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Proceedings

MR. CARDONE: Good evening everyone. I would like to welcome you to the seven p.m. public hearing on the Sterling LLC hardship variance.

I will turn it over to council Brian Nugent.

MR. NUGENT: Thank you, Mr. Cardone, anybody here from the applicant Sterling Monroe LLC?

All right. This is on for a hardship variance. There was a submission of verified petition presented by Sterling Monroe LLC. that was received, and this public hearing was set to allow them to come and discuss the application. I have not heard one way or another. And the last correspondence, I think, we received was September 7 from Blustein, Shapiro, Rich & Barone as attorney. There are some issues, which I guess, I will put on the record with this verified petition. And then we can always continue the public hearing until the next town board meeting.

We would note that with respect to this
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petition, that there is a problem with the deed, a copy of the deed they provided was notarized September 26 of 2017, although the deed itself is dated May 26 of 2017. So, we will probably need corrected document with respect to that.

And in addition, there is a signature of Abraham Schwartz [ph], but nothing indicating the other owner of the LLC, Martin Schwartz, had consented to the application. Nor is there a resolution from Sterling Monroe LLC as an entity. So, we will probably follow up with the applicant, request those documents and we would recommend that the town board continue this public hearing until your next town board meeting. We need a date for that.

MR. McGINN: Actually, I will make a motion to change the date of the public hearing -- of the town board hearing so that we can have the public hearing reflect that date.

MR. NUGENT: Okay.

MR. CARDONE: Well, we can't do that now. We have to do to the town meeting,
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right?

MR. NUGENT: I think you noticed -- I mean the town meeting was also noticed for 7:00 as a recall, right? Both the meeting and the public hearing start at seven.

MR. COLON: 7:30 is town meeting. Did we make it seven or 7:30.

MR. CARDONE: I don't think we changed it.

MR. NUGENT: The agenda indicates 7:30.

MR. CARDONE: So, why don't we make a motion that we continue the Sterling LLC at the next town board meeting.

MR. NUGENT: The problem is we need a date, so why don't we do this. We can put this on hold for now and we will pick it up again at 7:30 so that Mr. McGinn can make the motion with respect to the changing the meeting date.

THE CLERK: Just so the board notes, that after the last town board meeting when we set this public hearing, the next day I did reach out to the applicant and spoke with Mr. Barone and let him know that we needed a
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correction on the notary page, and that they needed to do the LLC application or the form.

MR. NUGENT: Okay.

THE CLERK: So, they have been notified to the things that we needed. And they were given the public hearing notice, date and everything. So, I will reach out to them again tomorrow and let them know the new date contingent, that they supply us with the proper --

MR. NUGENT: Okay. One last thing, while on this, in paragraph 21 in the petition they also, in paragraph five they indicate there is no application before the town planning board, but in paragraph 21 they're talking about an extension of a preliminary or conditional approval, so that might be a typo. But we need to get that clarified. So, I will work with the town clerk to follow up with them, and if you want we can continue the public hearing. But we will set the date for continuation at 7:30 during the regular meeting. Okay.

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Will the public
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be allowed to speak on this tonight?

MR. NUGENT: You can speak now if you
would like.

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Open it up for comment
from the public.

SPEAKER: Good evening. Mike Goldstein,
Town of Monroe. According to Chris McKenna,
on October 4, 2017 in a complaint filed on
September 24 in the U.S. District Court in
White Plains the Town Board of Monroe is
accused of suspending construction and taking
up zoning revisions to prevent homes from
being built for the Hasidic community. Two
of the land owners already have cases pending
in Supreme Court to fight the moratorium.

I bring this issue up because the
hardship variance that we were discussing
tonight has many more complications than just
the hardship being claimed. The article goes
on to state, the intent of the moratorium,
which is now been extended for nearly a year
and a half, without an end insight is
obvious. If the projects and others that
Proceedings have been approved from the town are allowed to proceed it will make available housing that could be purchased or occupied by the Hasidic Jewish community. Notice that they're naming who they are going to be marketing these things to.

