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November 2, 2011 meeting of the Suffolk County Planning Commission. I note that a quorum is present and I ask Secretary Esposito to lead us in the pledge.

(Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.)

The first order of business is to swear in a new member of the planning commission. Glynis, if you would please stand.

(Commissioner Berry was duly sworn in by the Chairman.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, welcome. I would note that we have, actually, with the county executive's nomination and the county legislature's confirmation of Commissioner Berry, we actually have a full membership of the commission. (Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: It's good to have a full cohort. First item on the agenda is the adoption of the minutes for August, 2011. Without objection, I would like to table those.

The Editor-in-Chief and I have been chatting.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I would like to
mention that Susan Catalano is the sloppiest court reporter that Five Star ever sent to us, and I hope they never send her again because she doesn't proofread her minutes, and the August minutes was rather brief as our meetings go, and I found seventy-two errors, when they finally sent us the last seventeen pages, which they left off in the earlier draft. So, you know, let's table them, if you want to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Without objection, we will table the minutes for August. We have some work to do on that. We have some work to do on several of the minutes. I know the county has been struggling with that issue, and it's something we need to work on. I'd like to get this resolved and caught up by the end of the year, but we will see what we can do. The next item is the public portion. I have one card, Mr. Guy Germano.

MR. GERMANO: I will reserve for later.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: There is no later.

MR. GERMANO: That's fine.
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THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for being here.

If there is anything that you would like to say, now is the time. It's okay if you wish not to. Any other public comment? If not, we will close the public portion.

Couple of remarks from the Chair report. First of all, welcome to Port Jefferson. This is a particularly meaningful location for me since I was born in the hospital right out the window here, and had my first job here and went to high school here, and it's good to be back. Also, of course, we welcome our newest member, Glynis Berry. I know some of you had the chance to meet her and she was confirmed by the legislature a few weeks ago. She's an architect from East Marion. We're excited to have her with us and I hope you all get a chance to know her.

I want to thank Mayor Garant for hosting us here today. We look forward to hearing from the mayor and I believe Legislator Viloria-Fisher will be here as well.

To bring you up-to-date on some of the activities, the Comprehensive Plan, earlier
this year the Planning Commission, for the first time in thirty years, voted to release the draft of Volume 1A. We presented that draft to the legislature a few weeks ago. Our general time line is to work toward finishing Volume 1B around the end of this year and move to completing Volume 2 by the end of next year.

With regard to the task forces, our solar permit streamlining effort is going well. That was announced at a press conference involving a number of elected officials in the end of September. We have nine out of Suffolk's ten towns actively pursuing it. A few of them have adopted pieces of it as part of their process, and we hope that they will all adopt by the end of the year. The only one we are working on is Shelter Island. I ask Commissioner Holmes to give a call to Supervisor Dougherty to touch base on that. I know the LIPA folks reached out to him in the last couple of days to make sure he knew about the program.

The State of New York is looking at this as possibly a model roll-out through out
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the state, assuming goes well in Suffolk
County. We are excited about that.

On the East End Wind Code, as I
updated you in the past. We had several
meetings now on drafting a model wind code for
the East End municipalities. The town board
members from several East End towns have been
working with us on it, particularly staff from
East and Southampton have been working
diligently. We are planning on having a final
meeting on November 14th at Southampton Town
Hall regarding the proposed code with the
elected officials to go through it one more
time, and my goal is to present it at the
December meeting of the East End Supervisors or
Mayors Association, and I particularly want to
thank Commissioners Holmes and Weir who have
been at some of the meetings and assisted with
that.

With regard to our Protect and Grow
effort, as you know, at our urging, the county
has identified local sources of sewer
financing. I see Legislator Viloria-Fisher is
here, and you know the legislature passed that
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bill in August and now Director Lansdale is
heading the committee reviewing specific
criteria to make sure financing goes to areas
in the county where development is most needed
and corresponds with the Comprehensive Plan and
to projects that support the values that the
Planning Commission and others have identified
as important to Suffolk's future, like
workforce housing, transit-oriented design,
energy efficient buildings, public safety, etc.
So, we will get an update from Director
Lansdale in a few minutes.

With regard to SUPP, it continues to
make progress. I know the Village of Port
Jefferson had staff at several of the meetings,
as have a number of planning directors from
various towns, as well as elected officials.
That continues to progress. We have been
working on that for a year. It's slow and
steady progress. It took Silicon Valley, when
they tried to do it, five or six years. The
key is if the next county executive embraces
this as the current county executive has and
the next administration continues to move it
forward as we have in the last year.

Professional certification for commercial interiors, our idea is to follow the lead of New York City in eliminating the need for building inspections for routine interior commercial alterations. This effort has the support of ABLI and other groups, and Commissioners Finn and Casey have been working on that. We have a draft plan by Farrell Fritz. Brookhaven Town has indicated a willingness to pilot the program, and we will be meeting with them this afternoon to put together the first steps. That is good news for making that a reality.

With regard to housing, we started working, as you know, on the Suffolk County Housing Summit, which we are planning to host in early February. The Town Supervisors Association and Village Officials Association are going to co-host with the Planning Commission. The Long Island Housing Partnership, thanks to Commissioner Weir, is going to be our nonprofit partner organizing and coordinating the event, and the Long Island
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Business Institute will be involved as well.

We have Commissioner Kontokosta, Commissioners Weir, Casey, Kelly and Roberts who we are counting on to lead this effort and put it together. I'd like to grab a few minutes with those members after this meeting to catch up on some of the planning.

With the task forces, we have public safety. As you know, we have a draft design standards that Andy worked on as well as Tom McAdam. The Town of Brookhaven indicated an interest in piloting those, and we will be meeting with them later this afternoon to work on getting those into their code so new developments and new projects are designed with public safety in mind. Some of you have been on more than a year, District Attorney Tom Spota has been a supporter of that effort and we hope with Brookhaven testing it out, we will find out whether it works. It's working in other places around the country and overseas and it should happen here.

Congratulations to Andy and the whole staff and everyone around the table for the
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great Planning Federation event. We had over
two hundred people, our highest attendance
ever. Congratulations to the staff. We had
folks from Melville to Montauk and I know some
folks from Nassau as well. Elected officials,
 zoning board and planning board folks and a lot
of you, so thank you for that.

Under the County Charter, at this
meeting the Planning Commission needs to name a
nominating and rules committee that will report
back to the commission at our January meeting
on proposed officers for next year and bylaws
changes. I will discuss that more at the end
of the meeting. We have the guidelines
committee that Director Lansdale will give us
an update. There have been some stakeholder
meetings on that as we look towards changing
and updating our guidelines going forward and
hopefully resolve those by the end of the year.

The Nassau County Planning Commission
requested to meet with us and to do a joint
meeting with us. The goal would be to get to
know each other better, and they were
interested in some of the projects we started
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here. The solar code is a good example. We started that. A number of towns and villages in Nassau are also getting on that standard. But there is more that we can do together, particularly with the regional council having funding problems and not really as involved in the policy level as we are or having the authority that we have. I hope by working with the planning commission across our county line, we can work on things with regional consequence.

We are looking for possibly doing that in Hauppauge the morning of our January meeting, which is the first Wednesday in January from ten a.m. to eleven-thirty a.m. I think they will come to us and we will do a joint meeting for an hour and a half or so before we have our regular meeting.

That's the update of the activities of the Planning Commission. Any questions or comments around the table? Seeing none, we will move to the Director's report and then to our guest speakers.

COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: Just a couple
of updates. I want to build on what Chairman Calone spoke about with the Planning Federation. It was our highest attended event. I want to extend my thanks on behalf of the entire Commission for Andy spearheading the coordination. It's the first event that we went paperless in our invites and our resource packet, and it was well received by the members who attended. We had a roundtable for the first time ever with all the planning directors of the various towns. That was one of the more highly rated sections, along with the sewer debate and waste water restructure debate, which many of you participated as panelists, thank you all for participating in that, especially Adrienne and John Finn and others.

We, as you know, continue to work on the SUPP, along with the Department of Economic Development and Workforce Housing, and internally at the Planning Department level we are looking at putting our referrals that we receive from the various towns and villages on line as a first step in the SUPP process so
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2 that folks can see the status of the referrals
3 on line at the department level.
4 We are continuing to work on our
5 update to the Planning Commission guidelines.
6 This Friday, we had an interesting conversation
7 around native vegetation, storm water runoff
8 and other key environmental issues, and one of
9 the things the Towns of Islip, Brookhaven,
10 Smithtown and Southampton and many stakeholders
11 who participated. This will be our third
12 meeting of the guidelines committee. We are
13 looking to wrap that up at the end of this
14 year, early next year.
15 We are continuing to work on the
16 Comprehensive Plan at the staff level and
17 working diligently on a couple of chapters,
18 including energy, land use, housing and natural
19 resources and doing that with the assistance of
20 several interns. We have now have three
21 interns, Kate O'Hagan, Carla Miranda and
22 Melissa Preska who are working to help us with
23 the Comprehensive Plan update.
24 In addition to the housing summit
25 that Chairman Calone talked about, we are also
planning a parking summit for the second half of next year. We are working with one of the interns to help put that together. We are working with the sewer infrastructure committee. We have a meeting. It's open to the public, November 4th. I want to thank Glynis and Adrienne for sitting in on the meetings. I will make sure --

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is it?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE: Twelve-thirty, fourth floor of the Dennison building at the Planning Department, our conference room. We are also -- the county has submitted an application on behalf of, in partnership with Islip and Town of Brookhaven for a sewage treatment plant at Ronkonkoma Hub as part of the Regional Economic Development Council, and I also want to thank, on behalf of the entire staff, Chairman Calone and all members of the Planning Commission for submitting a letter to the members of the legislature advocating for the department and the restoration of our budget during this period.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Did that
15
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actually go to the legislature?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did get a call from
the county executive. He was not happy about
the letter. But, FYI. But I did get some
responses from the legislators who did receive
the letter. We all know they have difficult
decisions to make. I appreciate all of your
feedback and input on it. The Commission, as a
volunteer body, is trying to do a lot of things
to move the county forward. The department is
involved in a lot of important initiatives. We
can't do that without quality and number of
folks to get that done. We will see what
happens as a result of that process.

Maybe Legislator Fisher can give us a
sense of how that is playing out, if she thinks
that is appropriate. Any questions for
Director Lansdale? If not, I want to thank
Mayor Garant for hosting us and I know she
wants to say a few words of welcome and
highlight some of the things going on around
here. Thank you for the tour. About half of
us were on the tour.
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MAYOR GARANT: I want to welcome everybody. A lot of you are familiar faces that I have seen at some of the functions you attended. I gave some of the members of the Commission a nickel tour that turned into a dime tour, but it was really only about the boardwalk and waterfront projects that we are looking to do in conjunction with the Town of Brookhaven to expand some of the asphalt into green space and enhance some of the parks and marine uses that we have along the waterfront.

I think the Commission saw the zone change we did last year when we rezoned the waterfront from a generic MW to MW1 and MW2 to preserve the maritime uses and working aspects of the harborfront. We are working on many projects, so everything that you folks talk about, we are working on on a day-to-day basis to try and enhance the quality of life here in the village. Not only along with the town are we working on the waterfront revitalization programs and looking to work with the Department of State on widening the sidewalks in upper and lower Port Jefferson.
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We are currently updating our Master Plan. As part of that, we are looking to create a revitalization zone in the upper port C2 commercial district. On the south of the side of the tracks we are back in the Town of Brookhaven, so we are once again partnering with the town and the civic groups in the station area. A little disappointed that the Route 112 restoration stopped at the 25A turnout because they abandoned three quarters of a mile of road that comes to the gate of Port Jefferson. We are trying to work with the town to revitalize that as well as the new gateway into Port Jefferson Village.

