BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING - VIA ZOOM
FEBRUARY 1, 2021
6:00 P.M.
PUBLIC HEARING RE: BILL NO. 1 OF 2020
PRESENT:
KENNETH C. RISCICA, MAYOR
DANIEL CATALDO, TRUSTEE
SILVA (AIDA) FERMAN, TRUSTEE
GUS PANOPOULOS, TRUSTEE
DIANNE SHEEHAN, TRUSTEE
ALVIN SOLOMON, TRUSTEE
NORMAN TAYLOR, TRUSTEE
CHRISTOPHER PRIOR, ESQ., VILLAGE ATTORNEY
EDWARD P. BUTT, BUILDING INSPECTOR
KATHERINE HANNON, SPECIAL PROJECT ASSOCIATE
ARLENE DRUCKER, VILLAGE CLERK
JENNIFER DEVLIN
COURT REPORTER

1	MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. So we're going to
2	start the public hearing now. As is required
3	the this meeting will be both recorded and
4	transcribed by a stenographer. When a
5	meeting is transcribed it's very important
6	that the person speaking identifies themself
7	and speaks in a clear and slow voice, because
8	there's only so much can keep up with. She
9	cannot keep up with crosstalk. But we
10	shouldn't have much crosstalk because
11	everyone on the call except the board will be
12	muted until they raise their hand. The hand
13	raise function is at the bottom of the of
14	your screen. And I don't know where it is in
15	yours. Where Arlene, can you give me
16	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: The hand raise
17	was in the reactions from me.
18	MAYOR RISCICA: Reactions. Yeah. I
19	don't have the hand raise function because
20	I'm the host. So I need to
21	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Then I think
22	also you have the three dots. It could be in
23	there as well.
24	MAYOR RISCICA: Right. And I don't have

that, so I would ask Dan who is a 1 2 participant --3 TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: You're right, Arlene. TRUSTEE CATALDO: If somebody wants to 4 5 participate, there is a "participants" button on the bottom. You click on that and another 6 7 box will pop up. And there will be a hand 8 raise button there with a list of 9 participants. 10 MAYOR RISCICA: Dan, can you show us how 11 that works and what that looks like on the 12 screen? 13 TRUSTEE CATALDO: As you mentioned, on 14 the bottom of the screen there is a button 1.5 called "participants." 16 MAYOR RISCICA: I know that. But could 17 you raise your hand so people can see what 18 that looks like. There you go. So that 19 means that we know that Dan Cataldo wants to 20 speak. And now he's unraised his hand. All 21 right. Okay. 22 So this is our first public hearing on So I do hope you will bear with us. 23 24 The meeting is being -- the meeting is being

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

recorded. We talked about that. Just like any other meeting, guests need to identify themselves by name and address. That took a little while because it has to be done while we're meeting. And it will interrupt the meeting periodically as we --

CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Why don't you just double check and make sure nobody is there waiting now.

MAYOR RISCICA: Can I finish my train of thought on housekeeping before I do that?

I plan to check on intervals. And I'm at the housekeeping item. And I would like to do that and then stop and check again. Okay.

CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Okay.

MAYOR RISCICA: Chat is available. you're having a difficulty or you want to get a point across like Jennifer Devlin did a short while ago and said, hi, I need to be unmuted, you can chat.

We have a large crowd, which is great. We never have a large crowd, so I'm happy to see so many people engaged.

When it comes to the public comment

period, I'm accustomed to meetings running with 3-minute time limits. And the clerk will be the timekeeper. So that's what we're going to do in our meeting.

I would honestly like to allow more time.

And if there are fewer questions and fewer people that want to ask them, we will liberally expand that. But if there are people that want to ask questions, I think 3 minutes is customary. And that's what we will do.

We're not trying to rule anything out.

We will be here until the last question is asked. Okay. There's nothing that we're not prepared to -- there's no time limit on the meeting. So that's the way we're going to control the time.

This is a very complicated topic. This is not a simple matter. And that's why we're here, because it's a complicated matter and the matter the board has struggled for a period of years with how to get this right.

And we have a suggestion on the table.

And so we're going to explain to you our

1.5

2.2

thinking in coming to our conclusion. And that starts with a fundamental understanding of what is a Planning Board, how does it operate and what are the requirements of members? And then — and then the building inspector is then going to give us a presentation about Planning Boards in general, but also very specifically about issues in our village. And so — so the building inspector is going to speak.

And then the -- and then the trustees will have an opportunity to weigh in if they have anything to say. And then we're going to introduce the public inputs that we got since we announced the meeting. And then we're going to have your public comment.