Conveniently, the Sterling suit leaves out the plan marking of these homes to a specific population. Since we now know that the intention is to sell to the Hasidic population, I feel it is incumbent upon the town planning board to require a knew SEQRA before any discussion is made about filing final maps.

The 30-year old project did not foresee the number of occupants that will live in these houses. Using bedroom counts will not produce realistic environmental impacts.

Viewing the recent planning board work shop, and I thank you for putting that on the website, the chair stated, of the planning board, she was not aware of these facts. I therefore, respectfully request that this and all other further litigation be referred to
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the planning board so that they can make
rationale decisions about the true impacts of
the developments in question.

It is interesting to note that the names
of the developments flip so often that the
federal lawsuit is using outdated names for
the various projects. It will be necessary
to provide the judge with a flow chart of the
names to make heads or tails of the suit.

When I first read what the LLC's were saying
I didn't know where the projects were.

I suggest all concerned citizens FOIL
the federal suit and pay particular attention
to pages starting at number 33. Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you.

MR. NUGENT: Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Anyone else?

SPEAKER: Ward Brower, private citizen.

I just want to echo what was stated by
Mr. Goldstein. Was at the planning board two
meetings back, raised these concerns, and I
have been sort of perplexed by the responses
coming from both the planning board and their
consultants, in that their hands are tied
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with regards to the head count or otherwise known as the bedroom count. And they keep pointing fingers back to the county board of health. And we never get to the crux of the matter, which I'm sorry to say, we don't have Bonnie here. Because this is part -- when you look at these lawsuits, one of the fundamental points is that this whole emphasize and whole exercise in the comprehensive plan is really a rouge, that with no real public consequences other than to stall selling houses to a certain group.

Comprehensive plan -- we used to have master plans with master plan committees. Those committees were composed of members of the public, members of the town board and consultants. Well, we don't have that in this case. All we have is a firm that does all of this work. We don't have -- citizens aren't involved, the town board not directly involved, we don't have meetings to reflect this. This, I think, was a mistake. So, we're forced to make all of our comments at this time here, which is really restricting.
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Because I remember in the 1990's and the revisions, and the turn of the millennium, we had a lot of input went on for a great length of time, and a lot of data. And a lot of these important questions we're raising about like bedroom counts, not bringing up, they're not being brought up. I bring them up. Mr. Goldstein brings them up. There is no interaction here between the different boards.

By the way, there also member in those comprehensive plans, master plan committees there were representatives from planning board, town board and conservation commission. They are all represented. This is not happenstance. This is a flawed process, that I will agree with. But the purpose should not be relegated to irrelevant, just a stalling tactic to stop this thing. That's not the verb. I wish Bonnie was here so we could start getting to the real issues. The real --

MR. NUGENT: Mr. Brower, I don't want to cut you off. But we're still on Sterling
Proceedings

LLC.

SPEAKER: I understand. This is all still part of the process.

MR. NUGENT: I know we have a comprehensive plan coming up next, so --

SPEAKER: I will duck tail on that. I will bring that up again. But that's my point. Is we really need -- we should have had all of these various agencies should have been involved in this. We put this over on Bonnie's hands. And Bonnie is sometimes -- she's a great -- I know Bonnie for years. She does a great job. But she's only one part in a complicated mechanism. And I think that was a short sided here. I will bring it up on comment on the later on. Thank you.

MR. COLON: Thank you, Ward.

MR. McGINN: Thank you.


We need a motion to continue the Sterling LLC hardship variance hearing public hearing.

MR. McGINN: I make a motion we continue
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the public hearing to the next town board
meeting date to be set at the regular meeting
at 7:30.

MR. COLON: I will second that.

MR. CARDONE: Any discussion? Call to

question?

MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. McGINN: Aye.

MR. CARDONE: Aye.

So moved.

We have -- I will make a motion to open

up the continuation of the public hearing by

our comprehensive plan update.

MR. McGINN: I second it.