We are looking at instituting a parking district in upper port. We have managed parking in lower port and we are looking to update the system. We got a grant from the DEC to enhance and revegetate the Mill Creek. We just did a study on stormwater management, which you can see on some of the boards up here, you can see some of visuals and some of the things we are working on.

I respect and appreciate the support
of the members of the Commission, planners, fellow government leaders, Vivian Viloria-Fisher. We can't do any of this on a local level without the support of the officials we deal with every day. Yesterday Adrienne and I met and we had a lovely tour of our power plant. We were hosted about three hours. We can see the scope and size of the project that we are dealing with there. We would love to protect our waterfront and harbor. I'm happy to announce that the plant received a SPEDES permit, renewed for five years to help us manage the once-through cooling system that the plant utilizes to produce energy through units three and four. So they will be doing major upgrades to the plant to continue to protect the environment of the harbor, and so it's never a dull day in Port Jefferson.

We have a ferry, train, two hospitals, two vibrant commercial districts, fourteen linear miles of beach, a country club, sewer plant, landfill so we have a vibrant active community and I invite you to come and
visit and come for a day or for your lifetime.
I have a lot of stuff hopefully coming down the
pike. See you guys soon.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to acknowledge
Legislator Viloria-Fisher not only a friend of
the commission but it's great to see you here
in your district as opposed to Hauppauge.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER: It's great to
be here. I don't see you showing off a copy of
this, but I have to tell you, I had a chance to
look through this. You really do Suffolk
County proud. Really, there is so much
information here -- if you only look at the
pictures, you get a good view, but I did read
the narrative too. I'm beginning to put some
questions together. I hope to have, although I
only have, I think, sixty days left as a
Legislator. I can ask questions after I'm not
a Legislator. I'll just be a gadfly.

Getting to the budget, I really you
want all to know what a great leader you have
in Sarah Lansdale here. You know, the budget
working group was working together and we were
presented a very difficult budget. We said
well, there is no clear picture that the commissioner saw this before we did. We knew that they hadn't. I suggested to my colleagues that we reach out to the commissioners of the different departments and just to ask what is your priority so we could align the priorities. We left that meeting at four o'clock in the afternoon. I adopted three departments to speak with, and one of them was Planning. I made appointments with those three commissioners, and Sarah was the first commissioner to meet with me. I called at four-thirty in the afternoon. At eight o'clock the next morning we were meeting. She came prepared with priorities, with notes. We went over what is important to the department. You can't construct a budget if you don't have the functionality available to you, the prioritization available to you as a decision maker, because you can't set policy without the institutional knowledge and with the professional input of what is important. So, I just have to thank Sarah again for being there, as I said, eight o'clock the
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next morning. I meet with three commissioners, one at eight, one at eight-thirty and one at nine because at nine-thirty I was being taped at Cablevision with Pat Halpern, so I had to give them a little time to cover up the face before the cameras started rolling. But it was that important to us. John Kennedy met with, I think with Jim Tomarken from Health that night. Everybody understood the kind of pressure we were under. I congratulate Sarah.

Andy, congratulations for putting that program together, with three hundred people?

MR. FRELENG: Two hundred.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER: Next year three hundred. There is a lot I have to talk about. I'll do it very briefly. Regarding the Unified Permit Portal that is something that some of us have been trying to work on for years. I had been working tangentially on parallel tracks with my colleague Connie Kepert in Brookhaven Town who had that blue ribbon or red tape cutting commission, I think she called it, to try to get it so people could get
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through the permitting process more easily. I met with three Health Department commissioners, not Planning, because it's the Health Department permitting that sometimes slows things down. We have to protect our drinking water, we have to protect our environment, but at the same time it's difficult for a people who are paying for a mortgage on a business, to pay for nine months and not be able to open it.

Which brings me to the budget. If anybody saw the article on the kind of testimony that we got from our Department of Social Services, and Department of Health, with the staff cuts that they would realize from this budget that was presented to us, we would not be able to do the kind -- the Health Department would not be able to do those Article 6 inspections and permitting for going out more than six months because the staff won't be there. Our Medical Examiner's Office would not be able to release bodies to funeral parlors for weeks. I asked, what about religious restrictions. She said, we could not meet them with only one medical examiner. They
wouldn't be able to release a body lying in the street.

So we are working very hard to fix the holes in the budget. Our beaches would have to close because we wouldn't have the staff in our Health Department to do the coliform counts and see if our waters are safe. If you can't inspect the waters, you can't let people swim in them.

I can't give you any details because we haven't yet published -- we pretty much put it to bed right now. Our Budget Review Office is crunching the numbers. We will be meeting Monday morning before we finalize the piece that goes to the printer. So we will probably be in Hauppauge very early Monday morning going over that. So, if I could share more, I would, but it's not definitive yet. We are trying to put all the numbers together. You know it's a bipartisan working group, so I'm proud of the work we have done.

I brought this on purpose because not all of you were there when your chairman and our commissioner presented this to the
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legislature, but we were very impressed.

You're volunteers, you're putting in your own
time. I want to say, it's a great document to
begin the conversation. You can't have the
conversation -- the only thing I wanted to ask
about that, because it's something I spent a
great deal of time on, it's health disparities
and access to health services. I'm wondering
if sometime maybe in Volume 2 we could get a
snapshot of that.

I mention that because when I was
looking at page -- I haven't looked at it for a
while; I had other things on my mind -- I think
when you talk about the types -- when you look
at the type of employment and economic dollars,
our health services and professionals. I think
there was a category of jobs, I think
professional and services, but our health
industry is a very important piece of our
economic picture here. This morning I met with
Pederson-Craig, a not-for-profit, and our
models for health delivery systems are changing
a great deal. They need to change because of
tight money. They need to change because the
definitions in health care delivery are changing, coming down from the federal government and state. It's also changing because of our demographic changes with older populations and their needs.

So, when I spoke with Pederson-Craig this morning, it was about collaborative services. Pederson-Craig provides abuse and mental health, but they are talking about working with other agencies that provide more health care for physical health, because you have to integrate systems now. I think it might be interesting to look, I know it's a little bit out of your purview, but if you look at economic challenges -- I don't want to take up too much of your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The quality of life section is -- one of the most important qualities of life is our health. Health management is not only quality of life, but also a driver of the economy. I think our number three employer on Long Island is LIJ. I know Sarah has more information about our next volume.
COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: Yes, I just had a meeting with Dr. Bob Scott, President of Adelphi University. He produces Vital Signs, which is index health statistics for the region. There is that growing linkage between community planning, land use planning and health. That is something we will definitely work on.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER: The East End is really having a problem with access to health care and that is an aging population; that is important. I wanted to speak with our mayor here about we are trying to see where we are going with the property that used to be the KFC on Hallock. I'm not throwing it on your lap, I'm saying that the county now owns it through tax default, so we are trying to see what would be the best use of that corner. I've been looking at that for quite a while. I've been trying revitalize it for quite a while because it's a blight.

MAYOR GARANT: There is a civic meeting on November 22nd. They invited me, the group that is working to revitalize the upper
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port. That would be a good time to throw that out. I'd be happy to help any way I can.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER: Energy efficiency. My green homes, green jobs task force will be presenting the report at the EEE legislative committee next week. What you are doing regarding energy efficiency and green buildings has been on my mind for a long time. I introduced the lead legislation to require all municipal buildings to be built according to green standards.

We are all working in the same direction. Thank you for the work that you are doing there. We will get a copy of that to you. And of course the Commission will be getting a copy of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that next week?

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER: I don't have the date with me. It's Wayne Horsley's Committee. It's three E's, energy, economic development and education. The Food Policy Council is continuing our work. You know, I well be reporting to you. Our Chair right now is Yves Michel. John King has taken
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a lead on one of the subcommittees. He does
the food distribution. That is working.

I'm excited about the solar code work
that you are doing because that is one of the
recommendations that came out of our green
homes, green jobs, that we need standardization
of the different codes, the thresholds that we
need. We need to standardize that throughout
our towns regionally. We need to have a
standard code and guidelines.

I thank you for the work that you do.

By the way, one of the sights you missed in
your ten cent store is there is a legislative
office right here in town. I often joke that
they put all of the vices together. I'm
between the bar and tobacco lounge. Thank you
very much for coming here.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Can I ask a
question? LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: In your sixty
days left, do you think possibly you might help
us get legislation that would authorize us to
audio tape our meetings instead of having a
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court reporter? With the outstanding stellar exception of Judi, I'm having so much trouble.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER: Guess what, I'm ahead of you. I already asked counsel to draw that up because I know that that can be something that will save money, and we will have the recording and minutes taken.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: And a nice summary. That would be wonderful.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER: Sarah Lansdale brought that suggestion to me. I acted on it right away. I got in touch with counsel. I believe it has been drafted and it will be laid on the table next Wednesday.

Any other questions? Thank you so much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Moving onto the administrative portion of the agenda, the first item is the new New Frontier project in the Town of Babylon.

MR. FRELENG: Thank you. As indicated the first referral -- COMMISSIONER WEIR: I must recuse myself. MR. FRELENG: The first
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Matter on the regulatory agenda is the referral from the Town of Babylon. New Frontier jurisdiction is that the subject application is adjacent to New York State Route 110, locally known as Broadway. The applicant seeks Babylon town board change of zone approval on nine parcels for the construction of forty-five thousand square feet of retail space and five hundred residential multi-family. This is going to be on twenty point two six acres. Twenty percent of the units intend as affordable housing component.

The referral also includes re-subdivision approval of nine parcels into five for the purpose of phase construction. The first phase, including the retail component and fifty units of housing, is also referred for site plan approval. The retail component of phase one will require a use variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, has not been referred to the Planning Commission pursuant to Article 14 of the County Administrative Code.

The subject property is currently developed with approximately three hundred
seventy five residential trailers, and you can see from the aerial photo up on the screen, this is the layout of the manufactured home park. The park appears to have little in the way of typical residential amenities throughout the mobile home park. With respect to General Municipal Law considerations regarding compatibility of land uses and community character, we took a look at the existing community character of the site, first in terms of zoning. We note that the vicinity is predominated by B residential zoning district. The subject parcel is Central to senior citizen designations, multi-family residences and two parcels zoned E business an additional MR parcel is noted south and adjacent to New York State Route 110. That might be hard to see here but we have some MR here. We have the subject property zoned BE, senior citizen, multi-family residence, senior citizen and multi-family residence below.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: What is the road to the east, the one that is going diagonal?
MR. FRELENG: Great Neck Road. This aspect here is not part of the subject application. I'm just showing you the zoning around the subject property. This is the subject property. (Referring to the slide.) Staff believes the proposal intends to redevelop and provide land use to improve the health safety and welfare conditions on the subject property for the improvement of the compatibility of land uses, community character, public convenience and maintaining a satisfactory community environment. It's the belief of staff that the use can be compatible with the existing land use character of the area.

In terms of the Local Comprehensive Plan recommendations, the Town of Babylon Comprehensive Plan makes no specific recommendations for the subject property. There are some general recommendations in the plan to develop a program of mixed uses which strengthens highway strips, and to take a look at the affordability of housing for young families and increase the range of housing.
choices. Those are generic statements in the plan.

