

7/21/2003minutes

Minutes of a Public Hearing held by the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead at Town Hall, 200 Howell Avenue, Riverhead, New York, on Monday, July 21, 2003, at 6:00 p.m.

Present:

Robert Kozakiewicz,	Supervisor
James Lull,	Councilman
Barbara Blass,	Councilperson
Rose Sanders,	Councilperson

Also Present:

Melissa White,	Deputy Town Clerk
Dawn Thomas, Esq.,	Town Attorney

Absent:

Edward Densieski,	Councilman
Barbara Grattan,	Town Clerk

(Supervisor Kozakiewicz called the public hearing to order at 6:02 p.m.)

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "We're going to get under way. Before we resume with the public hearings that were held over from the other day, the 7th, I'd ask everyone to stand-- the Pledge of Allegiance, please."

(At this time, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you all for returning. As you know, we're here to continue discussions with respect to the comprehensive land use plan and simultaneously therewith, take up comments with respect to the generic environmental impact statement.

As we all know, this is a process the Town has been working its way through for quite some time. We had designed this to gain as much consensus up front as possible by sending out questionnaires and having the focus groups meeting.

We have the comments back from Planning Board, the Planning Board having met again in November, 2002, having devoted their meetings in November, 2002 to hear from you with respect to the topics that I mentioned.

7/21/2003minutes

Under the Town Law, we had asked the Planning Board to guide us, if you will, and prepare the documents in order to have this comprehensive land use plan, hopefully become the adopted land use plan of the Town of Riverhead.

As we all know, the last one was 1973 so it is definitely due.

I do have cards that I'm going to be going off of and asking speakers to come up, identify themselves, their name and address for the record, and the first speaker I have a card from is Jim Tsunis."

Jim Tsunis: "Good evening, Supervisor, Town Board Members. My name is Jim Tsunis and I'm here to provide the Town Board with several comments relative to the proposed master plan.

I commend the Board for their interest, dedication and desire to adopt a comprehensive town-wide master plan to ensure farmland preservation and responsible and efficient utilization of parcels within the Town.

It is obvious that a tremendous effort by many officials and community organizations has contributed to this comprehensive plan.

I would like to call your attention to a site specific situation, however, that seems to have fallen between the cracks. I am the contract vendee for a 47 acre parcel identified in District 0600 Section 108 Block 1 Lot 1, located on the southwest corner of Middle Road and Harrison Avenue in the Town of Riverhead.

We believe that this parcel has been improperly identified on the proposed zoning map as being zoned Agricultural A and has been eliminated from the AOZ zone. This contradiction will, if not addressed, will significantly affect its economic value.

The proposed plan also identified the north boundary of the proposed Agricultural Overlay Zone as Sound Avenue and the south boundary as Route 25 and Middle Road (refer to Goal 3.5 on page 3-9), so this parcel clearly does not lie within the AOZ.

While one of the main goals of the proposed master plan is to preserve active farmland, we wish to call your attention to the fact that this parcel has not been agriculturally productive for over 20 years. The owner of the property, William Ahern, provided testimony at a previous Board meeting that the property has not had any agricultural value and will not have any in the future. Furthermore

7/21/2003minutes

it has become a financial burden for him.

The development of this property would not in any way reduce the current level of agricultural productivity in the region.

The Town of Riverhead will be experiencing an increase in demand for senior housing as the baby boomers reach the over 55 age group. Concurrently, their offspring will be maturing and joining the work force for which there currently is a desperate need. While the Town has clearly expressed their interest and concern to provide work force housing, no specific zoning designation has been considered nor established for this use.

The Town's vision statement (Section 8.1, page 8-1) expresses its concern and need for senior and work force housing. Policy 8.4B on page 8-16 promotes allowing campus-style housing development along Middle Road. The parcel in question is surrounded by compatible land uses (RC, DRC, and SC) and would compliment all of these uses.

In an attempt to assist the Town in addressing these community needs, I propose to change the land use for this site, to include a mixed use housing development, for both senior and work force families. As stated in Policy 8.4B, properties designated Residence RRC can have a net density of 10 units per acre. I propose to request a density of 8 units per acre. I believe a mixed use project such as the one proposed, would be the first of its kind in Suffolk County and would place the Town of Riverhead well ahead of all other towns in their efforts to address the work force housing needs.

I look forward to your favorable comments and revising your land use map to reflect the master plan narrative by correcting the "A" zoning designation to "RRC" with a work force housing component added.

Thank you for your consideration."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Okay. The next speaker I have listed who has handed up a card is Stuart Stein. Name and address, please, for the record."

Stuart Stein: "My name is Stuart Stein, 400 Garden City Plaza, Garden City, New York 10530.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am one of the owners of property on Route 58 and Mill Road, formerly the Hazeltine property. We've been before you on matters related to this property and you

7/21/2003minutes

granted us a special permit for the movie theater and for restaurant use.

That covers the front of the property. The rear of the property is in the destination retail zone, which is fine. The plan you are considering this evening contains an overlay district ordinance which permits the Board to adopt what would be classified as a luxury apartment zone to overlay the existing zone and I want to support that and commend the Board for considering an overlay zone.

We think this property is appropriate for a luxury apartment should the Board so deem it appropriate and we have an interest in developing for that kind of purpose. As a model, we have a developer who has developed substantially in Brookhaven township and own some units in Riverhead and what we would propose if the overlay zone is adopted and if it is applied to this piece, is that we would develop units- luxury apartments with clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, single one bedroom units having approximately 1100 square feet and two bedroom units having approximately 1250 square feet.

While there are, of course, apartments in the township, I don't think there's anything like this. If Calverton is going to be successfully developed, the need for this quality of apartments is going to grow and I think it would be a good use for the town. Brookhaven has similar units and I think this town should also.

Our developer's experience indicate that the occupants of this kind of housing are primarily empty nesters or young couples waiting to get established and we do not feel that it would be a material burden on the school district.

For these reasons, I stand here tonight to support the master plan as it is written and to commend the Board for its consideration and particularly to support it as it relates to creating an overlay district ordinance. Thank you very much."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next speaker is Sid Bail."

Sid Bail: "Good evening. Sid Bail, President of the Wading River Civic Association.

One general comment about the whole process and where we are. It's actually the last comment on the second page of my sheet.

The Wading River Civic Association urges the Town Board to

7/21/2003minutes

swiftly review all public input on the comprehensive plan, make necessary modifications and to adopt the comprehensive plan. It is our belief that the comprehensive plan should be adopted even if the differences about the nature and scope of a TDR program have not been fully resolved. These issues can and should be resolved at a subsequent time.

I'll confine most of my brief comments to the hamlet of Wading River. I've included a letter in this packet from John Heilbrunn. It's a letter previously submitted and he rather eloquently puts the basis of planning efforts in Wading River, the so called Wading River Hamlet Study of 1989 where the present zoning, etc., you know, derives from.

It has worked rather well and, you know, we realized it was time to update it, but I think- well, we were always told that the essential features of the Wading River hamlet study would be- could be maintained. We've been trying to get that across to the Town, the Planning Board, etc.

You have a page of notes, Wading River, Route 25A, Wading River Hamlet. These are notes that Joe Baer who has an interesting prospectus since he was a member of the Wading River Hamlet Study of 1989. Now he's a member of the Planning Board. These are some of the notes that he submitted.

We were a little bit concerned with the latest version that some of the aspects, some of the elements that we feel are essential still have not come through. If you- I'd like to make some comments about Route 25A.

Very briefly, the CR Business Zone has been refined, have created three Business Districts or Commercial Districts, BC, SC, and BC and CRC, four districts. The proposed BC District was supposed to be Mr. Pike's Main Street. All right. And, but really if you go through the master plan update, BC has this- has uses in it that are not appropriate to a small hamlet. They are- it was envisioned for Route 58.

Some of the- we are requesting a modification. BC-1 or we can call this BC Light, if you'd like. That would be nice. A nice tone on it. We want to eliminate gas station, auto repair, auto dealerships, car washes, drive-thru windows as it says in the preferred uses, from the preferred land uses.

7/21/2003minutes

Also, another feature of the Wading River Hamlet Study was 19 hours of business operation and we would like this continued in all the business and commercial districts. A few years ago, someone wrote a little (inaudible) about Wading River, and under the section night life, they said there is none. We'd like to keep it that way. We could come to the big city for all the wonderful things Riverhead has to offer such as the Blues Festival, etc.

We also strongly oppose the rezone of two A-1 parcels along 25A at Wading River behind the Wading River Commons, King Kullen Center to CRC. We believe that it's inconsistent with the goals expressed in the comprehensive plan, creates more commercial sprawl, creates more traffic problems on Wading River Manor Road which is an admitted disaster right now.

We concur with the recommendation in the comprehensive plan for these parcels and I quote preserve newly planted orchards and adjacent farmland.

There are two brief comments about Wading River Hamlet. Thanks to the town's work on the parking lot, it's shaping up very nicely. These are some comments that are self-explanatory, so I will skip over those.

Other considerations. We do not support the rezoning of the industrial recreational IR parcels located south of Wildwood State Park to agricultural A. These commercial parcels are currently in agricultural use. Some of these industrial parcels are protected active farmland. These parcels are also located in the Shoreham-Wading River School District and thus not envisioned to be sending or receiving areas for AOZ transfer of development rights.

By rezoning the parcels agricultural A, we would be encouraging residential subdivisions in an area surrounded by active, protected land in agriculture. One critical thing that we're not lacking in Wading River right now is McMansions. There's no McMansion shortage and I think it's a beautiful vista coming in- and you know we talked about Sound Avenue, for the connection between Route 25 and Route 25A with all the active farming and it's something that we should work to preserve.

We also strongly support the rezoning of all Residence A-1 parcels in Wading River to Residence RA to conform to town-wide standards, the new standards proposed.

7/21/2003minutes

We strongly recommend purchase of development rights for the parcel on the south side of 25A, west of the village center. In the Hamlet Study talks-the comprehensive plan talks about three parcels. There's actually just two because one of those is- our second country inn and I don't think Mr. Barra is going to expand into those other two parcels. So this is a good opportunity to keep some open land on 25A and- to be a variety of uses. And it was recommended in the comprehensive plan.

We further recommend the acquisition of land on the north side of 25A, just to the east of Wading River Commons. A second major shopping center is not needed in Wading River. There's room for expansion in the existing center. Not all the existing stores have been filled.

We agree with the comprehensive plan's recommendation as not necessary or desirable to turn 25A into a miniature version of Route 58. Any town houses- fourth recommendation- any town houses or multi-family residences constructed in CRC, should be owner occupied whether they are luxury or whether they are work force or whether they are for senior citizens. Such a provision currently exists under MF-1 in Wading River and we think it would be a good idea to carry over and it works well in any community.