MR. CARDONE: Call to question?

MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. McGINN: Aye.

(Gerry McQuade is now present.)

MR. McGINN: Anyone like to speak on

this matter? This is on the comprehensive

plan update.

SPEAKER: Comprehensive plan update,

Ward Brower, private citizen. To be

continued. Again, I wish Bonnie was here.
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And Gerry just walked in, so I'm going to repeat some of this.

In past when we had master planning committees. They were composed of members of the town board, planning board, conservation commission and members of the public, as well as the planners. We did not do that in this process. I believe it's going to set us up for a fundamental flaw.

The lawsuits I looked at fundamentally are charging that this comprehensive plan is really a stalling tactic. It's not a stalling tactic if it's done properly. And to do it properly there are many issues that need to be addressed.

One of my pet peeves has been the bedroom count. Bedroom count traditionally has been 4.1 to 4.5 individuals per household. These were numbers where it came down through statistics coming from the school board. And it's been the standard for, ever since I have been going, my short tenure of 30 years.

Always the shoe size that everyone seems
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to fit into. The problem is, we're now experiencing where these are being marketed to, what I call, supersized families, it doesn't matter what ethnic group they're from the supersized family still has a mega impact. The impact is at least twice of what the impact of what a standard sized family would be. But this has never been addressed in the SEQRA process. Now we have -- and since we ignored it, we have lawsuits, which the town is being specifically singled out for denying LLC's, in particular, their vested property rights. While, excuse me, the people or the organizations or former companies that had those almost vested rights, they're not quite vested rights. They got to a certain stage and it stopped. It stopped because they didn't want the maps signed because they didn't want their taxes to go up. But they were almost to that stage. They almost had vested rights. But the vested rights was reflected for a certain size family, which was 4.5 at max.

And all of the SEQRA information, all of
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the SEQRA'd ramification, traffic, sewer, water, social services, you name it, were all based on that size family. We know from these lawsuits, these are not marked to the standard sized family. They told us that. In fact, in these lawsuits they said this action is prejudicial against large Hasidic families. So, we know that.

It's time to address this issue and stop ignoring it. And I brought this up at the planning board and I keep getting (not heard) it's the Board of Health's problem.

Well, the trouble with the Board of Health, County Board of Health that is, they are working on numbers they have never, to my knowledge, never have received an application from a supersized family. So, they're based on all statistics too, outdated in this present scenario. They need to be brought up to speed. But if no one notifies these people, like the planning board, it's responsibility of the lead agency. Because I happen to go personally to the engineer at the county board of health. I presented this
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problem. He said give him a formal letter.

I did.

The formal letter, in essence, says it's the job and it is the job of the lead agency, whatever that lead agency is, who ever, the town board, in this case it's the planning board. They are responsible to make sure SEQRA is done properly.

SEQRA cannot be done properly if you have a phony bed count. Which statistic paraphrasing the first George Bush, this is voodoo engineering. He said voodoo economics. This is bogus. And for those LLC's owners to say we have vested rights.

No, you don't have that. If you were marketing to a standard sized family you would have a case for vested rights. They stated in lawsuit they're not marketed.

That's the problem.

Another problem that needs to be addressed here and that is what's happening here, and this lies below the radar. When we have resales of homes, these homes, for the most part, were SEQRA'd many years ago, some
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decades ago, for a certain sized family. And the infrastructure was set up to support that. It has proven that infrastructure was adequate. Now you get a problem where resale comes along, supersized family moves in --

MR. CARDONE: Thirty seconds.

SPEAKER: -- infrastructure gets overwhelmed. And we have empirical evidence on that because we just venture across the quick way, there are certain sections in the Town of Monroe, where this happened 30 years ago. In fact, I can point out a resident in this room that can testify to that. New family moves in, within a matter of months leaching fields are overwhelmed, water is overwhelmed. We need to address this problem. These are two things that need to be addressed. It's not --

One other thing, you do not pass laws restricting the number of people in a dwelling. You don't do that. I didn't say to do that. All I'm saying is we do the SEQRA to reflect an accurate count --

MR. CARDONE: Time.
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SPEAKER: (Speaker not heard).

