 informed decision.

18 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. So we have the
19 comment. I would just --

20 We want to change, Andy, just things

21 01 06 10_Planning_Commission.txt
like "our commission" to "the commission,"
22 and those kinds of things.

23 And then the other -- the other, I
24 think, more important piece was just that
25 that conversation was critical for us to

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 119
2 evaluate the proposal.

3 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: (Head gesture)

4 CHAIRMAN CALONE: And I also -- we also,
5 of course, mentioned that the County Planning
6 Department with the Brookhaven Town Planning
7 Department be the key -- you know --

8 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Key players.

9 CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- key players.

10 All right. Constantine felt that you --
11 you captured it so well.

12 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Any other
14 thoughts, comments?

15 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: So we have a
17 recommend--- or the -- what we have
18 discussed is a denial for the reason that the
19 action suggested by the land use plan failed
20 to address the stated goal of reducing the
21 oversupply of retail square footage in the
22 subject area, and the comment that -- as it's
23 been read twice. So I think we all heard it.

24 All right. Any other thoughts,
25 comments?

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 120
2 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
3 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seei ng none, we'II
4 entertain a moti on.
5 SECRETARY ESPOSITO: (Indi cati ng)
6 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Moved by
7 Secretary Esposi to.
8 COMMI SSIONER HOLMES: I'II second it.
9 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seconded by
10 Commi ssi oner Hol mes.
11 All in favor of the resoluti on as has
12 been di scussed for deni al for the reason
13 indi cated and wi th the comment, please rai se
14 your hand.
15 (WHEREUPON, the members voted.)
16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: That' s 9 to zero.
17 Thank you all .
18 We have one last i tem on our agenda, and
19 that is j ust an update on the -- the County
20 Comprehensive Pl an by -- by Seth Foreman.
21 I thi nk what we'II do is we'II hold the
22 Pi ne Barrens conversati on unti l next month.
23 I don' t thi nk there' s any cri ti cal rush on
24 that, Andy. I appreciate you prepari ng that,
25 but gi ven the ti me --

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 121
2 MR. FRELENG: Yeah.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thanks.

(Discussion held off the record.)

CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. The last item on our agenda today is the update from the County Planning Department.

Dr. Seth Foreman will be making that presentation today on the -- on the latest update on the comprehensive plan, and it's the quality of life section.

Seth.

DR. FOREMAN: Thank you, Chairman Calone, Executive Director Isles, and Members of the Suffolk Planning Commission, and Deputy Director Gulizio.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Last but not least.

DR. FOREMAN: Of course.

I'm happy to have an opportunity to share -- to update you on some of the activities we've been involved in with regard to the quality of life segment of the comprehensive plan. It's a segment that's taken a lot of time on the -- of the staff to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 122
get off the ground because it's not easy to negotiate the quality of life in general when you're talking about measuring it, but also because Suffolk County has some really unique things about it. And we don't want to -- we don't want to just resort to comfortable

8 ideas and methods, we want to do something
9 that's different, that really captures some
10 things we think are important but really
11 haven't been captured in other reports that
12 we have read about in the recent past.

13 So a lot of what I'm saying here in this
14 draft that I've handed out and in what I want
15 to talk about here is the methodology in the
16 way we've gone about creating it and
17 establishing it to get some feedback from
18 commission members, additions, deletions,
19 what have you. The data that I'm presenting
20 here today itself is preliminary at best, but
21 to give you an idea of how we are going about
22 structuring the report.

23 The draft simply states that the quality
24 of life, as you know, has been a subject of
25 considerable attention in the past decade.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 123

2 And a lot of that can be attributed to the
3 fact that Suffolk's one of the early postwar
4 inner ring, if you will, or old-lying
5 suburbs. And that it was basically populated
6 on the West End by a bedroom -- as a bedroom
7 appendage of westernmost areas of Nassau and
8 New York City.

9 And these suburbs throughout the country
10 that are developed at this time are said to
11 have -- to be facing a number of very

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 significant challenges. And among them are
13 the high cost of living, dwindling amounts of
14 developable real estate, aging population and
15 demographic diversity, and highway
16 congestion, and growing income inequality,
17 among other things.

18 So oftentimes these first suburbs are
19 distinguished from newer exurbs, if you will,
20 by the fact that the newer exurbs, many of
21 them located in the south and southwest of
22 the country, are -- economically independent
23 of large cities for the most part, are
24 usually located a county or two or three away
25 from a major city. And they have more land

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 124
2 to expand outward or to continue the sprawl,
3 and they're younger demographically and more
4 homogenous as well.