Okay. I'd like to thank you for your time, etc., and I know there's a lot of folks out here to speak and I'd like to thank people, you know, like John Heilbrunn, Joe Baer, Del Kucera, and Joe Lynch, people who were part of the original Hamlet Study for their consistent, long support for this effort. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next card I have is from Andrea Lohneiss."

Andrea Lohneiss: "My name is Andrea Lohneiss. I'm the CD director for the Town of Riverhead and I was asked to speak on behalf of Mitch Pally, the Vice-President of the Long Island Association. He could not be here tonight so he e-mailed his comments.

The Long Island Association, the region's largest business and civic organization, wishes to express its concern over the possible impact of certain provisions being discussed within the Town of Riverhead master plan on the ability of Long Island to provide affordable housing to its citizens.

While we understand the need to preserve open space through

7/21/2003minutes

certain up zonings, we remain deeply concerned over the ability of developers to provide affordable housing within this context. Recent census data indicates that Long Island lost more of its residents within the ages of 25-34 than any other metropolitan area in the country over the past five years.

The main reason for this loss is the lack of housing which is affordable to residents who are trying to start their careers on Long Island. The loss of these young people is having a detrimental impact upon the ability of our businesses to find workers in many of our specialties, especially the high-tech businesses which are designed to be the backbone of our new Long Island economy.

We highly recommend that certain exceptions be made in appropriate areas for the construction of affordable housing without the need for TDR's or other special permits that make the building of such housing both politically questionable and unaffordable. It is essential for the Town of Riverhead to designate certain areas as acceptable for affordable housing, and not to up zone such areas that would then require additional proceedings and possible TDR credits. Up zoning of all empty parcels to one acre zoning or above makes the building of affordable housing impracticable.

The Long Island Association understands the need for the Town of Riverhead to ensure the continuation of its quality of life through the up zoning of certain parcels to ensure open space and a reduced build out. In addition, we understand the reluctance of the town to provide housing for all of the east end.

However, we strongly believe that it is essential, if only for its own residents, for the town to ensure that affordable housing can be built for its residents who want to start their careers in the town. A delicate balance between the up zoning requirements and the need for affordable housing can and should be provided for and we know that the town can do so by ensuring that some areas are preserved and others are allowed to provide the increased density which makes such housing both affordable and acceptable.

This delicate balance between two conflicting agendas was achieved in the designation of areas under the Pine Barrens Act and we find no reason why the same balance cannot be achieved now. We urge the acceptance of this premise within the master plan and its inclusion within both the findings and zoning.

Thank you very much for your consideration of our views.

7/21/2003minutes

Respectfully submitted, Mitch Pally, Vice-President, Long Island Association."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you, Andrea. The next speaker who handed up a card is Ann Marie Jones of Long Island Housing Partnership.

While Ann Marie is jumping up to address us on the master plan and on the generic environmental impact statement, I do want to indicate that Dave Immolata is here once again joining us should there be any questions specifically addressed to the environmental impact statement."

Jim Morgo: "Good evening, Mr. Supervisor. I am not Ann Marie Jones."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Wait a minute."

Jim Morgo: "I am Jim Morgo, President of the Long Island Housing Partnership. Ann Marie Jones, in fact, is passing some material to you right now. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed comprehensive plan of the Town of Riverhead.

The Long Island Housing Partnership has helped more than 6,000 Long Island families achieve homes that they can afford, most of the homes they own where they build equity and they build net worth. You know, net worth for all Americans is found in their homes, not in stocks, not in savings, not in bonds, and the Housing Partnership has had the opportunity to have families throughout Long Island build their net worth.

The Housing Partnership is a private sector, not-for-profit partner of most Long Island towns, including the Town of Riverhead. Last November, the Housing Partnership published a study done by Dr. Pearl Kamer, the lack of affordable housing a prescription for economic disaster to quantify the need for homes affordable to Long Island workers. You have- Ann Marie Jones passed to you the executive summary of that study.

A home was considered unaffordable if the housing costs, the principal, interest, taxes, insurance, consumed more than 35% of a household income. Most of the time you hear a homeowner should spend no more than 30% of his or her income. We use 35% on Long Island because of our high costs.

7/21/2003minutes

Every single census tract on Long Island, every neighborhood on Long Island was looked at and we used the 200 census and the following was noted for Riverhead. There are a total of 6,500 owner occupied homes in Riverhead. About two-thirds of them, 4,300, are mortgaged. Of those 4,300 homes, 26% of the homeowners pay more than 35% of their gross annual income for their housing costs. Of this 26%, 13% of these households in this town pay more than 50% of their household income for housing costs. Twenty-six percent, a fourth of all the families in Riverhead, are considered living in homes that are unaffordable. In these families, then there's less money for discretionary spending which means fewer dollars to be spent on goods and services in Riverhead's commercial establishments.

As far as that 13% that are spending more than 50% of their gross incomes on housing, that doesn't leave very much for things like health care and education.

It's always interesting to compare Riverhead-- as does the proposed comprehensive plan, it's interesting to compare Riverhead to the other east end towns. The percentages in those towns are as follows: in Southold, 23% of the families are spending more than 35% of their income for a place to live. In Southampton, it's 24% and in East Hampton, it's 28%.

According to these figures, more homes- more families in Riverhead are considered to be unaffordable places to live than households in neighboring Southold and Southampton. Some of these- in some of these places, the people who live in these homes may choose to spend more than 35% of their incomes for a place to live. That is they buy- they have higher incomes and they're able to buy a home that's worth more and they choose to spend more. In Riverhead, frequently the families who are spending more than 35% of their income, are doing it because they have no choice. This is all they can afford.

So then who needs work force homes in Riverhead? To make homes affordable to workers, the Housing Partnership blends public and private money. Public money, government money; private money, money from banks. Developments that use state and federal funds are limited to those families that make a percentage of the median incomes for Long Island. These regulations limit to whom you can sell and the limitation is most often, you cannot sell to someone who earns, whose combined family income is more than 80% of the Nassau/Suffolk median.

The theory is if you earn more than 80%, then you don't need help

7/21/2003minutes

finding an affordable home. Also you are a first time home buyer, so you're not bringing any equity from a previous home. The theory is if you earn more than 80%, you don't need any help. And that's just it, a theory.

What does this really mean and what kind of figures are we talking about? For a family of four, 80% of the median income for Nassau/Suffolk is \$66,950. So to qualify for one of the Housing Partnership homes that we work with the Town of Riverhead on, you have to make less than that if you are a family of four. If you're a smaller family, you have to make less; if you're a larger family, it's higher than that.

Families in these income brackets include workers mentioned in your proposed comprehensive plan, teachers, nurses, police officers, social workers, service industry workers, working people who are essential to the community. Work force housing is just that - housing for people in the work force. In today's economy, one wage earner in a family is often not enough. Even when the job is one that has been traditionally seen as a good job, a postal worker, utility worker, a school district employee, one wage earner is usually not enough.

Going back to the percentage of what families spend for housing, to be affordable a family should spend no more than two and a half times its income. This is what the bankers tell us when they give mortgages. With the lower interest rate, in fact it's gone up to two and a half times, it used to be considered two times. The health care worker or postal worker then should not spend more than, total price for a home, \$167,375. Unfortunately we don't find too many homes in Riverhead or anywhere on Long Island now that cost \$167,375 or less, certainly not a home in decent condition that doesn't need a lot of money to be put into it.

To show you what we're doing with the town. Seventeen homes that the Housing Partnership is working with the town on in Millbrook Gables, they are going to be all new three bedroom homes, and they're going to be priced between \$89,623 and \$128,951. These are well within what we would consider homes affordable to workers.

Well, how can you build homes affordable to workers in Riverhead? As I already mentioned, one way is to blend private sector money, money from banks, and public sector money. Another way is to reduce costs, the costs of development wherever it's possible.

In nearby Manorville, the Housing Partnership built 72 homes on a

7/21/2003minutes

69 acre parcel, but the homes are all clustered on 11 acres and the remaining 58 acres remain pristine and undeveloped forever. Of course, using smart growth principles, building in downtown, making homes compatible with the surrounding- which the Housing Partnership has done all over Long Island. And, finally, generally follow the recommendations in the proposed plan with some exceptions. Do not up zone all existing non-conforming properties to one acre lots. Certain parcels conform to the criteria I mentioned should not be up zoned, that is, parcels- sorry, parcels that have never been farmed, parcels that are in existing communities.

If a property is zoned Residence C, has never been farmed, is surrounded by existing homes and has good access, it should be reviewed and considered to remain in its present zoning category and be developed as homes workers can afford, half acre lots or as long as you cluster.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Okay. The next speaker who has handed up a card is Jill Lewis."

Jill Lewis: "I know it seems long, I'll try to shorten it a little bit. Supervisor, Town Board Members. As a member of the Last Chance Riverhead Coalition, the Long Island Pine Barrens Society continues to support the citizens master plan that was submitted and compiled from input of local residents, civic, environmental and business groups.

Still, we are eager to react to proposed changes and improvements advanced subsequent to the Planning Board's recommendation and would like the Town Board specific comments we made to the Planning Board during its public hearing on the master plan. And, again, I'll try and paraphrase as best as I can.

To start off, we applaud the change made in the June, 2003 plan which proposes the minimum lot areas of the Ag A, Residence A, and certain Residence C districts to be upzoned from 40,000 square feet to 80,000 square feet. While we support these upzonings, it should be noted that a narrative in Policy 3.4A still states that this provision may not apply to the Wading River area. We, again, bring to your attention that there are lots greater than 10 acres in Wading River. Therefore, we strongly urge you to consider increasing the minimum lot size to 80,000 square feet in Wading River as well.

7/21/2003minutes

Additionally, similar to what Sid was speaking about earlier about rezoning the parcel that's located south of Wildwood State Park, from Industrial A, Recreation, to Ag A, additionally we found out about a parcel that's being rezoned in Calverton on Route 25 and Manor Lane. We're trying to get an understanding of this. It appears to be spot zoning almost to accommodate particular developers and the Wading River parcel, I think that as Sid said, it's protected by farmland. A residence-- then surrounding farmland- as we know, doesn't always work. You have people that move into these areas and they're complaining about the ag uses that are going on and if your goal is to keep agriculture in the AOZ, I don't think putting a subdivision in the middle of it gets you there.

We also continue to urge that the master plan incorporate new zoning categories that conform to the community goals set forth in the original Wading River hamlet study.