Notwithstanding the retail component, the change of zone to MR would form the nucleus of a higher density zoning district node consisting of SC and MR, senior citizen and multi-family residence zoning along this location of Broadway. If you take a look at zoning map, it seems appropriate to change the zone of this property to match the high density zoning in the area.

So staff believes the proposed change of zone is compatible with the Town of Babylon Comprehensive plan. In terms of the Suffolk County Planning Commission guideline considerations, the Town of Babylon, in concert with the petitioner'S Consultants have jointly prepared and submitted an "Analysis of Conformance to the Suffolk County Planning Commission Policies & Guidelines for the Referral of Proposed Municipal Subdivision and Zoning Actions." We have attached that to the staff report. Planning staff has reviewed the analysis formulated by the county and
petitioner. There do not appear to be any significant environmental issues regarding the proposed project negatively. All sanitary waste generated by the project will be conveyed to Suffolk County Sewer District 21. Proposed plan includes recreation areas with a pool and pool house, lawn and landscaped area and all storm water runoff is to be retained on site and treated in accordance with storm water pollution prevention plans.

This is a significant improvement over the existing conditions of the subject property. The referred material to the Suffolk County Planning Commission also indicates that the petitioner has considered energy efficiency and one hundred units to be set aside for affordable housing purposes. The petitioner offered, as part of the development, a relocation package and the Town of Babylon, in connection with the Long Island Housing Partnership, is preparing a short and long-term relocation plan for current residents.

With respect to the site plan phase of the proposed development, elements of the
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proposal from the perspective of the Town of Babylon far exceed the density under the code. For comparison purposes, other multi-family rental projects in the area were revealed to have these densities. I'm not going to go through the exact densities in and around the area, but suffice it to say that the subject density is slightly higher than the average density, with the exception of the senior citizen projects.

The town and petitioners have put forward in their analysis that there are extenuating conditions associated with the existing site conditions that warrant the requested density. Foremost is the fact that the mobile home park is under a consent order with the Suffolk County Department of Health Services with respect to violations and need to connect with public sewers. The petitioners contend that the ability to prepare and redevelop the site, coupled with the relocation assistance adds cost to the project that would not otherwise absent the unique conditions associated with the site. They hope
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that the suffolk county planning commission
will find that the requested density is
warranted. The Town and petitioners identified
several variances from the local zoning law
provisions that will be needed to construct the
project as proposed. The Suffolk County
Planning Commission will have the opportunity
to deliberate the merits of the density of the
subject proposal, its site configuration,
parking requirements and other site planning
issues as reflected by the zoning relief
necessary at the time. The current referral
appears to reflect the evolution of planning
efforts between the Town staff and applicant
and considerations of affordable housing and
other Suffolk County Planning Commission
guidelines for development appear to have been
incorporated. The proposal would eliminate the
substandard living environment of the
manufactured home park and would improve the
livability of the surrounding community while
addressing the displacement of residents.

So the point of the last statement I
made, there are some variances that are going
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to be required as a result of the application. The variances petitioned to the Zoning Board of
Appeals have not been referred to the Commission, so the Commission will have the
chance later on to deliberate those aspects that are being asked for relief. In
consideration, staff is recommending approval of the change of zone request on the nine
parcels from E business and B residence to multiple residence. The reason for that is
provided.

Staff is also recommending approval of the re-subdivision of nine parcels to five parcels for the purpose of a five phase development. Staff is recommending approval of the phase one site plan with the following modifications and comments:

The first modification is that staff recommends is that maximum number of units be established consistent with the density of similarly zoned parcels. The staff report goes into the density of the multi attached unit projects surrounding the subject property, and for reasons explained, this project is at the
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higher range of densities in the area, and it's noted that that project is not a senior citizen project where the higher density attributed in the area are to senior citizen projects.

The staff recommended to the Commission a modification. The second modification being, in order to address equity concerns, twenty percent of the units built in phase one shall be set aside for affordable housing purposes. In the Town of Babylon reports the displaced residents will have first preference for the affordable units in the development. The timing of availability of affordable units would be a crucial element for relocation. Staff recommends to the commission that an appropriate portion of the number of the affordable units be set aside in phase one so relocated persons will have the ability to get into the program. Staff is recommending a third modification that the application to the town of Zoning Board of appeals shall be referred to the Suffolk county planning commission in accordance to New York State General Municipal Law 239 and Article 14 of the
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Suffolk county Administrative code and that is so the variance issues with respect to all the relief required for the site plan can be deliberated at the commission at a later date.

Staff is recommending some comments that the commission should refer to the Town of Babylon. With regard to the extenuating circumstances existing with the site conditions, the application will be stronger if the applicant provides a financial analysis that supports the contention. There was none provided in the referral material provided to the Suffolk County Planning Commission. We are not aware of what financial analysis was referred to the town. The town should really consider providing more than twenty percent towards affordable housing purposes. We want to make sure that the displaced residents have the maximum opportunity to be relocated on site, if appropriate. The third comment that a greater effort should be made to relocate available parking behind the retail structures and create additional green space along the Broadway corridor. It's to break up the mass
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of forty-five thousand square feet of retail, to create a more friendly breakdown. That is the staff report, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a Babylon project. That means that -- I am the representative.

COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: Andy, can you go back to the zoning map?

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you want to show the pictures Andy, too? I think that is helpful.

MR. FRELENG: Existing conditions at the site, this is across the street from the proposed development. This is within the proposed development. This is pretty much typical state of the internal roadway network and pedestrian circulation.

Another view of an internal street network, this is across one of the attached unit projects to the north. This is what the streetscape would look like outside the mobile home park. This is looking out from the park. A typical streetscape. I believe the mobile home park is to the right in this slide.
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DIRECTOR LANSDALE: I want to -- can you point out what color the senior housing is and what that density is in relation to the site?

MR. FRELEN: The two SC owned properties is pale blue. Not your typical zoning colors, but we are working with our color blind staff. SC is up to the north adjacent to the property and to the west opposite Route 110. The densities for the SC southward, Amityville, a hundred seventy-four senior rental apartments, twenty-four point nine units to the acre. That one is -- that would be the South Wood complex. That has twenty-four -- sorry, twenty-four point nine units to the acre, and Crystal Manor complex has sixty-two senior affordable units on two point four acres, and that one is, that is number three. That would be that. (Indicating) Those are the two senior citizen projects.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE: I did some research on manufactured home parks, which is the new term for mobile home parks or trailer
parks. There are approximately seventy-one
thousand residents in New York State that live
in manufactured home parks and there are
approximately forty parks in Suffolk County,
just for background.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a few opening
comments from the area perspective. It is, as
your materials indicate, it is a parcel in need
of a lot of help. You can see that from the
photos, you can read that in the materials.
There are significant environmental issues.
There are -- the site itself hadn't been --
obviously, it's under a consent decree. It
needs to be upgraded.

I think that in this case, I think
the town has done a good job working with the
developer to try to figure out what makes
sense. It's on Route 110, a critical corridor
for our region. I think that the plan that has
been come up with is a good one. It will allow
a lot of the environmental issues to be
remediated and allow some good commercial and
needed housing in the area.

With respect to the density, it's on
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par with sort of with some of the neighboring
parcels, a little bit more than some of the
others. There is a significant amount of
environmental work and really upgrades,
refurbishment that need to be done to the area,
and I think this project allows that to happen.
From my perspective, it's a relatively dense
project, but it's a much more appealing
project. I think it will be much better for
the area.

I think an important piece of this is
that the developer and town are working with
the Housing Partnership to make sure that those
who live there can either stay there in the
affordable units, and there is relocation
package that the Housing Partnership is
coordinating. I like the idea on the twenty
percent that we require, the twenty percent in
the phase one and also the town to ask about
whether the town should not consider more. I
think that is an appropriate comment. Other
thoughts, comments, questions?

COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: Going
forward, the next phase, what is the percentage
of workforce affordable housing going to be then?

MR. FRELENG: It was not indicated in the referral. Overall, the project is proposing twenty percent. It wasn't broken down.

THE CHAIRMAN: The idea is it has to be twenty percent overall and the proposed modification that it be done in phase one. We will see phases two, three, four, five in the future.

MR. FRELENG: You should.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under the law we will.

Anything else?

COMMISSIONER CASEY: I like the idea of breaking up the commercial and putting the parking behind. I think that is a good recommendation. I think that will help not have another strip mall look along there.

COMMISSIONER GABRIELSEN: I just want to address the residential. Three hundred seventy-five units in that. I'm thinking, how many per household, you may have up to a thousand people that are going to be displaced.
In phase one, we have fifty units going up, and twenty percent of that would be, that they have a choice on low income housing, you are talking ten units. That is not really going to put a dent into anything.

I was wondering, as far as coming up with a short and long-term plan, have they come up with anything yet?

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Where are the people going to go?

MR. FRELENG: The project is evolving. The Long Island Housing Partnership has taken the lead. There is a financial package to some of the residents there. All the information we have that was referred to us indicates that they are working on a relocation package and they're in negotiations now.

COMMISSIONER GABRIELSEN: The twenty percent doesn't do justice.

THE CHAIRMAN: It doesn't mean they're going to rip the whole thing up in one phase, either.

COMMISSIONER GABRIELSEN: That is my next question.
COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: To me it just means they will lose their home in phases. It seems like it's a massive relocation. Maybe this is not the Commission's purview, but it seems like it's a massive relocation of modest and low income homes and residents. And I just can't imagine where they will go. I can't imagine how they will resettle their lives.

COMMISSIONER GABRIELSEN: I would like to see the long-term plan that they have. I just don't want to see them lost in the shuffle.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: This is a major one. I roughly estimate there has to be a minimum of eight hundred people, including children.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's something like that. The bottom line is this area -- as someone who lives near here is in -- the status quo doesn't work. It is environmentally unsustainable. It's bad for public health. It's not good for the corridor from a commercial perspective. I think the equity
points are well taken. If this application had come in and said we wish everyone the best, I think that would be a problem. I think having the Housing Partnership involved, and having the developer acknowledge that and paying, I think what I read three months or so, which was a minimum amount of payment, plus relocation expenses seems to be appropriate under the circumstances.

COMMISSIONER FINN: Just a couple of points. You would hate to see anybody displaced from their home. If this applicant wasn't before us, I think in the information that we have seen, they're in violation of the law right now. There is an environmental issue, they're unconnected to the sewer district. Whether this developer comes along to redevelop the property, they have a pending problem as it stands.

The issue about the percentages, one of the things with any multi-family housing to encourage the number of affordable units, you don't want them to be all lumped in one building. As you come in a project of this
size of five hundred units, first building on the right is all people living in the affordable unit. They tried that in the '70's and that didn't work, you want them spread out over the community.

I understand the need to have three hundred seventy-five units be affordable, and you want them to have a home, but the goal is to have this a successful real estate venture. From a development standpoint, there are a lot of dollars going out the door. For him to demonstrate that this is going to work, twenty percent is onerous from an affordability standpoint. To have them all lumped in the first phase is not such a good idea.

As to the commercial property, I can understand wanting to have the campus feel. One of the things to be mindful of when you have a surface area, from a retail perspective, you have that flexibility. When you start making multiple buildings you don't have those footprints to deal with those type of retailers that come in because you're confined by the size of those premises, so I would be a little
reluctant to break those buildings up into smaller buildings. You can all separate the footprint. It's separate. It's in the front, it's properly located. I would be leery of making these buildings smaller.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: I think they can put the parking behind that. I think that makes it more pleasing to the eye.

COMMISSIONER FINN: But it doesn't make it more successful. If you go to some of the downtown areas, the areas where you can park in the front are more successful from a retail perspective.