5 So, in some ways, Suffolk does look like
6 the first suburb that we hear so much about.
7 Its major population growth is probably
8 behind it.

9 Figure 1 on the handout that I handed to
10 you shows you that between 1950 and 1960
11 Suffolk's population grew by 141 percent.
12 Over the past eight years, 2000 to 2008, it's
13 grown by about 6.3 percent. So we've had
14 most of our growth and we've experienced a
15 net loss, like the other first suburbs, of
16 native or domestic population over the

17 eight year period. Approximately 59,000 more
18 residents moved out of Suffolk County to
19 other parts of the country than moved in from
20 elsewhere in the United States. But also
21 typical of inner ring or first suburbs is
22 that we netted 31,000 residents from overseas
23 migration during the same period, and we
24 gained about 66- -- 66,000 through natural
25 increase. Related to that, of course, is the

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 125

2 fact that overseas immigrants also tend to
3 have higher birth rates than native-born
4 residents.

5 There are other factors that also make
6 Suffolk County similar to inner ring suburbs.

7 Peter Lambert told you last time that
8 you met that we have aging population; the
9 average age was 35 in 1980, it's 38 in 2008.

10 It's become more expensive to live here
11 relative to other places; roughly 30 to
12 40 percent higher than the average for the
13 rest of the nation.

14 And we have a fragmented government
15 structure and a decentralized decision-making
16 government structure. So -- that's also
17 typical of a lot of first suburbs. Often
18 used as -- to have, maybe sometimes, a
19 negative connotation, I don't think it always
20 has to have that, but it is something to be

21 01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
observed.

22 Many of Suffolk's roads often make it on
23 to the state's most congested list every
24 year.

25 And the region's public schools are

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 126

2 highly regarded, but they're also racially
3 imbalanced and they have uneven quality.

4 Our household income has been growing
5 more stratified. We have more upper-income
6 households, which we've defined as \$150,000
7 or more; they've increased by about 11- --
8 excuse me, 11 percentage points since 2000,
9 and that's good. And there's been a small
10 decline in the number of low-income
11 households by about 3 percentage points,
12 which is also good. But we have a very large
13 decline in the number of middle-income
14 households of about 8 percentage points. So
15 that if the trend continues, the great middle
16 class postwar suburb may soon reflect the
17 dumbbell income distribution of Manhattan or
18 San Francisco with lots of households on each
19 side, top and bottom, and fewer in the
20 middle.

21 So along with that, and this is one of
22 the challenges of the study, Suffolk also
23 has, unlike a lot of first or inner ring
24 suburbs, many characteristics that make it
25 akin to an exurb. There's enough that's

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 127
2 unique about it to make it totally -- not
3 completely accurate to lump it in with the
4 other first suburb or inner ring suburb
5 models that we've seen.
6 First, we know that Suffolk's landscape
7 is diverse. Only Western Suffolk County
8 really reflects the traditional settlement
9 pattern that expands outward from a central
10 business district -- in our case, Lower
11 Manhattan or Midtown Manhattan -- that's
12 typical of the inner ring suburbs. The
13 westernmost portion of Suffolk is like Nassau
14 characterized by a mix of suburban and urban
15 development.
16 Suffolk's east end was settled earlier
17 than its West End, and it only became linked
18 socially and economically to New York City
19 and the rest of the state with the
20 development of rail transportation in the
21 middle of the 1800s. The east end retains
22 a small town agricultural, somewhat
23 New Englandish feel. In fact, the Nassau
24 Community College Scholar, Faren Simonoff,
25 explains in her recent book "Crossing the

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 128
2 Sound" that the east of Long Island was

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 settled mostly by New Englanders coming from
4 Connecticut in the 1600s, and evolved really
5 as part of this tumultuous New -- New England
6 world.

7 So the density cutoff, as you know, for
8 suburbia nationally is about a thousand
9 people per square mile. And in Suffolk, we
10 average about 1,600 people per square mile.
11 And when I say the cutoff, I mean the level
12 of population at which it becomes
13 prohibitively expensive to provide urbanized
14 level to our infrastructure and water
15 services and sanitation and things like that.

16 We have 1,600 residents per square mile,
17 but it's much -- but it's much lower on the
18 east end, lower than the typical suburban
19 density, and higher on the West End, which
20 resembles the 4,500 per square mile that
21 Nassau averages.

22 So the difference that's reflected in
23 the -- in the half and half nature of
24 Suffolk County in terms of population,
25 geography, and landscape is also reflected in

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 129
2 governing structure as well.