We are extremely concerned by the decision of the 70% mandatory clustering provision within the AOZ being deleted. The earlier version of the comp plan recognized that voluntary clustering had not been extensively used and has not resulted in significant open space preservation. We feel that rationale still applies and would like to see this provision be restored.

Further, even if a farmland owner wished to preserve a significant portion of their land and create a residential subdivision, he'll be severely restricted by the Suffolk County Health Department regulations. The challenge I explained in more detail in my comments and giving you an example using a 100 acre lot subdivision.

Even though mandatory clustering is no longer a proposed policy, 3.6C still proposed to exempt small parcels from the voluntary cluster requirements. This seems unnecessary.

Similarly, we are disturbed that the development standards for clustered housing areas have been revised and increase minimum lot size and width.

The modifications to policy 3.6G also represent movement in the wrong direction. Although the policy is allow very limited use of agricultural parcels on a clustered subdivision, the changes allow more non-farm uses than originally proposed including country inn. While we believe that country inns can benefit from the proximity to working farms, they should not be allowed on preserved agricultural

7/21/2003minutes

land.

The revisions to proposed policy 3.10 pertaining to golf course development are unclear to us. As written, they seem to imply that existing golf courses within the AOZ are allowed residential development in addition to the golf course use. Far more egregious is to allow new golf courses in the AOZ and to allow adjacent areas to be designated as residential receiving areas. If this is the case, we are concerned that a large acreage of farmland can be lost to new golf course use; that contiguous farmland can be fragmented by golf course use; and that new residential sprawl developments will be permitted to exacerbate the fragmentation created by new golf course development on prime farmland.

As you know, the Pine Barrens Society supports a transfer of development rights program as part of a comprehensive land use strategy and thanks the Town Board for organizing a meeting of community leaders to devise a workable plan. The Society is especially pleased with the consensus to proceed with the master plan independent of the TDR proposals so that this important component can receive the analysis and refinement it requires and deserves.

Among the observations the Society has pertaining to TDR's as they are described in the master plan are the following:

We are in support of the general direction of the amendments to the TDR ordinance offered in the revised policy, 3.7. While we still question why the density bonuses are being offered for selling developments is justified as set forth in policy 3.7C, the density incentives completely eliminate the density reduction benefits from the proposed rezoning to 80,000 square feet.

Similar to the revisions to the clustered housing areas, we oppose the revised standards for the residential receiving zones as they will utilize more land for residential lots and leave less land for preservation.

We continue to express dismay over the fact that the plan fails to target specific acreage of farmland for preservation.

We are also concerned that policy 3.7 that calls for the establishment of a TDR bank or clearing house that can not only purchase and hold development rights, but can also resell development rights from the AOZ. This provision appears to undermine all efforts to reduce build out population and commercial development. None of

7/21/2003minutes

the development rights that have been purchased should be resold for development.

With regard to the natural resources conservation element, we continue to find that the entire chapter treats the natural resources of our community as an after thought, without developed standards and tools for preservation. Open space acquisitions, cluster development, upzoning, established setbacks, coverage restrictions and clearing restrictions should have been offered in a cohesive plan to protect our natural resources and it is our hope that these standards will be developed when implementing the master plan into town code.

Specifically, the plan still fails to provide a map depicting generalized boundaries of important ecosystems. It still fails to provide a ranking or a ranking system for use in prioritizing for acquisition parcels.

Policy 4.2B in the natural resources conservation element chapter still fails to acknowledge the Peconic Estuary Comprehensive Management Plan and the Long Island Sound Study. There are still no recommendations for minimum setbacks from the Sound or bluffs, just language directing the Planning Board to consider such factors.

Again, standards still have not been set forth for Goal 4.6. We still urge you to go farther to implement policy 4.7. We have to question why policy 4.1C from the original plan is deleted in the new draft plan. The policy formerly stated cooperate and partner with local non profit organizations who are working to acquire and protect in the central pine barrens area. Why you would feel the need not to do that any longer is not clear.

We also object to the deletion of the last bullet in policy 4.2J that says- that used to say new plantings should be native, non invasive. We applaud the changes made to the goal and implementing policies 4.9 which directs the town to work with Cornell Cooperative Extension to help educate the general public about environmentally friendly property management and Sea Grant to help with boat vessel waste education.

And we continue to support Goal 4.10 and 4.11.

And, again, I said this several times before. I don't know how much more we can urge that this plan include design criteria for purpose of establishing consistent and appropriate architectural standards for construction in business zones. It is clear that absent

7/21/2003minutes

specific standards, zoning alone is inadequate to capture the rural attributes that residents seek to ensure.

In conclusion, we feel that the Last Chance Coalition was aptly named. The master plan represents Riverhead's last chance to control suburban sprawl and related taxes and to shape a landscape that advances economic, environmental and quality of life objectives of most Riverhead residents.

We urge the Town Board to commence the next step in this critical process by adopting the master plan as quickly as possible. Then, and without delay, concerned community members can hammer out the details with the Town Board, require full implementation of its goals and objectives. As we have throughout this process, we stand ready to work arm in arm with government to fashion a town code that will take the master plan out of the realm of good intention and literally into the law of the land.

Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Barbara, do you want to address the- comment?"

Barbara Blass: "Just a general comment, Jill. All of the references to the estuary and its recommendations of the CCNP are being incorporated into the LWRP, the local waterfront revitalization plan which is a separate element but yet going to be incorporated into the master plan. You are welcome."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next speaker who has handed up a card is Nancy Gilbert."

Nancy Gilbert: "My name is Nancy Gilbert, I live in Jamesport. And I'm here to speak on behalf of the Board of the East End Arts Council. I am the Vice-President of that Board.

While there has been much interesting discussion on land use issues, we want to make sure that some of the very important points of the master plan regarding downtown Riverhead are not lost.

We want to enthusiastically support the master plan policies regarding the focus of the arts and downtown Riverhead. Many of the ideas mentioned in the master plan were initially cited in the 1995 revitalization of downtown Riverhead report which was funded by a grant secured by the Arts Council.

7/21/2003minutes

Several of these ideas have already been initiated including staying open on summer and fall weekends, coordinating family centered activities such as our (inaudible) art and science program in collaboration with local organizations and restaurants, and installing a rotating sculpture exhibition on the grounds of the Arts Council.

We agree with the master plan that the arts can be and should play a vital role in the economic revitalization of downtown Riverhead. Since the highly successful town renovation of the Corwin house, we see roughly 400 people a month in the gallery and have experienced dramatic increase artist participation as well.

To further the master plan's goal, we encourage the Board to more clearly define the arts district law so that artists can find affordable living and working space in Riverhead. Also, we understand there is currently a proposal in Albany to create culture zones, much like economic zones. We think this is something Riverhead should actively pursue and support.

The East End Arts Council looks forward to working with the Town Board to maximize the potential of downtown Riverhead through the arts. And, again, we thank you for your support and look forward to working with you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. The next speaker is Stephen Angel."

Stephen Angel: "My name is Steve Angel. I'm here representing Crown Sanitation, the Rosano family and the 865 Youngs Avenue Corp. which I believe is the owner of the property I'm going to talk about.

Our client, I think everybody on the Board knows, our clients own and operate a transfer facility, a solid waste transfer facility, on a two acre parcel on Youngs Avenue. It is shown on that plan that I handed up, a portion of the tax map, the facility was zoned Industrial B on May 2, 1972, and has been zoned in such fashion since then. On that same day, a predecessor Town Board also granted a special permit to operate the recycling, salvaging and compaction business that goes on there.

And, as you probably are all aware, that business has been operating continuously and continues to operate today. In fact, it receives the town government's waste, the waste that's generated by the town government, Riverhead. If it does a project, or if any of its departments generate waste, it deposits it at the Crown facility

7/21/2003minutes

on Youngs Avenue.

I also believe that it's probably- I believe it's the only operating transfer station- solid waste transfer station in Riverhead with all necessary governmental approvals. I mean it's been given the imprimatur of the various state agencies and it exists in a legal state.

Now, the proposed comprehensive plan and the proposed map of the proposed comprehensive plan would rezone the property from Industrial B to Agricultural. It would make it non-conforming. I- it's possible that this was a mistake. It's possible it wasn't. But I'm addressing that particular what I think is an incorrect decision on the part of the town to make it a non-conforming parcel. It's been used in conformance with the zoning.

We hope to continue to use it in conformance with the zoning. Certainly if the zoning remains Industrial B, there are significant limitations on the use of the property but nevertheless it could be updated properly without having to deal with the difficulties inherent in having a parcel that is non-conforming.

Now, I've also looked at your proposed comprehensive plan and looked at the various policies that are clearly delineated for agricultural lands and that's a very important part of your comprehensive plan and I think if you look at those 10 or 11 basic policies, you'll see none of them will be affected in a positive fashion by creating this Crown site into a non-conforming site. It's not going to encourage agriculture or encourage the family farm or result in TDR's or result in more agricultural land to take this existing facility and make it into an agriculturally zoned, non-conformity.

I would also like to point out and this is going a little further than our client's property. But in looking at the proposed comprehensive plan, it really does not deal with the concept of solid waste the same way that your solid waste management plan doesn't deal with the concept of solid waste. I saw no references in the comprehensive plan to particular land uses such as my client's property that would be appropriate for the location of a solid waste facility, a transfer station. And, as you know, being up there dealing with these issues, disposal of garbage is a big deal in the governmental business nowadays. It's important. It's like police protection. It's like having a hospital. It's like having doctors' offices. You need it.

7/21/2003minutes

The plan doesn't talk about it. It pays slight lip service and one page to the disposal of solid waste and recycling. I think that that's improper, I think that the law imposes upon a municipality the size of Riverhead the obligation to have its zoning encompass all reasonable industrial, economical, residential, agricultural uses. I think not to deal with that issue in your zoning or in your comprehensive plan is improper and I think one of the ways to at least address it in part is to leave things the way they are and leave our client's property zoned Industrial B.

Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next speaker is Art Binder."

Art Binder: "Good evening. My name is Art Binder and I feel somewhat like an endangered species standing before you tonight because my residence happens to fall in zip code 11933. I'm sure many of the people gathered here today are not aware that that is the hamlet of Calverton. The master plan is quite specific for much of Calverton. Much of it I view in a positive way. It's not perfect and it's far from poor.

The last hearing that we had there was an addendum to the plan for a piece of property on the corner of Manor Road and Route 25 which in the master plan itself specifically states that that should remain rural corridor. The hamlet center in the master plan was stated for development closer to the entrance at Epcal, more in the vicinity of Miloski's turkey farm and the Carving Board.

That piece of property on the corner of Manor and Route 25, if it were to be developed specifically as to a shopping center would be nothing more than a continuation of Route 58. I think that would be very unfortunate for the people of 11933. I think it would be very unfortunate for the tourists that come through that area and are able to purchase our farm products that we grow and see our vistas which is fast becoming something almost as endangered as myself.