THE CHAIRMAN: One comment. It says the two structures could be broken up. It doesn't say should be, in my mind that comment is relatively benign. Just raising the issue, from another planning perspective, going back to the town saying you may want to look at this. I think at the end of the day that is negotiation between the developer and town. Us simply throwing it out as a comment, I don't see that as a problem.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: First, this is
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a residential development, not retail, and I
don't think you can compare the two that well.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: It's both.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I think that

the estimates that some commissioners are
making about the population in this mobile home
park is excessive because most people I know
who live in mobile homes, it's one person or a
couple. There aren't that many total families
living in mobile homes. It would be helpful if
we had a figure for the population that is in
that mobile home park now. That would be
helpful for us. I don't think we can assume a
thousand or even eight hundred or something
like that. I think it's probably less.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that was in
the DGEIS.

MR. FRELENG: The number of mobile
homes fluctuates. We originally calculated
three fifty. I'm sure the Town of Babylon has
that number and Long Island Housing Partnership
has that.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: They better
have it. I want to point out a small but happy
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thing. First, I want to respectfully disagree with my colleague. As someone who grew up in Amityville, and has been in that area, there are families living there. One happy thing, Andy skipped this very significant line. The proposed development includes, in addition to the retail and housing units, recreation areas with a pool and pool house -- ninety thousand square feet of permeable pavers. I wanted to bring that out here. Say something nice about permeable pavers and say how delighted we are to see that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for brightening our day, Adrienne. We are starting to see this. I think this is the result of the effort of the Commission in the last two or three years, a number of the policies we have been advocating, energy efficiency. Babylon has been a leader in this all along, things like permeable pavers.

I want to also note this is not the first time, but we have now seen the review by, I guess it's Nelson, Pope & Voorhis comparing the project to the Commission guidelines. I'm
sure we didn't take that on face value. I'm sure it's helpful to us, if take a look at it, to know that the developer and consultants are thinking about the regional guidelines when they are thinking about the project. We have seen that in the last few months. It's encouraging for us to see these sort of issues that we have been flagging and raising being incorporated into the thinking of the developers and consultants.

At the end of the day, these things only get built project by project. Unless the projects incorporate this regional thinking, it doesn't get done.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: First, I support the comments that were made by the staff. I'd like to have a little more discussion about some of these issues and a couple of suggestions in addition. First of all, going down to the five lots I think is fine. But I would make a suggestion in a slight realignment. The small retail in front of phase three I think should be cut off of phase one and combined with phase three. I think how
you develop that will have an interrelationship.

Phase one doesn't have any green space for its residents. And there is also no indication of where deliveries are made, so there could be a safety issue of how that is laid out. When they look at phase one, I think they need to consider those safety items.

I'm also concerned about how many people are being displaced. And actually I think it would be a better project if phase three were done first. I think it sets the tone. It's really a mixed use. You would have more affordable houses as part of that. I think it's a better start to the project.

In terms of the density, a couple of things that are supportive of what the staff is recommending, is that the parking, forty-three percent is cut. That is a very high percentage, and there is no compensation given for that. I'm afraid if they start having traffic issues, they will start taking the green space back, which is one of the charming points about this plan, that each residential
part has green outdoor space, except for phase one. If we are going to allow less parking, I think it needs to be compensated by a program that is carefully thought out; for instance, shared cars or something like that. They need to address this seriously and not just say we are cutting forty-three percent of the parking because I don't think that would be a viable option.

The other thing that bothers me is that they asked for -- they increased the density without having to pay for development credits elsewhere to decrease density in other locations, but we have seen no financial sort of reasoning on why we should allow that. I'm for the higher density, especially as recommended by the staff, but if we are going to forgo a lower density elsewhere, maybe that money should be go towards the families being displaced and/or the clean up. I think that equation needs to be looked at more carefully.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a bunch of things here. Andy do you want to respond to any of those?
MR. FRELENG: Staff has no comments on that. I don't think that is something to respond to. The reallocation of lot line is something the Commission can consider as a comment. We have no hard numbers on the number of folks being displaced.

With respect to phase three being done first, I think from a planning perspective that is logical. That is the core of the development project and most of the residential units are there and this could be oriented to the way that it relates to the rest of the site.

Staff did indicate that variances would be the subject of review from the Town of Babylon will have to be referred to the Commission, and the Commission will then have the opportunity to deliberate the adequacy of parking, lot lines and a whole bunch of issues that would have to be relieved.

The Commission does have a policy that increases in density should be offset by a density shift. Staff is four square behind the concept. The applicants put forth a number of
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reasons why that should be reconsidered as a mandate. The only comment that staff had was that staff was not provided with any financial analysis to be provided to the Commission to see if that was a substantial argument. We have to rely on the locality to iron these issues out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other thoughts? Seeing none, there are a few things here to chat about and see if there is any other interest to raising any of the issues to a condition. Realignment to the lot line, carving out phase five.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: Taking part of phase one that is in front of phase three, so that is developed with phase three. Also, so that green space can be allocated to phase one.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the proposal?

COMMISSIONER BERRY: The proposal is to realign two of the proposed lots so that the retail that is in front of phase three would be part of phase three and allow for green space for phase one.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I'm confused.
Could you say that again?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think a fundamental issue is we don't know the background of why it was done the way it was done.

MR. FRELENG: So we are all clear, phase one includes forty-eight thousand square feet of retail and fifty units on top. I think Commissioner Berry is recommending to remove that piece of retail from phase one, consider it in the development with phase three, so you can either -- staff recommending breaking this up and maybe move the retail around and try and provide more green space to try and relate it to more to what is being developed on that site.

COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: Is that even within our scope?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we would be hard pressed to be redrawing lines.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: I think one of the issues is we want to have more residential units being built first because so many people are being displaced, and the first phase is only fifty units and that is why she suggested it. I think one of the issues is getting
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housing built so maybe some of the people
getting displaced have a place to go.

I have another question. Some of
these people own these homes. My concern is
are they going to get some kind of money for
these things?

MR. FRELENG: Some of them are
rented, some of them are sublet from the owner.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: They just lease
the land. That is another financial component.
These are people's homes, even thought they're
not regular homes, they're still something that
people have ownership interest in. They might
have mortgages on them.

MR. FRELENG: Staff doesn't have
details on them. I just know that the Long
Island Housing Partnership and the Town of
Babylon are working out the details.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE: It's my
understanding that that the Town of Babylon and
Long Island Housing Partnership are working
with the residents of that park, and working
out actively a way to resolve this for
everyone.
COMMISSIONER KONTOKOSKA: Rearranging lots, there is a logic, I hope, that went in the subdivision of the development that is far beyond the information that we have, or making decisions on changing that would go far beyond the information that we need to make an educated recommendation on that. It highlights an important issue that I think has been coming up a lot; that is phased development, which is a major concern. It's mitigated by the involvement of the town and Long Island Housing Partnership.

It's your concern that a developer will come in for approval for a phased plan, cram in the money making parts, for lack of a better term, and abandon the remaining phases. I think there needs to be a way to look at agreement between the developer, the town and perhaps the local community representatives or between the town and developer to actually look at locking in how the benefits would be accruing over the life of the development.

To be honest, if some benefits are given in exchange for the developers giving
affordable housing and increased density, there is some response if the project isn't built out as planned, then the town gets to recoup, or the residents get to recoup some of their losses, as we are seeing in other areas in the country.

I think it's a practice we should look at.

The punchline is we need to have some way to make sure that the phased developments proceed as planned and each individual phase is sustainable in its own right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was it Patchogue where it was a phased development and there were certain guarantees given by the developer, covenants, right? I think that would be germane for us to raise that issue here, suggesting that a community development agreement covering all the phases be entered into between the developer and township would be, I guess the right parties. I don't think we need to define what is in that. The public benefit is something that the town is in a better position to judge what they think they are. We can throw out what we think they are,
green space, et cetera, it might be simply just noting to the town and developer that we think a community development agreement is appropriate in this case, given the phased development. What do you think would be appropriate?

COMMISSIONER KONTOKOSKA: There are other methods of doing it, deed restrictions, covenants, conditions on the approvals for the individual phases. We should bring it to the attention of the town, that there needs to be some strategy to make sure the benefits of the development actually accrue and they're not front loaded to the first phase of the development.

COMMISSIONER GABRIELSEN: What would that be, condition or comment?

COMMISSIONER FINN: I think that needs to be a comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is good, I want to make sure we don't lose some of the other issues. I think the vice chairman talked about a little bit about the lot line realignment. I think the same thing goes
towards to the pacing of the phase of the development, what makes sense from a construction perspective. Phase one does have a relatively low number of units compared to other parts of the project. I want to see if there is any kind of support for adding something along the lines that the developer consider in terms of doing phase three first.

Is there any other support for that around the table?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I think we should support that.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I think that is a good idea. If there isn't a compelling reason not to do it.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: Maybe phase two would be easier. I think give them the option that they should have more housing.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I don't think we can do that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the only thing we can consider doing is saying just concerned about the amount of units being put on line and that we would encourage the town or developer
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to consider doing phase three or one of the other phases first that has a greater frontloading of the housing units.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I appreciate that point of view. It's very problematic to me that we don't have more information on the relocation plan of perhaps a thousand people in these trailers. That definitely has regional significance. I'm mulling on how we can have that message put in and will we have an opportunity to hear that plan? I think it's important for us to know what is going to happen to these people in the trailers.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are hearing three pieces, change of zone, subdivision and site plan for the first piece in phase one. So this is the time where, once that zone is changed, the project is going forward. The rest is how you are going to move the deck chairs around.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: Perhaps adding a comment here when this comes back to us for further review that that plan is part of what is presented in front of this Commission.

COMMISSIONER FINN: To that point,
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It's got to be some logic to that. You see the site plan is staged in phases. Obviously, they are thinking about this, so this is going to been ramped up. It's interesting how they picked phase one; we can only guess at this point. On the commercial side, if they have a plan to leave and allow the three hundred seventy-five trailers to be -- it's a point that they have it in phases. There has to be some logic to that.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: I was curious where they superimpose what. This is what is on top now?

MR. FRELENG: We don't have an overlay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Phase one is the upper left-hand corner, the northwest corner.

MR. FRELENG: Phase one would be approximately the center of the property right here.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: There is trailers where the retail stage is going.

MR. FRELENG: This is north.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: There are a
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bunch of trailers in there.

MR. FRELENG: This is phase one, so there are a bunch of trailers right here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here are a couple of things I heard around the table. One, that there be strategy indicating that the benefits of the entire development, accrue, and not -- and that there be some agreement -- some kind of condition on the project that public amenities are fully delivered. That is not an elegant way of saying that, but that's the idea.

The second one, as Barbara mentioned, the Commission is going to look to see an understanding of the housing plan when this comes back to the Commission for site plan review. The third thing is that the developer consider doing phase three before phase one. I think there is some disagreement about that.

The last issue which Commissioner Berry mentioned, that I have in mind also, something about public safety. I think we can have a situation of relaying the public safety guidelines which cover a bunch of public safety
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I think those are four potential comments. I'd like to take them one by one to see if we have agreement on them. See if there is any objection to adding them as comments.
If are there any other issues that people want to raise?

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I thought we had an agreement that rather than suggest phase three first, that we would suggest that they look at possibly changing the phasing so more housing was done.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: That works better.

THE CHAIRMAN: The public safety one, we have a typical sort of language would be the developer be directed to consult the Planning Commission's guidelines on public safety. Any thoughts or objection to including our language on public safety? Seeing none, we will add that as a comment.