3 We know the western portion of
4 Suffolk County, the five towns, Babylon,
5 Brookhaven, Huntington, Islip, and Smithtown,
6 constitute the county police district, where
7 policing is a county function. And the

8 eastern portion, the townships and the
9 villages really take over the police
10 function. They're not in the police
11 district.

12 The east end townships also levy in
13 additional real estate transfer tax for land
14 preservation within their boundaries. And
15 that, to me, is indicative of some
16 significant political differences from --
17 between the east and the West End. We know
18 that Brookhaven, in recent years, voters
19 rejected a similar kind of tax for land
20 preservation. And, you know, I think that
21 the assumption or the conclusion or the
22 message from that is that in some places in
23 the county, taxes and housing costs are, you
24 know, more in -- more -- of greater
25 significance in terms of concern for people

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 130
2 than open space preservation. Obviously,
3 that's a loaded political statement, but I
4 think we've seen that.

5 But unlike Nassau County and other
6 similarly situated suburbs, Suffolk still
7 has a decent amount of acre developable to
8 land, and that accounts for its persistent
9 growth rate. Again, we've grown 6.3 percent
10 since 2000, which is close to the national
11 rate of population growth, and it's double

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 the statewide average. So we are growing
13 county -- or a growth county in New York
14 State.

15 Suffolk County's population is
16 relatively affluent, but our educational
17 attainment is average. That's surprising to
18 a lot of people. We have a median household
19 income of roughly 85-, 85,000.
20 Two-thirds above the national median and
21 55 percent above the statewide figure, but
22 only slightly over 31 percent of adults over
23 the age of 25 have college degrees. Which is
24 the same for the state as a whole. And
25 that's probably related to the fact that

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 131
2 unlike most inner ring suburbs, Suffolk
3 retains a fairly high concentration of
4 manufacturing activity. Specifically in
5 computers and electronic products.

6 And it also has a comparatively large
7 percentage of its labor force working within
8 the county's borders. Based on the
9 2000 census, 74 percent of all employed
10 residents of Suffolk County work in the
11 county, with another 14 percent working in
12 neighboring Nassau. The remaining 12 percent
13 work mostly in New York City. A relatively
14 small proportion of Suffolk's workforce
15 reverse commutes, meaning to Manhattan. Nine
16 percent commute to Nassau, and three percent

17 commute to New York City.
18 No, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Excuse me.
19 A relatively small proportion of
20 Suffolk's workforce, but a growing
21 proportion, reverse commutes from New York
22 City. Nine percent of our workforce commutes
23 from Nassau. Three percent from New York
24 City, or about a hundred thousand.
25 So while Suffolk shares some of the same

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 132
2 problems and possesses many of the qualities
3 of -- associated with inner ring suburbs, its
4 wide-ranging physical form, its relative
5 economic independence, and its unique
6 government structure requires a different
7 approach be taken to gauging the quality of
8 life. Lumping Suffolk together with the
9 other first suburbs of the country and
10 ignoring distinctive nature will do little to
11 help lay the groundwork for its evolution
12 over the next 30 years.

13 Now, there are several problems with
14 measuring quality of life, in general. Most
15 of them stemming from the opaque and sort of
16 nondescript nature or meaning of the phrase
17 itself. What constitutes a high quality is
18 different for everyone. It's obvious to make
19 the -- it's obvious to -- to note that good
20 schools might mean less to a single adult

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 than they do to a family with children.
22 Higher wages might mean more to workers than
23 they do to retirees. Access to parks might
24 mean more to middle class hikers than to
25 wealthy yacht owners, and that's not to

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 133
2 indicate that wealthy people don't hike or
3 that middle class people sometimes don't own
4 yachts.

5 It is neither possible nor desirable to
6 impose a single and universal interpretation
7 on uses of data related to planning.
8 Scientific methods and -- especially in the
9 social sciences are imperfect. They result
10 in analyses that can not be expected to have
11 uniform understandings. Most -- the most
12 planners could hope to do, and what we hope
13 to do, is to clarify complicated public
14 issues through the careful and disinterested
15 collection and evaluation of data. And
16 through the discovery of new information, as
17 well, to illuminate the ground we work on, or
18 illuminate the ground that we stand on, and
19 to provide policy options that might pave our
20 own way -- our own course for the future.