I've had the opportunity not only to review the master plan but to review the stakeholder's TDR proposal. Like the plan, there's some very positive things and some things that are not quite up to snuff on. Maybe in your wisdom and your abilities to look ahead better than I can, we can straighten some of this out.

The way I read it, the stakeholder's master plan in regards to

7/21/2003minutes

the AOZ area which is approximately 10,000 acres which is supposedly the shipping area of TDR's, and that's fine, that's wonderful. But there is a little section on the back which also clarifies it somewhat as a receiving area. And that's what troubles me.

The authors of the plan believe that they can salvage or save 80% of the almost 10,000 acres and that's admirable and that would be wonderful. But in doing so, they are willing to sacrifice almost 2,000 acres at a density of six units per acre. That translates into 12,000 domiciles if you will. Twelve thousand domiciles even if it were senior citizen housing that would be two people per unit, would be approximately 24,000 new residents just on those 2,000 acres. That concerns me.

The plan itself calls for approximately 42,700 residential density town-wide if the stakeholder's proposal is utilized in conjunction with the master plan. And that would probably be a very satisfactory number for everybody who lives in the town. I think we could acclimate ourselves to an increase of roughly 40% above where we are right now. But when I read into this and I started to do the basic arithmetic and it came out to 24,000 just on the approximate 2,000 acres, not taking into consideration the rest of the density build out around the town where the majority- where probably 95% of those TDR credits would be utilized, I really became concerned.

I think the Board needs to look into that very carefully and you guys should be able to do the mathematics equally as well as I can and it's critical that before we go ahead and put our future and our destiny and our children's destiny in a plan that we absolutely know what this build out in the future and that will happen very fast entails. And we really need to know which direction we're heading when it comes to density.

Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. The next speaker to hand up a card is Rex Farr."

Rex Farr: "Rex Farr, President of the Greater Calverton Civic Association which is also a member of the Last Chance Coalition and I'm on the implementation committee.

Just a few brief comments. First of all, the Civic Association for the most part supports the master plan but we have some- we do have some questions and we are concerned. For example, about the

7/21/2003minutes

eleventh hour switch that was made, particularly on the zone change on Manor and 25. None of these changes were made by our residents and before I go on, I would like to also address the gentleman who talked about Crown.

I think it's an appropriate situation for the Town Board to reconsider the zone change that is in the new master plan, in that that industrial land, that 2.01 acres which by the way I believe they're working on a lot more than 2.01 acres but that's neither here nor there, probably was appropriate in 1973. It's now 2003 and that zone of Industrial B in the heart of what is the fastest growing hamlet in the Town of Riverhead is no longer appropriate. And I think as the Town Board knows, we've been talking concerning the situation for the last two and a half years, for the last two years.

So having said that about Crown, I would like to say that there are some great things that the master plan does address but what it doesn't address is in my opinion density. I know at the implementation meeting that we had which I think is the first time that we had an opportunity as citizens to sit down with the town Planning Board, with the Town Board, with Rick Hanley and so on, and I think that we all agree that that was a very informative give and take meeting and so we certainly look forward, you know, to working with you.

But one of the issues that I brought up was density. I'm concerned that if you start building out to the maximum, and I've heard a number such as 70,000 people eventually in Riverhead. Am I wrong or- we have any idea what a good number for density build out is? Is that-

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I think there's some difference of opinion on the numbers."

Rex Farr: "Yeah. I mean it seems to me--"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "That's the only thing I think everybody agrees on."

Rex Farr: "That there are a lot of different numbers out there. Yeah. Well, I think that's- I think if we can start there because when we look at where we are in Calverton- there's a lot of purple area out there and under the master plan it seems to me that that bulls eye has been painted on Calverton. Now, we're used to that because over the last 10 years we've had stuff come down on us, you

7/21/2003minutes

know, week in and week out, month in and month out, year in and year out, so while we have a chance before these laws go actually into effect, we certainly would like the opportunity for you guys to think about maybe, you know, spreading the wealth so to speak and we don't need all 24,000 people in Calverton as far as I can tell.

Also, planning in my mind is something that- planning is knowing ahead of time where and how things are going to happen. And we also agree that I think the 70/30 equation should be put back in. If you don't have that, aren't we standing the chance of having fragmented development all over Riverhead if we don't put back in that 70/30 number? I'm not sure.

I know that we really haven't had a chance with the new- we, that is the Civic Association in an open meeting, haven't had a chance to go over line by line the plans that we had discussed on Friday. I'm hoping to do that in our next open meeting.

But, to wind up here, again, I think a lot of good work has been done by a lot of people, both in front of me here on the Town Board, with the citizens' committee, we certainly look forward to working with you down the road. We definitely want to make sure that that TDR plan is not part of the master plan or is not holding up the process of the master plan. I think we discussed that. Anyway, well done and thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next speaker, Richard Wines."

Richard Wines: "Good evening. I'm Richard Wines from Jamesport. Tonight I'm not going to speak about land preservation although I'd certainly love to push that cause some more and I've heard a lot of support for it already tonight. I want to speak instead about the historic preservation language in the draft of the master plan.

I'm speaking on behalf of the town's Landmark Preservation Commission of which I am the Chair. We strongly support the recommendations of the plan that help protect the town's scenic and historic resources. However, we have made several suggestions that are not yet been incorporated.

First, two minor technical points. The plan does not recognize that the town already has 36 designated town landmarks and a procedure that designates existing landmarks as well as historic districts.

7/21/2003minutes

Moreover, the draft plan repeatedly refers to something called a town register of historic places instead of to this officially designated list of town landmarks.

In addition to these 36 officially designated landmarks, the town also has a comprehensive inventory of over 700 historic structures. This inventory was completed in the 1970's, and filed with the State and with the Town Historian's Office. That survey needs some updating. But, more importantly, the town needs to find more ways to get structures on this inventory which is basically the town's heritage, additional visibility and protection even if they are not officially designated as town or national landmarks.

Since that survey was completed over 25 years ago, a number of these structures have been demolished by their owners, including almost 40% of the structures along the so called Sound Avenue Historic and Scenic Corridor. At this rate, the town is rapidly losing its heritage. We need to find better ways to stem these losses.

Obviously one solution is the designation of additional landmarks as well as historic districts in parts of downtown, parts of South Jamesport, Wading River, and other historic parts of Riverhead. We believe this recommendation should be added to the master plan.

We also want to make one more suggestion. At present, the owner of an historic structure can apply for a demolition permit and demolish it before anyone knows what happened. For instance, a structure that was included in the inventory and was even pictured in the 1976 Bicentennial Album, recently disappeared under such circumstances. There was a modest sized structure and it was quite likely the Landmarks Preservation Commission could have ensured its preservation by finding it a new home had we only known.

Therefore, we want to propose that the town code require that we give to the Building Department this inventory of historic structures and that the Building Department then notify the Landmarks Preservation Commission whenever a permit is requested for the demolition or exterior alteration of a building on that inventory. The Commission would then be given 60 days to review and suggest alternatives before such alterations or demolition could begin. This would probably not significantly extend the current time necessary to obtain such permits. However, it would allow the Commission time to talk to the owner, perhaps helping him or her to develop more sensitive plans or find an alternative to demolition.

7/21/2003minutes

We believe that this simple notification process could enable the Commission to avoid the inadvertent destruction of important parts of the town's heritage without imposing any new mandatory preservation controls.

I am submitting a technical memorandum of the changes needed to accomplish these goals. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next speaker, Edmund Power."

Edmund Power: "Good evening. I'd like to thank the Board for allowing the citizens of Riverhead to participate in the plan. I just want to say that I personally endorse it. I've been following it in the paper, an ordinary citizen. I have- I just recently- I've been out here 10 years. I love Riverhead. I come from west, like so many of us. And it's a beautiful place. What attracted me was the beautiful vistas and everything else. Now, I keep- interested in property and I love it out here.

I just want to say I endorse the comprehensive plan- you can tell I'm an educator- I endorse the comprehensive plan and I have reservations about what was said in the paper about the stakeholder's plan.

I look at Riverhead as a slab cake or a sheet cake. To the north, I see that the cake has already been cut into. I see Reeves Park, Rolling Woods. I see The Meadows. I see development along Sound Avenue to the north. I go further west, I see Friar Tuck, I see the golf course. I go further down and I see the developments of Baiting hollow to the north. But when I look to the right and I'm heading out east, I see the beautiful vistas of Riverhead. And I look at the heart of Riverhead and I come and I just get excited when I see it and I say, this is pure joy to anybody that lives on Long Island, anybody who comes from Patchogue or Levittown or I come from a little town, East Rockaway, which is an historic town also. And years ago, if you talked to an old timer, now they're all gone unfortunately, but back in the '20's and the '30's you had farms and I remember as a child coming out in Patchogue and seeing the farms and what was left of those and they disappeared.

So last week when I came- when I read in- I follow everything that's going on here and you're seeing my face for the first time, I felt it was my obligation as a citizen to come down and say that I was concerned that development would be in the heart of Riverhead. That

7/21/2003minutes

is the thing that will be- should be preserved at all costs.

Now I understand the developers have interest and, you know, I think that right now what we have here is that slab of cake that is untouched, that part between Sound Avenue and Main Road. And right now we have an opportunity to probably save a great deal of that. And I heard the stakeholder's plan wanted to somehow eat into that slice of cake and I just kept on visioning a cake, all right? A large cake. And to the top of the cake, you can see it there, I've already cut off pieces for all of us to eat.

And in the south, along the Main Road, of course, we have the town of Riverhead and then we have Aquebogue and Peconic Avenue and we see development, new houses, and we're cutting into the cake on to the south. But the center, the heart of Riverhead, it's just a- it's a beautiful sheet of cake that we should save for future generations.

I have a small business that I- I'm a teacher but on the weekends I have a small business out here. It's one of those little gift stores and I really get excited about it and it's Sir Edmonds Cove. It's in Aquebogue, it's on the corner of Church Street and Main Road. It has a pirate and a ship. And I came out here because it's a vision and I think as the Town Board and as the Supervisor, it's important for vision. And I'm just here tonight to share my vision with you of what Riverhead could be.

In five years, the developers will devour Riverhead if you don't see that smart development happens. The heart of the sheet cake can be preserved. People will come. If you build it, they will come. If you keep it the same, they will come, and they will come in numbers and the tourist industry, the restaurant business, the inns, the hotels. And even the builders and the farmers will benefit because that part of the cake will bring people out. It will be the center point.