MR. CARDONE: Thank you very much.

SPEAKER: Thank you for your spare moment.

MR. COLON: Thank you.

SPEAKER: Mike Goldstein. It's too bad that the lady that is preparing this is not here. I have some questions about what has already been passed, what I think has been passed or accepted, going to be in the plan. I want to know at the comprehensive plan will now consider revisiting the accessory apartment law enacted, due to the federal lawsuit that claims this clause is discriminatory for the Hasidic population of the town.

Since we have been assured by Mr. Eoghan [ph] that no new annexation requests will happen for at least ten years, why do we have to change the zoning of the property, which will be just outside the proposed new town? The comprehensive plan has to make sure that the planning board will be responsible to review SEQRA's if they find something has
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changed. Shay Meadows, 30 years old. 30
years old, and we are going by that data.
How wrong is that. And the planning board
said they can't do it, it's up to the county.
But you can give them the right to do that, I
believe.

And then I wanted to know if they were
going to be considering spot zoning, as
requested by the leaders of KJ to the homes
and residents on Seven Springs Road, who were
not to be included in the planned new town?

Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you.
MR. COLON: Thank you.
MR. CARDONE: Anyone else?
SPEAKER: Christine Tucker. Town of
Monroe resident. I just have two questions
pretty much.

There was several requests made to the
board, when and if will the public receive a
full redline copy of the CPU that the board
is going to vote on? And then originally,
there were four options, I believe, that was
presented to the board. And you guys had one
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option built out, correct? Excuse me. You requested the one to be built out. What happens to the other proposals that were not addressed by the planner? Do they stay in the CPU until they're needed, and if so, does the public, at that time, have a right to have public hearings and follow the same procedures that we follow for this CPU. So that we can have an opportunity to say about those, if you are going to have the build outs on the other three options. That's it.

Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you.

MR. McGINN: Thank you.

MR. McQUADE: Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Okay. Anyone else?

SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Simon Gill [ph]. And I was here in June, July, August, September asking for the same question. And I will ask that question again. If there is a possibility to meet with the town planner to discuss the concerns.

MR. NUGENT: Can I ask you to speak up a little bit so the stenographer can -- speak
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into the microphone.

SPEAKER: In June and in July and August, September and now in October, I am here asking the same question again, if there is a possibility to have a meeting with the town planner to discuss the concerns that we have for the proposed zoning law?

MR. McGINN: I will address it at the end.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Anyone else? Do we need a motion to continue the public hearing on a comprehensive plan update?

MR. NUGENT: Yeah. If the board wants, it's up to you, you can close the oral comment and leave it open for written comment, if you want, to the next meeting or you can leave it open entirely, it's up to you. We will, again, need to set the date at 7:30 when the regular meeting opens.

MR. CARDONE: We have to do those at 7:30.

MR. McGINN: I make a motion that we
Proceedings

close the oral and keep it open for written
comment at the -- until the next public --
until the next meeting to be announced during
the 7:30 regular meeting.

MR. CARDONE: I second that.

MR. McQUADE: That means until the
meeting is over next time, is that it?

MR. McGINN: Yeah.

MR. COLON: And that's a written
comment.

MR. CARDONE: Call to question?

MR. McGINN: Aye.

MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. McQUADE: Aye.

MR. CARDONE: So moved.

We need a motion to open the
continuation of the public hearing to the
amendments of Chapter 57 zoning.

MR. McGINN: Before we do that, I just
want to reply to -- Mr. Gill, just -- at the
last meeting I believe we told you to give
the planner a call. And I believe you had
some meetings with the planner thus far. So,
I will tell you again, give her a call. We
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told you to do that the last time. And you're more than welcome to call her again, all right. You can set up a meeting. We told you that at the last meeting, I'm fairly certain. We can go to the videotape to confirm that. And you have met with her. So, I think to sit there and kind of say that like you have been denied access to her is not correct. So, give her a call, if you want to meet with her, and set up an appointment. That's all I can tell you.