21 Indicators that are very important for
22 the quality of life are not always conducive
23 to change via governmental intervention. It
24 may, you know, be obvious to a lot of people,
25 but most studies don't note that the reason

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 134
2 or the quality of life in a -- in a region or
3 a -- the reason people live in regions are,
4 you know, mostly related -- I would say when
5 they do these surveys on why people move, the
6 census has found that most of it -- most of
7 the people indicate, first, family reasons;
8 secondly, jobs are important and, of course,
9 they do matter; but other things such as
10 annual precipitation, average temperature,
11 average wind speed, the number of sunny days
12 in a year. Those are highly correlated
13 factors when you talk about migration
14 patterns. The amount of coastal land and
15 inland surface water -- you can't really
16 control those things -- those indicators will
17 be addressed as they relate to challenges
18 they may pose. Such as cold winters that may
19 be very hard on the elderly, or the
20 advantages they may offer. Access to beaches
21 attract residents and tourists, so we have to
22 talk about our coastal policies. So we'll
23 deal with policies that can mitigate related
24 problems, or further augment advantages that
25 these somewhat uncontrollable indicators

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 135
2 have.

3 The primary way we are attempting to
4 study and clarify the quality of life is to
5 focus on nonsubjective data. And by that I
6 mean, most would not interview non- -- or
7 opinion survey. And we know that there are
8 several studies or a handful of studies that
9 have been done recently that focus on
10 interview of public opinion survey.

11 We're trying to do nonsubjective data
12 analysis in order to compare the desirability
13 of living in Suffolk County with other
14 similarly situated counties throughout the
15 country. A list of 12 -- in some cases 13,
16 but the staff has been kind of wrestling with
17 whether to include one or throw out another
18 or what have you. But a list of 12 counties
19 nationwide that have been chosen for purposes
20 of population densities, geographic income,
21 wealth, and demographic similarities with
22 Suffolk County. And we've established, like
23 I said, a list of 12, which I'll tell you or
24 show you in a minute, they're in the figures
25 that are attached.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 136

2 Some of the most basic nonsubjective
3 measures for the quality of life include
4 crime rates and safety, cost of living,
5 employment, educational quality, physical and
6 mental health care accessibility, the amount
7 of parkland, environmental quality, the

8 number of national parks, the social and
9 economic mobility, diversity and homogeneity
10 of communities, the frequency of manmade or
11 natural disasters or events, average commute
12 times, and cultural and religious life.

13 This analysis will attempt to determine
14 peoples' overall utility in comparable
15 counties. That is, to assume that people
16 like amenities such as high incomes and
17 dislike -- excuse me for the awkward phrase,
18 but disamenities such as high housing costs.
19 When possible, amenities will be adjusted to
20 the existence of disamenities in order to
21 determine the overall net utility of living
22 in Suffolk as opposed to a comparable county.
23 For example, high home prices are a dependant
24 variable driven by the demand for housing in
25 a given county. But it's not clear just by

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 137
2 making that observation that this is a
3 disamenity, that it's deleterious to a
4 region's quality of life. By themselves,
5 high home prices do not suggest unaffordable
6 housing for inhabitants. The high cost of
7 home prices must be adjusted to reflect
8 incomes and to compare the resulting data
9 with other similar counties.

10 Does the high cost of income -- excuse
11 me, of homes take a larger percentage of

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 income from residents in one county than in
13 another comparable county? If high incomes
14 compensate for high housing costs, it's
15 possible that housing costs are not at the
16 core of the challenges that a county faces.
17 This is the kind of analysis economists call
18 compensating differentials by -- by
19 geographical areas.

20 In some cases, either because of the
21 lack of data availability or time constraints
22 or because of irrelevance in a particular
23 case under investigation, comparison will be
24 made with only a selected group of the
25 comparable counties, or even with just

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 138
2 counties located in a New York town, state
3 region being that they may be more relevant
4 to a specific question.

5 At any rate, just to get into the data a
6 little bit, perhaps the most important
7 indicator available in determining whether
8 Suffolk is -- has an advantage over relation
9 to comparable counties, it's important to
10 look at migration patterns. I mean, this is
11 known as the TBU principle that people
12 essentially vote with their feet. And
13 there's been a lot of criticism of that
14 principal, but it's still accepted as a
15 pretty good measure of whether people feel
16 they are -- it's advantageous to stay or to

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

go.
And simply put, as we mentioned before, more people living in Suffolk County choose to leave it and live elsewhere in the United States than choose to come to it from other areas in the United States. While it's not clear why this is so, it is probably fairly said that this means the disamenities of living in Suffolk outweigh the amenities for

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 139

many people. Obviously, not for the vast majority, but for many people.

It's important to note, though, again, that migration patterns, especially the one that has seen many people move from the northeast to the south and southwest, is a pattern that's been observed for decades. And it has a lot to do with the decline in manufacturing as a proportion of our economy, the rise of the information economy in which living in dense, coastal cities with Atlantic Ocean ports, has become much less important. There's little counties and regions in the northeast can do about that.