I mean the Hamptons- what's the difference between here and the Hamptons? They have the ocean but you have the agriculture, you have the farms. That's a key part of Riverhead. And, again, vision. Can we see in 10 years what we'll do to that slab? I get- I've been out here about 10 years now and I come along Sound Avenue and I love like down Mill Road, and I look across, those sod fields and you just see- you can see like for 10 miles and it's wonderful. But as I go further down, I notice a small development here and there. Nice homes and I believe in building, too. I think it's a great business.

7/21/2003minutes

But I think with that particular piece of land, I just want to say I don't want to go on with this, but you have- you should really preserve it for what it is and try to realize that in five or 10 years, that's going to be an ace in the hole for Riverhead. It's going to bring people- they're going to talk about the Hamptons and everything else but they're going to say, hey, have you been to Riverhead? It's happening now.

I mean- I'm- I have an opportunity. I teach in the New York City School District, okay, in the schools, and I have an opportunity to see those New York people when they first discover Riverhead, they say, you know, I was out at Tanger Mall and I went a little further and, gee, that's the most- and that's going to keep happening and happening.

So let me just conclude here that Riverhead is the gateway to the north fork. It is the gateway. It is the door opening. And you have the opportunity Board members to really shape this whole thing. I just plead with you, I implore you to look at the heart of the cake. Do not cut it up any further.

Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Bob Krudop, next speaker. Good evening."

Robert Krudop: "Good evening, Mr. Supervisor and Town Board. My name is Bob Krudop. Is that good or bad or whatever? Riverhead, New York.

It's a tough one and you're in a tough spot. A piece of cake is a lovely piece of cake and you'll notice that everybody went for the icing which is all around the edges. Somebody is going to have to pay to keep the rest of that cake open. To just change it from 40,000 to 80,000, that's not fair to the people that have been working that land.

I feel strongly; I hear a lot of people talk, I haven't seen too many of them act. No, I wasn't born here but I've been here for 63 out of my 64 years. I've tried. I think I've given to our community. I am employed. I still provide employment for people who are in our town. I give of myself and I have participated very actively in the open space program. I stuck my neck out on a limb to buy land, and I'm grateful that we've been able to save 85 acres of that under the development rights program. I wish others would continue to try to do

7/21/2003minutes

the same instead of just take.

While revisions to our current master plan are needed, some of which are already I have to agree too late, many of the proposed zoning changes are fraught I feel with light handed thought. Values, property taxes and existing commercial use are factors what must be considered in any zoning decisions.

Selfishly here I'm addressing a concern I have. We have land on Raynor Avenue. We renovated a building that they used to drag go carts inside. Some of the youngsters that were children that did it now are adults and they say, wow, what a difference. That land on Raynor Avenue along with that of my neighbors, if it is rezoned from Industrial A to Residence C, a resulting possible non-conformity will not allow for further development of this property or the possible need of different industrial use.

I'm sure you're aware tenants come and tenants go. My family depends on the income from the very substantial investment, not only of money but of our time and effort in renovating this property.

Commercial buildings correctly zoned will be changed to residential which places additional burdens on a school district that is already overcrowded in its current facilities and causes drastic increases in school taxes for our already overtaxed residents.

In your proposed zoning change, we're not discussing vacant land. You are talking about changing improved property with a commercial use and at the very least should be grandfathered or more appropriately should be exempted from any zoning change.

As I view your proposed master plan, somebody had deemed it appropriate to change this improved property to Residence C because probably because of its proximity to Route 58. To me that smacks of the lazy approach. I'm not blaming anybody here. It's something that was proposed to this town from their consultants.

The lazy approach because if it's easy walking distance let's say to Route 58 as opposed to say for example utilizing mass transit. I'll give you an example. They're talking about taking land which is Industrial A, changing it to Residence C. My neighbors to the north, first is the Long Island Power Authority, high tension transmission line. They're currently doing the archeological studies to see if they want to go underground or increase that by three-fold. They're going to triple the transmission of electric through those wires.

7/21/2003minutes

In addition to that, as a neighbor to the north we have a trucking warehouse and welding shop. Do you really want residential in the proximity of these high tension wires? Furthermore, the industrial land that I own to the rear of this property, I just conveyed title to to Suffolk County who in turn I'm happy to say is going to be making this available to our town seven plus acres, going to be annexed and become part of the Riverhead town and going to increase our playground to Stotzky Park. So that means we won't have any residences behind my property. There will no longer be the chance for development on that.

The prudent thing to do in this instance would be to cut the map around the already improved industrial property to allow us full and complete use permitted in our current zoning laws.

I covered the upzoning. I think it's confiscatory on the Industrial A to 80,000 square feet. Discretion, however, must be used in permitting development. I like the idea of transfer of development rights. I also commend the Board when they were looking at allowing an increased use of some commercial property on Route 58 in exchange for people acquiring development rights. Those are wonderful plans.

The only other said thing is, I'm afraid- I wonder if the change of zoning of our land from Industrial to Residential wouldn't be a conflict of interest because is it possible that the town is looking to get rid of competition in the Calverton enterprises.

All said and done, you, our Board, have a very difficult task, an unenviable task I say that. I expect you will use fair and just discretion in making your decisions.

Thank you very much."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Next speaker is Sheila McCoy."

Sheila McCoy: "Hi. My name is Sheila McCoy. I live on Pulaski Street and I'm a member of the Acorn group. I'm here because of my inability as a low income worker to find affordable housing in Riverhead. I've heard it discussed and I've read the master plan's summary on the rentals in Riverhead since this is really out of my realm to even think about buying a home here. Having three children, I would need at least three bedrooms to rent.

It has here in the 2000 census, the rents were 600 to 750 a month and I'm assuming that was probably for a one or two bedroom. Last

7/21/2003minutes

year, I was able to rent a two bedroom house for \$700 a month. This year, looking for a three bedroom apartment, the rents are \$1,700, \$1,600, some \$2,000 a month. And it's- it's me now looking at being homeless, you know, because where I live, my house is being sold and it doesn't seem to be any real consideration here for people with low income to remain in Riverhead. I work in Riverhead; I love the town. You know, I contribute; I'm a single parent. And without government assistance, I'm not going to be able to live here, you know.

And so that's my issue. I feel that it's insane having an income of \$30,000 a year and \$20,000 or better of that will be going to rent. So that's more than 35%; that's more than 50%. And right now I'm desperate and I know a lot of other people even though they may not be represented here today, are feeling the same crunch, you know. And I would love to buy a home but that's just ridiculous now. It's not even a thought. So at least I would like to be able to stay here and give my contribution back to the community and pay rent. But affordability is my big issue. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Dana Anthony."

Dana Anthony: "Good evening. I live- my name is Dana Anthony. I live at 821 East Main Street which is called River Pointe. I'm also a member of Acorn and the reason why I'm here is because I feel that where I live at, we don't have enough space as far as where the kids have to play. You know what I'm saying? And you claim that we have recreation facilities. Well, like I say, where I live at, we don't have enough space. And I feel that these kids need more space and more places to, you know, play at. Because we do have a lot of children in Riverhead today and the younger generation. We need to look after, and like I said, we need more space. And that's why I'm here and I'm nervous right now, so, but anyway, that's what I feel. And, hopefully, we can do something about it. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next speaker, Richard Amper."

Richard Amper: "Thank you, Mr. Supervisor and Members of the Town Board. I did not intend to talk tonight. We couldn't improve on Jill Lewis. She has given her heart and soul and mind to this process working with this Town Board to talk about this master plan, cares about the place, a great colleague. But she's a great citizen of Riverhead."

I was glad that I remained for the last two speakers because why

7/21/2003minutes

I was motivated to come to the podium was comments by the Long Island Association and the Long Island Housing Partnership about the very important issue of affordable housing. I have a different term for it than most.

I call it achievable housing, something that our young people can look forward to achieving in their lifetime so that they can live with the rest of us and make the same contributions that the rest of us make. Achievable housing in that the seniors that have worked all their lives in this community can achieve housing that allows them to stay on Long Island where a recent poll showed they want to be.

I came to the podium because if I were not doing environmental work, that's what I would be doing is affordable housing. It is perhaps the most important need that we have on Long Island. When we hear people who through no fault of their own are not able to afford to live here even though the community depends on them, that's wrong, and we have to change policy to do that.

I wrote a column in the News Review recently complaining about the problem that happens when developers come to town and I'm reinforced by that. The number one problem on Long Island that goes to the heart of whether drinking water protection or traffic or affordable housing is in the end overdevelopment. Overdevelopment of the kind of development that we don't need. It's called sprawl now. It's called suburbanization and it's reached the rural town of Riverhead. And now you're confronted with doing it and I don't think it's a curse. I think it's a real opportunity for this Town Board. I believe that you're on the verge of making a very important decision.

But I don't believe that efforts to preserve farmland, to preserve tourism, to preserve second industry, to effectively preserve the east end can be blamed for the absence of affordable housing. We have a million houses on Long Island. Open space preservation, farmland preservation is not interfered with their construction. How many of them are affordable?

Don't let them blame you or the people who live here who have a right to protect their tax base, their tourism base, the quality of life they want for their kids, to control traffic. Don't let them put that on the people of Riverhead and especially on you. And I think I'm allowed to say that because I don't know anybody who's been more critical of the government of Riverhead but I want to tell you I got my back up tonight when I heard somebody imply that this town was doing less than Southold or East Hampton or Southampton for people who

7/21/2003minutes

need housing most. That's not fair. It's not right and it's not what the master plan is about.

The two women who spoke before me deserve government policy that accommodates their needs. But I have not heard within the stakeholder's group or the implementation group any statement by the developers, let us rebuild downtown for Riverhead because it would be good for Riverhead and the people who live here. I don't hear them say that. I hear them saying let's- let us do more of the same. I don't hear- I didn't hear one person stand here tonight and say, tell you what government should do. Make us build 10% affordable housing for every subdivision that we produce. I don't hear them saying that. I hear them saying let us build more.

Let us do more of what has destroyed every up island town and is knocking on the door of Riverhead. And to play off the good people of this town against those who need achievable housing, is the most unfair abuse of the development juggernaut I have heard in the entire 20 years I've been in this business. That's not what it's about.

We need to do both and we can do both and this master plan is an opportunity to set that in motion. You're going to adopt a master plan. I'm absolutely persuaded you are going to do it. And I am also persuaded that everybody involved in the community, we've heard a lot about stakeholders. Some of the people sitting out here are stakeholders, too, and they need to be in that process because when we implement, it's not just a plan, it's not just a concept, it's not just a dream. When we implement this plan in Riverhead this year, their needs need to be met and all of us whether we are devoted first to the environment or first to affordable housing, need to be a part of making that work.