Two, when the Commission receives future referrals in that project with regard to the site plan, that the Commission will be
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looking to see a definitive housing plan has
been -- housing relocation plan -- any other
thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER BERRY: I think I would
like to say including costs for relocation.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would like to see a
housing relocation plan for existing residents.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: And trailers.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: That is what
he means.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: In trailers.

COMMISSIONER FINN: Is it
ownership or rentals?

THE CHAIRMAN: They're not all
rentals. They're all owned by someone.

COMMISSIONER FINN: They're on a
ground lease?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. FRELENG: Proposals for all
rental, the trailers are a mix of people
renting from the owners and people who occupy
the trailers.

THE CHAIRMAN: New proposal will be
all rental. Comment number two. Any
objections to adding that? Seeing none.

Then the one with regard to the phasing comment to the extent that we recommend that the order of the phased development take into account emphasizing prioritizing housing developments earlier in the development, which is the time line. That is an inarticulate way of saying it.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: More houses in the earlier phases.

THE CHAIRMAN: That the developer and town consider putting more housing units earlier in the development of the project.

MR. FRELENG: We can adopt that in concept and draft it up and circulate it among the Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: The last one, that town and developer enter into some kind of agreement or some kind of -- there be some kind of strategy that the benefits of development are guaranteed to accrue. The benefits of the entire development are guaranteed to accrue.

VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Or some agreement is made that outlines and stipulates
the benefits that would be provided by the
developer in exchange for approval. The main
concern is the first phase is built and then
demolition begins on other units and if future
housing isn't built for one reason or another,
then those people lose their houses. I would
like to see that relocation assistance is given
to anyone whose home was taken in this process.

THE CHAIRMAN: Benefits including
relocation assistance. Any objections to that?

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Can you read
it again?

MR. FRELENG: Developer enter into
strategy to distribute the benefits on the
entire development of the agreement should
outline and stipulate the benefits provided,
including relocation assistance. That is that
I have. We will massage that and circulate it
around.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: That is the
equivalent of the town sharing information.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: No, between the
town and developer.

THE CHAIRMAN: That there should be
an agreement with regard to the overall benefits of the development. We don't know that that exists now. We have seen it in Patchogue where an agreement was reached on the river project where they were going to do it, no matter what, even if the phases didn't materialize.

COMMISSIONER FINN: It says noted that the petitioner has offered as mitigation of the displacement of the mobile home park a relocation package. Perhaps we should find out what the relocation package is.

THE CHAIRMAN: When they come back, we want to understand what the relocation package is. The benefit, the point is that the package should survive, whether phase one occurs and phase two doesn't occur or whatever. This is a comment, but I think it's an important one. That is with regard to making sure that the benefits of the bargain accrue to the community no matter what happens. Separate and distinct. People are going to be displaced no matter what.

We have those four comments. Any
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other considerations? If not, we will move on.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: I have a question. Was anybody else concerned about the parking?

THE CHAIRMAN: I know we will see that again with regard to the future phases of the site plan. With regard to phase one, that would be the time to speak with regard to parking. How much was it under on phase one?

MR. FRELENG: I don't have that readily available. The town was going to indicate that they were going to look at the particular phases as they came in. I don't recall any other concerns about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is an underage here, there should be an overage elsewhere. That is a cumulative thing that we should keep an eye on. Any other thoughts, comments, suggestions?

Seeing none, I think we have a staff report which we amended by adding four comments.

I had one question on the first modification. I think it's confusing. The second and third ones, second one, I certainly support and I also like the fact that there is
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a comment that says you can go further, and I think the third one is obvious. The first one, I don't know what that means, "maximum number of units shall be established consistent with the density of similarly zoned parcels." It's a little more dense than some of the things nearby. It's a little less dense than the senior next to it.

If this goes to a planning board or town board, I don't know that they know what we are trying to say. If that's the case, I suggest that we strike it or say that we think it isn't consistent for some reason.

MR. FRELENG: Similarly zoned properties would be the other MR properties. I think in terms of planning, you can make a distinction between the spinoff impacts one, for lack of a better term, of attached units whether affordable or senior units. I think trip generation multipliers would be different for seniors than attached units. Staff is recommending MR stay as MR and senior citizen stay as senior citizen, unless there are extenuating circumstances, as the developer
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provided. However, that needs to be in the record. Staff believes if you're going to use MR, you should be consistent with MR, and senior citizen should be consistent.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is more than what is allowed in MR, and less than what is allowed in senior citizen.

MR. FRELENG: Correct.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: They should be consistent.

THE CHAIRMAN: In my mind, this project, there are a lot of extenuating circumstances in my mind because of the kind of project and environmental issues and rundown nature of this area that requires a lot of work. Personally, I believe that allowing more density here can make sense because there are significant problems and community benefit.

This doesn't say that. This says something that, I mean --

MR. FRELENG: This provides an opportunity for the locality to provide, in their deliberations, the rationale for going beyond seventeen, seventeen and fifteen units.
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to the acre, to more like what they are
proposing, which is twenty-four units to the
acre, which is more consistent with the SC
code.

In this particular instance, we are
going to allow a higher density. It allows the
next project that comes in not to use this as a
case study for higher density in an MR zone.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is saying it
should be less. With respect to this
commission, it should be less. Now Town of
Babylon is going to deviate from that, you have
to override us and you have to put that on the
record. It's a different thing than saying we
think, in the circumstance, given the knowledge
that we have, which isn't complete, it makes
sense to have the higher density, but you, Town
of Babylon, should put that on the record.

It's a different thing.

We can procedurally force them to put
it on the record or procedurally, through a
modification, to force them to put it on the
record without us necessarily taking a
position, whether it is or is not appropriate
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to have a higher density than what is currently there. This density as scripted out here, it is not appropriate. Town of Babylon, you override us if you feel like it.

It's different than saying we understand there is a lot of issues. We think, Town of Babylon, you should put on the record why you think the density is appropriate.

MR. FRELENG: The proposal is not consistent with the MR code.

COMMISSIONER FINN: To that point, you had the benefit, which most of us have not, to visit this site. This site specific, wouldn't you think, as a planning professional, this would warrant the additional density, to take the existing conditions, to make this plan come to fruition? Would you be an advocate to have additional density in this location?

MR. FRELENG: Are you asking staff's personal opinion? I don't know the economics of the project. I don't know if seven units to the acre plus fifty thousand square feet of retail would make the project work for the developer. From my personal opinion, is a
redevelopment of the site a good idea? Yes, but I don't know what the appropriate density is.

COMMISSIONER FINN: I understand what your concern is going down the road with painting site plans with a brush. This particular situation is an unusual situation. It's a health and safety hazard and it's a problem. The site is a problem. This applicant knew that, which we never talk about did on this commission, but is density a bonus or incentive for someone to come in and take a blighted property.

We know on adjacent parcels they have the same exact density, if not more than this site. I think the way the modification is written, I think it sends the wrong message. I think it's we will make a modification that is too dense, or just strike it altogether.

MR. FRELENG: If you ask this staff member's personal opinion, I think this project may be too dense if you look at the number of variances that are required in order to do the project. Staff doesn't have the luxury of taking into account the other items the
THE CHAIRMAN: We can do one or two things. We can make a value judgment, or simply say to the town we recognize what you are saying, this is more dense than typical of MR code, but we are not in a position to judge all the public benefits. So if the planning board believes this is appropriate to allow the increased density, they should say their reasons on the record. We can simply say that without us making a determination whether it's too much or too little, whether it works or doesn't work for a developer.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I think that is the way we should go. We don't have information to make a greater evaluation than that. I think it would be inappropriate to start directing, based on such limited information. I prefer that be the tactic that the Planning Commission takes.

VICE-PRESIDENT KONTOKOSTA: I agree.
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they on the SEQRA process? Has a finding statement been issued?

MR. FRELENG: I'm not sure, I don't think a finding statement has been issued.

VICE PRESIDENT KONTOKOSTA: That is a key barometer of what the impacts would be.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Suffolk County Planning Commission notes that the density proposed by the application is greater than that allowed by the MR code. If the town planning board believes that the benefit justifies the excess of the MR code, they should enumerate those justifications in their decision.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: It should not be a "should," it should be a "shall;" is that right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, that is why the committee works with others.

MR. FRELENG: Just to follow up, phase one is about thirty percent short of the required parking.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Would you read that again, David?

THE CHAIRMAN: Change modification
11/2/11 Suffolk Planning Commission

one to the following: The Suffolk County Planning Commission notes that the density proposed by this application is greater than that allowed by the MR code. If the town planning board believes the community benefits of the application justify density in excess of the MR code, they shall enumerate those justifications in their decision.

Any thoughts, comments, questions?

Any objection to making that change? Seeing none, we will make that change. We have two other modifications. Any comments or suggestions? If not, I will entertain a motion to adopt the resolution with the three modifications, including number one, which is amended, and there are three comments as articulated by staff and four comments as added by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Move the adoption of the staff report as amended.

COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor, please raise your hand. (Show of hands) Ten to zero. Next item is the Mount Sinai Industrial.
Welcome back, Commissioner Weir.

MR. FRELENG: The next referral is from the Town of Brookhaven, Mount Sinai Industrial, LLC, otherwise known as Mount Sinai Village Center. The applicants request a change of zone totaling thirty point three two acres from L-1 Industrial, J-2 Business and A-1 Residential to all J-2 Business in order to develop the site as a mixed use commercial center with retail, office, bank, restaurant, all totaling proposed gross floor area of approximately two hundred thirty-three thousand fifty-eight square feet. The proposed commercial center includes ten buildings, two of which are anchor retail and sub-anchor retail, a store converted to a bank, a one hundred seat stand alone restaurant and six other one and two and three story retail buildings. There is an office component in the project that is the second floor of three of the proposed retail buildings, and total office component is seventeen thousand six hundred square feet.

The Town of Brookhaven zoning law
requirement for off street parking is not met and would require relief. Parking is approximately twenty percent short of the requirement.

The application material indicates that the development is not going to be connected to an existing sewage treatment facility or propose to construct a sewage treatment plant on site. Rather, the development of the commercial center will discharge sanitary waste to septic tanks and leaching rings on site in accordance with Suffolk County Department of Health Services requirements.

The petition also includes the proposed creation of a commercial center which includes a village center type development with a boulevard design and internal sense-of-place, walkability between office, retail and public outdoor use space. Approximately twenty-three point eight two percent of the subject property provided as natural open space.

In terms of General Municipal Law considerations, the proposal does not appear to
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have any significant regional or inter-community concerns regarding the development of the subject property. One item of note is that the subject development is adjacent to the County Route 111 corridor, which is undeveloped and proximate to county parkland which may form the headland of the Greenbelt Trail. Opportunities exist to link the pedestrian network with possible future trailheads to the regional trail system.

The Town of Brookhaven 1996 Land Use Plan identified the subject parcel as appropriate for residential use. The proposal does not appear to be consistent with the '96 Comprehensive Plan. Several other initiatives have been conducted; none have been adopted by the Brookhaven Town Board. The commentaries from the later planning documents indicate a desire to improve the subject property with commercial uses along the 25A corridor with considerations for residential lots or planned retirement community units.

