## Appendix B

I would like to introduce my fellow Board members. On my left Arthur Mager, on my right Pete Pappas, and on my far right Rick McCormick.

We have a bit of business to begin the hearing. Rick lives immediately across the street from the proposed development, and he's fine with the idea that if he sits in on this hearing is a member of the Planning Board he gives up his ability to come back later and object as a member of the public. But we're going to leave it up to counsel from the applicant to see if that's an acceptable situation.

MR. GUIDO: Just so I understand, the gentleman would be voting as a member of the Planning Board?

CHAIRMAN QUINN: He would be, yes.

But he would be prohibited from speaking as a

member of the public, as a neighbor, if you

will, he would be acting solely as a member of

the Planning Board.

3

5

4

6 7

10

9

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. GUIDO: I guess I have no objection to that. It's the first time I've run into that, frankly.

MR. WEILER: Well, as I said, he's a next door neighbor, he's a member of the Planning Board. There's no problem if you would feel more comfortable that he recuse himself and not participate in the proceedings as they go down the line. That's also an alternative. And I don't think you want to feel embarassed or prejudiced if you wish to take that position if you feel more comfortable that way.

MR. GUIDO: No, no. Lets proceed. I have no problem with it.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: To a certain extent I'm a resident with property bordering Mill River Road myself. In a village this size I think it's unavoidable to have this.

MR. GUIDO: Absolutely. No problem.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: I'd also like to introduce one of our Trustees, Mike Schwerin from the Village of Upper Brookville.

This a public hearing and the

2 meeting of the Planning Board to receive public comments and information regarding the application of The Oaks at Mill River regarding a 5 proposed subdivision of approximately 97.2 acres of land consisting of the former Dean and Warren 6 properties on the west side of Mill River Road 7 into 14 lots. Before the Planning Board can Я 9 give serious consideration to the actual subdivision layout, the law requires that there 10 be compliance with the State Quality Environ-11 mental Review requirements, commonly known as 12 SEQRA as part of the approval process. 13 On October 24th, 2007 the Planning 14

On October 24th, 2007 the Planning Board designated this action as a Type I Action, which is defined as an action which is most likely to have significant impact on the environment. After a hearing on April 9th of this year, the Board approved the final scope document for a Draft Environmental Statement. Thereafter, the applicant submits a Draft Environmental Impact Statement proposed 14 lot residential subdivision, Mill River Road, dated April, 2009, which we hereafter refer to as the DEIS, Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Я

The Board's initial review of the DEIS was compared to the approved scope document. After several informal meetings with the applicant, certain items were added to the DEIS to ensure that the DEIS was complete to address all items in the approved scope document.

At this stage of the procedure the Board desires to receive public comment on the DEIS. Notice of hearing was sent to the neighboring property owners as well as involved and interested governmental agencies. Now is the time for any interested person or agencies to comment about the DEIS and make suggestions about the ultimate content of the Final Environmental Statement, FEIS, which will guide the Planning Board in the consideration of the proposed 14 lot subdivision.

Please understand that the Board has not approved the subdivision, it cannot do so until such time as it takes a hard look at all the environmental issues related to the subdivision development.

The procedure we will follow

l

1.5

tonight will not as follows: The applicant or its representatives will be asked to make a brief statement concerning the subdivision application and any environmental aspects of it

The Oaks at Mill River

as may be contained in the DEIS. Members of the public or representatives of any governmental

agency present this evening will have an

opportunity to speak and make statements to the

Board. Speakers are requested to identify

yourselves before speaking so that the hearing

stenographer can make a complete record of the

hearing.

Questions, if any, should be directed through the Chair.

are no open questions related to the content of the DEIS, it may declare the hearing closed, after which all interested parties will have up to October 23rd of this year to submit written comments to the Board. After the comments are received, the Board will take that information into consideration for the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Another hearing or hearings will be held before the FEIS

is approved.