And my personal conviction is that it's not going to be done first in Southampton or East Hampton or Southold. It's going to be done first in Riverhead.

Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Next speaker is David Latimore, Jr. Did he leave? All right. If he arrives, then let us know. That's it for the individuals who have handed up cards asking to speak tonight. Is there anybody else who would like to address the Board? Yes, sir. Oh, you have more people who signed up out there? Go ahead. Well, we'll just open it up, Eric. I didn't realize there was- are they looking for copies of the plan or are they looking to

7/21/2003minutes

speaking? All right. Well, I pretty much said it already. There are more copies of the master plan available. There's a sign up sheet outside and you should see Eric Roseman who is a planner with the Planning Department of the Town of Riverhead. Okay? Yes, sir, your name and address for the record."

Paul Adams: "My name is Paul Adams. I live in Baiting Hollow and I live north of Sound Avenue which brings me to the main concern that I have about the comprehensive plan and that is the idea of making north of Sound Avenue a receiving area for TDR's.

It seems like two different people wrote different sections of the plan and the proposal to have the TDR's transferred north of Sound Avenue on the left hand and then the right hand doing something completely different, pointing out the fragility and the beauty and the significance of Sound Avenue and the area north of Sound Avenue. And nobody seems to have had an overview to try to reconcile these two approaches.

I can understand the logic of making north of Sound Avenue a receiving zone as far as the logic goes and the logic is that in order to have a successful TDR program, you want the receiving areas to be desirable for further development so you will actually be able to sell those TRS' otherwise the program doesn't work at all.

And the next part of the logic is also right, that north of Sound Avenue is highly attractive to development. But the last part of the logic is screwy because the rest of Riverhead, all the undeveloped and unreserved areas are going to be equally attractive to development. It's all that's left on Long Island or soon will be and so we don't really have to worry about which areas of Riverhead are most attractive to developers in terms of buying TDR's. They're going to buy the TDR's wherever they're available.

So what we should be doing instead is deciding which areas of Riverhead are most appropriate for the increased density that comes with the transfer of TDR's and which areas of Riverhead are the least appropriate for this. We have that luxury and that's what we should be doing and to a large extent, the master plan has failed to do this particularly north of Sound Avenue.

And along the Sound Avenue corridor we know that as far as history, as far as natural resources, as far as traffic is concerned, as far as agriculture is concerned, these are some of the most valuable areas of Riverhead and it would make a lot more sense to

7/21/2003minutes

steer the high development away from north of Sound Avenue.

An alternative approach would be to carefully document and delineate and prioritize the areas north of Sound Avenue which are important for historical value or for their natural resource value or as agriculture. Decide exactly which areas should be saved and then you can put the TDR's into the remaining areas. But the master plan-the comprehensive plan does not do that work and it doesn't even propose a mechanism for doing that work.

So in summary I would recommend and it seems more logical to put the increased development density closer to stores, to small businesses, to services, put it close to where development will be welcomed and steer it away from the extremely fragile and beautiful and historic and significant areas along Sound Avenue and north of Sound Avenue.

Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Anybody else who would like to address- "

Joe Baer: "Joe Baer, Wading River. Members of the Town Board, you also know that I'm part of this planning process with the writing of the comprehensive plan being a member of the Planning Board.

You probably also know that we went through a lot of time and effort in reviewing this section by section, page by page, etc. and as we did that, the Planning Department then came back to us with their drafts of changes which we then went through and the final document is I think with the changes or what you see before you. So you see a lot of cross outs and you see a lot of boldness that we're adding things or taking out.

We went through the whole report that way, except for one chapter and that's chapter 2 and I just wanted to make two comments for you with regard to chapter 2 that we didn't have a chance to review.

The first one is on page 6. It talks about agricultural- on the bottom of the page, it talks about Agricultural A, Residence A, and certain districts in Residence C. It neglects Residence D. And in our discussions, two things come out that we agreed to on the Planning Board and that was, number one, the word certain should not be there for Residence C, and that Residence D should be two acre.

7/21/2003minutes

And, I also note that in policy 3.4A, it should be added there as well. It just says the same thing, basically A, B, C, D- and D should be added. It's just- it's like the forgotten zone. And we should- we did include it and I felt it should be the same. And that's all I have to say. And I wish you good luck."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Anybody else who hasn't had a chance to address us who would like to address us regarding- Peter Danowski."

Peter Danowski: "I would like to say it's good we're getting more copies of the master plan because some of us did go out and make our own copies but, well the other thing that might be suggested is the maps are so darn small that old guys like myself can't possibly read the zoning lines.

This is a very large map- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "How big of a map do you need, Pete?"

Peter Danowski: "Very large. But even for members of the general public, I think they'd appreciate if you could somehow recopy this map, have it available for sale at the Town Clerk's Office. It would be a lot easier for people to read than the small map where if you have a small piece of property, it's very close if you can figure out where the zone is.

My comment tonight deals with, I think, kind of a blase treatment of people and organizations who are not-for-profits and I think over the years we've just categorized them by their current use. And when I looked at it I said what about parcels such as the Boy Scout property when I have, in fact, appeared before town representatives talking about my representation of that organization.

Many of the non-for-profit organizations have no intention of developing their parcels. They don't look to have anything other than the potential ability to sell development rights off their property. And, in fact, with regard to the Boy Scouts in particular, they've come and made an offer to sell development rights to people and although they're not in contract, they've certainly heard a lot of offers. So for those who sit in the immediate vicinity, Baiting Hollow north of Sound Avenue, I think they'd appreciate the idea of the Boy Scouts having the ability to sell their development rights off their parcel.

7/21/2003minutes

I raise the question because in looking at the map, I take it that the town looks at uses as they currently exist, and says, well, this is a recreational activity today, the Scouting organization. And wherever you see a type of scout camp let's just make it for future use as recreation. That in and of itself is not bad except the value of that property then becomes questionable and if, in fact, any of the owners of these tracts of land wish to go to a developer who may use those rights either before the Health Department or the town in the future, they may face an obstacle of saying, well, wait a second, you're not allowed to develop on this property. You can pitch your tent on the property and that's it.

Now, whenever I go through a master plan book, I do have questions and not answers and that is you correctly suggest this is a master plan, correctly say the zoning provisions in detail may not be supplied until later. I'm not sure what the final outcome will be in a recreational zone as to what forms of allowed use there will be for these sites. That's true with every designation and it does cause problems because people don't know whether to stand up here and object to it or not. So they don't know how to react.

I pointed out because it seems in fairness that somehow if you're going to create future legislation for these scouting organizations, these types of camps that exist today, you'll give them the benefit of the ability to sell the development rights. What form that takes in the legislation, I'm not sure but I do know that if you create a zone specifically for them saying, thanks a lot. We're not developing your property, thanks for having campgrounds, and that's what we'll let you do the rest of your lives. It raises a question in my mind about whether you can or cannot sell the development rights off the property. And I'd like to retain that ability. So I raise that as a question.

I also see that somewhere in this book you talk about the proposed land use map being this map and it's sort of interesting. It says when adopted and you cross out language that says, if adopted. All right, suggesting that this will be the plan that will be adopted. That this land use plan will set the zoning regulations. I'm not sure that paragraph is correct. Your subsequent later public hearings and your subsequent later zoning amendments and that later zoning map may set the regulations that someone has to follow. I'm not sure the proposed land use map when adopted will set those goals. Okay? It may set goals but it doesn't set regulations.

So, I think you have to be careful about what does the proposed

7/21/2003minutes

land use map if adopted mean and I don't believe it means it's the zoning regulations to follow. And that is the concern when you talk about taking the industrial zoned land in the town, eliminating the industrial zoning. The people who have been paying taxes on it for a long period of time in many instances where there are currently industrial buildings located on some of the parcels, not distinguishing as Mr. Krudop pointed out those parcels that have buildings on them and those that do not and suggesting that you may set the future specific uses sometime in the future and they may change from what's in the master plan today or may not be specific in the master plan. It's hard to alert the public and the owners of these lands to say, stand up and object or don't, because they're not quite sure how the rules will finally apply to them.

But certainly for my clients such as the DeLeo sod farm people who employ people, who own land in Calverton, who wish to remain in an industrial zone, who as one example have sold part of a parcel to the Federal Express people, they want to continue in the industrial zone. You talk about Edwards Avenue, you talk about properties that are near to Grumman. You would like to think that the town is going to let competition exist in the industrial zoning area. You need a tax base in this town. There are many who criticize residential building and kids in the school system, why don't you allow the industrial tax base to remain in the town in areas other than within the Grumman fence?

The example that Bob Krudop pointed out is interesting. If Federal Express were to leave town and a new tenant were to come in and you change that zoning to other than industrial, would the Building Department say no to the next tenant that came in distinguishing Federal Express from any other industrial tenant? Or would you win the argument that any industrial user is okay, it's non-conforming? It may turn out to hurt the owner of that building.

So I do think that when you look at properties and when you look at changing the zone on those properties, you should look to see if they're improved and you should add language that says if you have an improved parcel in a particular zone, circle that and take it out of the change of zoning regulation and if there are parcels that are part of a subdivision tract, if you have an industrial park, are you going to say that lots in an industrial park will now become residential lots?

I mean those are practical questions. I've had the same criticism about the AOZ. I don't object to your categorizing areas to be preserved within the agricultural tracts, but no one went out and

7/21/2003minutes

specifically said what is agricultural and what is non-agricultural. I think you should visit those issues. You should inventory them and for those parcels that are not actively farmed, you should at least consider whether they should be in the AOZ or not. It's certainly a misnomer to say the agricultural parcels. And where are you going to put the density? Obviously your crucial issue. Obviously people that live in one area want it sent in another area. But I think for the industrial tax base in this town you have to take serious consideration before you take the industrial zoning out.

And I made the comment the last time. If you want to talk about taking industrial out and substituting some form of discretionary residential, you should do that on a case by case basis but leave the industrial tax base there.

Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Larry Oxman, I saw your hand before."

Larry Oxman: "Hi. Larry Oxman, land value real estate with offices located on Main Street in Riverhead. I just came in late. My first comment is I'm a little shocked at the lack of turnout. It seems that when we have a public hearing where something is affecting someone's property, people might turn out in droves. But here's an opportunity to basically guide and chart the future of Riverhead; I'm a little surprised that there aren't more people involved or at the hearing even though this is the second hearing.

I wanted to talk about several subjects. One, just a quick note. At the very beginning of the comprehensive plan, it talks about the time frame of the plan. I think that has to be amended to talk about that the Planning Board has just recently given the Town Board the plan for its review. It's a little misleading. It talks about-- in years to come when you read it, you might think that everything was done in 2002. It doesn't make a reference to 2003 when the revised master plan was tendered.