You can see from the zoning map the residential areas. The plans also recommend
limiting the big box retail element on the site to a maximum of seventy-five thousand square feet of gross floor area. The plan also recommends a minimum of twenty-five percent undisturbed natural area and buffering to the adjacent residential community. In context with later planning studies, the proposed change of zone for the subject property would appear to be in conceptual conformance. Planning Department staff consistently had a concern that we related to the Town of Brookhaven that townwide, the town has less than one percent of its land industrially zoned. Staff believes a light industrial park, tradesperson park or even a technology park could be a viable option. The town contends that there is not a significant base in the Hamlet of Mount Sinai. It's pointed out that there are scattered industrial zoned lands with existing uses and some potential growth. Staff wanted to take a look at that. It's hard to see from the graphic here. This is the subject property. We tried to show some
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radiuses, three point one nine, four and a quarter miles.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is this articulating?

MR. FRELENG: Other light industrially zoned properties in the area, just to pictorially represent the applicant's contention that there are existing scattered industrially zoned lands with potential for growth near the subject property.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do those parcels have room for growth?

MR. FRELENG: Some have redeveloped as businesses roll-over and some have vacancies with the ability to develop. The applicant contends that neither Mount Sinai or the region would suffer from the land use conversion.

Another concern raised by the department was with respect to shopping center vacancy rates in that area. We, in the staff report, we indicate what the vacancy rights rates are for those areas. The applicant's consultant concluded that the vacancies that exist in the area may be more related to the
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style of development of the strip commercial
centers, poor access, poor signage, rent
considerations or other factors. The applicant
feels there is a significant market share in
the area to develop the land as proposed.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: The purple piece,
is that the subject property?

MR. FRELENG: It's right in the
middle. Within three and a half miles there
are a couple of identified pieces heading due
west. South, four and a quarter miles there is
a parcel zoned light industrial, and all the
way out here, about four and a quarter miles,
there is another piece large piece of zoned
industrial.

With regard to the Suffolk County
Planning Commission guideline considerations,
the Town of Brookhaven Department of Planning,
Environment and Land Management, in concert
with the petitioner's consultant, Nelson, Pope
& Voorhis, had jointly prepared an "Analysis of
Conformance to the Suffolk County Planning
Commission Policies & Guidelines for the
Referral of Proposed Municipal Subdivision and
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Zoning Actions" dated October 11, 2011.

Suffolk County Planning staff reviewed the
analysis formulated by the town and petitioner
and has following observations:

If you take a look at the overall
area, Suffolk County has been acquiring land
for open space purposes to the east of the
property and adjacent to County Road 111 that
was to be at one time the extension of County
Road 111. It ends at the Expressway.

There were plans to bring it up and through the
Port Jefferson area up to Setauket. The county
is picking up land. There is a county holding
here.

What you can't see is that this trail
hopscotches and links all the way down in to the
Pine Barrens. This could conceivably be part
of a trail system where this would be the
headlands of a trail. Staff thinks it would be
appropriate to consider design elements of a
project along the northeast property line that
enhances the open space qualities of Suffolk
County lands. If we go to the site plan, you
can see the right-of-way for County Road 111
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runs along this property, and there could be
connections made or some sort of amenities.

This buffer appears to be off site, and we want
to make sure there is a vegetated buffer along
the parking line is substantial enough to
provide protection to the right-of-way.

You can see the vegetation here.

When we get into site plan, maybe you can bump
it out another five feet or so.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is not a site
plan?

MR. FRELENG: This is a change of
zone.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will frequently
flag these kinds of issues the staff identifies
as comments in a change of zone. This way,
when the site plan is fleshed out, the
developer is aware of what issues they may not
be thinking about that we may be looking at
from a regional perspective that are particular
to this project, like the one Andy spoke about.

MR. FRELENG: The petitioner includes
elements of the development proposal that would
be in conformance with Suffolk County Planning
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Commission guidelines, including energy efficiency, traffic safety, walkability. There is a whole list of public benefits and mitigations that the applicants are proposing. There is connectivity between the adjacent sites. Again, staff is just saying that we should just pay attention to the Greenbelt Trail to develop in the future.

In terms of energy efficiency, we are proposing to be redesigned and looking towards the reorientation of the subject site. The site has been designed in an attempt to be walkable.

With all of the above considerations, staff is recommending approval with the following comments:

First is that the subject property, while it’s not located in the Central Pine Barrens, it is situate to the Suffolk County owned lands and unimproved corridor for County Road 111. The second comment being that site planning and variance relief, if any, is subject to the Suffolk County Planning Commission and should be referred for our later
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review. That is the staff report.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a Brookhaven project. Since Mike is not here and I lived most of my life in Mount Sinai, I can tell you that this is a significant improvement over the aesthetics of the existing strip mall kind of atmosphere that pervades my home town. You don't want to pave paradise to put up a parking lot.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Thanks, Joni.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a good use of the land and it's industrially zoned. It's meant to be developed. I don't believe this is on any county list.

MR. FRELENG: Staff does not have any specific knowledge of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's meant to be utilized in an industrial capacity. The question is changing it to the kind of capacity that we here. My question is the over intensification of the commercial. At the end of the day, that is something the developer has to decide on. If we are going to do more commercial in the area, this is a more tasteful
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way of doing it.

I want to raise the issue of storm water runoff. Before I get to that, I will ask if there are any other comments.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Having driven past the site on the way here today, I agree that the proposal would be an improvement.

There is a lot of pavement.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Not much paradise.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: This has structures on it already, or is this unimproved?

MR. FRELENG: It's unimproved.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's treed. It's wooded.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Open space doesn't need to be improved, in some people's eyes.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: Although I admire the design, it is a green field instead of a gray or brown field. Because of that, although I agree with the change in zoning, I don't think they should be given anything extra. For instance, I think
that the twenty-five percent undisturbed land should be on the lots that they own and not include the right-of-way.

I agree with the comments that the staff made about linking to the future greenway. Also relative to the parking, they're asking for twenty percent relief. I have no problem with them not building the twenty percent, but the design does encourage temporary intensive uses of open space. I think we may find in the future they may need that parking. I would like to see that parking banked in addition to the twenty-five percent undisturbed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have-- he doesn't have a parking variance yet. This is just a change of zone? MR. FRELENG: This is based on the conceptual plan provided with the change of zone, correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: While it's instructive, there hasn't been any specific application as to what their -- what kind of parking they are proposing.

MR. FRELENG: It's conceptual. It
still has to go through site plan, and at that point they have to negotiate the parking, and they may have to go to the ZBA for variance. The conceptual plan is showing they will need a variance for twenty percent of the parking.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be appropriate to say we are concerned about the parking shortfall; we are going to keep an eye on it.

MR. FRELENG: It should be noted if they are going to provide the parking as land banked, it's is going to been functional in the future and they may have to change the size of some of the buildings or go higher or changed the footprint. It's kind of an advisory that the applicant may want to change the size of the buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can say we are concerned about the shortfall. We are not ruling on it now. It's not really before us now. It's not at site plan. But we are saying that we have some concerns about the adequacy of the parking. Unless there is an objection.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: The size of these
large retail, is that big box stores? Is that a Lowe's type of situation?

MR. FRELENG: One is seventy-five thousand square feet. In accordance with some of the local planning initiatives, they don't go larger than seventy-five thousand square feet, and the other is fifty thousand square feet.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I'm going to beat this drum. I know it's a conceptual site plan. We should mention to them this is the perfect situation to include green methodologies for storm water runoff, permeable pavement, bioswales, natural vegetation uses. It's green space now. It's the perfect situation to tailor it to meet those storm water guidelines, and we will be looking forward as to how they use them when we get the site plan. Just saying.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think they can consult our guidelines, our publication on green methodology storm water runoff. These are all comments. Anyone have any issues with the change of zone? (No response)
There are two existing comments, one on parking one on storm water.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: And the twenty-five percent undisturbed should be on their property rather than included in the right-of-way.

THE CHAIRMAN: The proposal preserves approximately twenty-five percent natural vegetation, natural place clustered -- oh, I read that as saying that it doesn't include that. That is on the parcel. Am I reading that wrong?

MR. FRELENG: The proposal is twenty-three point eight two percent along the southern property boundary. Unadopted property documents for the area recommend twenty-five percent. The applicant is saying if you take the abandoned roadway and combine it with the project, you have twenty-five percent.

THE CHAIRMAN: No one adopted the twenty-five percent standard. It's typical Brookhaven. It's not in the Pine Barrens?

MR. FRELENG: No. Staff was hesitant to put a benchmark on what Commission
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guidelines would be. If it was in the Barrens for a commercial site, it would be thirty-five percent to be left natural. Staff didn't put it in because it's not in the Pine Barrens. You don't have guidelines for clearing outside of Pine Barrens. The only benchmark is what is being circulated out there on the discussion. They should have twenty-five percent on the property. The applicants are coming back with twenty-three point two, and I guess it's a discretionary call as to whether it's close enough.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Berry suggested we include twenty-five percent on site. We don't really have a standard.

MR. FRELENG: Staff could make a suggestion that perhaps this could be land banked and you can provide open space in terms of the land banked scenario and tie that in with the Greenbelt.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is there now?

MR. FRELENG: This is a strip of parking. It's not land banked. You can do a little bit of semantics put into land bank and
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call it open space and say it can be added to.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't have to make up the parking elsewhere.

MR. FRELENG: Hopefully, at site plan they will provide a parking analysis.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Should not we really talk about that at the site plan stage, parking?

MR. FRELENG: Unless you are concerned that the change of zone phase at the conception, is a little bit over --

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: You're talking about one point eight percent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it's fine to mention the parking because it's a little bit of a shortfall. It isn't like a de minimus shortfall, so we will keep an eye on it when it comes to site plan. What I'm hearing is that the differentiation of twenty-three point two versus twenty-five when there isn't a formal standard of twenty-five, may not be something that we can get into.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: From what I understand, it's almost twenty-four percent on
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the bottom. Somewhere in the matrix of the plan there must be some green space that might or might not make up the green space.

MR. FRELENG: That would be natural green space.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: They could if they do bioswales.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I was going to say, following up on Commissioner Berry's suggestion, could we say that the developer should consider putting twenty-five percent of parking on their own property? Should consider, could consider?

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone feel strongly about that, including it? I don't see anyone feeling strongly about that. If someone wants to make a motion.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I'll make a motion that it be included, and Commissioner Berry will second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Holmes is the senior member and Commissioner Berry is the junior member. The proposal is that you add language in as a comment that we suggest that
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the developer consider increasing the naturally
occurring open space to be twenty-five percent
as a comment. That is the motion?

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not increase because
it's just conceptual. That they meet the
twenty-five percent standard for on site open
space.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: She said on
site parking.

COMMISSIONER BERRY: They're two
different things. One is twenty-five percent
undisturbed being on site, which came from a
recommendation from the community. That is why
I picked that up. The other is that the twenty
percent unbuilt parking be land banked in
addition to the twenty-five percent open space.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was no objection
to including the parking, or at least
acknowledging the parking issue. The question
is whether anyone wants to add language on open
space. I didn't see a lot of nodding heads on
that.
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We have had this situation in Brookhaven where they had planning documents that they haven't adopted. There is no formal standard. It hadn't happened.

COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I make a suggestion. I think we can include these as comments. It's better to give the applicant more information rather than less information.

There is no site plan. It's a conceptual site plan. We just made a comment what we would like to see, to keep the twenty-five percent, fine.

Then we will look at the site plan when it comes back and evaluate. I don't think adding it as a generalized conceptualized comment to a conceptualized site plan is going to be harmful.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to adding it the way Adrienne articulated it? We will see it at site plan. Seeing none, we will add that as a comment. The other comment was on parking. We did that.

