TOWN OF OYSTER BAY TOWN BOARD REGULAR MEETING March 22, 2016 8:22 p.m.

## HEARING P-3-16

To consider the application of Joan III, LLC and Joe III, LLC, fee owners, and BSL NY Development LLC, contract vendee, for a special use permit to permit the development of a two-story assisted living facility and site plan approval in a Neighborhood Business Zone on premises located at 900 Woodbury Road, Woodbury, NY. (M.D. 2/9/16 #15).

## PRESENT:

SUPERVISOR JOHN VENDITTO COUNCILMAN JOSEPH D. MUSCARELLA COUNCILMAN ANTHONY D. MACAGNONE COUNCILMAN CHRIS COSCHIGNANO COUNCILMAN JOSEPH G. PINTO COUNCILWOMAN REBECCA M. ALESIA COUNCILWOMAN MICHELE M. JOHNSON

(Appearances continued on following page.)

I certify this is a true and accurate transcript.

Yomne Angeles

YVONNE ANGELES Official Reporter/Notary

Jaci Channel party

JULIA GIANNAKOPOULOS

Official Reporter/Notary

ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT

## ALSO PRESENT:

JAMES ALTADONNA JR., TOWN CLERK JAMES J. STEFANICH, RECEIVER OF TAXES LEONARD GENOVA, TOWN ATTORNEY FRANK M. SCALERA, CHIEF DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY THOMAS SABELLICO, DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY DONNA B. SWANSON, DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MATTHEW M. ROZEA, ASSISTANT TOWN ATTORNEY LINDA M. HERMAN, OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK RALPH J. RAYMOND, DEPUTY TOWN CLERK ANDREW S. ROTHSTEIN, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS, OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISOR RONALD SCAGLIA, ASSISTANT TO THE SUPERVISOR, OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISOR CAROL STRAFFORD, DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS MARTA KANE, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS, PUBLIC INFORMATION BRIAN DEVINE, RESEARCH ASSISTANT, PUBLIC INFORMATION BARRY BREE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC SAFETY FRANK A. NOCERINO, COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS TIMOTHY ZIKE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT FRANK GATTO, ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

3 1 (Whereupon, the following proceedings were reported by Stenographer Yvonne Angeles:) 2 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and 3 4 gentlemen, if everyone will find seats, we will 5 continue and we will continue by asking our Town Clerk, Mr. Altadonna, to kindly poll the Board. 6 7 MR. ALTADONNA: Supervisor Venditto? 8 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I am here. MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Muscarella? 9 10 COUNCILMAN MUSCARELLA: Here. 11 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Macagnone? 12 COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: Here. 1.3 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Coschignano? 14 COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: Here. 15 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Pinto? 16 COUNCILMAN PINTO: Here. 17 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilwoman Alesia? 18 COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: Here. 19 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilwoman Johnson? 2.0 COUNCILWOMAN JOHNSON: Here. 21 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and 22 gentlemen, if everyone will please rise and join in 23 Pledge of Allegiance to our flag led by Councilman 24 Joe Pinto. 25 (Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

2.0

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Mr. Altadonna, if you would call the first hearing.

MR. ALTADONNA: Hearing P-3-16, to consider the application of Joan III, LLC and Joe III, LLC, fee owners and BSL NY Development LLC, contract vendee for a special use permit to permit the development of a two-story assisted living facility ad site plan approval in a Neighborhood Business Zone on premises located at 900 Woodbury Road, Woodbury, NY.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Counselor?

MS. SIMONCIC: Good evening,

Mr. Supervisor and Members of the Board.

My name is Judy Simoncic with the firm of Forchelli, Curto, offices at 333 Earl Ovington Boulevard in Uniondale. I'm appearing this evening on behalf of the applicants, Joan III, LLC, Joe III, LLC, the owner of the premises and BSL NY Development, contract vendee.

With me this evening is Cathy Hooker,
Regional Director of Operations of Benchmark Senior
Living, Director; Ken Littlefield, Director of
Development for Benchmark Senior Living; Chris
Robinson with RMS Engineering. He is the engineer
and the gentleman who prepared the plans before the

1.3

2.0

Board this evening. Wayne Muller with RMS

Engineering, our traffic engineer; John Breslin

with Breslin Appraisals, real estate appraiser;

Steve Ruiz from Mosley Architects. He is the

architect that prepared the plans that are before

the Board this evening; and finally, Stephanie

Davis, Senior Project Manager of FPM Environmental

Consulting Group.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Welcome.

MS. SIMONCIC: First, I just want to briefly address how they changed the time of the hearing.

As the Board knows, the original hearing was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. and at the request of some neighbors, it was moved to 8:00 p.m. and because we had we had already sent out the notices for the 10:00 a.m. meeting, we were instructed by the Town Attorney's office to resend certified mailing to everyone within 300 feet of the property, which we did.

We also did send notice by regular mail as well because we wanted to ensure people got notified. And finally, we did change the time on the posters that were on Woodbury Road and Lark Road. We had subsequently submitted an Affidavit

of Mailing for the second mailing and second

2 posting.

1.3

2.0

I would like to submit to the Board some green cards that we received in the interim (handing).

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Return receipts?

MS. SIMONCIC: Correct.

So between the Town posting on the website with the new time and the efforts that we made -- we believe we gone above and beyond.

We did also have somebody here this morning at Town Hall. Nobody showed up for our meeting. We wanted to be certain if somebody came, we can answer any questions; also, advise them that there were postings that the hearing was changed to 8:00 p.m., so we really covered all our bases.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Well done.

MS. SIMONCIC: Turning to the application, the premises that is the subject of this application before you this evening is known as 900 Woodbury Road in Woodbury. It's designated as Section 12, Block 527, Lot 24 on the Nassau County Land and Tax Map. It has a total lot area of 3.76 acres. It's zoned Neighborhood Business.

It's presently improved with a

## ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

one-story building that's been historically used for retail uses and it also has a two-and-half story single-family dwelling which is actually a nonconforming dwelling. It's been on the property since about 1938. Residential use is not permitted in the zone and it's illegally nonconforming use on the property. It also has a two-story accessory structure and a one-story frame garage. The premises has frontage of 371.26 feet on Woodbury

Road and frontage of 15.29 feet on Lark Drive.

In terms of the surrounding area, before you, on the board to the right, is an aerial photo. It's really an isolated pocket in Woodbury that's surrounded by single-family dwellings, but if you look to the north, it's bounded by the north by the LIE overpass; to the west, you have the Seaford-Oyster Bay Expressway; to the south, you have the Northern State Parkway, and then to southeast, Manetto Hill Road. So we are bounded on four sides by very major arterial roadways.

With respect to the application itself, we are here tonight seeking a special use permit and site plan approval pursuant to Oyster Bay Codes, Section 246-5.2, to permit the property to be developed with a two-story, 73,955 square foot

2.0

building to be used as an assisted living facility.

This building is proposed to

3 accommodate 91 units with a maximum of 105 beds.

The proposed assisted facility will be owned and operated, as I indicated before, by Benchmark Senior Living.

At this point, I'd like to introduce Cathy Hooker who is the Regional Director of Operations with Benchmark to talk about Benchmark and describe the amenities and services that will be provided in this particular community.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Welcome, Cathy.

MS. HOOKER: Thank you. Good evening.

As Judy said, I'm Cathy Hooker, the Regional Director of Operations for ten of the facilities in Connecticut hoping to come to New York.

Benchmark Senior Living is a leading provider in senior living services. It has been in business for eighteen years. Benchmark currently owns and operates 51 assisted living facilities throughout the Northeast, in Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and Vermont.

Benchmark has been the recipient of

1.3

2.0

numerous national awards for its innovative and effective senior living programs. While Benchmark does provide a variety of levels of care within its communities, this proposed facility will have two levels of care; one level is traditional assisted living, providing assistance with basic activities of daily living such as bathing, dressing, transportation, activities, medication program, social activities, cultural and educational activities, beauty spa within inside the community and taking our residents out. We will have an assisted living enhanced resident licensed.

The second level of care will be for our memory-care residents who have dementia and Alzheimer's. Special needs assisted living residence license will be for that.

Benchmark Senior Living is there to make sure -- it's designed to ensure a happier, healthier life for all our residents. We care for residents with very little -- very little assistance needed for activities of their daily living for those with memory impairment and very high needs. Benchmark allows has a variable staffing model. It varies according to our residents' needs as opposed to a fixed staffing

2.0

model. Each resident is assessed prior to moving in by a registered nurse. The assessment provides the information needed to ensure the community is prepared to provide the proper individual care needed.

An assessment is completed every 120 days with a family meeting to follow.

Communication between the community and the family is of utmost importance to the well being of everyone.

Our Live Now, Live Well program is designed to offer fitness, social, spiritual and cultural opportunities for our assisted living residents. Our Live Now, Live Engage program is designed to offer similar opportunities for our memory impaired residents.

This an award-winning program led by a certified dementia specialist. Benchmark teaches our residents how to share moments, memories and milestones online to our Benchmark connections coordinator. Many of our residents have a Facebook page and can Skype with their family and friends.

We have an arthritis exercise in-house,
PT from an outside provider in-house doctors,
podiatrists and dentists.

2.0

Benchmark is proud of our award-winning dining program. Dining, which is one of the most important parts of our residents' day. Chef demonstrations, special holiday events, private dining room for friends and family to spend time together. Sensory dining for our memory impaired residents. Special dietary needs are part of the assessment and shared with the dining staff to make sure dietary restraints are met.

We followed the leadership model in our communities which means we have seven-day a week management presence in the community. Benchmark supports our associates through continued education from our own Benchmark University. Our company funds associates in need -- run and funded by associates and raises funds for any associates that need.

Surveys are sent to all of our associates ensuring that we as a company are meeting their needs to perform their role.

Benchmark also has their own internal audit tool that is used throughout the year which models and exceeds the State's survey. This tool is used to ensure that all departments are meeting the standards and requirements set by Benchmark in the

2.0

state in which they operate. This ensures the highest quality of our services to our residents.

There's an annual customer survey as well which is sent to all residents and their responsible parties. Benchmark is making a difference in other states and our residents have a very wonderful life.

Thank you.

MS. SIMONCIC: Before I introduce Chris Robinson to talk about the site plan, I want to talk about the process and what this application went through prior to being scheduled for this public hearing.

First, we did undergo extensive site plan review with the Department of Planning and Development and its consultants reviewed the application. They issued comments. We responded to those comments and that took place for many months of review and tweaking the plan and making it the best plan it can be and acceptable to the Department of Planning and Development.

Additionally, with respect to the environmental review, we did undergo a full assessment by the Town's consultants, Cashin, Spinelli & Ferretti and that review occurred over

2.0

several months and there are numerous comment letters that the applicant was required to address.

And ultimately, we did address all their comments to their satisfaction and the environmental review resulted in the culmination of an extensive memorandum issued by Cashin's office dated October 8, 2015. That memorandum addressed a number of environmental factors that were considered during review.

And of particular note on this application, is the Town's consultant's finding with respect to the character of the surrounding community and the proposed facility. The Town's consultant found that -- and I'm quoting from the memo -- the proposed assisted living facility generally is a more compatible use with respect to surrounding single-family neighborhood and certain other uses; for example, office, retail stores, fast food restaurant in multiple-use building, a veterinarian office and a motor vehicle dealership.

As I indicated at the beginning of my presentation, John Breslin, our real estate expert, is here to testify and you will hear more about the character of the neighborhood and how this truly fits best with this neighborhood.

14 1 At this point, I would like to 2 introduce the applicant's engineer, Chris Robinson, 3 to talk about the site plan and discuss the overall 4 proposal. 5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: All right. Welcome, Chris. 6 7 MR. ROBINSON: Good evening. 8 Chris Robinson, RMS Engineering, 9 355 New York Avenue, Huntington, New York. I'm 10 here on behalf of BSL NY Development LLC. 11 As Ms. Simoncic explained, the 3.76 12 acre parcel located on the southerly side of 13 Woodbury Road between Lark Drive, Wren Drive and 14 the Seaford Oyster Bay Expressway. 15 The proposal is for a two-story, 16 91-unit, 105-bed assisted facility. 17 development as proposed is designed completely to 18 comply with the NB, Neighborhood Business District. 19 No variances are being sought at all. The special 2.0 item would be the special permit required for the 21 assisted living facility. 22 I have hand-ups for each of the Board 23 that we have up here (handing). The building is 24 designed in a residential style. It's a two-story 25 building. It will be 29'6" high with 11 and a half

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

15

feet to the first floor, 11 to the second floor. Then, there's a sloped roof that goes up another 7 feet to the ridge. From the street, it will appear as a typical peaked-sloped shingled roof. In actuality, that will go up and it will cover a 7-foot drop down to the flat roof. All the mechanical equipment will be hidden and screened, both acoustically and visually behind that. can see the picture of the sloped roof, all the mechanical equipment will be hidden behind that; very similar to the Sunrise Assisted Living building that was built in the Town of Oyster Bay several years ago on Old Country Road, where the look from the street as a peaked roof and the mechanical equipment is hidden behind that roof. There's a copy of the rendering here on the wall facing the audience. We also have some reduced copies that's been just handed up. Also, I have with me tonight, Steve Ruiz from Mosley Architects, if there are any specific questions regarding the architectural style or the amenities that are provided. The building is set back 91.1 feet from

Woodbury Road, 49.8 feet from Lark Drive. It's

35.7 feet from the westerly property line at the

2.0

closest point and the 83.4 feet from the easterly property line. The building will cover approximately 24 percent of the property and permeable surfaces such as pavements, walkways will cover another 22 percent. The remaining 53.3 percent will be a mixture of landscaping and natural areas. That equates to approximately 2 acres out of the 3.76 acres will remain green with landscaping as, well augmented landscaping.

Benchmark prides itself on beautiful landscape grounds. In addition to existing trees, Benchmark will be planting over 200 trees and over 800 shrubs and plants.

The plan indicates two gardens; one is an internal garden in a courtyard which is a memory care garden which is a secured facility so the memory care residents can have an outdoor experience inside. The exterior garden which is on the west side of the building is shown with the round patio and walkways so the residents can enjoy benches, be outside and enjoy the beautiful landscaped gardens as they walk the property.

The site is currently fenced with a six-foot high white solid vinyl fence along most of the east of the property line. The balance of the

1.3

2.0

site right now has a chain-link fence with green privacy slats. We are going to replace that fence with a new six-foot vinyl fence to match the one that's on the east side now which will run around the entire property.

There are significant landscape buffers on the property, 17 feet on the easterly property line to the curb line which will be planted with a staggered row of evergreens. Plus, there's additional landscaping between 20 and 50 feet on the other side of the parking to the building.

On the front side of Woodbury Road, you have 22 feet to the nearest parking stall and the landscaping ranges from 91 to 140 feet back from the street.

The building, as you can see, is kind of an articulated facade, so it provides for layers of landscaping. There's not a long straight line that faces any line, so it has more of a residential feel as you see it from the surrounding with staggered layers of landscaping.

The refuse enclosure is located on the east site about 65 feet from each property line.

We provide two loading spaces as required by Town code. They're really just parking space for

1.3

2.0

delivery trucks. They're about 85 feet from the east property line. With respect to the delivery trucks, it's primarily food service for the food service for the residents. They get one to two deliveries per week. It's a small box truck.

The NB district permits a lot coverage of 60 percent. The proposal here is 24 percent, less than half than what's allowable. As a matter of fact, the gross building area is a little over 73,000 feet. It's much less that you can actually cover for the property -- one-story shopping center or office building.