Figure 4 indicates, though, that compared to other downstate counties in New York, Suffolk County does have a higher net migration -- excuse me, net domestic migration loss than counties such as

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 Rockland, Putnam, Dutchess, and Orange.
22 Those are the other sort of one county up
23 suburb counties -- suburban counties in the
24 MTA region, the Metropolitan Transportation
25 Authority region. However, though, we have

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 140
2 less of a net loss domestically than New York
3 City, Nassau, and Westchester.

4 Lots of people don't know this, but
5 New York City has lost 1.2 million people net
6 from domestic migration over the last eight
7 years; Nassau County, 96,000; Westchester,
8 75,000. Again, compared to Suffolk's 58- or
9 59,000. Putnam, Dutchess, Orange, less.

10 It's important probably to measure those
11 migration losses as a percentage of the
12 population base in 2000. Suffolk's place
13 improves, because when that's done, Rockland
14 County surpasses Suffolk County as a domestic
15 migration loser. Suffolk County lost
16 4.1 percent of its base in the last eight
17 years, and Rockland County has lost
18 9.2 percent. Westchester lost 8.1 percent;
19 Nassau, 7.2 percent; and New York City,
20 14.4 percent.

21 So we're all domestic migration losers,
22 some worse than others. However, it's also
23 informative to look at some of the comparable
24 counties that we've identified. Suffolk's
25 position becomes even more positive when you

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 141
2 do that. Out of 14 counties, and we added
3 Mammoth County, New Jersey, to the migrati on
4 analysis, Suffolk has the lowest percentage
5 net domestic migrati on loss for the past
6 eight years.
7 Fairfax County, Virginia, which has been
8 pointed to in some recent studies as a place
9 that's doing things right as opposed to
10 Suffolk or Nassau, Fairfax County, Virginia,
11 leads the pack in the terms of percentage
12 loss at 11.1 percent of their base
13 populati on. And then they're followed again
14 by Rockland at 9.2. Prince George's,
15 Maryland, which is, again -- the two counties
16 in Maryland, Prince George's, Maryland and
17 Montgomery, Maryland, again, appear in
18 studies time after time about the way to do
19 things right, and it appears that they're
20 losing a larger porti on of their base
21 populati on than Suffolk County is by a
22 substantial amount. Prince George has lost
23 8.3 percent; Montgomery County, 7.8 percent,
24 again, compared to our 4.1 percent.
25 And you can see --

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 142
2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: So your Y actual ly

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
should be percentage.

DR. FOREMAN: It says "number of people," you're right. Damn.

DIRECTOR ISLES: This is a draft.

DR. FOREMAN: "Draft" it says, you know.

CHAIRMAN CALONE: And we're -- we're here just to provide feedback.

MS. SPAHR: Aren't you impressed that he read it?

DR. FOREMAN: That is nice that you read it, it's nice to know. There are private conversations that can be held, too; that's not against the law.

(Laughter)

DR. FOREMAN: Anyway, there are a number of cost of living calculators that are available to researchers preliminarily. We have landed on Sperling's BestPlaces and the townhunter.com cost of living calculators because we found that we could find most of our comparable counties between those two calculators. So when --

So these tools indicate that someone

Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 143

earning the median household income of \$85,560 in Suffolk could enjoy a similar standard of living with considerably less income in most comparable counties. For example, 75,000 or almost 76,000 in Barnstable, Massachusetts; 73,000 in DuPage,

8 Illinois; 50- or almost 60,000 in McCoon
9 County, Michigan; 81,000, 82,000 in
10 Middlesex, Massachusetts; 47,000 in
11 Montgomery, Pennsylvania; and 62,000 in
12 Prince George's, Maryland; 81,000 in
13 Rockland; and 79-, almost 80,000 in
14 Westchester.

15 There are several comparable counties
16 where you need a higher salary or income to
17 have the same standard of living in Suffolk.
18 They include Bergen County, New Jersey, where
19 you need almost \$95,000 to live like someone
20 in Suffolk making 86,000; 88-, almost 89,000
21 for Fairfax, Virginia; and almost 90,000 in
22 Montgomery County, Maryland; and 93,000 in
23 Nassau County, New York.

24 Now, the thing that we hope to do is to
25 be able to adjust these -- these tools, these

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 144
2 calculators for -- you know, for quality of
3 life differentials. I mean, you could
4 compare counties directly, they mean one
5 thing, and when you adjust for the cost of
6 living in each case -- in each instance, they
7 mean something else.