MR. McQUADE: I would like to answer something too, because Mike said we will wait to the end of that session. A few of the people had some comments.

I do watch the planning board meeting that Ward was at where he asked the planning board to write a letter. And did they ever get that letter to you that were going to hand in?

SPEAKER: I'm not aware of.

MR. McQUADE: Because you were worried about the impacts in the bedroom counts.

SPEAKER: Maybe --
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MR. McQUADE: I know the engineer was telling you that the state law was such, but that you did get the board to agree to give you a letter. Did you or John get it?

SPEAKER: Not to my knowledge. Maybe in the --

MR. McQUADE: Other than that, I understand Ward's point with the bedroom counts not being accurate anymore. I also understand someone else was speaking about the A, B, C and D options. I don't think that at this time in our community, we need an A, B, C and D option for higher density zoning outside of the Village of KJ or the Town of Palm Tree, whatever occurs in the near future. I think we should use that as a buffer zone. Keep it the way it is with one unit per parcel, sort of as a buffer zone from high or extremely high, as it might turn out, zoning density into a lower, you know, pretty low stable density and environmental impacts will be kept to a minimum at that point. I think it's foolish for us to do otherwise.
Proceedings

As far as the accessory apartment law, I think, once again, I know the board tried to tighten it up, but there is no real enforcement, as members of the public have stated too. And I think we should, for the time being, do away with the accessory apartment law. Because with all that's happening, and all of the density that's going to be going on, I think there is plenty of room for people to have high density housing in the area. It might in be in the town next door, but it's definitely close by. So, historically, we have rarely used the accessory apartments law, and in the last three or four years it's been used in a way it was never intended.

If you're telling me that low income housing is met by people who are putting millions of dollars into the house, that's not true. I mean lets be honest, I mean we're all trying to work together hopefully here. Lets just let, for the next five to eight years, let it sit. And see what the pressures are on the community. And if it
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does need to be change at the next
comprehensive plan, maybe then you will see
what the build outs are in KJ or Palm Tree,
and then you can make an informed decision in
a future board. Thank you.

MR. COLON: I have a comment on that, if
I may.

First off, comment a was made that in
previous years gone by that they would get
plan planning and zoning and conservation
committee together. And if all of this
planning and all of this went into what we
now have, I don't think it was very
effective. Because we wouldn't be discussing
what we're discussing now, A.

B, I also feel that the market will
dictate regardless of who ever is building
where ever. Market will always dictate the
value of the home. Market will dictate what
people will build in the ultimate end. The
market will dictate that. I'm a firm
believer in the housing market, if there is
too many houses that are up for sale then the
price goes down. That's a fact. If there is
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not enough buyers in the market the price
goes down. And the market will dictate this.
And so will the banks. And the banks will
not loan out needlessly, no matter whose
money it is. They're not going to be in a
big hurry to push that money out the door.
But that's just my feeling. I've always seen
the market place make adjustments on that.
We saw that in the housing bubble when it
burst in '09 and we may have to see that
again. I hope not in this country, but
that's what, I think, the market place will
dictate.

Thank you.

MR. McQUADE: Can I respond to one thing
he said?

MR. COLON: You had your time.

MR. McQUADE: Okay.

MR. CARDONE: I will make a motion to
open the continuation of the public hearing
for amendments to Chapter 57 zoning.

MR. COLON: Second call.

MR. CARDONE: All in question?

MR. McGINN: Aye.
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MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. McQUADE: Aye.

MR. CARDONE: So moved.

Any speakers?

SPEAKER: Simon Gill again. I would like to make, for the record, I called Bonnie several times. She never returned my phone call. And when I met with her for a different project, she specifically at that time she was -- she made it clear before and after, that would only talking on this one particular project. I'm still waiting for the other clients that I'm representing, I'm waiting for that meeting for the last four months. And I was here the last meeting and the board -- in August, the board asked me that I should submit in writing all of the, like an outline summary I would like to discuss, and I did that. And since then that was the end of it. I'm still waiting for that meeting.