The development is going to provide
95 parking stalls, 65 will be paved, 30 we're
indicating as land bank parking pursuant to Section
246-7.5.5 of the Town code. The land bank parking
is located on the southeast corner where the
natural wooded area will remain. It meets 100
percent with the dimensional criteria with the
Town. This would be built if the Town felt it was
necessary, but certainly, we feel that the
Benchmark facility does not need that extra amount
of parking.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You said 91 beds?

MR. ROBINSON: Parking spaces.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: No, beds.

MR. ROBINSON: It's 91 units up to 105 beds. There are some companion units, some double units and single studio units.

The lighting on the property is going to be very residential style. We have 44-inch high bollard lights that go around the walkways around the property. The lighting for the park areas themselves are only ten-foot high poles, very similar to the driveway light you have in your house. It's all low intensity LED lighting, fully dark-sky compliant providing a very low level of lighting.

We prepared a photometric plan that was reviewed by Cashin & Spinelli and the Town. We have copies of it if anybody has any questions regarding the photometric, but there's zero spill that would leave the property. It's all self-contained. All the lighting will be turned off by 11:00 p.m. on any given night. Although, there will be some decorative lighting throughout the building, low voltage and exit lighting before the doorway.

The existing -- the property as it is today, as Ms. Simoncic explained, has a small

retail building in the front. That building today is 12.3 feet off the west property line, 19.8 feet off Woodbury Road as compared to the building — the new building will be at its closest point on the west, 35.7 feet and over 91 feet from Woodbury Road. So we are going to pull the buildings away from the property, landscape around the perimeter. It will be a nice setup.

Also included with some of the reduced copies that we handed up are two as-of-right plans. As part of looking at zoning here, the NB zone, Neighborhood Business District, we looked at what other uses could be permitted on this property without any relief and without the special permits from the Board for some requirements like site plan approval and a building, we prepared two plans; AR1 is a -- shows a typical one-story, multi-use office building with an internal bank with a drive-thru, internal restaurant, less than 75 seats. That plan, in a very conservative -- played out to global 46,000 feet, 100 percent required -- meet parking requirements, buffers and landscaping.

The second plan we put together, AR2, which you have in front of you, indicates the potential for a small community shopping center,

1.3

2.0

typical retail stores, about 48,000 feet, a bank with a drive-thru, some inline restaurants and a small second floor office, we call it. Very typical that you see around the town that could also be built on this property, completely as-of-right, only needs site plan review from the Building Department.

I would be happy to go through anything else the Board may have, any questions, drainage, any other items. I will be available for any questions that the community may have.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay. Standby.

MS. SIMONCIC: I just want to make one other note regarding the development.

I had spoken with a couple of the neighbors and this was a question and concern, whether there was any kind of access to Lark Drive. There is absolutely no access to Lark Drive on this development and all the accesses are from Woodbury Road.

Currently, the site has two access points on Woodbury Road and we're consolidating that and making it one. So I just wanted to make that point.

If the Board has no questions of me or

1.3

2.0

Mr. Robinson, I'd like to introduce Wayne Muller, our traffic engineer with RMS Engineering. Wayne has testified before this Board on numerous occasions and I would ask the Board to recognize him as an expert in his field.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: We may or may not disagree with him, but we recognize his competency to testify.

Good to see you, Wayne.

MR. MULLER: Good to see you, too.

Good evening, Mr. Supervisor, Members of Board.

My name is Wayne Muller. I'm with the firm of RMS Engineering. Our offices are at 355 New York Avenue, Huntington, New York.

As previously indicated by Mr. Robinson and Ms. Simoncic, we are proposing to construct a 91-unit, 105-five bed assisted living facility on the subject parcel.

The property is located on the aerial photograph to my right, the Board's left -- for the purposes of our analysis, a site plan and our reports, we have used Woodbury Road to be in an east/west orientation. It kind of runs on an angle. But this is supposed to depict east/west,

even though everyone contradicts that it's
north/south.

In this area, it runs east/west as depicted in the plans, as indicated in the reports that we prepared that we submitted as part of the record. The property is located on the south side of Woodbury Road.

As indicated on the plans prepared by my office, the subject property or the project requires 95 parking spaces and 95 parking spaces are provided on the site, 30 of which we are land banking; meaning, we don't believe or the applicant doesn't believe -- we don't believe, based on other studies that we've done at similar assisted living facilities, that being Sunrise and the Bristal, that all 95 parking spaces are not required for the utilization that we would anticipate; however, in the event that the needs arise and the Town determines, you have to build the 30 spots, we have that option and we would be fully code compliant.

Mr. Robinson is indicating, as shown on the site plan, two loading spaces are required and two loading spaces are provided. Therefore, the quantity of parking and the loading on the property that's configured on the site plan satisfies the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2.4

Town code requirements. We are not seeking a variance for those provisions.

As shown on the plan, we are proposing one single-access driveway to the property essentially located in the middle of the property along Woodbury Road. It will be configured for all entering and exiting movements. You can make a left in, a right in, a left out, right out. Woodbury Road, along the project frontage, two lanes in each direction, that would be the east and west direction with a center left-turn lane to assist vehicles to enter the project. One of the requirements the Town's consultant raised was what would be site distance; meaning, how would cars be able to see when they're exiting the driveway looking east and west on Woodbury Road. The site distance at the subject driveway far exceeds any recommended standards. Woodbury Road is straight and level. You can see through Terrehans Lane to the south and all the way past the expressway to the north.

As Ms. Simoncic indicated and as shown on the site plans, there will be no access from Lark Drive to the property. All accesses will be from Woodbury Road. We are pretty confident that

2.0

2.5

even if we did propose a driveway to Lark Drive, there would be no way that the Town would approve such a driveway. Again, Woodbury Road is where the driveway should be and that's the way we designed it.

We prepared a detailed traffic analysis of the development of the subject property that we are discussing here tonight in accordance with recognized standards and procedures. The methodology employed and the results of the analysis are summarized in our August 2015 report which was previously submitted as part of the record. A review of the analysis that's contained in our report is presented in the Cashin, Spinelli & Ferretti October 8, 2015 Memorandum to the Chief of Commission.

The traffic analysis that we prepared specifically analyzed the peak traffic conditions at the two most impacted intersections along Woodbury Road; that being Lark Drive to the south and Wren Drive to the north, as well as the proposed site driveway under the building condition.

Traffic volume and turning movement counts were obtained at those locations in March of

1.3

2.0

2.6

2015 during the peak hours of traffic; that being the morning commuter peak hour, the afternoon weekday -- excuse me, the p.m. commuter peak hour and the Saturday midday peak hour.

Those would be the time periods in which Woodbury Road and those intersections would experience their highest volumes.

The weekday data was collected on Thursday, March 19, 2015 and the Saturday day was collected on March 21, 2015. The traffic volumes were then synthesized to create peak conditions and what we did is, we analyzed the existing level of service in the way these intersections operate under 2015 conditions throughout the property.

We analyzed two future traffic conditions. The first being the no-build condition. That means future traffic conditions without traffic generated by the subject development. The second scenario would be the build condition that in which the traffic generated by the project would be superimposed onto the no build condition.

In order to obtain a no-build condition, we expanded the existing volumes that we obtained utilizing a growth factor that we obtained

1.3

2.0

from the New York State Department of
Transportation for two years. That would represent
the no-build traffic condition assuming traffic
growth within the study area.

In order to estimate the quantity of traffic that would be generated by the proposed Benchmark facility, we consulted two sources; the first being the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation. I believe the Board is familiar with that. That document has been discussed here many times in the past; although, I haven't discussed it.

The second being data that we obtained from Benchmark themselves at four existing assisted living facilities in Connecticut. The first one being Brookfield Commons which is located in Brookfield, Connecticut. The second is the Village at South Farms in Middletown, Connecticut. The third being Carriage Green in Milford Connecticut and the fourth being Coachman Square at Woodbridge in Woodbridge, Connecticut.

What we found is that utilizing that data and adjusting it, at least, on the square footage of the building because, obviously, that has some bearing on it, that the Institute of

1.3

2.0

2.5

Transportation Engineers Traffic Generation data was higher than what they had observed in Connecticut. Therefore, we used the highest standard for the analysis that we presented here tonight. We then superimposed the traffic generated by the proposed assisted living facility onto the roadway network and then analyzed the no-build and build conditions using the appropriate modeling software. And what we found is that there would be no significant change to the operation of the roadway network upon the introduction of the traffic generated by the assisted living.

In addition, we found that the driveway would operate at acceptable levels of service; meaning, we do not anticipate that there will significant delays for vehicles exiting the property or entering the property.

COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: Just out of curiosity, when you compute the number for the proposed development, is that also amplified in two years -- with the amplification for two years' worth of traffic, the same that you do it when there's a no-build?

MR. MULLER: The traffic generated by the proposal would be static because there are only

29 1 so many units and so many beds and it's based on a 2 per bed ratio, so it's static. It would be, 3 like -- they're not going to add any more beds. Wе 4 know how many beds there were at the other 5 facilities. We know IT rates are computed on a per bed basis, so it's per beds. 6 7 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: When you say 8 there's no change, no change from what? 9 MR. MULLER: From the no-build 10 condition. The no-build -- the worst level of 11 service that we saw was Level C. We maintain that. 12 If it was A, we maintained it. In general, at the 13 study intersections -- and I will pull out the 14 actual levels of service -- if the no-build service 15 was, for instance, a B, the B was maintained. 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When everybody 17 comes to visit their relatives on a Saturday 18 morning, it's going to be a mass --19 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Excuse me. Hold 2.0 on. 21 Excuse me, young fellow, what we are 22 going to do is when they complete their 23 application, anybody in the audience who wants to 24 address the Board can so then. You will have ample 25 opportunity.

1.3

2.0

MR. MULLER: For instance, at the intersection of Woodbury Road and Lark Drive in the morning peak hour, the level of service leaving Lark Drive is C and the no-build is maintained at C. The build condition which is just a minor increase in delay. That will be anticipated.

Similarly, in the afternoon peak hour, the same thing, level of service is C. That's maintained with a small increase in delay and the level of service on Lark Drive gets a little better on Saturday because the volume is lower and that's a B and that's maintained at a B. At the intersection of Woodbury Road and Wren Drive, the level of service leaving Wren Drive is a C in morning. It's maintained at a C. C in the afternoon, maintained at a C and a B on Saturday and maintained as a B.

There's a minor increase in vehicular delay; although, no significant changed in the level of service. We would anticipate there would be some change; however, the change is relatively small based on the fact that the traffic generated by these types uses is also relatively small.

The next step of our analysis indicated that it was essentially an analysis of the -- based

2.0

on our analysis, this important to know, we do not believe that traffic mitigation is required or proposed for the development of the property as an assisted living facility. The volumes that are generated by these facilities are not great enough to warrant any modification to the roadway.

Also, in speaking with Ms. Simoncic, the inquiry was made as to whether or not the traffic signal would be installed as part of this development and our analysis has indicated that no traffic signal will not be installed. We don't believe that it's warranted to be installed; meaning, that there are certain criteria established by the Federal Government to install a traffic signal and those are based on the volume of traffic both on the main street, Woodbury Road and that it would come out of the side street that being the driveway to the assisted living facility. We do not meet any of those criteria; therefore, we are not proposing to install a traffic signal.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: What is the traffic criteria? I'm sorry.

MR. MULLER: There is specific criteria set forth in the manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

32 1 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Can you give me a 2 thumbnail on it? 3 MR. MULLER: Absolutely. 4 Let's say, on Woodbury Road, the major 5 street volume would have to be in the magnitude of 420 vehicles an hour in both directions. Woodbury 6 7 Road easily satisfies that one piece of criteria; 8 however, the second piece would be that we would need to have 140 vehicles on the side street, that 9 10 being Lark Drive, Wren Drive or the subject 11 property's driveway and we are nowhere near that 12 criteria. 13 COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: Sorry. 14 What about the proximity of Manetto 15 Hill Road to the access point on there? That isn't 16 close enough to factor in for a traffic light? 17 MR. MULLER: No. 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, it is. 19 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Everybody will 20 get a chance. 21 COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: I'm asking by the 22 standards. 23 MR. MULLER: If you look at the aerial 24 to my right, we are a few hundred feet from the 25 either Lark Drive or Wren Drive. We essentially

2.0

tried to put the driveway in the middle of the property. We believe, in accordance with the recognized standards, that driveway is far enough not to warrant the installation of the signal.

COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: I don't mean to put you on the spot. This might be a better question for Ms. Simoncic.

Do you think the applicant would be opposed to putting a traffic light there if that was something that would make the community feel a little more comfortable?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, we don't want the traffic light. We don't want the building.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and gentlemen, please. Everyone will get a full -- we will stay here all night. Everyone will get a full and fair opportunity to be heard.

COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: I'm intimately familiar with the area because it's the entrance to my neighborhood. I traverse it twice a day.

MR. MULLER: The installation of the traffic signal, putting the Federal criteria aside, would be determined based on the approval of the Nassau County Department of Public Works because

Woodbury is a County road.

We would have no problem going to the County and discussing the installation of a traffic signal with them. And, obviously, the final determination, whether we believe that it doesn't satisfy, there might be other factors that we're not seeing based on the analysis that we've seen or we would have no problem going to the County and discussing that with them.

In fact, if this development were to move forward, by law, we would be required to go to the County under the 239 NF, so we would definitely discuss that with them and report back to the Town.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Let me stop you at that point.

I believe the stenographer is -- you want to make the switch?

(Time noted: 9:04 p.m.)

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were reported by Stenographer Julia Giannakopoulos:)

21 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and

gentlemen, we will continue.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you put the tripod on the first deck, please? We can't see it. On the first deck.

2.0

Thank you. Much better.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay, so continue.

MR. MULLER: Just to briefly discuss a little bit more the manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices criteria, there are actually eight different warrants that could be satisfied to warrant the installation of a traffic signal.

The first two are based on the minimum volumes which are based on eight-hour volume, which I don't believe that we would satisfy. Second warrants for four-hour volumes. We don't meet or satisfy those. And then there's a peak-hour warrant. So if, say, a facility had extremely high peak hour, that would satisfy it. That could be used to satisfy the warrant, but we don't meet that warrant. And there's a minimum pedestrian volume which we in no way, shape or form meet. And there's one regarding a school crossing which are located at the facility, which we don't have in this instance.

As part of the coordinated traffic signal system, there's a signal to the south at Terrehans Lane, and there's one all the way to the north of Manetto Hill Road, we don't satisfy that. They are too far apart, those two traffic signals.

36 1 And then there's one called the roadway network 2 which is kind of a catch-all. We don't necessarily 3 satisfy that, but, again, talking with the applicant, we would have no problem going to the 4 5 County and discussing installation of a signal in this area with them provided they would agree that 6 7 the warrants would be satisfied. 8 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You'll let us know the results of that discussion with the County 9 10 when they first become available because that 11 impacts on our decision? 12 MR. MULLER: Okay, we'll do that. 13 We'll get a meeting set up as soon as 14 we can with Mr. Wenberger, Mr. Nimmo, and then go 15 meet with them, find out what they would want us to 16 use on the project. 17 COUNCILMAN PINTO: With regards to 18 access, going into the location, did you ever think 19 about -- do you have a turning lane, by any chance, 20 going in and out? 21 MR. MULLER: Yes, there is. It's on an 22 aerial. 23 COUNCILMAN PINTO: If there's one, 24 that's fine. I just wanted to find out.

MR. MULLER: Yes, there's a left-turn

37 1 lane on Woodbury Road, that would allow cars to 2 make a left in. We are not proposing --3 COUNCILMAN PINTO: I'm talking about going along Woodbury Road, to make that right turn 4 5 lane, you can put a turning lane in --UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not showing 6 7 on the map. 8 MR. MULLER: We don't have one shown. We don't believe we need one because we have like 9 10 an intersection or a radius-type driveway shown. 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Isn't there one 12 now, by the way? 13 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and 14 gentlemen, please let --15 COUNCILMAN PINTO: My question was, if 16 we could put a turning lane, that might soften 17 traffic going in and out. 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's already 19 one there, there's a turning lane. 2.0 COUNCILMAN PINTO: So the answer is you 21 don't have one? 22 MR. MULLER: We do not have one 23 depicted on the plan; however, speaking with my 24 partner, Chris, we could easily provide a small 25 deceleration lane to get into the property.