1.6

1.8

Neighboring property owners,
interested and involved parties and other
persons making a written request to the Planning
Board will receive written notice of future
public hearings.

When the FEIS is completed, the Board is required to approve and issue a findings statement before it will be in a position to make any decision on the proposed 14 lot subdivision.

Mr. Weiler, would you please present the affidavits of mailings and postings of the notice of hearing or any other pertinent documents?

MR. WEILER: Yes. Mr. Chairman, we have these documents, and I would recommend that they be annexed to the minutes of the hearing.

On the mailing, we received two
letters that were returned to us-- three
letters: Sagamore Woods Association, the
Sagamore Hill Homes and Michael Pescatore.
Those were returned to us based upon the list
that was provided to us by the applicant.

I'm just stating that for the record. There will be other opportunities for people who didn't get notice to make comments anyway on the DEIS that's the subject of this hearing.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Those three parties did not receive notice?

MR. WEILER: No; the letters were returned to us. So I don't know exactly what the trouble is. But I just wanted to state that for the record.

We also have received a letter today, dated October 5th, from the Nassau County Department of Health, copies of which were e-mailed to all board members today, and we will make that part of the record. The applicant's counsel, Mr. Guido, has already received a copy of that letter. My understanding is that it's basically a pro forma letter that the health department sends out in situations of this sort.

I do note, however, there is a responsiblity on the part of the developer to respond to that letter or reply to the letter within 60 days of yesterday. So I think they're

aware of that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: I have receive a copy of the letter, obviously I haven't had a chance to go through it in any detail, but what impact does that document have on the proceeding?

MR. WEILER: On this particular thing I don't think it has any significance, other than it does mention certain requirements that have to be taken care of, and I think eventually it will be linked in, possibly, to the preparation of the final impact statement, because is this just a draft. And ultimately, as this process goes on, after the comment period that goes up until October 23rd, after that, then, of course, this Board, working with the applicant, will demand and require that certain amendments be made to the draft so that it becomes a Final Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So it might be that, in answer to your question, that some of these requirements in this letter--

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Will modify the

1.1

DEIS.

MR. WEILER: Right. It may end up as being part of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Maybe Jim Antonelli can address that a little better when he makes his remarks. But I can foresee possibly some of those itmes being mentioned in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: I would request that James Antonelli, the Village Environmental Consultant, make a brief statement regarding the SEQRA process.

MR. ANTONELLI: Thank you Mr.

At the risk of sounding repetitive,

I just want to make sure that everybody here is

clear as to where we stand, and advise the Board

members as well as members of the public just so

we know exactly where we stand in the SEQRA

process.

The Chairman had mentioned that the DEIS was deemed complete by the Board lead agency. That was based on our review, which

Chairman.

included not only the fact that the DEIS addressed the items in the scoping document, but also it had to follow the SEQRA form and clarity, and also the contents of what the DEIS should include.

Now, once this hearing is completed and the hearing on the DEIS is closed, the process includes the preparation of a Final EIS, which we call the FEIS. I think some of things were mentioned on what that would include, but it does include any corrections or additions to the DEIS, any supplemental information that we may find due to the comments that are coming forth from the public. It would also include responses to substantive comments on that, and also, and I think more importantly, it would include any plan changes or presentation or submission of a modified or revised plan and an evaluation of that, which would all be part of the FEIS.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thank you Jim.

The applicant is invited to make a brief presentation.

MR. GUIDO: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

My name is Robert B. Guido, I am the attorney for the applicant, which is The Oaks at Mill River Associates.

Give me one second to put up the map for the benefit of the members of the public, who perhaps have not seen it before.

Fundamentally we are here to listen this evening. We have completed the DEIS, the DEIS has been accepted by the Board as complete. At the conclusion of the hearing, at the closing of the hearing I would like to make it clear to the Board and Mr. Weiler that we are prepared to sit down with the Board and its consultants as soon as possible, even before the end of the public comment period, to start fashioning the FEIS, and we will be happy to work with the Board to make that happen as soon as possible.