Okay. Let me talk about residential C zoning and the plan's recommendation and, again, I realize this is the plan that we're addressing. This is not the Board's thoughts at this time.

The upzoning of Residential C and now we just heard from one of the members of the Planning Board that instead of certain areas, that their recommendation is the entire town. So that would include Residential D is now being proposed to going up to two acre zoning.

7/21/2003minutes

Representing a particular property owner, but talking about Residential C town-wide, it just somehow seems quite unfair that the Residential C property owners aren't being treated in the same respect that Agricultural A property owners are being treated. In Agricultural A if you own property, the comprehensive plan talks about the property owner having some choices. One choice would be to- if they chose to develop the property, to reduce yield to two acre zoning. However, the option still remains that based on the current zoning, one acre, that they would get a yield of that many units and they can sell the transfer of development rights. That's property within the Agriculture Overlay Zone, the AOZ.

Nothing like that is being offered to anyone outside of the AOZ. There are certainly some areas that are designated in Residential C as receiving areas. There are some that are not. But basically someone that currently can build on half acre lots is now being told that this upzoning is going to four times that which he is allowed today. He has no recourse and in order for him if he was in a receiving area, he would literally have to go out and buy development rights to get back to where he is today. It just- it seems very inequitable.

And the paper that I just gave you, if you look to page 3, there's a simple chart. And I use a Agricultural A and a Residential C property as an example and I use 50 acres as an example. Currently in Agricultural A, that 50 acre parcel would have a yield of approximately 40 one acre lots. That's taking into account the loss factor for roads and drainage. That same 50 acre parcel in Residential C, would be allowed 80 lots. The proposed zoning for both properties going up to two acre minimum would change the Agricultural A to 20 lots and it would change the Residential C also to 20 lots.

Here's where the difference starts to lie. The Agricultural A parcel would still be allowed 50 development rights which they could sell on the open market. The Residential C property, zero.

What's also interesting is that by special permit, Residential C property would be allowed condominiums. The same 50 acre parcel based on five units per acre would be allowed 250 units today if the town gave it a special permit. It is proposed that condominiums not be allowed in Residential C and that it goes up to two acre zoning. I just think that the Residential C property owner is really being badly stripped of his equity and not being treated in the same respect that the Agricultural A properties are being treated.

So I would proposed that basically- first of all, there are only

7/21/2003minutes

a handful of Residential C properties in the town. We're not talking about thousands of acres such as Residential- excuse me, Agricultural A. Most of them are in areas that are already disturbed or built out, surrounded by half acre homes. The master- excuse me, the comprehensive plan talks about areas where it is built out, that it retains that same type of lot size and look. Having two acre zoning surrounded by half acre lots, I don't think accomplishes that goal.

So, you can certainly read this- this letter is particularly from one client. The clients who have property and have had property for a long time in the Aquebogue hamlet, outside of the Aquebogue hamlet area.

Another topic that I wanted to talk about was the letter I had given you- I don't know if you read it this morning, but I entered it into the record on the DRC zoning in Riverhead at Route 58. So, please read the letter. I won't go into a long explanation but for the public basically what I'm discussing is the- two things. One is the permitted uses that are allowed in the DRC which is the western end of Route 58. It's this area.

One of the things that you can note is that the DRC which is the western portion- this is Tanger out here, the end of the Long Island Expressway, is that it's contiguous to BC which is Business Corridor. It's also contiguous to SC which is Shopping Center. Those zones have different permitted uses and more so their coverage as proposed by the master- by the comprehensive master plan, is up to 20% if they have city water and sewer. That same percentage is now being afforded to the Destination Retail Center, the DRC, which compromises- which comprises approximately 200 acres of land, about 40 acres that's undeveloped vacant land, and about another 160 acreage that could be redeveloped into a better use.

That 200 acres represents a tremendous amount of tax revenue to the town. The difference between 15% coverage as proposed and a 20% coverage which is allotted to the- to other commercial districts next door, adds up to about \$1,200,000 per year of lost revenue and that's- how I calculated that roughly is that one acre could supply- you could build a 6,000 square foot building, commercial building, on one acre. That's based on 15%. If you were allowed 20%, it would be an 8,000 square foot building. The difference in tax revenue for 6,000 square foot building would bring in \$18,000 a year based on \$3.00 a foot which is the average number currently used up on Route 58. We could check with the tax assessor. The 8,000 square foot building would provide \$24,000. That's a loss of \$6,000 for not building that extra

7/21/2003minutes

2,000 square feet. You multiply that by 200 acres, you come up with \$1,200,000.

Now, what's the difference between a 6,000 square foot building and an 8,000 square foot building? In my opinion, not much. If both buildings have a 100 foot storefront, the only difference is going to be depth, which is totally unnoticeable from the front of the building. One building would be 60 feet deep; the other building would be 80 feet deep. It's not going to be noticed from the street. The way that you would control the look and the growth of Route 58 is through careful site plan, through landscaping, through other uses that you have within your control. But you're really walking away from quite a bit of large revenue to the town.

So, I would ask that when you review the comprehensive plan, that you make- that you basically level the field between the Shopping Center District, the Business Corridor District and the Destination Retail District, that they all be allotted the same coverage and I think for that matter the uses should be very similar. If you want to control big box development, then maybe assign it to Destination Retail. But just level the playing field.

When- the current zoning that fragments Route 58 I don't think is really working well. Clearly, between the traffic circle and the terminus of the expressway it's mostly built out. There are a handful of properties that are left to be built. I think that they're really more one zone than three or four zones.

Lastly, I want to talk about work force housing and senior housing, an important and integral part of any community. The comprehensive master plan talks about areas suggesting that type of development should go. My concern is though, however, that if that type of housing relies on developers to purchase development rights, it's not going to work. I applaud the transfer of development right program for certain aspects. It's certainly fine for building more expensive houses in certain areas. But given the current price of a single development right, it's not going to work for this work force housing that we're trying very hard to produce.

Therefore, I think that certain properties should be looked or examined or allowed to have the density increased based on the merits and the quality of that particular property such as its approximation to the hospital, to shopping, to the train station, to other facilities that are integral to that particular type of development.

7/21/2003minutes

I just think that if you rely solely on the transfer of development rights, that you're going to not be able to develop a critical component of any community as housing (inaudible).

With that, I thank you for your time. I didn't hear, Bob, is there- what's the time period for written comment to be entered? Will you allow it to the end of the month?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "We haven't even discussed that. I know the intention was to close today's hearing, so two weeks I would think which would be basically the end of the month."

Larry Oxman: "Okay."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "All right?"

Larry Oxman: "Very good."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Yeah, I'll have Dave address the issue on the GEIS."

(Inaudible remark)

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you."

Larry Oxman: "Thank you. Good luck. You've got a long task ahead of you and good luck. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Anybody else who- yes, Rob Pike."

Robert Pike: "Robert Pike, 138 Ostrander Avenue. Most of you who have heard me speak before know I like to do something (inaudible) and I'm terribly torn tonight between what originally I wrote down as the journey of our generation, you know, you hear the trumpets roaring and that. And as soon as Mr. Power got up and started describing Riverhead as a layer cake- sheet cake, (inaudible) kicked in and it came down to you know it's all a matter of how you cut the cake.

Actually I ended up with a Twinkie as my metaphor, but somehow that just doesn't get the trumpets or music going at all, so what I want to talk about is your opportunity here to do some very great things, not all of which will be popular.

And it is that latter portion that will make your journey and the

7/21/2003minutes

steps that you have to take from here to there the most difficult part of this job.

Just one other information item, the people should be reminded that this is all available on the web, the maps, all of the text have been available for some time at RiverheadLI.com."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: ".com. RiverheadLI.com."

Robert Pike: "Okay. The steps to make it really work, I'm going to go through a number of them. This started off as a one page outline which I promised myself I'd limit it to. You know me, I failed. But in terms of the general principles that are going to be required to really make this work, not just as a political gambit but as something that will shape and affect the map of Riverhead, Long Island into something truly great.

Rebuilding our downtown should be and is in this plan a major priority but that requires some innovative thinking like upzoning Residence C. Do not underestimate the demand and the value for Residence C with a TDR receiving component in an overall master plan that drives up the value of this town manifold. Everybody who thinks that they're losing something (inaudible) specific, forgets that a rising tide does lift all boats and that we are in the beginning of a massive flood of redevelopment potential and development demand.

If we can turn that development demand into redevelopment reality, you will have harnessed the power of the demand that is here. Residence C as a receiving area, upzoned, bring it back down is a great idea.

You've heard some resistance in earlier hearings to the idea of walkable communities, i.e., we should continue to do the secluded one-way street communities through which traffic and people cannot pass. I think it's a mistake. I grew up in a walkable community. I still live in a walkable community. The invasion of the stroller moms which occurs every day particularly these days is a great joy to me and if my kid every wanted to make a fortune whenever he or she arrives, the lemonade stand will be quite successful.

I think we should keep the TDR and TDR program separate. Every time I hear somebody start to play with what a TDR means, I get (inaudible). Making TDR work is a simple one dwelling unit per TDR system will be hard enough. In fact, it will be the most difficult and in the long run the most unpopular challenge of this entire plan.

7/21/2003minutes

Because, in order to make TDR, you're going to have to lock it in. You're going to have to make this the iron law of Riverhead. These formulas cannot be varied; they cannot be legislated; they cannot be changed once they start working. Surely they don't work yet. But once you get that going, it should not be possible to bypass them with an overlay district. It should not be possible to bypass them with a variance. Period.

If you can, that's all you'll get, is variances and zoning change request. TDR will have to become the essential (inaudible) fabric of how this town redevelops. That will not be popular but it would be the right thing to do.

As to clustering, you know, it's interesting. What we're all looking for here, I think, it not in numbers, 70, 30, 60, 40, 50-50, split the baby. What we're looking for is equality, something like many things is hard to describe but you certainly know it when you see it and you certainly know when it's not there when you look. And I think that the plan safely predicts but the difficult thing will be implementing the need to design how we develop the farmland.

Clustering is one of the tools as is architectural review for residential development in the farmlands. To the extent that the stakeholder's proposal makes a fairly radical proposal to allow TDR receiving within agricultural zones, that could be a complete disaster, the cancer that I spoke about the last time, or if you make it so they have to make it attached housing, i.e., you know, what is legally a townhouse or a condo but looks like indigenous agricultural architecture, you have a historic opportunity- a historic opportunity to move the way this town develops in the right direction even as you develop it.