There's a left-turn lane on Woodbury Road to come in, so that would satisfy -- that we can easily do that.

COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: I understand what the Councilman is saying, we would like to see one making a right-hand turn in if the traffic is slow on Woodbury Road.

MR. MULLER: Sure, we could do that.

COUNCILMAN PINTO: To get off the main road, you really just turn -- have a turning lane just for that complex.

MR. MULLER: We can definitely incorporate that into our plan. Again, when we meet with the County, because, again, it's a County road, we'll discuss with them the right-turn lane in and possibility of a signal along the frontage.

In addition, as discussed by

Mr. Robinson, we created two plans depicting

development of the property in accordance with the

existing neighborhood business, or NB, zoning.

Those plans are shown on my right, I believe they

went to the Board previously this evening, and what

they show is we prepared essentially two different

scenarios. And the first one we call the -- just

bear with me for one second -- the multiuse

39 1 building scenario. 2 Under that scenario, we were able to 3 determine that a building, one building containing 4 41,500 square feet of medical office, a 5 3,000-square-foot bank and a 75-seat restaurant could be constructed within the NB zoning 6 7 without any relief from the Board. 8 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Are these the plans that Mr. Robinson referred to? 9 10 MR. MULLER: Yes. 11 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I was going to 12 wait until you completed. I don't believe we have 1.3 those plans. I don't know what happened, but I 14 don't think any of the Board members have those 15 alternate proposed development plans. 16 MR. ROBINSON: I have full size of each which we'll hand in as exhibits. 17 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You don't have 18 19 one, a desktop size? 2.0 MR. ROBINSON: We have one of each 21 (handing). 22 MR. MULLER: For the record, what we 23 are submitting is one copy of we call the 24 as-of-right plan for the multiuse building, and in 25 the plaque is an 8 and a half by 11 with all the

2.0

numbers blown up because as we get older, it gets difficult for us to read.

COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: Mr. Robinson referred to them as AR1 and AR2?

MR. MULLER: And AR2, correct. And the second one is AR2 which is the multiuse retail building with, again, 8 and a half by 11 on the back, and then one additional set of AR1 and AR2 without the handouts.

would you know the residents that would residence there that probably wouldn't be driving, but at least have vehicles, if could you tell us how many employees there would be there or what you are basing your numbers on for in terms of whose cars will they be and how many?

MR. MULLER: During the maximum shift, which is between 7:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., there's a maximum of 26 employees that will be on the site, and the peak hour traffic generation at these types of facilities, believe it or not, is probably made up of employees.

There are not that many visitors that come to these facilities. That's just kind of the way it is. You know, the traffic generation is

41 1 based on employees. So during the maximum shift, 2 there will be 26 employees. The next shift would 3 have 10 to 12, and then 4 to 6 in the overnight. 4 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: On what basis do 5 you say no visitors will come to visit the facility? 6 7 MR. MULLER: I'm not saying no 8 visitors, but it's not that every unit has a 9 visitor come all at the same time every day. 10 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: On what basis do 11 you say that? Are there studies at other 12 facilities? MR. MULLER: Yes, the studies that were 1.3 14 taken by Benchmark's other consultant in 15 Connecticut jive extremely well with the Institute 16 of Transportation Engineers data and also data that we've collected or had collected at the Bristal in 17 18 North Hills, which is a very similar facility to 19 this, but much larger. 2.0 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I would like to 21 think that people in the Town of Oyster Bay, 22 generally, have more heart that --23 COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: You've mentioned 24 the Bristal in North Hills. I've been in that 25 parking lot quite a few times. Very crowded and

it's not enough spaces there. Your studies might say something, but I go there a lot for business, and I see it packed quite a bit.

MR. MULLER: You are absolutely correct, but the thing is, is that for a comparative purpose -- I'm just trying to find my data, just bear with me.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I think part of the problem we are having, I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but, basically, it seems to be you are trying to convince the Board that this has virtually no impact. I mean, it has to have some impact.

MS. SIMONCIC: It's generally accepted that assisted living facilities are a benign use, they don't generate lot of traffic. And with respect to comparing this to the Bristal in North Hills, this particular facility is anticipated to have an average age of residents of 87 years of age.

Bristal do have younger residents and, unfortunately, it is sad, but people do not come to visit these older residents, and that has been the experience of Benchmark at other facilities that do service, you know, elderly, more elderly residents.

43 1 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: All right. 2 Thank you. 3 MR. MULLER: Just to go back to the 4 Bristal in North Hills, that's a much larger 5 facility than this one, it's 170 units. And you are right, that parking field, when we observed it, 6 7 was full; however, the ratio of the number of cars 8 parked per unit was around 0.46. So if we would 9 apply that to this facility, we would come up with 10 a number of vehicles parked of roughly around 11 40-something which makes sense, well below what the 12 Code would require and well below of what we are 13 providing on the property. 14 COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: How many 15 spaces are on your plan? 16 MR. MULLER: 65 paved and 30 land bank. 17 COUNCILMAN PINTO: Does that take into 18 consideration the workers? You said there's 26 19 workers at a time. 2.0 MR. MULLER: Yes. 21 COUNCILMAN PINTO: So 46 spaces with 22 the workers? 23 MR. MULLER: Yes. So the workers would 24 be there, assumably, in one per vehicle, if you 25 wanted to take the worst-case scenario, that some

2.0

could come by carpool, be dropped off, or mass transit. They could, I'm not saying that they would be. So if we were to assume the worst-case scenario, that we would have 26 cars parked there per employee, right?

So that would still leave 65 minus 26 for visitors, but based on studies that we've done at Sunrise at Huntington, the Seasons at East Northport, which is, again, that's another Bristal facility, similar in size to this, that the parking ratios are less than 0.5 per unit. So these numbers that we are proposing tonight, with 65, hey, are more than adequate to satisfy the anticipated demand during the weekday and on a Saturday.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: All right.

We understand your position.

MR. MULLER: Again, just to briefly discuss the two as-of-right plans, plan AR1, which is the multiuse building containing various different uses, that would be, again, 41,500 square feet of medical office, 3,000-square-foot bank and 75-seat restaurant, at the site driveways during the morning peak hour, a total of 170 vehicles would be anticipated using the ITE statistics to

2.0

generate the traffic by those uses.

In comparison, the assisted living will generate 24 vehicles. So the impact of the multiuse building for the morning commuter hour would be significantly greater. In the afternoon commuter hour, the multiuse building would generate a total of 252 vehicles versus 38 for the assisted living, and on a Saturday afternoon, the multiuse building would generate 270, versus, again, 37 for the assisted living. So, just looking at that ones as-of-right scenario, the assisted living is roughly about eight times less than what could be built there without any relief from the Board.

If you went to the second scenario, which is plan AR2, which is, again, the community shopping center, we would look at 27,500 square feet of strip retail, 3,000-square-foot bank and the 75-seat restaurant and the second story consisting of 14,600 square feet of medical office.

Again, running through the same type of comparison that I just did, in the morning a total of a 132 vehicles would be generated versus 24 for the assist living; 258 in the afternoon versus 38 for the assisted living; and 305 on a Saturday afternoon versus 37 for the assisted living. So

46 1 just for a comparative purpose, the assist living 2 that we are proposing tonight generates a 3 significantly lesser quantity of traffic. 4 COUNCILMAN PINTO: I don't understand 5 this parking ratio. You said it's 0.46, a number of parking space spaces per unit, it's 91 units, 6 7 right, and that takes you to roughly 43, 44 spaces? 8 MR. MULLER: Correct. 9 COUNCILMAN PINTO: And then you have to 10 add the 26 --11 MR. MULLER: Correct, but the numbers 12 of space that is we observe, say -- and I found the 13 data, it was right in front of me -- at the Bristal 14 in North Hills, during weekday we found that the 15 maximum number of vehicles parked per bed was 0.44 16 during the weekday peak hour, 0.46 on Saturday and 17 0.44 on Sunday. That's total, that's everybody 18 that was parked there at any given time. 19 COUNCILMAN PINTO: That's including the 20 employees? 21 MR. MULLER: Everybody. 22 COUNCILMAN PINTO: That's not on top of 23 it? 24 MR. MULLER: No, no, no. 25 So, again, if we were to looking to,

2.0

say, put 105 beds, it's roughly 48 total vehicles parked, staff, visitors, trucks, whatever came during that time frame that we analyzed. And just going through the various different other facilities that we looked at, we looked at Sunrise in Dix Hills, this is a comparative purpose, the maximum that we saw there was the Saturday peak hour, 0.43, again, very close to the 0.46, and the Bristal at East Northport, we saw a maximum 0.5 on a Friday at 2:00, again, very close to what we are anticipating here, far below of what is provided by Code, and then the Bristal at North Hills which we just discussed, so all these different facilities which are located in different areas of Long Island have a similar parking generation characteristics.

And again, the 65 spaces that we are proposing here before the Board paved we believe will more than satisfy demand. Again, but if there was a situation that arose where the Town did not believe that those 65 were adequate, we have 30 additional to satisfy the Code, which we would then pave.

Again, it's my opinion that based on the traffic generated by the facility, which we believe is much lower than what we could put there

2.0

in accordance with the neighborhood business, that the traffic generated by this project will not significantly increase any vehicular or pedestrian safety or have an impact on that, and that's primarily due to the fact that the traffic generation based on this type of facility is extremely low.

We would consider this to be a very low generator of traffic, and it fits well within this area because, in fact, it is a low generator. You have the uses that could generate a significantly larger quantity of traffic, and then we would have to analyze those impacts, but, in my professional opinion, those impacts would be significantly greater.

Again, based on the analysis that we prepared, no mitigation off site is required as a result of the analyses that we prepared; however, during the course of the process, we will set up a meeting with the County and discuss signalization along the frontage, the installation of a turning lane for vehicles traveling which we would say, in the -- I guess the easterly direction -- it's kind of confusing -- to make a pretty smooth move into the facility and don't have to slow down traffic on

Woodbury Road.

2.0

Based, therefore, on all the analyses that we performed, it is my professional opinion that the granting of the special permit will not create any significant traffic congestion or hazard traffic, and that the project should be approved by the Board based on the fact that it is a fairly favorable use compared to other uses that could be put there as a course of right or as of right.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thank you.

MS. SIMONCIC: At this time, I would like to call John Breslin of Breslin Realty to address the Board. Mr. Breslin has appeared before this Board on numerous occasions.

MR. MULLER: I'm sorry, just one final thing.

I would just like to submit the copies of the two tables that we prepared, A and B, and these represent the traffic generation numbers that were cited before based on the two alternate development plans (handing).

Thank you.

MS. SIMONCIC: I was just indicating that Mr. Breslin has testified before this Board as a real estate expert, and I would ask the Board if

1.3

2.0

they still recognize him.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: With that stipulation, Mr. Breslin has been previously made -- MR. BRESLIN: Good evening.

My name is John Breslin. I'm the principal of Breslin & Breslin Appraisal Company in Huntington, the office address is 44 Elm Street.

I haven't been here for a while. Nice to see you all again. Some new faces since the last time I was here.

The proposal for an assisted living facility is another step in providing housing for elderly citizens. This Board has been -- your predecessors had been, you know, the leading proponents of taking care of senior housing. I remember being at this podium and other venues with respect to applications for senior housing over the last twenty years when this Board has granted different types of applications for senior housing and this room was already crowded with people. It provided necessary housing for our seniors.

The population continues to the age, and the next step in the process is this type of housing, assisted living. It's something essential, there's a tremendous need for it, both

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

51

in the Town of Oyster Bay, as well as Long Island in general.

This type of use is in many Zoning districts a residential use. Oyster Bay Zoning District is a little bit more stringent, so of the other communities on Long Island, you need a special permit if your business is in industrial districts. Special permit clearly is something that's contemplated by the Zoning districts. You have to meet the certain criteria, but it's in a business and in industrial district that you require to be a special permit; however, it is clearly a residential use which makes it, I think, compatible with surrounding residential uses, and in this particular case, I think, it provides a tremendous transition from the traffic of Woodbury Road, the intense commercial utilization of Woodbury Road and the expressway across the street and the surround residential community that's behind it on Lark Drive.

Lark Drive is a nice residential community, a pocket of residential community surrounded by major highways, very well-maintained homes, and you have this pocket of commercial property in front of it along Woodbury Road.

2.0

This development gives you the opportunity to provide that transition of residential use in the commercial zone as opposed to the as-of-right plans that Mr. Robinson provided that are far more intense and could have significantly greater impacts on those surrounding residential communities that we are abutting. The scope and the intensity of those developments, I think is slightly grossed over, but we are talking about roughly 50,000 square feet of commercial development as opposed to a residential structure.

Mr. Robinson eluded to Sunrise that exists on in Plainview on Old Country Road, and I happened to take a picture of that facility and I would like to hand that up, as you look at it from Old Country Road, and I think that's an example of one right in the Town here nearby where the assisted living facility on the road similar; although, not as busy like this particular location, blends in very nicely and provides that transition as well like I believe Benchmark will in this facility, and it is a residential appearing structure similar to what's proposed by the Benchmark, two stories in height, very, very similar in size to what's contemplated here, but I

2.0

would like to hand that up (handing).

As indicated, the property we are proposing on the 3.76-acres, a 91-unit, 105-bed assisted living facility, it does require a special permit from the Board. One of the exhibits is the aerial that's before you, it shows the pocket, it shows the unique nature of this particular property and the development that surrounds it and the nature of the highway system that completely dominates the Expressway, the Northern State, the Seaford-Oyster Bay Expressway that bound the perimeter of this little pocket of the subject property and the residential homes that surround it.

When you look at this and you decide on the special permit criteria, there's certain things and criteria you must look at to see whether or not this is going to have an adverse impact on real property values and the pattern of development and a character of the community.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Mr. Breslin, sorry to interrupt you, but how many units are at Sunrise Plainview?

MR. BRESLIN: I think it was 78 or something like that, if I remember correctly.

1.3

2.0

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay. We could check. I just thought you might know.

MR. BRESLIN: I think it's a smaller site than what we have here, but it's very similar.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I got it.

MR. BRESLIN: When you compare this contemplated use from an intensity point of view compared to what can be built as of right, clearly under the special permit criteria, this is certainly far less intense.

The coverage, as Mr. Robinson indicated, is only 24 percent as opposed to something that will be and is allowed as 60 percent range. It's only 24 percent. There will be over two acres of landscaped area. One of the criteria is the buffering and landscaping of the site as compared to what could be on the site in connection with the zoning. Clearly, this proposal meets those criteria and, in fact, exceeds them.

One of the other criteria you look at is whether it would be environmental conditions, and I think the report by Mr. Cashin's office clearly shows that this is a very significant positive from an environmental point of view redevelopment of this property as compared also to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

55

the as-of-right. Also, the site, there was an environmental issue with respect to the dry cleaner. As a result of this redevelopment, this is getting cleaned up. The height and bulk, as contemplated by the Zoning ordnance, this particular development is a two-story structure, residential in appearance. The setbacks of the structure, as Mr. Robinson indicated, are significant from the nearby community. Again, far greater than what's permitted as of right. buffer is significant. Again, far greater than what would be permitted as of right. All those, when you analyze them under the special permit criteria, are significantly better than what one could have, again, making it a positive situation under the special permit criteria.

One of the other things is looking at it from the intensity point of view. The intensity is measured different ways. One is traffic.