I really don't have anything more to say, I don't want to take up the time of the public. We're here to listen and we will prepare the FEIS on a prompt basis for the Board.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thank you.

Do we have a speakers' list?

MR. WEILER: There's no list. I circulated a list to find out who's here if they wished to put their name on it.

Now I think we can open it up to the public to make comments or ask questions.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Do we have anybody from the the public that would like to make a statement or ask a question?

MR. SCHWERIN: I'm Michael
Schwerin. As mentioned previously, I am a
trustee, but I am here today representing myself
and my family as homeowners, and I have a brief
statement I would like to read, and a submission
then, I'll hand it to you then as a submission
because there are written points that go further
than I think all of us need to hear tonight. So
if you pardon me, I'll actually just read this.

My name is Michael Schwerin, my wife and I have our primary residence at 39 Mill River Road, that's Lot Number 7 on the current county tax maps. If I can point to the map, that's this one right here.

As is evident from the plat

I

submitted by the applicaant, our property is completely surrounded by the proposed subdivision. We are the "Hole in the doughnut."

In addition to ownership of this lot, we enjoy and are burdened by various deeded rights of way and utility maintainence agreements relating to the lands proposed for development. For these reasons we are likely to be uniquely impacted by the subdivision should it proceed.

As we heard earlier, the proposed subdivision encompasses over 97 acres of largely undisturbed native land, right now this is essential all the woods with the exception of some landscaped property around this existing mansion, which is intended, apparently, to be preserved, and a little bit of landscaping here around the greenhouse and on the older structure, which apparently is proposed to be torn down. Otherwise this is all woodlands.

It is a beautiful site, it's one of the largest contiguous undeveloped parcels of land in Nassau County, but its topograpy is challenging. Large sections of it are very hilly. According to the DEIS submitted by the

applicant, Table 12, Page 113, 41-1/2 acres, or
43 percent of the total are classified as either
steeply sloped or severely sloped. These slope
areas are concentrated in the eastern or
northern 60 percent of the property, and are
generally those closest to Mill River Road.
You can see the wavey lines, I don't know if
it's apparent to the people in the audience, but
if Mill River Road runs here, the very hilly
property is here along where the wavy lines are,
and up here. So to the east and to the north.

In order to protect and preserve the flora and fauna on slopelands, and to protect and preserve the natural habitat of wooded areas, our Village code restricts the development of sloped areas, and I'm siting from Part 2, Chapter 205-10, Section F, and flatly bans development of severe slopes, except for "Purposes of constructing an access driveway and facilities for drainage and utilities." And that's 205-10F 1A.

On the other hand, the property also includes roughly 40 contiguous acres of nearly flat, tabletop land at the highest

H1

elevation to the western section. So that's up

here, where there are very few contour lines,

because this is essential flat land. That's not

from the DEIS, that's my own calculations,

you've got 40 acres of quite flat land up there,

which is largely surrounded by Planting Fields

Arboretum. This is prime, buildable land, the

development of which would have little impact, I

submit, on neighboring property owners.

H1 cont'd

I recognize that the applicant has the right to develop his property. However, it is imperative that this development be done responsibly. As residents of beautiful Upper Brookville and custodians of its uniquely bucolic setting, I am sure the members of our Planning Commission share this sentiment. Fortunately, by all appearances, the applicant also seems to understand and respect the imperative to do this right.

Nevertheless, my initial review of the DEIS reveals several deficiencies which I would like to note for the record. Rather than taking up everyone's time tonight, I'm prepared to submit these points in written form.

25

Has federal environmental and other standards been checked vis-a-vis this? Going to

H2

H2 cont'd

I was an investigator for 19 years for the state labor standards, I've been active in government for the last 30 years, I've been with the Nassau County Democratic Committee on national boards, it's a matter of interest to me.