So it's going to be a lot of presentation time first. That's a necessary predicate to an understanding of the issues so that we can deal with questions. And that's what we're going to do. So that's the agenda. And I've discussed housekeeping.

And so now I'm going to stop the share for a second and go see if there's anybody

1	else trying to get in. Nobody is trying to
2	get in. So I'm going to share my screen
3	again and ask the clerk to discuss the the
4	clerk to call the roll first to determine if
5	we have a quorum and then to discuss the
6	notice required and notice given for this
7	meeting.
8	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Okay. Roll
9	call.
10	Mayor Riscica.
11	MAYOR RISCICA: Here.
12	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Trustee
13	Cataldo.
14	TRUSTEE CATALDO: Here.
15	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Trustee Ferman.
16	TRUSTEE FERMAN: Here.
17	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Trustee
18	Panopoulos who might be muted, but I know
19	that I've seen him.
20	Trustee Sheehan.
21	TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: Here.
22	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Trustee
23	Solomon.
24	TRUSTEE SOLOMON: Here.

1	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Trustee Taylor.
2	TRUSTEE TAYLOR: Here.
3	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Village
4	Attorney Chris Prior.
5	MR. PRIOR: Here.
6	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Building
7	Inspector Ed Butt.
8	BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Here.
9	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Special project
10	associate Katherine Hannon.
11	MS. HANNON: Here.
12	MAYOR RISCICA: So do we have a quorum?
13	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Yes. We have a
14	quorum.
15	MAYOR RISCICA: Great. Could you proceed
16	to advise us if we if adequate notice was
17	given of this meeting?
18	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: I will. Can
19	you please unmute Gus also?
20	MAYOR RISCICA: Right now I can't do
21	that.
22	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: So I provided a
23	letter to you that should be there with a
24	list of the required documents.

1	The first requirement is to place the
2	legal notice in the official newspaper of the
3	village 10 days prior to the meeting. On
4	January 20, 2021, the legal notice was placed
5	in The Manhasset Press. I've enclosed the
6	affidavit of publication provided by The
7	Manhasset Press. Do you want to show that,
8	Ken?
9	MAYOR RISCICA: Yeah. I'm trying to
10	unmute Gus at the same time.
11	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Oh, okay.
12	TRUSTEE PANOPOULOS: I'm unmuted, Ken.
13	MAYOR RISCICA: Okay.
14	CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Okay. The
15	second requirement is the posting of this
16	legal notice on the utility poles within the
17	village as well as the bulletin board outside
18	of village hall and on the village website.
19	Enclosed is the affidavit of Katherine Hannon
20	dated January 19, 2021, stating that this has
21	been done.

And the third requirement is to provide to the Nassau County Planning Commission the bill for their review.

22

23

MAYOR RISCICA: That's not a notice 1 2 thing, is it? 3 CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Okay. Yeah. That's not a notice. It's a requirement, but 4 5 it's not a notice. I just want to --MAYOR RISCICA: What you just described 6 7 was the minimum -- the minimum requirements 8 for notices; is that correct? CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Correct. 9 10 MAYOR RISCICA: Did we supply anything 11 beyond the minimum required? CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: We actually 12 13 supplied three additional notifications. The 14 first one was a NorthShoreALERT on January 1.5 14, 2021, informing residents that the 16 village will be holding a public hearing in 17 order to satisfy input from residents. 18 There was a second additional 19 notification which was the village newsletter 20 which mentioned the public hearing. 21 provided on January 25th. And the third 2.2 additional notification was another NorthShoreALERT notification on January 29th 23 24 providing information to residents on how to

review documents that are relevant to this 1 2 public hearing. 3 MAYOR RISCICA: So I would ask the village attorney, if he's unmuted, is this --4 5 does this level of notice constitute inadequate, adequate or more than adequate 6 7 notice of the meeting, sir? 8 MR. PRIOR: You've taken care of all the 9 requirements. And you've also made 10 additional efforts in excess of what's 11 required by the law to notify the public 12 here. 13 MAYOR RISCICA: So we've met the notice 14 requirements to have this meeting? 1.5 MR. PRIOR: Yes, you have. 16 MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. I'm going to get 17 out of the screen share for a moment because 18 I do have another visitor. It looks to me 19 like he's from outside of our village. 20 Randall. Randall, I'm going to unmute you 21 for a second. And you need to give your name 2.2 and address for the record. 23 MR. ROSENBAUM: Sorry, Ken. 24 MAYOR RISCICA: No. That's okay.