Mr. Muller went over that. Other is the nature of the look and the amount of people that would go to the site. Again, it's residential in appearance compared to a commercial utilization of the site.

It's very important as it relates to the residential community behind it. Again, this is

1.3

2.0

2.5

significantly better, what we are contemplating on the site.

Lastly, if you look at it
aesthetically, the current configuration of the
site, the redevelopment of it would be a
significant improvement of the physical
characteristics that exists on the property today.
The redevelopment, as shown on the renderings,
would be a significant improvement of a look along
Woodbury Road, all for the commercial look along
Woodbury Road as well as for residential properties
that exist behind it.

I believe it is an appropriate land use for a road such as Woodbury Road, and it does provide that necessary transition between the busy street and a residential community. It provides the necessary service for the residents of the Town of Oyster Bay as well as the community at large. It's a land use that's necessary for the residents in the Town. The community, it's ideally suited for a busy street like this. It's a site that appears to meet all four provisions of your Zoning ordinance and the special permit criteria.

So, in conclusion, it is my opinion by granting this relief, and this is based upon

25

57 1 studies that my firm has done throughout the years 2 and measuring these assisted living facilities 3 mostly in residential areas, that by granting this to allow, it's not going to have any adverse impact 4 5 on the surrounding property values, it's consistent with a pattern of development as one would expect 6 7 having this use on a busy street and the residential use behind it. 8 9 It's not going to prevent the use of 10 the surrounding real properties both residentially 11 and/or commercially in this immediate vicinity 12 immediate vicinity. It fits well, and municipal 13 services are available to this property. 14 With that, I can answer any questions. 15 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thank you, 16 Mr. Breslin. 17 MR. BRESLIN: Thank you very much. 18 MS. SIMONCIC: Unless the Board has any 19 questions, at this time, that will conclude our 2.0 presentation. I know there are some neighbors here 21 that who would like to speak. 22 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: We have a number 23 of residents who want to address the Board relative

to this matter, so would you stand by in the event

residents have any questions and you to reply?

58 1 MS. SIMONCIC: Okay. 2 Thank you. 3 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: John Russell. 4 John, where are you? Come on up. 5 John, let me just, before you start, are there any residents out there who want to 6 7 address the Board relative to this matter who have 8 not filled out a speaker form? 9 If that, come on up and kind of quietly 10 go up to the side. 11 MR. RUSSELL: If I may. 12 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Sure. 1.3 MR. RUSSELL: Good evening. 14 Thank you for your time. 15 First off, it sounds to me in the last 16 few minutes that we are being forced that, A, a 17 nursing home, if they are calling it a health care 18 facility, which to me is a nursing home, 19 considering you have a 95-bed unit, up to a 105 2.0 residents, to me is a nursing home, call it what 21 you want. If you don't like nursing home, A, you 22 have a choice of AR1 and AR2, which, according to 23 the registered letters that they have sent me, is 24 not on this document, is not even discussed. 25 That's one.

The average age is going to be 85 years old, is what we were told earlier, of the residents. You have 26 nurses. Now, of the average age, they are going to have 95 parking spaces. Of that number, roughly, you have 60 -- no offense to anybody, it's older that I -- you have 60 residents 85-plus or in the 85-range driving around through the neighborhood, number one.

Two, the second floor is supposed to be for a memory handicapped people. As they pointed out -- if I may use their map.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Of course.

MR. RUSSELL: As they pointed out, we are in a heavy highway area. First off, when we moved there, Seaford-Oyster Bay did not exist.

There's the Long Island Expressway, yes, and there's the Northern State. If you have, and you know as well as I, residents that are memory impaired, they do get out. It's unfortunate, but they do get out of these facilities.

In the proximity of highways,

Seaford-Oyster Bay, Manetto Hill Road, and Woodbury

Road, you are going to have a very serious problem

with a potential of somebody seriously getting

hurt.

2.0

As far as the diagram of the building, they told us that we have a nice -- can I use their diagram again?

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Absolutely.

MR. RUSSELL: They show you a nice residential roofline and so long and so forth.

According to the other plan, which is this one, that picture you see here would be fair to say is Manetto Hill Road. Subsequently, the rooftop would be used for mechanical equipment, exhausts from kitchens, air conditioning, generators, medical facility oxygen, so long and so forth, which means they are going to be spewing out on top of us.

Also, left out of this drawing and that one here as well is where are they going to put the giant emergency generators that would have to be installed for this facility which has to be run, I believe, on a monthly basis, and those puppies are not small. They come in on special-use tractor-trailers. That's how large they are. The nursing facility over here just opposite the golf course has five of these puppies.

As far as safety, they mentioned the traffic, no hinderance and so long and so forth.

1.3

2.0

We are concerned, or I am anyway, which has increased in the last few years, people bypassing the traffic light, which they pointed out, on Manetto Hill Road and Woodbury Road. They are now in the process of cutting through, going up Lark, Wren and so long and so forth to bypass that traffic light as well as the evening to bypass the traffic light on Manetto Hill Road.

We are going to have increased volume of traffic there, not only from people getting into the facility, but people coming to see them due to the fact that they come off the LIE onto Manetto Hill Road. The first street is Canterbury Road; from Canterbury Road, up Lark, and into the facility.

We have a growing population of new people moving in with children. Potentially, there's an area to look for a disaster. People exceeding speed limits going through an area as it is, including some of my neighbors, but we have young children there.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: They just admitted they do.

MR. RUSSELL: I'm not pointing any fingers. I might be one of them a time or two

myself.

Overall, I don't think it's a good idea due to the fact it's a glorified nursing home.

That doesn't include any of the incidents going in and out basically you could almost 24 hours a day.

'Cause if you have senior citizens 85-plus, some of those are going to be taken away to hospitals, both for outpatient care or rehab or whatever the case might be, so you'll have these corporations or companies that take these patients in and out of the ambulettes, they go back and forth. Who is to say they are not going to come in off of Manetto Hill Road from Plainview, up Lark, Wren, and then get in, off of Woodbury Road?

The traffic light situation, there's one just south of the Seaford-Oyster Bay and there's one at the corner of Lark and -- Manetto Hill Road and Woodbury Road. People are already circumventing that one. So if you put a health care facility in there, forget about it.

You would go to any of the nursing facilities or assisted living facilities around here, as I believe you stated, try get a parking spot. If you have a total of 91 -- up to 105 patients, you got a staff of 26 people, that's like

6.3

1-to-4 ratio. That doesn't include doctors coming in, presumably, 'cause they are not there all the time. How many -- kitchen, dining room facility people, maintenance people, health care people, deliveries, how many people does that incorporate? This area is not the zoning for something of such as this use. And then to come up with AR1 and AR2 is like you take this one or we'll give you two or three. We've already been down this road once before, and we'll argue on this one again if we have to.

I thank you.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I think, as Mr.

Breslin said, the Town of Oyster Bay has been at
the forefront of appropriate housing for our senior
citizens. We can debate all day long whether or
not this is a residence in the sense of common
jargon, if you will.

Again, it has earmarks of -- you know, sometimes like hospital or, you know, institutional setting. We understand all of that. We are very, very mindful of all of the potential for traffic problems, but one thing that the applicant did very well, they certainly got the message through to you as to what the purpose of AR1 and AR2 is.

64 1 MR. RUSSELL: Yes, either you take the 2 A or we give you B or C. 3 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay, have a nice night. 4 5 MR. RUSSELL: Thank you very much. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Chris Miciagno. 6 7 Welcome, Chris. 8 MR. MICIAGNO: Thank you. 9 My name is Chris Miciagno. Ι'm 10 actually an internal medicine physician, so I have 11 some insight to some of the assisted living 12 facilities, and I have patients that I have filled 13 out applications for and prepared them and prepared 14 their families to go to. So it sounds like the 15 facility -- sounds like the Benchmark people have a 16 very nice set up for what they have to do, but I 17 just don't know if it's the right space. They are 18 very qualified to build the place, but I don't know 19 if they can do it here. 2.0 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: What do you mean 21 when you say not the right space, what do you mean, 22 not the right location? 23 MR. MICIAGNO: The location, yes, the 24 location. And I think there's a couple of things 25 that makes this, even compared to what they were

2.0

speaking in regards to the other facility that they've compared it to, sounds like the average age in this place is higher than some of the other facilities. They said 87 is the average age.

That's significant compared to some other facilities.

Most of those patients, which I call them patients, that's what they are, they are going to require more care than probably the other facilities. If you are in your 80s, you are going to have more physical therapists visiting, more visiting nurses, more home health aides. You may have more higher traffic than the 0.45 cars per a resident that will be there during the day. So even if you went with those numbers, 0.45, 45 spots, you have people coming in and out, plus or minus deliveries, plus probably a higher amount of ambulances, and you are going to feel a lot of traffic in and out of there.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Are there typically a lot of social programs there, too, as well, bringing people from off campus or is it all done in-house or --

MR. MICIAGNO: Yes, that's probably how you would get some -- I mean, a lot of these are

2.0

just residents, but a lot of times then there would be an invitation for some family members to come visit, so that will bring a little more traffic, a little more parking spots that need to be taken up.

I think in the proposal that's up there, now it goes up to 65 spots which goes right down the back of the residents on Wren Drive, which I think you probably would fill, just based on things they are saying now.

And then that extra, to make that 90-- 95 spots, that would probably clean up the last wooded area and it will go right up against the rest of the homes.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: There are 65 and 30 that are land bank.

MR. MICIAGNO: Yes, so the land bank ones that probably will be used very soon, and that means that nice wooded area is not going to be there. Like I said, it can fill up pretty quickly. Especially some of the things you mentioned, like some of the places, they are very crowded when you try to get in there. And I'm very mindful of our health workers who are very considerate about families and residents, but I think there may be a higher than normal traffic at this area due to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

67

age of the population that will be living there.

They need more transports back and forth to the hospital, which they can be discreet about, but that's also, if there's an ambulance coming, that's going to stop everything. That's going to stop traffic moving on and off of Woodbury Road, that will stop cars getting out the parking lot.

There's only one way out of that parking lot. It goes right down the one side.

Also, there is a big problem John brought up about the by-traffic that's coming through the residences. I have two small children. There is a lot of new families, and there's an increase in people bypassing Woodbury Road, Manetto Hill Road light and Canterbury, they go through our neighborhood. I even see people coming. I try to move my car a little towards the center so they would slow down, okay? But I can see that very easily, convenience-wise, people are going to make a right turn out of there, go past right down Wren, right out towards the Northern State, and they cut through our community. And it's not just these are regular roads. These are people's homes with children out there who are playing in the streets. So it's different than having in the middle of the

area where there's just big highways. There's actually small streets where the kids play, a lot of kids play.

And I'm not sure about all the traffic.

I know the number of cars that they were quoting,
that were coming through these areas, but in the
mornings, a lot of this is school buses. The
school buses are going to come right through there.
All the school buses go right down Woodbury Road
right to Baylis which is right down the street, and
that's the closest elementary school, and there's
cars coming right off Northern State down the
Terrehans Lane that can come onto Woodbury. That's
a lot of congestion in that area in the morning.

Like I said, I don't know if the turning lane would really help because people come down Terrehans Road, and they are going to come right into there, and if they are going to slow down for a turning lane, it's going to even back up into that road. Traffic light, although I like that more safely, I think that may slow things down more. I don't think the site is really perfect for this.

I guess, in general, that's -- one other thing. I looked at a lot of these plans, and

2.0

I looked at the lighting, and a lot of the lighting would be -- the fence would be 7 foot, the lighting would be 10 foot. Right now they are going to come probably back -- can I point on this?

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Sure. Show us which plan you are using.

MR. MICIAGNO: This plan (indicating).

right about every few feet to right about here (indicating). Right now they come right to about right here, right to my house, and they take up about 3 feet above the fence, which I saw the lamps' structures, they don't really seem to be reflecting towards the inside, towards the facility, they are just basic standard lamps, so that light will be shining into our homes, into our backyards.

And even some of the lighting from the building, on the building itself, there's lights that are coming towards the parking lot, those are also pointing right into our backyards. I know they are the same on this side lighting up a little park and this area (indicating). So I think some of the lighting things might not be as correct as -- I guess they could be fixed, but then the way

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

70

they are designed now, they are not designed that way.

And the last thing I think is the dementia unit is I think a little unusual, but those patients --

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: In what regard? MR. MICIAGNO: Most of patients I have that go to assisted living are capable of doing a lot of things themselves, but they do need simple They may need someone to check on their medicine, maybe they need help with just getting changed or someone to help them with groceries, just simple things. Having a dementia unit here, you are having people that are going to be there like all the time. Granted, they are not going to drive cars and they are not going to take up parking spots, but they do require a lot more care, a lot more intense care that needs to be done, so I think -- especially there will be a need for more people to come visit, like they'll need more physicians to come in, more providers, more dentistry. Those people, I don't think are in those 24 people, in case 24 people are running the whole place including the physicians coming in. And then also there are like home care people or

71 1 physical therapists that may come in, visiting 2 nurses, all these assisted people that are going to 3 come in and out of that place, it's going to be a lot. I think it's a lot more than 65 spots or even 4 5 90 spots will be taken up. And unfortunately, that's probably 6 7 going to come down to people parking in our 8 neighborhood down Wren, down Lark, so they can just 9 get spots so they can work for a few hours and 10 leave. And I understand that's -- this is a lesser 11 evil. It's a very good thing, and I agree 100 12 percent that we need more housing for elderly, and 13 they need to be taken care of, but this might not 14 be the place for this site. 15 It's a beautiful site, but not in this 16 location. Beautiful plan, but not in this 17 location, and I quess that's probably it. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: 18 Great. 19 We'll make a switch. 2.0 (Time noted: 9:50 p.m.) 21 (Whereupon, the following proceedings 22 were reported by Stenographer Yvonne Angeles:) 23 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Hank Garber. 24 MR. GARBER: The troublemaker is here. 25 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You better have

72 1 something good to say. 2 MR. GARBER: John, you've know me a 3 long time. 4 Have I never had anything good to say? 5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I'm kidding. I'm kidding. 6 7 MR. GARBER: First off, thank you all 8 for acquiescing and scheduling this for this 9 evening. We all appreciate it. 10 As you can see --11 (Applause.) 12 MR. GARBER: As you can see, it was not 13 going to be five or ten people showing up to 14 express our displeasure on what was thrust upon us. 15 By accident, two weeks ago -- Counselor, I hate to 16 tell you this, but your dog and pony show didn't do 17 a damn thing --18 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Hank, be a good 19 boy. 2.0 MR. GARBER: -- anything that's 21 proposed here. 22 Yes, it's beautiful and none of us, 23 none of us had any objection to providing care for 24 those of us that are starting to age as well as 25 those of us who may be fortunate enough to still

2.0

have parents who are in such a facility.

My mother-in-law is in one and I understand the need for it. Certainly, when I write the check every month. The issue is when you refer continually to our development as this pocket of homes or that residential neighborhood, this is where we live and when you belittle the impact on traffic, environment, noise, safety, that troubles me and I think I'm speaking on behalf of many people including, hopefully, many of you on the Board.

mentioned, but comparing us to either Old Country
Road, the Long Island Expressway or places in parts
of Connecticut that most of us have never heard of
is ludicrous. You failed abysmally in not reaching
out to us in the earlier stages of this plan.

What did we think about this? Did we have any input that maybe we can offer that might have helped make this a little bit easier of a pill to swallow?

The traffic is bad enough. Years ago,

I remember Cerro -- the traffic cutting down Wren

Drive. I used to have to stand at night and over

the Summer with either a baseball bat or a broom

1.3

2.0

stick threatening cars from driving down there at high speeds because our kids were all young at the time and this is where they played. They wanted to get together. This is not a new problem.