НЗ

I have nothing against the development of the project, I hope it goes through, people do need housing on Long Island, even if it's upper middle class or wealthy housing, it's a legimate issue. We have a limited housing stock. But especially for the concern of the Board, I'm curious if all federal standards have been met. I know the state standards are met.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: I'm sorry, could you just state that last comment a little slower and a little clearer

I'm asking you a question.

MR. FINKLE: I'm I'm sure you've done the state standards. I'm curious about federal standards. Have you gone through all the federal possibilities, E.P.A., environmental stuff, wilderness, endangered species, things

that fly, flora, fauna. That's all my question is, a point of information vis-a-vis Roberts, almost.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Jim, your reaction to how much of the federal standards are involved in here?

MR. ANTONELLI: I think there's probably no comment, it's got to be addressed to our satisfaction in the FEIS.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: If you look at the DEIS, you'll see a lot of flora and fauna cataloged as a professional's opinion about what lives on the property, so to speak, and at this point there hasn't been anything identified, to my knowledge, that was endangered or would fall under any federal regulations for protection.

MR. FINKLE: Potentially because you're dealing with Long Island Sound close and things that go along with that. You never know what falls in on you.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: The water runoff issue is of prime importance to us, if that's what you mean.

MR. FINKLE: It's got multifactored

possibilities. Birds fly over there, they end up up encroaching on things that may or may not be appopriate for it. You know, that type of stuff. I'm just asking.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: I understand. I'm having a little difficulty understanding you.

MR. FINKLE: The answer is there's all types of endangered species that have nothing to do with flora and fauna, they have to do with migratory birds that come in over the sound that will fly in. It sounds a lot like nature, be it could be a problem for you going down the line. That's all I'm asking.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Has the applicant taken into account migratory animals in the DEIS?

MR. GUIDO: I can check further,
Mr. Chairman, but I'm quite sure we have, as
we've complied with all the provisions of the
State Environmental Quality Review Act as to
what has to be reviewed, we've complied with the
final scope that we developed in conjunction
with the Board. So yes, we have a complete
section with respect to flora and fauna in the

Н4

DEIS, which is available for your review if you would like to take a look at it.

MR. FINKEL: I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: I think the question may go to timing of when an inventory of animals was assumed. I can tell you from living across the valley from this property that this time of year there are a lot different birds, for example, around, and in the spring again. So maybe we could find out when the environmental assessment was done regarding species found on the property.

MR. ANTONELLI: It's mentioned in the DEIS. I think tonight we don't want to try to resolve issues and questions that are brought to the Board. I think these are to be examined with the document with the information we have, and then responses formulated for the FEIS.

But I do know, for everybody's curiosity, that we did require that the vegetation and the fauna inventory be taken throughout the year and during multiple seasons to catch everything, and I do know that they specifically address the migratory bird

situation, flyovers, etc., I know specifically that they addressed the various federal lists, which included endangerd, threatened, etc. But again, we will-- this does have to be resolved prior to acceptance of the FEIS and any findings that are drafted.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MRS. GOLDSBOROUGH: My name is

Judith Goldsborough, I'm an attorney and also an

Associate Director with the North Shore Land

Alliance. We are a not for profit land trust

and our mission is to preserve and protect green

spaces, farmlands, wetlands, groundwater and

open spaces of Long Island's North Shore

primarily.

The Village of Upper Brookville
lies within our service area, and we count many
Upper Brookville residents as supporters and
members.

We have received a lot of calls recently about this proposed subdivision, and I have a few comments about it. We also will be submitting written comments, I think up until

October 23rd.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yes.

MRS. GOLDSBOROUGH: So we have a few more points which I won't cover tonight.