8 (WHEREUPON, Commissioner Holmes left the
9 Legislative Auditorium.)

10 (Time noted: 2:51 p.m.)

11 DR. FOREMAN: One way to better put in

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 context the median household income in
13 Suffolk County in relation to other counties
14 is to adjust the measures of income by cost
15 of living differentials. So, for example, if
16 an annual household income in Suffolk County
17 is 85,560, and it's 13.3 percent higher than
18 a comparable income of 75,000 in Barnstable,
19 Massachusetts, then Barnstable's 2008
20 per capita income would be increased by
21 13.3 percent.

22 This calculation yields a measurement of
23 each county's average standard of living and
24 shows how the actual purchasing power of a
25 resident in Barnstable compares with that of

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 145
2 a resident in Suffolk County. And the first
3 table we have here on that is Figure 8. It's
4 the per capita income adjusted for the
5 difference in comparable salaries. And in
6 that -- by that measure, Suffolk County comes
7 out the poorest county among the
8 12 comparables or 13 comparables; 47,624 in
9 terms of per capita income. Montgomery
10 County, Pennsylvania comes in the highest at
11 almost -- well, 94,000 per capita.

12 Now, some economists will tell you that
13 per capita income numbers or any kind of a
14 measure of an average income is in -- it's --
15 it can distort the perception of wealth or
16 the standard of living in a given area,

17 because very high earners can raise the
18 average significantly. Instead, some
19 economists recommend using an income measure
20 of central tendency like median household
21 income, since that statistic indicates a
22 precise number of residents living above or
23 below a certain level. So when median
24 household incomes are adjusted, the
25 differences in the cost of living, we see

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 146
2 that Suffolk pops back up into the middle of
3 the pack, Figure 8 shows, with an adjusted
4 median household income of \$85,000 higher
5 than Barnstable; Bergen County, New Jersey;
6 McCoon, Michigan; Middlesex, Massachusetts;
7 and Nassau County, but still lower than
8 Westchester; Montgomery, Maryland; Rockland;
9 DuPage; Prince George's; Fairfax; and
10 Montgomery, Pennsylvania.

11 Then I've given you a little bit of a
12 sample of how we assume or how we are going
13 to go about pulling apart the components of
14 just the cost of living. One of them being
15 the cost of government. We have several
16 figures here, Figure 9, 10, 11, that show
17 in comparison with the comparable counties,
18 the median residential property taxes, a
19 percentage of homeowner household income in
20 2008; the per capita real property tax in all

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 of these counties; the per capita real
22 property tax as a percentage of per capita
23 income, and in the back, we have -- the last
24 figure is per capita real property tax as a
25 percentage of, like I already said, median

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 147
2 household income -- sorry to repeat that --
3 and then the last table is just a table on
4 the town-by-town average real property tax
5 bill for the average resident in each town
6 from 2000 to 2009.

7 And, again, this is just to give you an
8 idea of the kind of data we're collecting.
9 There are a lot of other data points. Some
10 of them are of -- of -- of marginal interest
11 because we know about them; low crime rate
12 or, you know, access, or number of hospitals
13 or emergency rooms. But others we hope to
14 discover will tell us a lot more about the
15 challenges Suffolk faces.

16 So I hope that gives you a good idea of
17 where we are in terms of this chapter, and I
18 certainly welcome any feedback you can offer.

19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Seth. This
20 is fantastic and obviously a lot to digest,
21 and -- but this speaks further to why this is
22 an important exercise for all of us in terms
23 of knowing where we stand. And I would -- I
24 would just say two things.

25 One, obviously, a major cost of living,
Page 126

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 148
2 obviously, housing. I'm sure that's going to
3 be a piece of the component, the cost of
4 living, which obviously there's a lot of
5 quantitative data about.
6 The other thing I think that's
7 interesting is, doing this in a relativistic
8 way certainly allows us to benchmark against
9 our, kind of, peers.
10 And then I wonder whether there's a way
11 to be kind of, you know, idealistic about it
12 in terms of whether others that may be aren't
13 our peers, but are other data sets that can
14 be compared to --
15 I don't know the answer to that, I'm
16 just saying, you know, we're doing it in a
17 relativistic way, and that's helpful because
18 it allows us to stay within the -- in the
19 bounds of what is, you know, achievable of
20 where do we stand. And then, I guess, the
21 question becomes where do we stand against
22 some ideals. In other words, how do we get,
23 you know, to take that further step.
24 So I think this is a fantastic start,
25 that's for sure.