Having this, potentially can make it even worse. The increased volume of traffic in the community, more people avoiding -- makes it worse. Putting a turn signal in front of this facility is the worst possible thing that can be done. Between the two lanes in each direction, there's a buffer that has the striped lines that most people used to use it to turn into the dry cleaner or the deli or the corsetier shop. So it's all there for an adequate turning lane. Put a right-turn lane in there, it's going to make things worse.

From an environmental standpoint, the noise level will increase. There is no way you can tell us it won't. It's bad enough now between being sandwiched between the Long Island Expressway and the Seaford-Oyster Bay. This will only make it worse. If you could put up 20-foot poles that blare white noise throughout the community, maybe we have, you know, a little bit of a smile on our faces, but that's not going to happen. The buses that come there with the schools. This also a

potential added volume when you add to it.

Granted, when it comes to assisted living facilities, the visitation schedules vary. But quite often, the parking lots are overflowing. I have heard nothing mentioned whatsoever as to how long this project will take to construct. Where the construction vehicles, the contractors, the workers, where are they going to park until there is sufficient and adequate space for their cars to be parked. They're going to be parking on Lark and on Wren and possibly Sparrow Street, that hasn't been mentioned.

We are a community of approximately 80 homes. We take great pride in our community. Most of us try and do the best we can. I understand, again, that an assisted living facility is necessary. There are many other open spaces within the Town of Oyster Bay that I think are much better served than forcing something like that this that can potentially can be a nightmare. I have spoken to real estate agents, contrary to what Mr. Breslin was saying and I was told, in all probability, the value, selling prices will go down. They are first coming back from the last ten years. This was told to me by someone who has been selling real estate

2.0

in the Plainview Syosset area for over 25 years.

So I think she has good pulse on what people do and don't want.

We tried to sell our house several years ago. We had a couple come from 36th Street and Third Avenue in Manhattan and they complained that the noise level was too high. What it's going to be with generators and compressors and all this other stuff? I don't know. I don't know. I can't, in all conscious say, yes, this is the greatest thing since slice bread because it's not. You have done nothing to convince me. I don't think you have done a thing to convince the 800 people here.

So I leave it in your hands to get to the bottom of it. If they would come back to us with something, maybe, scaled back, more responsible, more attuned to what we do and do not want or are willing to put up with, we are reasonable people. We will talk. We went down this road with you several years ago -- I'm sure you remember -- because it was an unreasonable request. You were fortunate enough to listen to us and turn it down. I don't see why you would do any different today.

77 1 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thank you. 2 Hank just has to be a little more 3 direct. 4 MR. GARBER: You want me to give you 5 more? SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Robert Archer? 6 7 Robert, where are you? MR. ARCHER: It has all been covered. 8 9 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Are you sure? Wе 10 did this whole thing just for you. Very good. 11 Audrey Ricken? 12 MS. RICKEN: Everything has been 13 covered. I too agree that I don't understand the 14 location. My mom is in an assisted living. has stores. She has restaurants. She is twenty 15 16 minutes from where I live. I don't understand the location. 17 18 The other thing is -- I forgot who said 19 it, that they don't get visitors. My family sees 2.0 my mom four times a week. To say they don't get 21 visitors is really unrealistic. I sit at the table 22 with my mom having lunch every Saturday and there's 23 five people at the table and three of them have a 24 visitor. So to say that we don't go visit is 25 really unrealistic. I don't understand the 24

78 1 people -- that's been covered. I think John and 2 Chris and Hank did a fantastic job. 3 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thank you. 4 Patrick Fallen? 5 MR. FALLEN: I wasn't going to speak on this topic. 6 7 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You're going to 8 wait for public comment? 9 MR. FALLEN: Yes. 10 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: This one, I can't 11 Is it Kobert [sic]? I don't want to read an 12 address. It says food delivery, pickup, traffic 13 lights, school children. Left? Okay. 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's 15 been covered. 16 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay. 17 Councilman Macagnone said Judy Korbett. 18 She's not here. 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Supervisor, two 20 of them were sitting here and wanted to speak, one 21 of them, but they are in the ladies' room. 22 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Even if you 23 haven't filled out a speaker form, we will still 24 listen to you. 25 MS. RUSSELL: I just have a question.

## ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

79 1 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Why don't you 2 come forward? Come to the podium. We will give 3 everyone a chance to speak. We will do it by show 4 of hands. Just identify yourself to the 5 stenographer. 6 MS. RUSSELL: Theresa Russell. 7 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Theresa Russell 8 related to John Russell? 9 MS. RUSSELL: One and the same. I just 10 got a question. 11 Would the Town -- I mean, if this 12 didn't fly, is a variance needed to put up, like, 13 private homes in that area? 14 I mean, down near Baylis, not far from Baylis, there's an area and they made, like, a 15 16 horseshoe of homes. I'm just wondering, does it have to be the small business that they said, if 17 you don't take it, then this -- could we have 18 19 private homes. 2.0 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You need a change 21 of zone. 22 MS. RUSSELL: That would be --23 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: The counsel would 24 have authorize and change, but it would have to be 25 brought to us first.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

80 MS. RUSSELL: That could be a pause --SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: If the owner chose to build single-family homes there, they would come to this Board with an application and say we would like to build so many one-family homes and we would have to approve it. MS. RUSSELL: That could be a D? SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You want an ARD? MS. RUSSELL: I was wondering because on Jackson Avenue, they have also -- where that florist was, there are five homes that were built and five homes have already been sold, I quess, before they even went up. And I guess, if you drive around in Oyster Bay, you can see the little ranches and whatever they are, the capes, are now mega mansions. So I was just curious to know. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I think the point the applicant is making with AR1 and AR2 is that without any Town Board action, other than approving the site plan, they wouldn't need a public hearing. They can go ahead and do the things that they pointed out, the retail use and the office use. Those would not be --

MS. RUSSELL: But the other thing -- getting a variance would be allowed?

81 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: It would be a 1 2 change of zone, actually. You have to change of zone to a residential zone. 3 4 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you. 5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Your better half there --6 7 MR. RUSSELL: If I may just add 8 something to that. 9 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Sure. 10 MR. RUSSELL: Basically, what you just 11 is what I was mentioning before. They can do AR1 12 or AR2. 13 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: As of right --14 MR. RUSSELL: As of right now without 15 any permission. 16 But their whole spiel, we are a 17 healthcare facility -- so it's basically, we are 18 going to force feed one of these three to you. 19 Which one do you want? If you don't like it here, 20 go back to Connecticut. 21 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I report. You 22 decide. 23 MR. RUSSELL: Thank you. 24 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Do you remember 25 the actor John Russell? Do you remember the --

## ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

82 1 MR. RUSSELL: Yes, I do. 2 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Which show was he 3 on; do you remember? 4 MR. RUSSELL: He's the --5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: The cowboy. 6 MR. RUSSELL: The Martian. 7 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: There you go. 8 Very good. Excellent. 9 All right. By show of hands, how many 10 people want to address the Board? We will go --11 let's go to the back, to the young lady back there. 12 Come on up. 13 Are you Judy, by any chance? 14 MS. KORBETT: Yes. 15 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Oh, okay. 16 were looking for you. 17 MS. KORBETT: I'm not a good speaker. 18 They say they are -- um --19 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Take your time. 20 You're only being watched but a few thousand 21 people. 22 So, they're for profit, MS. KORBETT: 23 correct? I mean, that's what --24 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I'm sorry. 25 They're what?

83 1 MS. KORBETT: They are for profit. 2 They make a profit. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Of course. 3 4 Hopefully, for their sake they make a 5 profit. 6 MS. KORBETT: Now, the food, are they 7 being delivered by U.S. Foods because those trucks, 8 the smallest trucks for U.S. Foods is the size of 9 the parking lot. 10 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I don't know who 11 the food provider will be, but they did mention 12 deliveries in --1.3 MS. KORBETT: But also the size of the 14 truck that comes through. 15 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I would suspect 16 that some of the --17 MS. KORBETT: That's one of my concerns 18 because I work in real estate and property 19 management and strip malls and I know what comes 20 through. 21 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay. 22 MS. KORBETT: Are they willing to pay 23 for our gated community because we should be -- if 24 we're commercial, we should have a gated community 25 without the residential being involved?

84 1 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Good luck with 2 that one. 3 MS. KORBETT: Well, if they want -they should be -- they're making profit. If they 4 5 want to be there, they should be paying for that. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I got your point. 6 7 MS. KORBETT: I have parents that are 8 87 and 89. I visit them every day, six days a week 9 in Queens. I would love nothing more for them to 10 come out here where I could walk over to them and 11 see them seven days a week. So, not that I'm 12 against it, I'm against it exactly where it is, in 1.3 between a residential community. It doesn't make 14 sense. 15 Okay, I think I have one more question. 16 I think they addressed -- they were talking more 17 about Saturday deliveries and Saturday people coming and that would be, like their peak hours. 18 19 What about the school buses? Peak 20 hours to me is Monday through Friday, 9:00 to 5:00. 21 The bus stop is right in -- I don't have 22 school-aged children anymore. They're past 23 college. The bus stops right in front of my house 24 on Wren which is Woodbury Road and Wren. 25 So how is that going affect them with

a five-minute break.

85 1 the food deliveries, the linen? When is the garbage going to be picked up? Is that a private 2 3 pick up? Is that every day? I haven't had a 4 rodent in my house since the deli moved out which 5 was, I don't know how many years ago. Otherwise, I had rodents living in my house. That is going to 6 7 happen again if I have that garbage there. 8 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: The applicant --9 the applicant -- all of us to some extent -- the 10 applicant is advocating a position, while we take 11 our seats on this Board, we don't leave our common 12 sense outside. We bring our living experiences in 13 this Town of many, many years with us. So we get 14 it. We are able to weigh all sides of the 15 argument. 16 MS. KORBETT: It's like ShopRite 17 pulling into the middle of your house. It's just 18 not right; when we moved in here and didn't pay for 19 that. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: For someone who 2.0 21 said you don't speak well, you did --22 MS. KORBETT: I really don't. 23 Thank you. 24 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I'm going to take

86 1 (Whereupon, a recess was taken at this 2 time.) 3 (Time noted: 10:20 p.m.) 4 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and 5 gentlemen, if everyone will find seats, we will 6 continue. 7 By show of hands, just people who still 8 want to speak on this application. I will work 9 back to front. I don't think -- we need you to 10 come forward. Just relax. It's only being 11 streamed town wide. 12 MR. OSTER: Steven Oster. I have two questions. The first one 1.3 14 was, right now -- two questions. The first one is 15 they have this pretty rendering with all the 16 greenery. They talk about the percentage of 17 parking lot coverage versus green space; however, they didn't go into their Phase 2, Phase 3 plans if 18 19 needed according to the 95 spots for 65 -- what the 2.0 percentage is because of the parking lots, you are 21 going to lose that most of that greenery. 22 The second question I had was I saw 23 something with you guys were trying to get into 24 Huntington. There was a lot of backlash from the 25 Town. I was curious where you guys were with that

87 1 I think that one was 65. This is 105. 2 Why is this bigger to start and why is 3 it not something smaller? 4 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Judy, will you 5 make a note of the questions? She'll address that when she comes back to the podium in just a little 6 7 bit. 8 Okay, let's keep working our way 9 forward. Young lady, just identify yourself for 10 the stenographer. 11 MS. BURCHSTEDT: My name is Samantha 12 Burchstedt. 1.3 I just want to be clear where everyone 14 is from because we are talking about AR2 and AR3. 15 So are you from a -- from Benchmark --16 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Address me. 17 MS. BURCHSTEDT: If they are -- is 18 Benchmark buying it or is it a real estate 19 development company that's buying it and if 2.0 Benchmark doesn't get approved, then we move on to number two or would another offer need be made to 21 22 the owner of the property? 23 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I think we are 24 going to find out that's it's a contract vendor and 25 a contract vendee subject to a contingency that the

25

88 1 Zone get approved. 2 Judy, you want to give -- that's a 3 quick answer. 4 MS. SIMONCIC: That's exactly it. 5 Benchmark is buying the property and operating it and it's subject to --6 7 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Benchmark is 8 going to be -- right now, I assume, a conditional 9 contract in place. 10 Benchmark will purchase the property if 11 they get the zoning to utilize it for the purposes 12 they expressed tonight. 1.3 MS. BURCHSTEDT: If Benchmark does not 14 get approval for it, we go back to square one and 15 possibly someone can make an offer to the owner and 16 build AR2. So they have nothing to do with AR2 or 17 AR3? They are trying to scare us a little bit. I 18 just want to be clear. 19 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Why don't we let 20 counsel give the most direct answer? 21 MS. SIMONCIC: If I may, regarding the 22 alternative, that was not presented to the Board to 23 scare the neighbors or to say if this is not going

ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

to get approved, this is what we are going to

build. Benchmark is in the assisted living

2.0

facility business. They want to build what we are proposing.

Under law, as this Board knows, this particular use, which is an assisted living facility, is a special use permit under the Code, so the criteria is to demonstrate that the proposed use is less onerous than other permitted uses in the district. That is the sole purposes of presenting those alternative plan, not because Benchmark wants to build that, they don't. They're proposing --

MS. BURCHSTEDT: If this gets voted down, which we hope it does, then we just go back to the drawing board and the owner looks for another buyer and we'll see what happens.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Hold on.

If it gets voted down, I would assume their contract now becomes void and the property is back in the hands of the owner. They may choose to develop it or they may look for a third-party purchaser who will come in with another proposal.

MS. BURCHSTEDT: Right.

We just go back to the drawing board.

I wanted to make sure there wasn't, like, you do A
or you do B or you do C. I was a little confused.

2.0

2.5

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: No, no. I think the point of AR1 and AR2 is to alert the community. How you react to it is a whole different question.

But it's to say to the community, as of right, we could to do these things, but we choose not to do them. Instead we would like to propose the -- to make the proposal that they're making tonight which they believe is less burdensome, if you will, than the AR1 and AR2.

MS. BURCHSTEDT: This has nothing to do with AR1 and AR2 and it's been drilled in, but I live on Lark and I have little kids. I have a 5-year-old and a 7-year-old and the cars speed through there. I have friends cut through to get down Gainsboro and Greenvale Lane because -- so they don't have to hit the light. It is so dangerous.

Right now we have three Baylis

Elementary school buses that come through there

because they each pick up a few kids. There are so

many buses in there. It's ridiculously dangerous.

Just so you're aware of how it is now. I can't say

how it's going to be.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Samantha, thank you very much.

91 1 MS. BURCHSTEDT: Thank you. 2 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: The gentleman 3 sitting behind --4 MR. MEJIAS: Hello, my name is Frank. 5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Can you give us your full name for the record? 6 7 MR. MEJIAS: My name is Frank Mejias. 8 I have a question. 9 In case of a fire, which way are the 10 trucks going to go in and exit? 11 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Judy, do you have 12 a quick response? 13 MR. MEJIAS: When you're putting out a 14 fire here, you're not going to potentially create a 15 second means of egress on Lark? How are you going 16 to get approved? I'm a builder and you need a 17 means of egress. 18 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Frank, I'll tell you what. You're going to stay around a little 19 20 bit, right? 21 MR. MEJIAS: Yeah. 22 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: They will back to 23 the podium shortly. We will make sure they answer 24 the questions for you. 25 MR. MEJIAS: Okay.

## ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Bob, I think you are up.

2 are up

2.0

MR. FREIER: Hi, I'm Bob Freier. I live in Woodbury also. I'm off of Jericho Turnpike, but I understand their concerns.

I just want to the comment to the applicant, I guess. We just recently went through a process with -- for those of you who know, there's a Best Western Hotel on the corner of Piquets and Jericho Turnpike. They are going to be taking that down, building a two-story medical office building. They are going to have a bank and they're going to have three or four retail stores.