Primarily, as Mr. Schwerin was saying, we're concerned about this application because of the very steep slopes involved. We recognize that the owner of the property has a right to develop it, but we think that with a little creative thinking on both the part of the developer and the Village, that the goal to develop it and the goal of the Village to protect the natural resources could be achieved. The comment, creative thinking, that we are proposing would allow development of the site while protecting the slopes and trees to a much greater extent than what they're proposing in the proposed plan.

The applicant states that the proposed subdivision has been designed to preserve the natural slopes to the maximum extent practicable, but because the parcel includes over 41 acres of steep or very steep slopes, as Mr. Schwerin pointed out, it will be

H5

H٤

on this site without a huge negative impact to

2 impossible to constuct the roads and build homes

H6 cont'd

H7

H8

the natural environment. The applicant further

5 states that the proposed subdivision conforms to

6 existing zoning laws. Even accepting the

7 statement at face value, it is clear that

8 subdividing this parcel as proposed does not

9 conform to the stated goals of the Village

10 master plan, which is to preserve natural

vegetation and slopes, to minimum the impact of

stormwater runoff, to protect trees and other

natural resources, and to preserve the natural

vegetation on the slopes.

The Village has laws that regulate

disturbing steep slopes, yet eight of the 14

lots on the proposed plan site structures on

very steep slopes. But as the proposal states,

they do conform to existing zoning. So this is

a bit of a conundrum.

A few years ago the North Shore

Land Alliance had a seminar featuring Randall

Arent as the featured speaker. Mr. Arent is a

nationally recognized authority on conservation

planning. His thesis is that conventional

1

3

15

21

zoning ordinances do not always work as they are hoped to. In this case you have steep slope ordinances on the books in Upper Brookville, and yet here you have a plan that proposes disturbing greatly the slopes that these laws are meant to protect. And it's not any fault of the applicant, it's just the way the laws were written. But we propose that there's a way that, as was stated, the property can be developed and the slopes protected.

Н9

Mr. Arent's idea is that the subdivision design process can be reformed so that developments can become a major helpful tool to help achieve a community's conservation objectives, at no additional cost to the developer. This technique is called conservation tion subdivision; many of you may be familiar with the Matinecock Farms. That is such a subdivision.

Conservation subdivision design

requires consideration and preservation of
natural and cultural resources as part of the

design process, and many studies have shown that
this design actually can save money on expensive

2.0

site grading and road construction, and that lots sell more quickly and at premium prices.

As I said, Matinecock Farms is a local subdivision using this kind of planning that you might be familiar with, and I believe Cherrywood on Piping Rock Road is also based on similar principles Both feature well designed homes on samller lots than required under existing zoning in order to preserve more trees and natural features, with a lot of open space under common ownership.

I would also like to make one comment on the DEIS, where the applicant talks about the fact that potentially up to 30 acres of the property will be put under a conservation easement. If you look at the map that shows the conservation easement areas, they're highly fragmented, and a lot of that area includes buffers between each individual lot, which does really not do a whole lot to protect natural resources on the property.

The North Shore Land Alliance does work with private landowners and local governments to protect open space, and we do use

H10

developed.

2.1

I want to state for the record my complete support of Mike Schwerin's piece that he has submitted, and express my concern. We are the first property or one of the few properties along Mill River Road that has no standing water. We're right on Mill River Road and also we adjoin the lane, that used to be called Mohawk Lane, and we're fortunate in that we have no water there, because the water cuts across just before our property across from Mill River Road and then comes back later.

So we're very concerned about any possible damage that may occur to our property and devaluation as a result of any change in status of the water or the drainage situation, and we're very concerned about the drainage consequences of this project.

And with all due respect to the gentleman who just spoke, he's not going to be impacted by the 14,000 truck trips that go up and down the road. It's going to significantly reduce our quality of live for the several years that this is going on.

H13

H14

I know we have until October 23rd to make additional comments and to submit written statements, and we plan to do so.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thank you.

Yes, ma'am.

MRS. DEGROAT: My name is Mrs. Michele Degroat, I live at 69 Mill River Road.