Without objection, any other comments? Anything else? Storm water.
COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Andy didn't forget about that, I'm sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have five comments, two written by staff. The concern about storm water runoff, concern about shortfall of parking and twenty-five percent open space. Anything else? Motion by the vice chairman and second by Commissioner Berry. Motion by me, seconded by Commissioner Berry. All in favor. (Show of hands) Eleven, zero.

Last item is the Walt Whitman expansion.

MR. FRELENG: Next application comes to us from the Town of Huntington referral, the Walt Whitman Mall, LLC. The applicants are requesting site plan approval from the Huntington Planning Board for various improvements, including the addition of seventy-two thousand square feet of retail space along the western portion of the mall, reconfiguration of parking areas and construction of new parking areas. A total of four thousand seven hundred parking spaces would be provided and is consistent with relief
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granted by the Town Zoning Board of Appeals.

Two recharge basins exist on the subject site, one on the northeast portion of the property and one on the southeastern portion, totaling approximately two point five six acres. The recharge basins are proposed to be developed as parking areas. In addition, minor improvements to internal parking lot, pedestrian circulation and additional landscaping is proposed to be provided to provide a more pedestrian friendly and aesthetically pleasing environment. The application material indicates that the development is to connect to an existing sewage treatment facility off site.

In terms of General Municipal Law Consideration, the proposal does not appear to have any significant regional or community concerns. The proposed improvement is approximately five percent increase of the total floor square area of the shopping mall. The Town of Huntington Horizons 2020 Comprehensive Plan Update identifies the property as a major commercial corridor, mixed
use center. The proposed expansion of the shopping mall and improvements to the parking lot appear to be consistent with the town's comprehensive plan update.

With regard to the considerations, it does not appear from the nature of the referred material that the material has given consideration to the contents of the Suffolk County Planning Commission guidebook. It's noted that the expansion and parking lot improvements are relatively minor compared to the overall existing gross floor area of the mall, and total acreage of the project area of sixty-five acres.

It's the belief of the staff that the proposal may find some benefit in viewing the Commission's guidebook, especially with respect to energy efficiency and public safety.

Staff recommends approval subject to the following comments:

All improvements to the Walt Whitman Mall should be in conformance with any SEQRA findings and prior relief granted by the Huntington Town Planning Board and Zoning Board.
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of Appeals. Second comment, all storm water runoff be kept on site and treated with best management practices. The applicants should review the Suffolk County Planning Commission guidebook and incorporate where practical, design elements recommended therein.

The staff is recommending a fourth comment, that this is related to recent site inspections that we have done, that a fence blocking motor vehicle cross access along the southern property line be reestablished so pedestrian and motor vehicle cross access between the two sites is consistent.

This is the north end of the site as it exists today. The proposed improvements would go along the front end of the building. There is a recharge basin over here in the southeast corner, and here in the northeast corner. That's it. There would be the zoning of the property. It's consistent with the zoning.

This would be the site plan. You can see this being Broad Hollow Road, this is the front of the building. The gray area shows the
improvements of the eight thousand square feet that would bump up to a second story and a deck. This is about forty feet and you can see all the minor parking fixes on site and then the recharge basins that are filled in and converted to parking. That is the staff report.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a Huntington project. Commissioner Casey, thoughts.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: Looking at it, seems like it's pretty good. The mall is a vital component on Route 110 and it appears anything that the parking is generally underutilized. I agree with the staff recommendations.

MR. FRELENG: I didn't point out one thing. This has been fenced off while they prepare for construction, but there is cross access between the properties. We are recommending that they reestablish the cross access.

COMMISSIONER CASEY: There is another shopping center to the south of it which is the Barnes & Noble park shopping center.
MR. FRELENG: There is a comment that we are recommending, it's not in the staff report, and we are recommending that this cross access be reestablished. They put up construction fencing. We want to make sure it doesn't become permanent.

Anecdotally, in the Town of Southampton, we have a couple of projects where they put up fencing and the fencing never came down, and we had some neighbors start to have arguments over cross access agreements and insurance and stuff.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments, questions? COMMISSIONER CASEY: I make a motion that we adopt it.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor? (Show of hands) Ten-zero. Where did Matt go?

COMMISSIONER FINN: He had to recuse himself. THE CHAIRMAN: That is why the vote is ten-zero. Unless anyone has anything else, let the Vice Chairman say a few words.

COMMISSIONER KONTOKOSKA: I came on
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this Commission about six years ago. I was
hoping to use the position to make a positive
impact, positive change on the county. I never
had any intention of being here just to keep
the seat warm.

I've been fortunate over the last few
months to take on a lot of responsibility,
including some projects with Mayor Bloomberg's
office and two projects on the East End. So
I'm going to be stepping off the Commission at
the end of my term as Vice Chair in February.
That will close out the vice chair position and
allow me to finish up the work on the housing
that I've been doing and commercial energy
efficiency. I'll be around for a few months.

I want to thank a few thank you's. I
want to thank the staff, Dan and Andy, who have
given us the information to make many times
sensible and logical decisions that implement
all of musings up here, which is pretty
impressive. Obviously, working with Tom is
fantastic. Tom was a great leader and I have
high hopes for Sarah. I know she will do a
great job. I told her not to be disenchanted
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by all the people who don't want change. And I
expect great things from our fearless leader.
Other parts of his legacy will be introduction
of the six hour planning commission meeting.
He's done an incredible job making this a very
relevant board, making this a leader in the
county and highlighting key and being an
advocate for key regional issues and by being a
leader in cooperation with the towns and
villages, which was something that was lacking
and is evident in your accomplishments.

I'm privilege to be part of the
Commission. I don't know how I became one of
the veterans of the Commission. It's been
fantastic to see the new members come on and
the professionalism and expertise that has come
on has been tremendous. You have me for
another couple of months. Use it wisely and
it's been an honor to serve the county.
(Applause)

THE CHAIRMAN: It goes without saying
we will miss Constantine, his leadership, his
expertise, his calm under fire, and I know
I will miss him very much.
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COMMISSIONER HOLMES: He's the only professor we ever had.

COMMISSIONER ROBERTS: I teach at Columbia Business School.

THE CHAIRMAN: Constantine said he will stick around for a few months. That is important to us. The housing summit, the green building effort being launched soon. Glynis is interested in that. Hoping you guys can connect on that. We will miss you.

That leads me to the other thing. We have three officerships coming up for next year. One or two appointed nominating and rules committee. We need to look at our bylaws. We did some major revisions last year. We need to take a look at our rules of how we conduct our business. I wanted to ask Diana Weir to be chair of the nominating and rules committee and Constantine as well as Tom McAdam. I look forward to them leading that effort.

Under the county charter the rules committee is appointed by the Chair with the blessing of the whole Commission in November of
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each year. They report in January who the
recommendations for the officers for the coming
year, and our organizational meeting, which is
in February, we will elect new officers, adopt
our rules for the year, adopt our schedule for
the year. We will be sketching out where we
want to travel in the county. We have hit all
ten towns. I think we should probably keep
doing that.

Thank you and most importantly,
thanks to Constantine for your service and I
appreciate the help of the nominating
committee. Diana will send out an E-mail to
let anybody interested in an officership,
interested nominating anyone for an
officership, let her know. You can circulate
the rules if they have any comments or
suggestions. Anything else? If not, if we can
grab five minutes, I want to hand out the draft
housing agenda and entertain a motion to
adjourn.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: So move.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Second.

(Time noted: 2:35 p.m.)
CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEW YORK)

) ss:

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

I, JUDI GALLOP, a Notary Public in and for the State of New York, do hereby certify:

THAT this is a true and accurate record of the meeting held by the Suffolk County Planning Commission on November 2, 2011, as reported by me and transcribed by me.

JUDI GALLOP

JUDI GALLOP
ERRATA

I wish to make the following changes, for the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>CHANGE:</th>
<th>REASON:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WITNESS' SIGNATURE DATE
anybody 22:12 47:12 71:4 109:15
        109:19
apartments 41:13
appealing 43:9
areas 7:4 34:7 49:12 51:8 60:6 82:25 84:23 100:22,23 101:8
aren't 50:10
argument 56:6
arguments 105:12
article 22:12,19 30:23 38:25
articulated 79:18 99:20
articulating 84:5
aside 34:17 38:10,18
aspect 16:16 37:6
asphalt 16:10
assistance 13:19 35:23 69:8,11,18
assisted 6:19
associated 35:14,25
Association 6:17 8:20
assume 50:14
assuming 6:2
At-Large 1:18
atmosphere 89:8
attached 33:23 37:23 40:20 72:19,22
attempt 88:13
attendance 10:3
attended 12:4,10 16:5
attention 61:12 88:8
Attorney 1:19 9:18
attributed 38:4
audio 28:25
August 2:22 3:6,12 7:2
authority 11:9
authorize 28:24
availability 38:14
available 20:19,20

39:23 71:12
average 35:9
aware 39:15 87:19
away 29:13

B
background 42:6 57:4
good 46:23
bank 80:11,17 95:25
banked 91:14 92:13 95:19,20 98:18
bar 28:17
Barbara 1:17 65:14
bargain 70:21
Barnes 104:25
barometer 78:7
Barrens 86:18 88:20 94:25 95:2,5,7
base 5:20 83:19
based 77:21 91:19
basin 103:18
basins 101:3,7 104:6
basis 16:19
beach 18:23
beaches 23:5
beat 93:11
became 107:14
become 105:7
bed 23:13
begin 24:5
beginning 19:16
begins 69:5
behalf 12:5 14:15,19
behind 39:23 44:18 49:8 55:24
belief 32:14 102:16
believes 32:7 33:13 73:3 77:11 78:12 79:6 83:15
benchmark 94:25 95:7
benefit 60:23 70:16 73:19 75:13 78:12 102:17
benign 49:18
Berry's 97:10
best 26:19 47:3 103:3
beyond 59:5,6 73:25
bill 7:2
bioswales 93:15 97:8
bipartisan 23:21
bit 25:15 43:3 61:24 95:25 96:12,16
blessing 108:25
blight 26:22
blighted 76:13
blind 41:9
blocking 103:11
Bloomberg's 106:9
blue 21:23 41:7
boards 17:23
Board's 77:3
boardwalk 16:8
Bob 26:3
bodies 22:22
body 15:11 23:2
| contents | contents 83:18 84:17 |
| context | context 83:7 |
| continue | continue 12:19 18:18 |
| continues | continues 7:14,19,25 |
| continuing | continuing 13:4,15 27:23 |
| convenience | convenience 32:12 |
| conversation | conversation 13:6 24:5,6 |
| conversion | conversion 84:18 |
| converted | converted 80:17 104:7 |
| conveyed | conveyed 34:5 |
| cooling | cooling 18:15 |
| cooperation | cooperation 107:10 |
| coordinating | coordinating 8:25 43:18 |
| coordination | coordination 12:7 |
| copy | copy 19:10 27:15,17 |
| core | core 55:10 |
| corner | corner 26:19 64:18 103:19,20 |
| correct | correct 73:9 91:20 |
| corresponds | corresponds 7:6 |
| cumulative | cumulative 71:18 |
| curious | curious 64:12 |
| current | current 7:24 34:23 36:13 |
| currently | currently 17:2 30:24 75:2 |
| cut | cut 52:24 53:20 |
| cuts | cuts 22:15 |
| cutting | cutting 21:24 54:8 |
| day-to-day | day-to-day 16:19 |
| De | de 96:17 |
| deal | deal 18:6 24:8,42 48:23 |
| dealing | dealing 18:10 |
| debate | debate 12:14,15 |
| DEC | DEC 17:20 |
| December | December 6:16 |
| decide | decide 89:24 |
| decision | decision 20:20 78:15 79:9 |
| decisions | decisions 15:9 59:6 106:20 |
| decrease | decrease 54:14 |
| decree | decree 42:14 |
| deed | deed 61:9 |
| default | default 26:18 |
| define | define 60:22 |
| definitely | definitely 26:8 63:9 |
| definitions | definitions 25:2 |
| definitive | definitive 23:19 67:2 |
| DEIS | DEIS 77:25 |
| deliberate | deliberate 36:9 37:6 55:19 |
| deliberated | deliberated 39:5 |
| deliberations | deliberations 73:24 |
| delighted | delighted 51:12 |
| delivered | delivered 65:11 |
| deliveries | deliveries 53:6 |
| delivery | delivery 24:23 25:2 |
| demographic | demographic 25:5 |
| demolition | demolition 69:5 |
| demonstrate | demonstrate 48:13 |
| Dennison | Dennison 14:12 |
| dense | dense 43:8 72:7,8 76:19,22 77:8 |
| densities | densities 35:6,7 38:2 41:11 |
| D | D |
| Dan | Dan 106:18 |
| Daniel | Daniel 1:21 |
| date | date 27:20 39:5 111:24 |
| dated | dated 86:2 |
| David | David 1:13 78:24 |
| day | day 18:6,19 19:2 49:21 51:15 52:12 89:23 |
| days | days 5:22 19:18 28:23 |
| densities | densities 35:6,7 38:2 41:11 |
| Department | Department 1:19 |
| departments | departments 20:6,9 |
| Deputy | Deputy 1:21 |
| design | design 7:10 9:10 81:19 86:21 90:21 91:10 103:7 |
| designations | designations 31:15 |
| designed | designed 9:16 88:13 |
| desire | desire 82:20 |
| details | details 23:11 58:17,19 |
| determination | determination 77:14 |
| develop | develop 32:22 53:2 80:10 84:16 85:6 88:9 |
| developed | developed 30:25 56:17 57:15 89:14 101:8 |
| developments | developments 52:11 59:25 |
| developments 9:16 60:10 68:7 |
| deviate | deviate 74:13 |
| DGEIS | DGEIS 50:18 |
| diagonal | diagonal 31:25 |
| Diana | Diana 1:14 108:18 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>joint 10:22 11:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>jointly 33:18 85:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>joke 28:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joni 89:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Judge 60:24 77:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Judgment 77:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Judi 29:3 110:9,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>junior 97:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jurisdiction 30:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Justice 45:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Justifications 78:14 79:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Justifies 78:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Justify 79:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K