The person who is doing that, for years now, way before they even submitted any paperwork to the Town, met with the surrounding communities.

They met with my community. There's another -- off Piquets Lane, there's another condo community called the Woodlands, the community behind that,

Crystal -- and they were, in all earnest, in all honesty, they were trying to be good neighbors.

They didn't have to come to us because they were not asking for any kind of variances or anything like that, but they wanted to support of the neighborhood before they moved forward. So we have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

93

been meeting with them, probably, for probably two years. You know, we had a lot of concerns about the trees. They got an arborist to come in and meet with us and we walked through all the trees. The Woodlands had a concern about people -- right now, people off Pickets turn in there just to come back out. So they agreed to put in -- pay for and put in a fence.

Our community, besides the trees, had an issue, you know, potentially about backing up, not being able to get out and there's no light to get out of our community. We had school buses making a left turn onto oncoming traffic. agreed, if the State should agree to it, and they put money in escrow for us to pay for a traffic light. So they went out of their way to be a good neighbor and we literally met with them so many times so every issue was addressed before they even filed with the Town. And when the Planning Commission had hearing to discuss it, they were discussing it, they were asking a lot of questions and someone from our development got up and said we have been meeting with this group for the last couple of years. Our community fully supports it. Once they heard that, they were, like, great, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

94

residents -- you know, the meeting ended.

It sounds like no one has done that I think the gentleman -- be a good neighbor. You know, don't give these guys two weeks' notice and say if you don't agree to this, this is going to be built. Don't use scare tactics. Meet with them and see if you can come to an agreement and work this out. That's exactly what they did at the Best Western Hotel. Some community outreach would be a really good idea. And just maybe just to mention also what kind of considerations has been It's a volunteer fire department. operate ambulances and things like that. How is that going to affect their ability to, you know, to continue to serve the community that they serve now because they will be more ambulances coming back and forth and ambulettes and things like that?

That's all.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thanks, Bob.

I think Bob makes a point that Hank made, I think, about the outreach thing and I think that's something that the applicant is pretty mindful of.

As far as the fire department is concerned, we will be talking about that.

95 1 Any other hands? 2 John, I know you want to come back, but 3 let me make sure we've exhausted everyone else. No other hands? 4 5 All right, John Russell. Come on back. MR. RUSSELL: It's very simple. 6 7 I am not against senior citizens. 8 Slowly but surely, I'm getting there myself. 9 rather than a nursing home, how about the Town of 10 Oyster Bay, the spirit that this Town is working 11 in, realizing that we are all -- collectively, we 12 are all getting older, how about senior housing 1.3 similar to what they built over near GEICO? That 14 would be good use for the property. 15 In reference to also -- I forgot your 16 Judy? In reference to that young lady with name. 17 the change of venue, the original meeting was this 18 morning at 10:00 and it was changed to 8:00. 19 only received that letter coincidently, they were 20 both typed the same day (indicating). 21 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I'm sorry. 22 MR. RUSSELL: This is notifying me that 23 the meeting is at 10:00 a.m. (indicating). 24 one is notifying me the meeting is at 8:00.

What is the

COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE:

96 1 date, Mr. Russell? 2 MR. RUSSELL: They were both mailed on 3 the 16th as per the envelopes. 4 MS. SIMONCIC: As I indicated in the 5 beginning, I sent the letter by certified mail and regular mail to make sure --6 7 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: He is saying that 8 he has one telling him --9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, impossible. 10 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thanks, John. 11 Last call. Anyone else who cares to 12 address the Board relative to this matter? 13 MS. KORBETT: I do. 14 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Is that Judy? 15 MS. KORBETT: There was a sign that was 16 put up by the attorneys I quess on Lark, not by 17 Wren. 18 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I have never seen 19 a lawyer that could put a sign. 2.0 MS. KORBETT: Somebody put up a sign. 21 It was down two days later. So if anyone was to 22 drive around the community, we would not know what 23 time this meeting...it was or anything else. 24 have flat down, backwards. So the people that 25 turned out tonight, we all had, like, an e-mail

25

97 chain going; Otherwise, we wouldn't have known and 1 2 we would have lost. 3 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thank you, Judy. MS. SIMONCIC: Regarding the signs, I 4 5 actually live within the mile of the site. I'm a resident of the Town of Oyster Bay and a resident 6 7 of Woodbury. 8 I have driven by this property every day since the meeting has been changed to ensure 9 10 that the sign was there. 11 At one point, it was leaning against 12 the fence and I called the sign company and said 13 get down here and secure it, make sure no one can 14 take it away. 15 So I will attest to the fact that the 16 sign has been on Lark Drive from the very beginning 17 and we did submit of affidavits of postings with 18 respect to the sign. 19 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay. 2.0 MR. GARBER: I have a picture of it. 21 MS. SIMONCIC: Obviously, we did a good 22 job of notifying everybody because residents did 23 show up. We did everything feasible in terms of

ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

Again, the meeting was changed at the

notifying residents by sending letter.

1.3

2.0

request of the residents. We are happy that everyone was here to voice their opinion and concerns about the project. So that's all I will say about those.

At this time, I would like Chris

Robinson to address a couple things and I'm going
to call someone else from Benchmark.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: We may have one or two people that want to come back. Let them finish up here and then we'll -- any remaining questions we will take and you may have to stick around.

MR. ROBINSON: I just want to answer a couple of questions.

One was on the land banked parking question. We have 30 land banked parking spaces, 14 which are shown on the northeast corner between the building and Woodbury Road, 16 in the southeast corner. The 30 spaces at approximately 380 square feet of pavement per space, that's the space in the 24-foot back up aisle will be approximately 11,340 square feet. It will reduce the open green landscape area from 53.3 percent green to 46 percent green.

With respect to other question

2.0

regarding lighting, the lighting is LED, low voltage lighting, 10-foot mounted, down lit onto the property. There will no spill. There are no building mounted lights. I'm not sure what he was talking about on the plan. There's some accent lighting over the doorways, but there's no building mounted lights shining on the property.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Chris, we listened to everybody's testimony, obviously. We got it.

COUNCILMAN PINTO: If there was a situation where the lighting was in the resident's backyard.

You would take care of that?

MR. ROBINSON: We would adjust it.

It's all going to be LED lighting. Very low, very low. We provided a photometric plan.

Again, all these plans have been reviewed and detailed by Cashin & Spinelli. They did review the photometric plan. We had some back and forth regarding that and having no landscaping shown on the property, we had zero spill.

Once you have the staggered row of evergreens, there will absolutely nothing that will shine on the neighboring properties.

2.0

With respect to the fire protection, the building is fully sprinklered, 100 percent. The fire department connection, the pump connection, will be out on Woodbury Road remote from the building so the pumper trucks can pull right up on Woodbury Road, if there ever be a fire, and there's adequate space to maneuver and access to the building code to bring a fire truck if they needed to access the roof of the building.

And, again, this will be reviewed by the Nassau County Fire Marshal. There will be an application made to the Nassau County Fire Marshal for site plan approval.

COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: That addresses the fire, but what about the EMS? The ambulance service, did we speak to the fire department about having added need for service?

MR. ROBINSON: A couple of things, the Benchmark facility has a van and a Town car readily available to drive residents if they need to visit doctors or go on excursions and the like. They generally have ambulette or ambulance visits; roughly, three a week is probably what they get. It's not as intense as it was being made out to be. There's plenty of adequate room for the

1.3

2.0

maneuverability in the portico in the front and turning around on the property.

COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: Thank you.

COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: Can you also address the comment that was made about generators?

MR. ROBINSON: There's a generator shown on the plan. It's a fully acoustic-screened

generator. It's located immediately south of the

loading -- parking spaces for the loading trucks.

It's shown on the plan.

We also have a transformer shown on that side just north of the trucks and as well as right behind the refuse enclosure. It's a fenced in and screened and be done with acoustical panels built into the generator.

COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: Do you know the dimensions off the top of your head?

MR. ROBINSON: It's roughly about 8 x 10 or 6 x 10, in rough dimensions. It will be a diesel generator. They do have to get exercised, I believe, every day. It will turn on for fifteen minutes, cycle off. It happens roughly about once a week, they cycle through. It's not -- there will be one. There won't be five. It's a single generator for the use of this building.

2.0

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thank you.

Judy, can you address the ingress and egress, I guess, for the emergency vehicles, fire department. I'm talking about ingress and egress. I think he was talking about surface -- unless I misunderstood.

MR. ROBINSON: The ingress and egress for the fire department will be through the main driveway on Woodbury Road. There's adequate width. They drive aisles provided are 24 feet.

The New York State building code requires a minimum of 20 feet for a drive aisle for a fire apparatus. There's adequate room to serve the building.

Again, the fire department connection, if there were a fire in the building -- the building is 100 percent fully sprinklered. It's made of steel construction, concrete flooring. The fire department connection would be at Woodbury Road, so the pumper truck will tie on to a hydrant, pull up to the fire department connection, put additional water into the sprinkler system. That would occur out on Woodbury Road. For emergency access into the building, to get on the roof, to get to the second floor, they will be through the

paved driveway.

2.0

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Frank, I just want to make sure -- I'm not saying you have to agree with it, but did he answer your question?

MR. MEJIAS: I know from experience --

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Go ahead.

MR. MEJIAS: -- that you need the ladder trucks, so for a ladder truck to come and enter this section (indicating) and set up here (indicating), there's going to be more than one truck for the fire.

My worry is, at a later point, you're going to create a second means of egress which is going to end up right in front of my house.

MR. ROBINSON: We have no plans for a second egress coming out of here. This application will be reviewed in detail by the Nassau County Fire Marshal and upon their site plan review, which is one of the next steps to take place.

Even if there were the need for a secondary egress, we would do what we have typically done on some of the major housing jobs, is put a grass creek style system where you have 100 percent capacity to handle the weight of the truck under the lawn.

1.3

2.0

We would typically screen that with concrete curbing, but it will be green and there'll be a crash gate fence. We don't think it's necessary in this case. I have been doing this for thirty years, designing these types of facilities, dozens on Long Island. We believe what plan we put together, we stick behind.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Frank, your point is well taken. He is representing that he is not doing that and we will hold him to that.

Judy, do you have anything else that you want to address?

MS. SIMONCIC: I wanted to have Ken Littlefield address some of the operational questions.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Go ahead.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Hi. My name is Ken Littlefield.

Thank you for hearing me.

I just want to address some of the questions that were brought up tonight. The first one -- there's no particular order -- one, I want to apologize if there was any lack of community outreach to the community. That's the last thing we wanted to do. We are more than willing to

continue to talk to the community to build a beautiful building to fit in with the surrounding community.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: For what it's worth, Ken, where are you from, the Oyster Bay area?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'm born and raised in Setauket, Little Wading River.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You're close enough.

In the Town of Oyster Bay, what you will find is that residents -- when residents are not aware of a proposal -- let me start again.

Residents of the Town of Oyster Bay, very jealously and I think rightfully, guard their property and guard their community. When residents of the Town of Oyster Bay do not understand or it has not been communicated to them, you know, the nature of the proposal -- by the time you come into this room, you're already in trouble. Whereas, if you go to the community beforehand, I think you would find them quite reasonable.

When you eliminate the barriers and the lack of communication, I think you would find, I would say most of the time, the residents may have

2.0

some suggestions that -- it's a compromise. It's certainly one that you can live and certainly one the residents can live with. I don't know if we are too far down the road -- no pun intended -- in this process, but you might want to the consider that. You might want to consider reaching out and talking to some of the residents that are here today. If you feel you have already done so and you've done adequate communication -- I'm not directing it or making it a condition of anything this Board does, but just a neighborly suggestion.

MS. SIMONCIC: Along those lines, we did have a meeting, a prehearing meeting, with the abutting neighbors and only two of the neighbors came to the meeting. It was a couple of months ago. And then when the hearing --

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and gentlemen, you've been great. You really represented your community well. Let's not spoil it.

Let her finish and if anyone wants to address the Board, I'll allow it.

MS. SIMONCIC: When the hearing was scheduled, I had sent out a letter which we typically don't do, but I wanted to ensure that if

2.0

anybody had any interest in it, they can call me and we would be willing to meet. I did send out that letter and I spoke to about five residents in the immediate area and everybody, after I spoke to them and answered their questions, they seemed positive. So, quite honestly, it's a surprise to me that there's so much interest in, I guess, opposition to this application at this time. But we did offer and I spoke with the neighbor last week when the meeting was changed to 8:00 p.m. I was expecting a call from Hank and they said they may want to meet with me and the applicant. We were willing to do that.

Obviously, along those lines, we are still willing to continue dialogue with the residents. We did design a project with them in mind. We increased buffer areas where they are not required, compliance with the Zoning code, full compliance. But, again, we are happy to continue dialogue. We are more than willing and I know Benchmark is more than willing to set up a meeting through Hank or any of the other residents. We will be willing to do that.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Fair enough.

All right, Ken, back to you.

2.0

Hank, we will back.

MR. GARBER: I want to challenge --

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Challenge noted.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I'll try to answer

some of the questions and then Judy can get back to your question.

The first one came up was the average age in our facilities. One of the things we noticed over the last five years is that the average age increased from 85, 86, 87 to 88 during the depression. It's now come back down to 87. We have over 5,000 residents in our communities and we have a pretty good feel for what the average age is in our communities.

In New York, we licensed to a special license called the Enhanced Assisted Living Resident License. That's for assisted living residence. This is a stricter license than what many of our competitors achieve. It's called AR license. The enhanced license allows us to have our residents' age in place. It allows us to have nurses on site. It allows us to build, to handle a type of resident in an I2 use group, which is a very frail resident that needs help to evacuate which allows us to evacuate within the building and

not have to leave.

1.3

2.0

What we do is we divide the building into sections so we don't have to take our residents outside because we build the building to the specific standards. We use structural steel and concrete, noncombustible materials, fully sprinklered buildings and this allows us to keep our residents safe in a protected environment.

Another question that came up was the NEP systems, mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems and the noise and where they are located. We talked about our mansard roof -- I will quickly point to the -- you can still hear me, I'll talk a little louder -- what this mansard roof is doing is that it forms a triangle where you have the sloped roof and then straight back forming a flat well on the inside. The whole building is surrounded by this sloped roof, but the inside is where the well is. That's where the mechanical equipment is. It's out of sight. It's elevated and there's, of course, acoustical properties in the well to prevent noise distribution.

So I wanted to address that we don't have these units around our building in plain sight and sound and smells.

The next issue that I heard spoken was about our memory care folks and what we call elopement issues or wander issues. There was concern about our residents getting out.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You said elopement?

MR. LITTLEFIELD: Elopement, that's the term.

So what we have done with this facility, we created an interior courtyard so our residents do not have access to the outside. It's a controlled environment. That's one step to keep them -- to have the outside feel, but keep them protected.

One thing that Benchmark is real proud of is over the last two years we partnered with Stanley Healthcare Systems and we have state of the art realtime locating systems for our residents. This allows us to track our residents all the time. It also goes to the outside of our building where we installed geo fences. So, not only do we know where our residents are, if someone is a wander risk, we are alerted when they're near the door. We are alerted if they get outside and then we are alerted

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

111

again if they are off the property. This is at great expense, but for the safety of our residents.

The next issue that came up from the good doctor, was talking about the amount of drivers and care staff to take care of the care levels. I wanted to make it clear about our residents. We deal with a very frail population. Obviously, our memory care folks are not driving. So if you eliminate those that drive right off the bat, you've eliminated a significant amount of drivers, and this is from experience, I would venture to say less than five people will have cars in the assisted living side and I'd venture to say that it's probably none. So we -- the residents can drive, if they are able, but what we found, based on the needs of the residents, when they come into our facilities, they usually have given up their driving.