I want to apologize for getting here late, I'm very sorry I missed as much as I did.

But I do have concerns about the traffic situation on Mill River Road. I think I read in the papers that it was described as under utilized. That's not my experience.

There's much traffic on Mill River Road, more than I would like, and I can't see how this is going to help, having all of the traffic that would come from the building and from making more residences in that area. I'm very close to the entranceways that are suggested, and it's a concern, traffic is a concern. It's very narrow where I live to come out of driveway, very narrow. I don't even know if it's the 22 feet

H15

2.4

2 Antonelli has any disagreement with that.

MR. ANTONELLI: Well, Paul Stevens and I will submit written comments, but certainly that will be within the public comment period, there's no reason to leave the hearing open for us. These are going to be written comments to the Board.

thing clear to everybody that made comments here tonight. The stage that we're in is simply deciding whether or not the statement is complete and includes comments to that extent. This is in no way an endorsement of the project at this point. There's going to be many comments, adjustments, and the things that you mentioned tonight will all be taken into account. All we're simply trying to do at this point is get from a draft to a final impact statement. This not, in any way, shape or form, a final meeting on this issue.

MR. WEILER: I may use this is an example. What we percieve happening here is that between now and the 23rd we will be getting comments that are written and filed with the

25

1

Subsequent to that, the Board will possibly hold a number of hearings in connection with the preparation of a Final Draft Environmental Impact Statement. For instance, we, in looking at -- in the form of preparing a Final Impact Statement there is going to be some scrutiny as to the question of the traffic, the building on the slopes, and it may well be that this document, right after the Final Impact Statement is prepared, is going to look somewhat different. There may be different enphasis on different problems, and at that point in time, and again, there will be final hearings, there'll be hearings on the Final Draft Environmental Impact Statement. So as the Board progresses along on identifying certain issues that may be of great concern to not only the Board members, but of concern to the public, this document will become somewhat different, and it might not have -- there may be many more critical comments of concern. Because under SEQRA this Board has to make sure that we've looked at all of the impacts that are related to the environment, we finally get to a point where

we have a final document that possibly says, as an example, the traffic that's going to be generated by the proposed development is so severe that it demands certain changes in the development in some way. And that might become part of the final document that the Board deals with.

Once the Board has that, then we get into the question of well, do we accept a plan such as this, as a Planning Board planning out a development? We look at the environmental impact statement, the final one, and we say, "Gee, we've identified certain areas that are so much of a concern to us that it's going to justify some changes that are going to mitigate some of those things that has been identified."

So that's the process. And I think where the rubber hits the road, if you will, is when the final document is going to be prepared. And again, you'll have another opportunity to look at that to make sure that it contains your concerns. And then, once that is prepared, this Board then must, as under the SEQRA process, it must issue what we call a findings statement,

The	Oaks	at	M:11	River
.1. 1.1 🗔	COCINCO	au	1'1 1 1 1	

and that findings statement, again, is a very important part of the process because it's going to be a statement that's going to be the guideline to how this property will ultimately be developed.

So there will be more hearings on this, and you all will be getting notice of it, and anyone who is not on the normal mailing lists, I recommend that you definitely send a written request to get mailed notices in the future, because if you don't do that we won't know who you are and you won't get the mailed notices. So it's important that you do that.

So that's the process.

Jim, do you agree with that?

MR. ANTONELLI: Yes.

MR. GUIDO: May I be briefly heard on one matter?

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Guido.

MR. GUIDO: I fully concur with Peter's comments, but I would like to, again, extend an offer for us, we would be more than willing to come in and sit down with the Board

1.1

1.8

1	The Oaks at Mill River	37
2		;
3	EXHIBITS	
4	Public's Exhibit Description Page No.	
5	1 Mr. Schwerin's Statement 17	
6	2 Ms. Goldsbourough's St'mt. 28	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		ATT TO ALBERTA
23		
24		
25		
		İ