MR. McGINN: I will give her a call. I will give her a call. I know there has been multiple meeting with multiple people over
the same area that you're discussing. So, I will give her a call and see if we can meet up with her, all right.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you.

SPEAKER: Mike Goldstein again. Many of the comments I made in the first two meetings were applied to this. But basically I don't understand why we're bothering to change the zoning regulation in light of what is happening in this town right now. What's left in the town, or will be left in the town, that zoning requirements was perfectly great. So, there is really no point, that I can see, in changing it. Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you.

Come on up, sir.

SPEAKER: I would like to --

MR. CARDONE: State your name and where you live for the record, please.

SPEAKER: My name is Herman Wackshell [ph]. I am a rabbi in the Congregation of Rambut [ph] Orange County, which is situated in the Town of Monroe.
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We have a piece of property that combined is about five acres. We would like you to take into consideration there is no -- there is not much or not sufficient senior living housing projects in this town. I would like to ask if that -- if those properties, this is in section 1-47-231 and 47-232, if it can be brought up to be senior housing. And the same time, I understand there is a fund, a Cavlanian [ph] fund in the Town that was allocated for the senior housing. I think we can work that out and do a nice project.

MR. CARDONE: Not that I want to go back and forth, because I haven't memorized all of the lots in the town, section, block and lot. Can you give me a street and cross street.

SPEAKER: It's off of Seven Springs Road on a private cul-de-sac called Lanzer Court. Right there in the back. It's surrounded by woods. It's a beautiful nice piece of property, situated there, perfectly fit quitey for seniors.

There is going to be a big problem. The
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baby boomers are coming up.

MR. CARDONE: Not baby anymore.

Okay.

SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. McGINN: Have you submitted plans to the town board?

SPEAKER: I spoke to the supervise before about it. I have not submitted any plans. I wasn't ready to spend a fortune of money before I know that there is something to talk about.

MR. McGINN: My suggestion to you would be to, if you could put something in writing something so we could see, submit it to the board and -- are you going to say the same thing?

MR. CARDONE: No.

I was going to say if you're coming here to expect -- and expect us to say yes or no to something like that so you can move forward, that's not going to happen.

SPEAKER: No. Basically what I wanted to say is first there has got to be a recognition that there is a need for senior
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living here, and there is not enough senior
living in this town. And then -- and that
the board is interested in the idea of senior
living all together. And if yes, I can start
working on it and spend money on it to do a
nice presentation, engineer and so on on it.

MR. CARDONE: Okay.

MR. McQUADE: It’s an interesting idea,
so I don’t see why -- maybe I know you have
monetary worries if it’s going to go no
where. And like Tony said, we can’t answer
you tonight. But maybe if you come up with a
little preliminary ideas.

SPEAKER: I will come up with something.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you.

MR. McQUADE: Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Anyone else?

SPEAKER: Ward Brower, private citizen.
Again, I question the merits of changing RR1
to SR10 given the almost slam dunk effect
that we’re going to have a new, create a new
Town of Palm Tree, which if you can believe
the leaders of the certain political group,
will solve our better housing needs for the
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next ten years. So, what's the rush
converting RR1 to SR10? And this is not --
doesn't require an algorithm, doesn't require
calculus. If you take -- originally when
that zoning was set up it was figured on one
acre four and a half people. Now we know if
we market them to a supersized family that's
ten people roughly. And then if you make
that quarter acre zoning, which SR10 does,
that's 40 people per acre. And then if you
-- ten years go by and you kick in the
accessory, that at least doubles to 80 people
per acre, and this is possible with simple
arithmetic. And I know last time I was
typecast as stretching the facts. This is
the real world.

There was never -- that zoning --
present zoning was never anticipated to be
sold to supersized families. That's why I'm
saying we need to get the parameters in
order.