Next item has to do with the traffic and some concerns about school-aged children. Busy time periods, we mentioned, are peak shift is from 7:00 to 3:00. That's when we have the majority of department heads in, when we have majority of our staffing in. But I want to make it clear, and we can talk about this when we meet with the community

1.3

2.0

later on, we are flexible with our staffing.

If there's a situation with bus traffic, traffic because of people going to work, we can be flexible with our staff. I want the community to realize that.

Another concern was construction parking. The role I have with the company is construction and development. I am very aware of the concerns of noise, traffic, deliveries, especially during the construction phase.

One of the questions was how long was it going to take. It's going to take about 14 months. In those 14 months, especially in the front end of that, there will be noise. There will be site clearing and heavy equipment and those are loud activities. However, they would diminish over time as the project gets built.

As far as on-site parking for the construction folks, we feel it's adequate. If there's ever a situation, we would make a deal with one of the surrounding office buildings down the road and provide bus transportation for our workers.

Another item that came up was pest control and rodents. We hired a large company. We

2.0

have national contracts with working. We don't want rodents anymore than you do. We would be very diligent before construction on setting traps and during the life of the facility, having an up-to-date pest control agreement.

Those were the questions that I heard.

If there are anymore, I'd be happy to answer them.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You did a good

job. Thank you.

There are a couple -- I think Steven, you wanted come forward again.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  OSTER: I want to make a comment on the certified mail. My two neighbors got them and I did not.

Also, I was wondering if there was -they were talking about the other facility they
were trying to build --

 $\label{eq:supervisor} \mbox{SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I think I missed}$  the latter part.

MR. LITTLEFIELD: I think he was talking about Huntington. There's been no decision on that facility right now. The Town Board let it expire. So we are currently working with the landowner. We still control the site. We are looking to our options.

114 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Judy -- Judy 1 2 resident. 3 MS. KORBETT: I didn't have any of my 4 questions answered. I'm curious about the size of 5 the trucks that's coming in with the delivery of food. 6 7 MR. LITTLEFIELD: We don't use U.S. 8 Food. We use DeCarlo and other companies. 9 Typically, they are small box trucks. 10 Now, I will say when we when we open up 11 the community, there will be large delivery truck 12 for furniture. That's about the biggest deliveries 13 we get. After that, they really go down to small 14 box size, not full 18-wheeler. 15 MS. KORBETT: How many days a week will 16 this be because one small truck is not going to 17 feed 96 units of people? 18 MR. LITTLEFIELD: It's simply about 19 three times a week. 20 MS. KORBETT: Garbage pickup? 21 MR. LITTLEFIELD: That's three times 22 and that's private carting. 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What time is 24 garbage pick up? 25 MR. LITTLEFIELD: Typically, between

115 7:00 and 9:00. 1 2 Once again, we are opened to being 3 flexible. 4 MS. KORBETT: If you have large amount 5 of food delivered and diapers. And at 87 years old, this is not even considered a senior 6 7 community. It is a nursing home. I'm sorry. My 8 parents are 87 and 89. 9 MR. LITTLEFIELD: A nursing home in 10 New York State has a tremendous amount of 11 requirement above and beyond what assisted living 12 is. We are not a nursing home. We are part of 13 senior living spectrum and we deal with the frail. 14 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Judy disagrees. 15 John Russell going for a 16 record-breaking floor --17 MR. RUSSELL: If you are 87 years old 18 or older, you are going to be using Depends or 19 whatever they use at that age. It's a nursing 2.0 home. You can throw perfume on it, it's still a 21 nursing home. 22 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay. Reasonable 23 people can disagree. 24 MR. RUSSELL: I'm not reasonable. 25 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Is there anyone

	116
1	else who cares to address the Board on this matter?
2	(Time noted: 10:56 p.m.)
3	(Whereupon, the following proceedings
4	were reported by Stenographer Julia Giannakopoulos:)
5	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Is there anybody
6	else who cares to address the Board relative to
7	this matter?
8	Speak now or Hank, did you want to
9	say something?
10	MR. GARBER: Judy mentioned my name.
11	You called me? You never called me.
12	You mentioned earlier that you reached out to some
13	people. Who? When? Where did you meet? None of
14	us have heard about this.
15	And then you said something about
16	moving forward, and, again, you brought up my name.
17	That's wonderful. Thank you for thinking to
18	include me, but why didn't you ask me if I want to?
19	Again, you are very quick to say, but
20	you don't prove anything.
21	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Hank, you made
22	your point.
23	Samantha, did you want to add
24	something?
25	MS. BURCHSTEDT: I just wanted to know

117 1 what the rest of this process was. 2 Are you going to get to that at the 3 end? 4 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I'm sorry? 5 MS. BURCHSTEDT: What's the rest of this process? 6 7 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: What we are going 8 to is when we complete the meeting, you know, 9 whether it's shortly of, you know, 2:00 or 3:00 in 10 the morning, whatever it takes, when we finish, we 11 are going to close the hearing, and we are going to 12 reserve decision, so we'll make a decision in the 13 future. 14 Where are my -- John Ellsworth, somebody help me here, what would be the timeline? 15 16 MR. ELLSWORTH: Depending on how they 17 work with the community. 18 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Let's assume that it's just us, if they -- look, if they get 19 20 together, as I'll remind them to do, we can always 21 wait for them to tell us that, you know what, we 22 are at an impasse and just make a decision. 23 let's assume they are at an impasse, what would the 24 timeline be. 25 MR. ELLSWORTH: If they are at an

118 1 impasse? 2 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: At an impasse. 3 MR. ELLSWORTH: And the project is not going to be approved? 4 5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: No, it's up to the Board to decide. 6 7 MR. ELLSWORTH: Okay, then the first 8 thing you would have to do is the Environmental 9 Resolution, and once the Board passes on that, they 10 get sent to the County Planning Commission. 11 have a month to render their decision, and then it 12 comes back to the Board, this Board for a decision 13 on the Special Use Permit. 14 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: So what do they 15 get, 90 days or 120 days? 16 MR. ELLSWORTH: Yes. 17 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Samantha, I don't 18 know if you heard that. 19 MS. BURCHSTEDT: Yes, that's perfect. 20 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Judy, you want to 21 wrap it up? 22 MS. SIMONCIC: Sure. 23 In terms of speaking, I did not reach 24 out to Hank. I spoke with one of his neighbors, 25 Valerie Massimo, and apparently, there was an

119 1 e-mail chain with all the residents on it, and I 2 said I'm happy to meet with the residents if they 3 want before the meeting, and she said I would be hearing from somebody, possibly Hank. 4 5 Obviously, we never spoke, but I'm happy to speak with the neighbors and set up the 6 7 meeting following this meeting. 8 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay, you'll keep 9 in touch with our attorney's office. 10 MS. SIMONCIC: Right. 11 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: We will begin the 12 process, and we'll render a decision. 13 The other thing -- go ahead, I'm sorry. 14 MS. SIMONCIC: Can I address the Board? 15 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Sure. 16 MS. SIMONCIC: Or if you want to go first? 17 18 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: No, you finish 19 up. 20 MS. SIMONCIC: Okay. I just want to 21 address the use of this property. 22 It is a true assisted living facility 23 as that term is defined in the Oyster Bay Code. 24 This facility is generally no different than, for 25 example, the Amber Court facility in Westbury that

2.0

has traditional assisted living and a dementia facility which was actually recently approved by the Board not that long ago.

Similarly, the Bristal at Jericho, which was just approved by the Board, also assisted living with a dementia component. That's how the Town defines assisted living facilities, so we fit squarely within the definition under the Code, and as such, we require a Special Use Permit from this Board, and as the Board knows, the determination of this use as a Special Use Permit is tend to amount to a finding that this use is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and it's zoned for this.

Based upon all the testimony that you've heard this evening, we believe we've demonstrated through all the expert testimony that the use will be in harmony with the character of the neighborhood and the surrounding properties, that it won't have any adverse impact on the surrounding property values, it won't have any adverse impact on traffic, on surrounding roadways, and, in fact, the purpose of those alternate plans was to demonstrate that this proposed use will have significantly less traffic than the as-of-right uses that could be on this property as currently

2.0

zoned, and that's the only purpose that we submitted those alternate plans. It's a benign use. It's a great transition use for the neighborhood.

Again, we are proposing the project that fully complies with the Town of Oyster Bay Code, no variances are required. And, as it was mentioned earlier by Mr. Breslin, seniors and the aging population are a high priority in the Town of Oyster Bay, and the Town was a pioneer of Golden Age housing years ago.

Since the adoption of that Zoning ordinance, there have been 1,400 units built, senior housing units built in the Town. In the Town of Oyster Bay, I just called the other day to just check on the waiting list, as everybody, I'm sure, is aware, there's thousands of people waiting to get into senior housing in this Town, and the wait is some two to three years, I've been told. And studies and statistics show that the elderly population in this town is growing at record numbers. The population increase of people 75 and older increased by 23 percent between 2010 and 2014, according to the census.

So this assisted living facility will

1.3

2.0

provide a comfortable and secure place for the Town's aging residents to spend the later years of their lives. People that want to stay in Oyster Bay, people in Woodbury, the draw for this facility we anticipate is between 3 to 5 miles within the Woodbury area. There's no other facility in the area. This is a very good location for it for that reason. This facility will also be an asset to the community, and, as I said, will provide a much needed assisted living facility in Woodbury area.

And, more importantly, this community will provide for use which is needed in the Town and will benefit the residents of the Town that have lived there their whole lives and want to stay here such as myself.

I plan on staying in Woodbury for a very, very long time. I am an advocate of the applicant as the attorney, but personally I think this project is a great project for the area and for the location. And based upon everything you've heard, we respectfully request the Town Board approve the application.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay, ma'am?

Again, not to be dismissive, but you brought it up so I'd like to just --

123 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: We need a name 1 2 for the record. 3 MS. OSTER: Marla Oster, Wren Drive. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Marla Oster, 4 5 related to Steven Oster? MS. ASTRO: That would be my spouse. 6 7 Hank is my next door neighbor. Hank is 8 a great neighbor. 9 I don't think anyone is dismissing the 10 need for this in the community. I grew up here. 11 We just moved back here after being in the city, so 12 I'm coming back to the Town of Oyster Bay. 13 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Good. 14 MS. OSTER: We want to have our family 15 here. My father is here, he lives in the town as 16 well. We are a community here. 17 I think, because you brought it up, I think it warrants being said. It is an important 18 19 part of the community; however, if this was in your 20 -- you said you live in Woodbury, you are part of 21 our community. I think if this was in your 22 backyard, you would be having a different 23 perspective on this. 24 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay, thank you. 25 Judy, what have you got?

MS. KORBETT: Pickup for garbage three times a week, that means 1,638 feces, diapers in the garbage in the back of our house.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You are really getting down and dirty.

MS. KORBETT: There's not one person that doesn't wear a diaper at age 87.

SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Ladies and gentlemen, before we close a meeting, you may find this following comment I'm about to make a bit odd; especially, in light of sometimes hearings like this get contention, but the fact of the matter is everybody behaved tonight in a very civil manner, everybody spoke their peace, the applicant certainly spoke its case, and the residents certainly represented their community very well.

I just want you to know that a night like this is exactly why the Town of Oyster Bay is a very special place that it is. When residents come together, express their views, state their positions, that's how you get a good project in the end, or that's how you don't get a project in the end, and that's why the property values are so high in the Town of Oyster Bay, and that's why it is and will continue to be among the nicest places

125 1 anywhere in this nation to live and to raise the 2 family in. It all begins with the residents 3 themselves who give a darn about their community. 4 So, thank you very much for 5 participating. MR. RUSSELL: One other thing. I won't 6 7 come anymore, honestly. 8 The generators that the engineer, or 9 whatever he is, mentioned, He said it's going to be 10  $6 \times 8$ . This is the a photograph of a local -- a 11 photograph of two generators at a local health 12 facility not far from here, and there's five of 13 these puppies up there. 14 And believe me, my generator at my home 15 is 3-foot wide -- 3-foot long, 2-foot high, 2-foot 16 wide. God bless if you are going to run a facility 17 on an a 8-foot generator with that many patients in 18 there, or residents. 19 Thank you. 2.0 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Mr. Muscarella, 21 I'll take a motion. 22 COUNCILMAN MUSCARELLA: Supervisor, I 23 make a motion that this public hearing be closed 24 and a decision be reserved.

Seconded.

COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO:

	126
1	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: All in favor?
2	ALL: "Aye."
3	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Thank you all
4	very much.
5	We are going to take a short break and
6	continue with our Regular Action Calendar.
7	(Time noted: 11:07 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

TOWN OF OYSTER BAY
TOWN BOARD
ACTION CALENDAR
March 22, 2016
11:30 p.m.

JOHN VENDITTO SUPERVISOR

JAMES ALTADONNA JR. TOWN CLERK

PRESENT:

SUPERVISOR JOHN VENDITTO
COUNCILMAN JOSEPH D. MUSCARELLA
COUNCILMAN ANTHONY D. MACAGNONE
COUNCILMAN CHRIS COSCHIGNANO
COUNCILMAN JOSEPH G. PINTO
COUNCILWOMAN REBECCA M. ALESIA
COUNCILWOMAN MICHELE M. JOHNSON

ALSO PRESENT:

JAMES ALTADONNA JR., TOWN CLERK

JAMES J. STEFANICH, RECEIVER OF TAXES

LEONARD GENOVA, TOWN ATTORNEY

FRANK M. SCALERA, CHIEF DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY

THOMAS SABELLICO, DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY

DONNA B. SWANSON, DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY

MATTHEW M. ROZEA, ASSISTANT TOWN ATTORNEY

LINDA M. HERMAN, OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK

RALPH J. RAYMOND, DEPUTY TOWN CLERK

ANDREW S. ROTHSTEIN, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS,

OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISOR

RONALD SCAGLIA, ASSISTANT TO THE SUPERVISOR,

OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISOR

CAROL STRAFFORD, DIRECTOR OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

(Appearances continued on following page.)

I certify this is a true and accurate transcript.

Juli Dennelopatos

ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT

JULIA GIANNAKOPOULOS Official Reporter/Notary

## ALSO PRESENT:

MARTA KANE, DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS,
PUBLIC INFORMATION
BRIAN DEVINE, RESEARCH ASSISTANT,
PUBLIC INFORMATION
BARRY BREE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC SAFETY
FRANK A. NOCERINO, COMMISSIONER OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS
TIMOTHY ZIKE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
FRANK GATTO, ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSIONER,
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

3 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: We'll continue 1 2 with the call of our Regular Action Calendar. MR. ALTADONNA: May I have a motion to 3 4 adopt Resolution No. TF 5-16? 5 Transfer of Funds Resolution No. 6 TF 5-16; Resolution relating to Transfer of Funds 7 within various departments accounts for the Year 2016. 8 9 On the motion? 10 COUNCILMAN MUSCARELLA: So moved. 11 COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: Seconded. 12 MR. ALTADONNA: Motion made by 13 Councilman Muscarella, seconded by Councilman 14 Macagnone. 15 On the vote, Supervisor Venditto? SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: "Aye." 16 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Muscarella? 17 18 COUNCILMAN MUSCARELLA: "Aye." 19 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Macagnone? 2.0 COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: Councilman Coschignano? 21 22 COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: "Aye." 23 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Pinto? 24 COUNCILMAN PINTO: "Aye." 25 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilwoman Alesia?

## ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

4 1 COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: "Ave." 2 MR. ALTADONNA: Councilwoman Johnson? 3 COUNCILWOMAN JOHNSON: "Aye." MR. ALTADONNA: Motion to adopt 4 5 Resolution TF 5-16 passes with seven ayes. May I have a motion to adopt Resolution 6 7 Nos. 133-2016 through 154-2016? 8 Resolution No. 133-2016; Resolution 9 authorizing the employment of the services of the 10 Nassau County ASA Umpires Association to provide 11 officials for the Town's Senior Citizen softball 12 teams for the 2016 season. (M.D. 3/1/16 #4). 1.3 Resolution No. 134-2016; Resolution 14 granting request from Joni Gladowsky, Trustee of 15 the Joni Gladowsky Breast Cancer Foundation, for a waiver of skate rentals and ice rink fees for a 16 17 charity event at Syosset-Woodbury Community Park 18 Ice Rink on March 4, 2016. (M.D. 3/1/16 #6). Resolution No. 135-2016; Resolution 19 2.0 authorizing the Supervisor and his designee, to 21 execute all forms in connection with the pursuit of 22 the 2016 Clean Vessel Assistance Program Operation 23 and Maintenance funding through the New York State 24 Clean Vessel Assistance Program relative to pump

out services offered at Tobay Beach and Marina,

2.0

Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Beach and Marina and Harry Tappen Beach and Marina. (M.D. 3/1/16 #12).

Resolution No. 136-2016; Resolution authorizing the Supervisor to sign a Youth Program Contractual Agreement under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act for the period March 15, 2016 through June 30, 2017, in connection with the delivery of youth employment and training services. (M.D. 3/1/16 #13).

Resolution No. 137-2016; Resolution pertaining to Contract No. PWC 15-16, On-Call Engineering Services relative to Traffic Engineering, Construction of Drainage Improvements for Division Avenue. (M.D. 3/1/16 #25).

Resolution No. 138-2016; Resolution granting request from the NY Autofest, for Town assistance in conducting a car show and concert on June 11, 2016, to utilize Municipal Parking Field O-4 in Oyster Bay and the use of various Town equipment for the event. (M.D. 3/1/16 #30).

Resolution No. 139-2016; Resolution authorizing Resolution No. 196-2007 be rescinded due to various circumstances in connection with the standardized refuse body. (M.D. 3/1/16 #27).

Resolution No. 140-2016; Resolution

25

3/1/16 #33).

6 1 authorizing Contract No. PWC 10-16, On-Call 2 Engineering Services relative to Construction 3 Management for Construction of Drainage 4 Improvements for Division Avenue. (M.D. 3/1/16 5 #26). 6 Resolution No. 141-2016; Resolution 7 granting request for Town assistance from LI 2Day 8 Hope Runs Here 5K Run/Walk to Fight Breast Cancer on August 20, 2016 and to use various Town 9 10 equipment for the event. (M.D. 3/1/16 #31). 11 Resolution No. 142-2016; Resolution 12 granting request from the Chamber of Commerce of 13 the Massapequa, Inc., for Town assistance in 14 conducting their Annual Street Fair on June 5, 15 2016, to use various Town equipment, Municipal 16 parking Field M-6 from June 3-5, 2016 and to have 17 Town Ordinance Chapter 82-3 waived for the event. 18 (M.D. 3/1/16 #32).Resolution No. 143-2016; Resolution 19 2.0 authorizing the Department of Environmental 21 Resources to host the Dune Stabilization Program at 22 TOBAY Beach on April 2, 2016 and to purchase food, 23 supplies and t-shirts for the program.

ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

Resolution No. 144-2016; Resolution

2.0

authorizing membership in the NYS Urban and Community Forestry Council for 2016. (M.D. 3/8/16 #4).

Resolution No. 145-2016; Resolution authorizing the securement and payment for the Town's property insurance coverage and to make allowance for potential new locations and/or increased values. (M.D. 3/8/16 #12).

Resolution No. 146-2016; Resolution granting request from Doreen Meringolo and Anne Cozzini to donate a tree and accompany plaque in memory of Donna Geraci to be placed at John J. Burns Town Park. (M.D. 3/8/16 #5).

Resolution No. 147-2016; Resolution granting request of Roman Catholic Church of St. Gertrude in Bayville, for Town assistance and the use of Centre Island Beach, the use of the Town showmobile and various equipment and to have a waiver of Town ordinances 168-3, 168-5B and 168-20 waived for their Annual Feast from June 16-20, 2016. (M.D. 3/8/16 #6).

Resolution No. 148-2016; Resolution authorizing the implementation of a resident and nonresident fee for the seasonal rental of Kayak racks at John J. Burns Town Park. (M.D. 3/8/16

#9).

2.0

Resolution No. 149-2016; Resolution authorizing the Department of Environmental Resources to co-sponsor the Annual Spring Oyster Bay Harbor and Beach Cleanup in conjunction with the North Oyster Bay Baymen's Association, the Friends of the Bay and public volunteers, scheduled to be held April 30, 2016 at Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Park, Western Waterfront, Beekman Beach, Centre Island Beach and Stehli Beach. (M.D. 3/8/16 #15).

Resolution no. 150-2016; Resolution authorizing the award of Contract No. SE 002-16, Recycling of Commingled Glass, Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metal and Rigid Plastic containers.

(M.D. 3/8/16 #19).

Resolution No. 151-2016; Resolution pertaining to an agreement with Junior League of Long Island, a member of the Association of Junior Leagues International, Inc., relative to a donation to build an additional playground at Haypath Park in Old Bethpage. (M.D. 3/8/16 #16 & 3/15/16 #4).

Resolution No. 152-2016; Resolution directing the Town Clerk to advertise a Notice of Hearing to consider the 2016 Hydrant Rental

9 1 Contract for the Oyster Bay Water District. 2 Hearing Date: April 5, 2016. (M.D. 3/1/16 #34). Resolution No. 153-2016; Resolution 3 4 directing the Town Clerk to advertise a Notice of 5 Hearing to consider the 2016 Hydrant Rental 6 Contract for the Plainview Water District. Hearing Date: April 5, 2016. (M.D. 3/1/16 #35). 7 8 Resolution No. 154-2016; Resolution 9 directing the Town Clerk to advertise a Notice of 10 Hearing to consider the proposed exemption of 11 taxation, special ad valorem levies and special 12 assessments for All Veterans Organizations in the 13 Town of Oyster Bay. Hearing Date: April 5, 2016. 14 (M.D. 3/1/16 #36).15 On the motion? 16 COUNCILMAN MUSCARELLA: So moved. 17 COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: Seconded. 18 MR. ALTADONNA: Motion made by 19 Councilman Muscarella, seconded by Councilman 20 Macagnone. 21 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Is that the whole 22 calendar? 23 COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: Yes. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: We have a speaker 24 25 on 136, Mr. Ripp.

	10
1	MR. ALTADONNA: 136, 148, and 151.
2	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Yes, Robert.
3	MR. RIPP: Yes.
4	Hello. My name is Robert Ripp. I'm
5	from Massapequa, New York.
6	Can I ask you, are we still
7	livestreaming?
8	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Excuse me?
9	MR. RIPP: Is the livestream working
10	tonight?
11	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Oh, yes.
12	MR. RIPP: Before I speak on a
13	Resolution, as a resident of Oyster Bay, I feel I'm
14	obligated to immediately provide this information
15	to the Town Board.
16	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Is it on a
17	resolution, Robert?
18	MR. RIPP: No, it's not, but it's
19	extremely important.
20	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Why don't you
21	hold it until the public comment period?
22	MR. RIPP: Because I would like an
23	official record of it.
24	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You'll get it.
25	You'll get it during the public comment period.

## ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

11 1 Let's deal with Resolution 136. 2 MR. RIPP: I'll move on, but I just 3 want to put on the record that I would have it preferred that it be on the record. 4 5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Robert, listen to me, as the Chair of the meeting, I'm asking you to 6 7 deal with Resolution 136. In a few minutes, we'll 8 be on public commentary. 9 MR. RIPP: I'd like to know in regards 10 to Resolution 136, does the Town have any idea, 11 approximately, how many people are actually 12 receiving training through this program here? 13 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Sure, we do. 14 don't know if we have the statistics available, but 15 we can provide them to you. 16 MR. RIPP: Okay, so that would be 17 something you have to tell me at a later date? 18 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Yes, we have to 19 find it. 2.0 MR. RIPP: I'm on 147, is that okay? 21 Actually, 148. 22 This is in regards to John Burns Park, 23 and I actually used the ramp down there quite 24 frequently. I think the kayaking thing is a great

idea, but I'm just curious, where in the park are

12 1 the plans are to put the kayak storage? And I 2 would like to draw your attention to, you know, 3 I've noticed -- I've used that ramp since the early '80s, I was a commercial shell fisherman. I went 4 5 out there every day. I've used the ramp every day, and I've seen a lot of changes in Burns Park. 6 7 I mean, my own personal opinion, I kind 8 of like it the way it was, but recently there's --9 I mean, the Town has so many sports activities and 10 things going on that the parking area that's 11 designed for the boat ramp use, there's a specific 12 like parking area that has elongated parking for 13 cars and trailers and has a nice wash-down. It's 14 really set up very nice. 15 COUNCILMAN PINTO: Southwest corner. 16 MR. RIPP: Yes. It's a great, set up 17 really, really nice, but the problem is that it's 18 so many people now that's using the facility, that 19 if you don't, like, launch your boat at, like, you 20 are at Dock 30, you may not get a spot there 21 anymore. 22 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Are you saying we 23 shouldn't bring the kayak to --24 MR. RIPP: I'm not saying we shouldn't,

but I'm just curious, like, where it's going to be

1.3 1 set up. And I just want to bring to your attention 2 the additional use of that area, I would like to 3 see some like --4 COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: Designated 5 spots? MR. RIPP: Designated spots for the 6 7 people that are going to be kayaking and boat 8 ramping. That's what I would like to say. 9 Thank you. 10 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Go ahead, Robert, 11 151. 12 MR. RIPP: Yes. 13 150? 14 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I have 151 here. 15 MR. RIPP: I'm sorry. I got 150 in 16 front of me, if it's okay. I might have made a 17 mistake. 18 In regard to this Resolution --19 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Which one is it 20 now? 21 MR. RIPP: 150, this is regarding the 22 recycling of commingled glass, ferrous, 23 non-ferrous, I don't know if I'm saying it right, non-ferrous material -- is this -- so I can 24 25 understand this correctly, is this the accumulation

14 1 of the material that's picked up from residents, 2 and then is it going to this facility to be 3 processed? Is this what's happening? 4 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I don't know what 5 you mean by accumulated. MR. RIPP: We have the -- this is what 6 7 I'm gathering, and I might be wrong, but, you know, 8 in the Town we have a recycling program, and, like, 9 specifically I've asked a number of times why the 10 private Sanitation service in my neighborhood is, 11 under their permit obligation, they are supposed to 12 be doing the recycling --1.3 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: This is about the 14 recycling. 15 MR. RIPP: This is about the recycling. 16 So when they pick that stuff up, what 17 I'm asking you is, is it then going to this 18 facility here with these Resolutions? 19 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Which facility? 20 I'm sorry, I don't have the Resolution. 21 MR. RIPP: I'm sorry. Where it says 22 here, Eric Tuman, the Commissioner of the 23 Department of General Services by a Memorandum 24 dated March 8, 2016, recognize that a bid proposal 25 SE 002-16 be awarded to Omni Recycling of Westbury,

15 7 Portland Avenue, Westbury, New York 11590, as the 1 2 lowest responsible bidder. 3 So I'm just wondering if what Omni is actually doing, is that like a recyclable plant 4 5 that the Town is delivering the stuff to? SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I believe that's 6 7 their offices. Am I wrong? What do they do to the 8 material, Hal? Just make it quick, whatever you 9 got. 10 MR. MAYER: They take it and they 11 dispose. You are correct, the address in Westbury 12 is their headquarters or offices. This Omni comes 1.3 to the Town's facility in Old Bethpage, sorts and 14 separates and picks up the commingled recyclables 15 and then they take it away and dispose it. They 16 were the lower bidder on the contract providing 17 that service. 18 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: You want to know 19 where they dispose of it? 2.0 MR. RIPP: No. I wanted to know what 21 their actual participation in the thing was. 22 So, the Town picks up the recyclables 23 and brings it to our facility in Town? 24 MR. MAYER: At Old Bethpage. 25 MR. RIPP: And then these people show

16 1 up, you mentioned something about, like, separating 2 or going through it -- is that what you said? 3 don't want to misquote you -- and then they remove it to their facility? 4 5 MR. MAYER: I'm not sure whether they separate it upfront or put it together and separate 6 7 it at their facility, but they get rid of all the 8 materials put there, glass and metal. 9 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Pursuant to the 10 contract. 11 MR. MAYER: Right. 12 MR. RIPP: Thank you. 13 151, that's the donation for the park. 14 I just wanted to know if the Town has 15 any intention of matching or contributing any 16 additional funds to that project. SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I know we are 17 18 charged with building and maintaining it. I don't 19 know if \$30,000 is enough to --2.0 COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: The only thing 21 I'm aware that we are contributing is the surfacing 22 material. 23 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: That's our 24 responsibility. 25 COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: Yes, it's a

17 1 special-needs playground. 2 MR. RIPP: That material, will we be 3 bidding that out or would that be under a 4 requirements contract? 5 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: I don't think that decision is -- no, we don't bid that. 6 7 Is that something you do in-house? 8 MR. NOCERINO: No, no. We have a 9 contractor for it. There's quotes for the 10 surfacing. 11 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Is it pursuant to 12 a requirements contract or you are going to be 13 bidding it; do you know? 14 MR. NOCERINO: We have -- there was a 15 bid on who does surfacing for us. They won the 16 contract, everyday repair, and they put that 17 service on. 18 COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: I'll also mention 19 that Senator Hannon's office is considering trying 20 to get a grant to add a little bit more to the 21 playground as well. 22 SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: That's always 23 welcome. 24 MR. RIPP: Just so I'm clear, the 25 paving and the surfacing you are talking about will

	18
1	be handled through the existing requirements
2	contract?
3	COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: Oh, yes. It's
4	not paving. It's not paving. It's like they
5	rubberize this
6	COUNCILMAN PINTO: It has to be
7	specially tested.
8	COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: Special surface.
9	MR. MAYER: It's the playground
10	surface. It's suitable for
11	MR. RIPP: Okay. Thank you very much.
12	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: There was another
13	speaker form.
14	I don't know
15	MR. ALTADONNA: Yes, Paul Molinari, but
16	he has gone.
17	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Okay.
18	MR. ALTADONNA: Motion made by
19	Councilman Muscarella, seconded by Councilman
20	Macagnone.
21	On the vote, Supervisor Venditto?
22	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: "Aye."
23	MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Muscarella?
24	COUNCILMAN MUSCARELLA: "Aye."
25	MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Macagnone?

## ON TIME COURT REPORTING 516-535-3939

	19
1	COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: "Aye."
2	MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Coschignano?
3	COUNCILMAN COSCHIGNANO: "Aye."
4	MR. ALTADONNA: Councilman Pinto?
5	COUNCILMAN PINTO: "Aye."
6	MR. ALTADONNA: Councilwoman Alesia?
7	COUNCILWOMAN ALESIA: "Aye."
8	MR. ALTADONNA: Councilwoman Johnson?
9	COUNCILWOMAN JOHNSON: "Aye."
10	MR. ALTADONNA: Motion to adopt
11	Resolutions Nos. 133-2016 through 154-2016 passes
12	with seven "Ayes."
13	We are complete, Supervisor.
14	COUNCILMAN MUSCARELLA: Supervisor, I
15	make the motion to adjourn the meeting.
16	COUNCILMAN MACAGNONE: Seconded.
17	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: All in favor?
18	ALL: "Aye."
19	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: Opposed?
20	(No response.)
21	SUPERVISOR VENDITTO: So moved.
22	We are adjourned.
23	(Time noted: 11:42 p.m.)
24	
25	