If you allow what happened at the Village Green at Baiting Hollow to happen architecturally in the farmland of Riverhead, it's all over. So to the extent that the AOZ and you do countenance the idea of TDR receiving in the AOZ, I believe it should be mandatory that it be attached housing and I believe it should be mandatory that they get architectural approval of what? Oh, good. No design standards. This entire plan very specifically calls out for developing hamlet design guidelines.

The ARB which was passed in my tenure on the Town Board is not doing its job if we do not reach a consensus on design standards. I believe you have to reinvigorate three basic ideas here with the villages, the hamlets of Aquebogue, Jamesport and Calverton should be

7/21/2003minutes

given the opportunity and the resources to do their own hamlet studies with the primary but not sole purpose, but the primary purpose of developing what they believe would be their home town, their home village, their architectural design standard and that that to the extent that it exists in the hamlet centers, should be allowed to spread out in the AOZ receiving areas. Without that, you will fail. With it, you may do something that will be nationally significant.

One of the things that keeps showing up here and it strikes me as odd is- and I think it appears in the expansion of the mandatory lot in the AOZ from 20,000 to 30,000 is the deference to the County Health Department's rules and regulations for water protection. And I'm tired of it. I didn't elect any of those guys. If you look at the build out of the town of Riverhead, under this plan we have taken a town of well over 40,000 acres and turned it into a township fully built out of slightly less, just over 41,000 or 42,000 people. That's one person an acre. And I can make a lot of mess but I can't make enough mess to scrub the water supply at one person per acre. Now the point of that is that we've done a pretty good job on that plus we have the (inaudible) charges.

We ought to be able to pass this plan forgetting what the Health Department says and then go to the Health Department and say look we have protected the water better than any you name me a suburbanized rural place anywhere near a metro area like New York that has one person per acre. It just doesn't exist. You will have a- come up with a plan that will protect the water supply and allow you to get the basic purpose that their legislation exists for to protect the water supply, achieved in a different way. And they are there to implement legislative purpose. You have done that if you adopt this plan and allow clustering, allow redevelopment in more intense ways that makes infrastructure smaller and concentrates into the sewer and water districts where that supply and demand is met.

I don't think anything about this should be designed around Health Department regulations. I believe that such a thing is not of the department but reasonable men down there. And if you actually pass the plan that works on a comprehensive basis, that you would have not only a moral but a legal basis for bypassing what currently seems to be driving parts of this design. That is not going to be a popular job, but it's the right thing to do.

I talked about the ARB. Telling people about what their buildings are going to look like is not a popular thing but it's the right thing to do. I spoke last time about developing band width into

7/21/2003minutes

the town of Riverhead. This is just going to be a major pain doing but it will change the fundamental nature of downtown.

I just heard Mary say they're tripling the electric supply. That's a lot of computers. And I would be more than happy to draft a section of this, 58 was successful for exactly the same reasons that that would be successful and it would be the economic highway of the future for the town. That one will just be a pain to do, but it's the right thing to do.

I talked last time about the bill of rights. I want to reiterate that I believe that the wording components of the bill of rights should apply to absolutely every property in the agricultural protection districts. People coming in there should know what they're getting into. They shouldn't be able to say later, oh, they make a lot of noise or, you know, could you turn the pumps off please. It just shouldn't work that way. They should know what they're getting into. It won't be popular with some of our new residents but it's the right thing to do.

The second to last thing I think is for Riverhead to realize that they can change their attitudes about a lot of these things. We are no longer going to be the poorest town. We are standing at the brink of a great wealth of investment. We are standing as one of the most desirable industrial, commercial and residential places in the entire New York metro area. They are going to come in waves. Pete is just part of the front edge of that. Steve Angel is just part of the front edge of that. They will get more insistent. They will get more demanding. They will get entirely more (inaudible). But they will come and they will keep asking. The attitude that has to change is oh, we're the poor town.

We can ask for more now than we ever have before. Our leverage and negotiation for the redevelopment of downtown and of making all of these things work is growing. There is a cost to that. Those of us who live here. Those of us who live in the communities of Aquebogue and Jamesport and Calverton cannot just say not in my backyard. Can't- they can also say not everything in my backyard. But the attitude has to be you know, I'm going to take some of that burden in my backyard. That will not be a popular thing but it's the right thing to do.

We will have to carry some burden of affordable housing. It's not massive redevelopment. It's work, sweat, it's projects like getting Mr. Morgo (phonetic) together; it's the real McCoy who showed

7/21/2003minutes

up here and say the folks who now own the old Riverhead Building Supply building and getting them together and saying, look, we've got to take this unused building and do something productive with it. That is the root to affordable housing. Single projects. Mr. Morgo has done some fine work. His suggestions that we not upzone is not the best of his work, he is wrong.

In the final analysis, you know that I believe in master planning and all of this discussion of oh, I'm about to become non-complying, is well, you have- you are. Master planning works because it plans not only for what is currently there but what might be there. The plan is a plan of the future and properties can adaptively be reused in the future. The idea that we should keep, for example, all the buildings in the industrial corridor that surrounds the railroad tracks, what is called the railroad shadow, in industrial use rather than make them available for higher density residential use is just plain wrong. Their use, their economic power is growing for other uses. The railroad comes through a couple times a day. I grew up with it, it's my alarm clock, it works just fine. And those properties, those uses should be changed, what is allowed should be changed to allow what the future should hold for them, not what has only worked in the past. And that is part of their carrying some of the burden.

In the final analysis this whole thing only works if you enforce the plan and I will repeat to you again my suggestions on that. One, no variances, locked down TDR. You have to make it one of the toughest things you've ever done. It has to be as tough to beat a TDR system as it is to get a piece of Suffolk County farmland out of the county program. You have to make it rock solid or they'll just come in, build out everything at the high density, and say, oh, by the way, circumstances have changed. Now let's do the rest of it and here's the precedent what you just put in.

Two. You have to knock down bureaucratic nonsense. The Health Department designing the future of the town of Riverhead would be a clear example of that. The Wild Scenic and Recreation Rivers Act would be another beauty on the page.

Three. For people who want to comply with the plan, you should make it very easy to develop in Riverhead. You should knock over bureaucracies for them if it's in compliance with the plan.

Finally, I ask you again to make compliance with this master plan in and of itself part of the development code of the town of

7/21/2003minutes

Riverhead. If you do that with these improvements and these suggestions you will have created a national model for a new way of taking and preserving a great little town and turning it into a great series of communities that collectively will be known as Farmland, USA."

Pete Kolokewicz: "Hi. I'm Pete Kolokewicz. I live at 219 Union Avenue. I was born and raised in this town and I've spent my whole life here except for three years in the Army. I went to school with Doug. I was wondering what he's doing these days.

I've listened to (inaudible), something about variances is definitely not the way to go. You have to have ability to change. You can't write it in stone. I wasn't going to say anything but I've got to say something. When you build something, you have to realize that you are displacing the wildlife. You knock down the woods, there is something living there. It's just like somebody coming in with a bulldozer and knocking down your house. I'd just like to mention that. Because the wildlife cannot speak for itself.

I want to commend the Board by the way because I've been watching you. You're very attentive. I voted for every one of you and I'm really proud I did. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakewicz: "Thank you. Anybody else who would like to address the Board? Larry, you already had a chance. This gentleman wants to come up. So, anyone who hasn't had a chance to address us this evening."

Chris Calderon: "My name is Chris Calderon and I live in Baiting Hollow and I just want to make some very brief comments. I'm presently selling a 72 acre tract of land in Mattituck to the county and the town of Southold and because the property is identified by the county as a sensitive groundwater recharge area, I felt that instead of pursuing development on it, we would turn it over and sell it to the county and you know it's been 19 months and we haven't closed yet and the only reason I bring it up is because, you know, we need to be effective if we're going to make, you know, programs work, and try and preserve land and try and give encouragement to people that, you know, the time frames can work. You know, that being- "

Supervisor Kozakewicz: "How long did you say, 17 months?"

Chris Calderon: "Nineteen months. But it's really not an issue here in Riverhead because it was a county issue opposed to- "

7/21/2003minutes

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Okay."

Chris Calderon: "-- you know something of that nature. But I just wanted to demonstrate as a home builder and a developer, you know, I'm sensitive to the property- use of property and in some cases not using a piece of property and I just wanted to set the record straight that, you know, higher density is going to be needed to have the ability to provide for, you know, work force housing and affordable rentals as some of the folks spoke about today.

And I've attended some of the stakeholder meetings and I've also suggested that at some of those meetings that a requirement whether it's mandatory or somehow, you know, with the TDR's, that 20% affordable housing component or a work force housing component can be added into a site plan so that we can give some of the folks in the community an opportunity to stay here in the community by having this- and it works in the town of Huntington and it's mandatory there whereas you know maybe being mandatory may not be the right answer but additional TDR's maybe to allow a developer to have some higher density to provide that or as an incentive in certain parts of the community where, you know, the Town Board and the Planning Department feels, you know, that a higher density may work well.

So, you know, it does work in Huntington and it does work in other parts of the country and it's something that may push, you know, this issue of work force housing, you know, into a reality. And that's really all I wanted to say. Thank you."

Councilman Lull: "Anyone else? Larry?"

Larry Oxman: "Larry Oxman. On the opposite end of the spectrum from high density housing, I've read the plan several times and if I read it correctly, and I'm not sure that I am, it seems to be recommending that the maximum size of homes be limited. I found this a little- first, I thought it was just referring to group housing, but it seems to be in other areas of the code, of the plan, and it talks about I think a when it deals with transfer of development rights, and I think if you find the passage, it talks about a one story house cannot be more than 2700 square feet. A two story house cannot be more than 3600 square feet. I- why? I mean, I'm not- you don't know the answer, it's not, you know, you're going to review the plan. But short of Southampton which I guess has enacted a law against homes about 20,000 square feet, I can't see why market conditions wouldn't prevail and it would be up to a builder to build whatever size home- again, within certain parameters. Usually there's a maximum

7/21/2003minutes

percentage of coverage of a lot but this seems beyond the coverage of the lot, but specifically citing the square footage of a home.

So, you know, it's easy to miss that passage. I didn't catch it at first. It wasn't what I was looking for and I was surprised that it was in there. So and maybe I'm reading it wrong."

Councilman Lull: "Thank you, Larry. David Latimore- didn't return. Okay. Is there anyone else who would like to address the Board? Then I will declare the public part of the hearing closed and open for written comments for two more weeks, Mr. Supervisor?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "What did we say? We said 10 days. Ten days is July 21- I mean July 31; 11 days would be August 1. Right. So if we do both timetables for the close of business for August 1 at 2003. Any other business? Thank you all for being here and thank you for your comments."

Meeting adjourned: 8:25 p.m.

Melissa A. White