Also, when we do these upgrades master
plans, comprehensive plans, they have a
lifespan of approximately five years. We
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know people have human faults. They cannot
project that far in advance. That's why you
do these every five years supposedly.

So, fault people 20 years ago for not
for seeing what happened 20 years down the
road is a human error and it was built into
the system. That's why it was supposed to be
revised every five years.

Thank you.

MR. CARDONE: Thank you.

MR. McQUADE: Thank you.

Anyone else?

Okay. Counsel, with respect this one?

MR. NUGENT: Same progress. It's now
after 7:30, so we can have Mr. McGinn make
the motion we can continue this to a date to
be determined now.

MR. McGINN: Okay. I would like to set
the date for the next town board meeting on
Wednesday, November 1, seven p.m. All
business thereafter, instead of October 30,
Monday, October 30.

MR. CARDONE: I will second that.

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Same venue?
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MR. McQUADE: Why, Mike?

MR. McGINN: There is like a variety of reasons. I will just say that one of the things is we're looking at setting the DGIS night, if that's the case then there is a time limit that Mr. Nugent sent us all in the e-mail, but I'm sure he could tell you about it now, that requires responses from other concerned agencies and things like that. And give adequate time. The 30th might not be enough time whereas the first should be enough time. And also, there is other conflicts with, personal conflicts with myself and I believe Mr. Cardone and Mr. Colon also. So, it just seems to be make good sense all of the way around.

MR. McQUADE: All three on Monday is a conflict, is that what you're saying, so I know?

MR. McGINN: Yeah.

MR. McQUADE: Okay. Wednesday might be a conflict for me. I will try to get out of some stuff. Normally we have the meetings on Monday. I don't know why it -- can we field
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three for Monday and then have three for
Wednesday and do the DGIS stuff on Wednesday?
That way I can make the meeting.

MR. McGINN: I think --

MR. McQUADE: Eight years on Mondays.

I'm used to it being Mondays.

MR. McGINN: Trying to do it all in one
night would be better than coming back,
especially we have budget coming up, and a
lot of other extra meetings that we might
have to have to address these other issues
out there.

MR. McQUADE: All right. I might not be
able to make it, but hopefully the board
will.

MR. CARDONE: I second that. Well, I
did second it. Sorry.

Call to question?

MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. McGINN: Aye.

MR. McQUADE: Nay.

MR. CARDONE: So moved. We have --

MR. NUGENT: We have three.

MR. McGINN: So, the first public
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hearing for Sterling LLC, make a motion that we continue it to the new town board meeting date of 11/1, Wednesday, 11/1.

MR. CARDONE: I will second it.

MR. NUGENT: We need a time so 7:00.

MR. McQUADE: Say it one more time. I want to hear it.

MR. COLON: Make the proposal for a time.

MR. McQUADE: Motion just made.

MR. McGINN: Make a motion that we have the public hearing, to continue the public hearing for Sterling LLC hardship variance on Wednesday, November 1 at seven p.m.

MR. McQUADE: Okay.

MR. CARDONE: I will second it. Call to question?

MR. McGINN: Aye.

MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. McQUADE: Aye.

MR. McGINN: I make the motion we continue the public hearing on the comprehensive plan for written comment only, also to the next board meeting on Wednesday,
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November one at seven p.m.

MR. CARDONE: I second that. Call to question?

MR. McGINN: Aye.

MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. McGINN: Lastly, I would like to make a motion that we do a continuation of the public hearing on the Chapter 57 zoning also for seven p.m. on Wednesday, November first --

MR. CARDONE: I second that.

MR. McGINN: -- for written comment only.

MR. CARDONE: Call to question?

MR. McGINN: Aye.

MR. COLON: Aye.

MR. MCQUADE: Aye.

MR. CARDONE: So moved.

We move into our regularly scheduled meeting.
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THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED to be a true and correct transcription of the original stenographic minutes to the best of my ability.

Debra Boggs
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