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 149
2 DR. FOREMAN: Thanks.

3 I think that you're -- you're suggesting
4 that we, obviously, delve into, you know, a
5 set of goals and objectives. And, you know,
6 we have done that, to some extent, but we
7 certainly want to -- to -- to work closer
8 with commission members to establish those.

9 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Appreciate that, and
10 also know this is a -- this is a baseline and
11 this is the start, so that's -- that's
12 appreciated.

13 DR. FOREMAN: Thank you.

14 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: (Indicating)

15 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Constantine.

16 VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Yeah. I
17 think -- you know, that's a great point about
18 the comparison groups here. I think there is
19 a little bit of selection bias depending on
20 what you're trying to accomplish. I mean, if
21 you're comparing -- you know, if you compare
22 a lot of other places that are in similar
23 dire straits as us or even -- or in Suffolk
24 County, if you want to look at it negatively,
25 it could be a positive thing either way, you

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 150
2 know, you might relatively be doing better
3 than them, but everybody might be doing very
4 badly. So there might be another angle to
5 this, which is to look at places perhaps with
6 better income quality or better other
7 measures of quality of life, and compare them

8 to what's going on. Compare us to what's
9 going on there to see actual differences in
10 perhaps places that -- that might be doing
11 things a little bit differently, that might
12 have higher measures in terms of some of
13 these areas.

14 The only other thing I would add here
15 are environmental impact measures like
16 CO2-per-capita kind of type measures,
17 carbonization per capital measures, and also
18 transportation. Average commute times and
19 vehicles miles traveled per capital, I think,
20 are important measures for quality of life.

21 And then the last, you have the measure
22 of central tendency with the incomes, but you
23 also need to look at dispersions. So I think
24 kind of the distribution of income is going
25 to be an important part, especially how you

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 151
2 reference the dumbbell distribution of
3 income. Obviously, the people who are making
4 the lower end of the scale have a very
5 different quality of life experience here
6 than the people in the middle or the higher
7 end of the scale. So I think it's important
8 to try and bring that in, if you can.

9 But other than that, this is great.
10 This is a great start. This is exactly what
11 we need for this kind of -- this kind of

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
12 project, this kind of effort. I mean, this
13 kind of data analysis is really going to help
14 us answer a lot of important questions.

15 DR. FOREMAN: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you,
17 Constantine.

18 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)

19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Vince.

20 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Just one quick
21 question related to the East End.

22 How do you account for the high housing
23 costs on the East End when, in fact, all the
24 towns east of Riverhead, the year-round
25 population is, you know, 40 to 50 percent on

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 152
2 average? So there's very expensive real
3 estate, but the incomes on the East End are
4 counted probably in Nassau or mostly in the
5 city, because there are people that reside in
6 the city but they buy very expensive houses
7 out east. I don't know how to deal with that
8 one, but that would seem to skew the --
9 the -- that comparison between costs and
10 income.

11 DR. FOREMAN: If that's, in fact, what's
12 happening, then it would.

13 (WHEREUPON, Vice Chairman Kontokosta
14 left the Legislative Auditorium.)

15 (Time noted: 3:00 p.m.)

16 DR. FOREMAN: We do have significant
Page 130

17 amount of seasonal housing, and we have
18 talked to Census about the time of year in
19 which they do their survey. And they're very
20 careful to try and ensure that a -- that a
21 person is -- is in a housing unit when they
22 do their household survey for a greater
23 period of three months --

24 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Right. But --

25 DR. FOREMAN: -- so they're hoping to

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 153

2 check.

3 So but even -- you're right. Even if
4 somebody lives somewhere else for, you know,
5 a half a year or what have you, it's
6 important that we make sure that we capture
7 their -- their incomes in terms of
8 determining quality of life but not to let it
9 be distorted, the median or -- or our
10 perception of the quality of life. So for
11 year-round residents, we know that they're
12 living at a lower standard than -- on the
13 East End than many people would infer from
14 the price of housing.

15 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Sure. And mostly
16 concerned that the price of housing ends
17 up -- or somehow gets pulled out of the
18 average price of housing because it's not
19 being purchased by the people with incomes --
20 residents of these towns, they're being

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
21 purchased by people from other places. So if
22 you just average the price of house in
23 Southold or East Hampton, 60 percent of them
24 are being purchased by people whose income is
25 derived from New York City. So, you know --

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 154
2 and if you look at the average income of the
3 Town of East Hampton or any of the East End
4 towns, you're going to see a much lower
5 number that would show this great discrepancy
6 between the average price of the house and
7 the average income of year-round residents.