Kate 13:21
Kelly 1:16 9:4
Kennedy 21:8
Kepert 21:22
key 7:23 13:8 78:7 107:8,9
KFC 26:16
kinds 87:16
King 27:25
KLEIN 1:22
knew 5:22 20:3 76:10
knowledge 20:22 74:16 89:17
known 30:6 80:5
KONTOKOSKA 59:2 61:8 105:25
Kontokosta 9:3 68:24 77:24 78:6

L

L-1 80:8
lack 59:16 72:19
lacking 107:11
laid 29:14 53:8
landfill 18:24
lands 83:21 84:10 86:24 88:21
landscaped 34:8
landscaping 101:11
lap 26:17
large 85:15 93:2
larger 93:7
launched 108:9
lawn 34:8
layout 31:4
learning 81:13
lead 2:5 8:5 9:5 27:10 28:2 45:14
leader 19:22 51:20 106:23 107:3,7,10
leaders 18:3
leadership 107:23
leading 108:21
leads 108:12
lease 58:10 67:18
least 98:21
leave 64:8
leery 49:5
left-hand 64:18
legacy 107:4
legislation 27:10 28:24
legislative 27:7 28:14
Legislator 4:22 6:24 15:17 19:6,19,20
legislators 15:7
legislature 4:16 5:5 6:25 14:22 15:2 24:2
legisurate's 2:17
less 50:16 54:3 72:8 73:7 74:11,12 83:14 99:9
let's 3:10
letter 14:21 15:6,8
level 11:8 12:22 13:3,16 18:5
life 16:20 25:18,20,21 59:23 89:5
lifetime 19:2
light 83:15 84:6 85:13
LIJ 25:23
limited 77:21
limiting 83:2
LINDA 1:15
linear 18:23
lines 55:20 57:19 62:8
link 82:9
linkage 26:6
linking 91:6
links 86:17
LIPA 5:21
list 88:4 89:15
livability 36:22
live 42:3 43:15 50:9
lived 89:4
lives 46:10,21
living 36:20 48:3 50:11 51:5
LLC 80:5 100:16
loaded 61:15
locality 56:7 73:23
locally 30:5
located 49:5 88:19
location 4:10 33:9 75:19
locations 54:15
locking 59:22
logic 59:3 64:2,11
logical 55:10 106:20
long-term 34:22 45:8 46:12
lose 46:3 61:22 69:7
losses 60:6
lost 46:13
lots 52:21 56:21 59:3 82:22 91:3
lounge 28:17
love 18:11
lovely 18:7
low 45:4 46:7 62:5
lower 16:25 17:18 54:19
Lowe's 93:3
lumped 47:24 48:15
luxury 76:24
lying 23:2

M

main 69:3
maintaining 32:12
maker 20:21
mall 44:20 89:7 100:16,21 101:22 102:3,14,23 104:12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manage</td>
<td>18:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managed</td>
<td>17:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>17:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandate</td>
<td>56:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor</td>
<td>41:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufactured</td>
<td>31:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>map</td>
<td>33:10, 40:9, 82:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marine</td>
<td>16:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>4:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maritime</td>
<td>16:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market</td>
<td>85:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mass</td>
<td>39:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>massage</td>
<td>69:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>massive</td>
<td>46:4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>17:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>match</td>
<td>33:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td>34:14, 39:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may</td>
<td>44:24, 49:20, 76:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may be</td>
<td>45:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may be</td>
<td>59:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayors</td>
<td>6:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAdam</td>
<td>9:12, 108:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>45:21, 73:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>4:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>40:6, 46:3, 76:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meant</td>
<td>89:14, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical</td>
<td>22:21, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet</td>
<td>4:15, 10:22, 20:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>2:3, 6:12, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental</td>
<td>25:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mention</td>
<td>3:2, 24:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met</td>
<td>18:7, 21:8, 22:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methods</td>
<td>93:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>85:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>89:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mile</td>
<td>17:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles</td>
<td>18:23, 84:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>17:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind</td>
<td>9:17, 24:14, 27:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum</td>
<td>46:17, 47:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minister</td>
<td>96:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mix</td>
<td>67:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobile</td>
<td>31:7, 35:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td>5:25, 6:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>models</td>
<td>24:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modest</td>
<td>46:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modifications</td>
<td>37:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montauk</td>
<td>10:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months</td>
<td>22:10, 20:47:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morning</td>
<td>11:14, 20:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mortgage</td>
<td>22:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mortgages</td>
<td>58:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motion</td>
<td>79:14, 97:18, 20:98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move</td>
<td>5:7, 7:25, 11:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>29:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi</td>
<td>37:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi-family</td>
<td>30:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiply</td>
<td>72:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>municipal</td>
<td>27:11, 31:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musings</td>
<td>106:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>16:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself</td>
<td>29:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative</td>
<td>19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>10:6, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native</td>
<td>13:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural</td>
<td>13:18, 81:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessarily</td>
<td>74:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>36:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>32:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiate</td>
<td>92:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiation</td>
<td>49:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negotiations</td>
<td>45:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighboring</td>
<td>43:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>105:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither</td>
<td>84:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>51:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network</td>
<td>40:17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newest</td>
<td>4:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news</td>
<td>8:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice</td>
<td>29:9, 51:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nickel</td>
<td>16:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night</td>
<td>21:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>5:13, 21:4, 22:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
types 24:15
typical 31:6 40:17,24
41:7 66:17 77:8 94:22

Unadopted 94:16
unbuilt 98:18
unconnected 47:17
underage 71:16
understand 48:7,18
70:15 75:2 76:5 96:25
understanding 58:21
65:16
understood 21:10
underutilized 104:15
undeveloped 82:7
undisturbed 83:6
91:2,15 94:5 98:15
Unified 21:19
unimproved 88:21
90:14,15
unique 35:24
unit 37:23 40:21 48:4
units 18:16 30:12,18
34:17 37:20
38:9,13,15,18
41:14,17,18 43:16
44:23 45:2,5 47:23
48:2,8 51:8 55:12
57:8,22,24 62:5,24
63:4 68:13 69:5
72:5,19,20,22 73:25
74:3 75:22 82:23
University 26:4
unless 52:13 72:24
92:24 96:10 105:22
unsustainable 46:23
unal 31:6 66:17 77:8 94:22

up-to-date 4:24
urging 6:22
utilized 89:19
utilizes 18:15

vacancies 84:15,24
vacancy 84:21,22
Valley 7:21
value 52:2 77:6
values 7:7
variance 30:20 39:3
88:23 91:17 92:4,6
variances 36:5,25 37:3
55:15 76:23
various 7:18 12:12,24
100:18
vegetated 87:5
vegetation 13:7 87:8
93:15 94:10
vehicle 103:11,13
venture 48:10
versus 96:21
veterans 107:15
viable 54:9 83:17
vibrant 18:22,24
vice 61:23 68:24 78:6
100:8 105:23
106:12,13
VICE-PRESIDENT 77:24
vices 28:16
vicinity 31:12
view 19:15 40:19 63:6
viewing 102:17
village 1:5 7:15 8:20
16:21 17:15 80:6
81:18
villages 11:3 12:24
107:11
Viloria-Fisher 4:23 6:24
18:4 19:6,9 21:16
26:10 27:4,19 28:20
29:4,11
violation 47:15
violations 35:19
visit 19:2 75:14
visuals 17:23
vital 26:4 104:13
Vivian 18:3
volume 5:4,7,8 24:10
25:25
volunteer 15:11
volunteers 24:3
Voorhis 51:24 85:22
vote 105:22
voted 5:3

walkability 81:20 88:3
walkable 88:14
Wait 100:12,16 102:22
warm 106:6
warrant 35:15 75:16
warranted 36:4
wasn't 44:6 47:14
waste 12:14 34:5 81:12
34:9,10 90:4
93:14,18,23 94:3
99:25 100:6 103:2
waterfront 16:8,12,15,22 18:11
waters 23:8,9
Wayne 27:20
Wednesday 11:15 29:15
week 27:7,18
weeks 4:17 5:5 22:23
Weir 1:14 6:18 8:23 9:4
29:24 80:2 85:7 90:12
92:25 105:17 108:19
109:24
welcome 2:2,14 4:8,14
15:22 16:2 80:2
welfare 32:9
We're 4:18
west 41:10 85:12
western 100:21
whatever 70:18
whether 9:21 43:21

York 1:5 5:24 8:5 30:5
31:17 38:24 42:3
young 1:19 32:24
you's 106:17
Yves 27:25

Z
ZBA 92:4
zero 79:24 100:11
zone 16:13 17:4 30:7
  33:5,11,14 37:9
  63:16,18 74:9 80:7
  83:9 87:14,17
  91:18,20 93:25 96:11
zoned 31:16,20 37:22
  72:6,15 83:15,21
  84:7,10 85:13,15
  89:13
zoning 10:7 30:21
  31:12,13 32:4
  33:6,8,10,12,23
  36:5,12 37:3 38:22
  40:9 41:8 80:25 82:24
  86:2 90:24 101:2
  102:25 103:20,22