8 Enjoy.

9 (Laughter)

10 CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's a good
11 statistical point. I'm sure that there are
12 many places which are second -- you know,
13 second-home kind of communities that have
14 also looked at this kind of issue. So I'm
15 sure there's some literature out there about
16 how you normalize --

17 DR. FOREMAN: I will just point out that
18 it's advantageous in most instances for
19 people who are making their living in
20 New York City to not be, you know, considered
21 a city resident, because there is a
22 significant income tax on high earners in
23 New York City.

24 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: But actually they
25 do it less often than we would expect.

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 155
2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.
3 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: You'd be
4 surprised.
5 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Other comments,
6 questions?
7 (WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
8 CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, we've had a
9 fuller day than we might have expected, and
10 Director Isles gets the last word.
11 DIRECTOR ISLES: Just one quick comment.
12 This is a draft product of the
13 department. It is a document not intended
14 for distribution at this point. We certainly
15 welcome your comments on it, and, obviously,
16 this is all subject to revision, corrections,
17 and so forth.
18 Thank you.
19 CHAIRMAN CALONE: So don't go sharing
20 the conclusions with anyone.
21 DIRECTOR ISLES: Right.
22 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: David, I just
23 have one --
24 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Barbara, yeah.
25 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Tom, are we

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 156
2 capturing health issues somewhere in this

01_06_10_Planning_Commission.txt
3 document, because that's part of the quality
4 of life, you know, with the cancer rates or
5 whatever. So is that appropriate to be part
6 of this piece of the study, or is that being
7 added elsewhere?

8 DIRECTOR ISLES: You want to comment on
9 that?

10 DR. FOREMAN: Yeah, like I said, this
11 is --

12 MS. MAHONEY: Seth, you have to come to
13 the microphone, please.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Just very
15 quickly while Seth is getting there.

16 One of the complexities of the study,
17 Barbara, is that whether we're talking about
18 quality of life or we're talking about
19 housing or we're talking about natural
20 resources, there are overlaps among all the
21 categories. The most important, I think,
22 response to your question is that, it's
23 absolutely an essential component of the
24 plan. Whether it's covered within the
25 quality of life section or it's covered

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 157
2 within another section, it will certainly and
3 absolutely be covered.

4 And, again, as my only other last
5 comment is that this discussion, I think,
6 highlights the complexity of this issue in
7 trying to quantify some of these criteria so

8 we can actually just understand how we're
9 doing right now; a report card, if you will.
10 And it just speaks to the critical importance
11 really comprehensively and thoroughly
12 understanding the data that we're talking
13 about. So much of our planning today is
14 based upon kind of, I would say, policy and
15 rhetoric absent the research and data
16 questions that Peter and Seth have been
17 working so diligently on. I think that's the
18 real contrast between this process and any
19 other processes you'll see that are going on
20 today.

21 COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Just to build a
22 little bit on --

23 Vince, this is a -- a passion of mine,
24 demographics. And LIPA has the best
25 information for understanding what's

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 158
2 happening with second home- or third
3 homeowners in the Hamptons. One of the
4 biggest trends I see is people over 50 who
5 are actually working out of their homes.
6 It's more of a pattern that you're going into
7 New York for only two days a week. And I
8 hope that we capture what, sort of, this new
9 kind of person, particularly on the East End
10 towns that is living there two-thirds of the
11 time, is really adding to the economy.

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: Sure. Good
13 point.
14 CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. Thank you.
15 And, Seth, actually, there was -- you
16 were going to respond, and then we'll --
17 we'll wrap.
18 Good?
19 DR. FOREMAN: (Head gesture)
20 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.
21 Thank you all.
22 Motion to adjourn by Secretary Esposito.
23 Seconded by Commissioner Roberts.
24 All in favor?
25 (WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

1 Suffolk County Planning Commission 1/6/10 159
2 CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you.
3 (WHEREUPON, the meeting of the Suffolk
4 County Planning Commission was adjourned at
5 3:06 p.m.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Suffolk County Planni ng Commi ssi on 1/6/10 160

2

3

4

C E R T I F I C A T E

5

6

I, THERESA PAPE, a Shorthand Reporter and
Notary Public of the State of New York, do hereby
certify:

8

9

That the foregoing is a true and accurate
transcription of the stenographic notes taken
herein.

10

11

12

I further certify that I am not related to
any of the parties to this action by blood or
marriage; and that I am in no way interested in the
outcome of this matter.

13

14

15

16

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand this 6th day of January 2010.

17

18

19

20

21
22
23
24
25

THERESA PAPE