1 MR. ROSENBAUM: I didn't hear you. Just 2 logging on. 3 MAYOR RISCICA: The clerk needs to record your name and address for the record. 4 5 MR. ROSENBAUM: I'm sorry. Randall Rosenbaum. Village of Flower Hill. I will 6 7 give you my home address. 1 Overhill Lane. 8 MAYOR RISCICA: Good to see you here. 9 MR. ROSENBAUM: I'm interested in your 10 public hearing. Thank you. Good to see you, 11 Ken. 12 MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. I'm going to go 13 back to our screen share. That's all that I 14 had in the -- that's all that I had in the --1.5 that's all that I had in the waiting room. I 16 will stop screen share because I don't think 17 I did that one right. And I want to go back 18 to the agenda. Okay. 19 Arlene, you have something there from the 20 Nassau County Planning Commission? What is that? 21 CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: Yeah. That's 2.2 actually another requirement. And that's the 23 24 last requirement where we have provided the

bill for them to review. So enclosed is the letter from them acknowledging that they reviewed the bill and have determined that this is for local determination, which basically means that they see no reason to provide input.

MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. So we have that.

So we have complied with all the requirements to have this bill. So what's next on our agenda, I believe -- let's check -- is the village attorney and -- I seem to have eliminated a page that I need. So I will stop sharing for a second and I'm going to re-establish that page. Okay. Here it is. I'm going to share that page.

So I would like to turn it over to the village attorney to speak. Can everybody see the screen share?

TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: Yes.

MAYOR RISCICA: And this is the legal language and the technical aspect of what we're proposing to do. And in Section A or AB it discusses the legislative history the Board of Trustees of Plandome Heights

1.5

1.5

2.2

recognizes. And this is essentially our rationale for what we're doing. And I think it's important that Chris read this into the record, because we wordsmithed this over three different meetings. We've been talking about this issue, as I mentioned, for years.

And when Flower Hill did what they did in merging their Planning Board last year, the board noticed that. The board pressed me that, how come we haven't acted on it? We talked about acting on it, and we haven't acted on it.

So we spent three different meetings talking about it and articulating our rationale. So this has been done in a thoughtful manner over a 3-month period. And I think it's important that Chris read it into the record. Chris, can you do that?

MR. PRIOR: I would be happy to. This is Christopher Prior, the village attorney.

As the Mayor described, what I'm about to read to you is contained in the bill that's before the board tonight and before the public in this hearing. And this section

1.5

2.2

explains why the board is proposing to take this action.

The Board of Trustees of the Village of Plandome Heights recognizes that the village consists almost entirely of building lots that are not able to be further partitioned or subdivided as of right in light of the village's zoning restrictions on lot dimensions.

Furthermore, the village has only very infrequently been presented with partitioning or subdivision applications for property in neighboring jurisdictions for which the village has shared jurisdiction. As a result the village is presented with applications for subdivisions or partitioning on extremely rare occasions, such that many years may intervene between meetings of the village Planning Board.

Due to such infrequency of meetings and minimal need for the Planning Board function, the duly appointed members of the Planning Board heretofore established by Local Law No. 1 of 2004 of the village do not have the

1.5

2.2

opportunity to become familiar with current property and zoning issues within the village or in neighboring jurisdictions, but are burdened by the obligation to satisfy annual training requirements which are rarely put to use.

At the same time the members of the Board of Trustees collectively meet regularly to address the many issues that arise in the village, including those that pertain to property and zoning issues. The trustees receive briefings and presentations relating to property, zoning and land use matters from time to time from the village attorney and the village building inspector.

In addition through the village's membership in the New York Conference of Mayors and the Nassau County Village Officials Association the trustees have access to property, zoning and land use materials and information from those organizations.

Furthermore, in a small village like Plandome Heights there is an inherent

difficulty in identifying and securing residents who are ready, willing and able to serve the village in a voluntary uncompensated role such as that of member of a separate Planning Board.

And the interests of the village are not served if such individuals do come forward and volunteer only to serve on a board that meets as infrequently as the village's separate Planning Board.

So this is the extract from the proposed bill explaining why we're here. And the text of the actual shifting of function from Planning Board to Board of Trustees is rather simple. And I don't think we need to read that into the record. So the -- just to give you just a little bit of background.

The New York State Village Law permits
villages but does not require them to have a
Planning Board comprised of separate
individuals separate from the Board of
Trustees. The village law authorizes
villages to regulate subdivisions and also to
regulate the site plans. These are functions

1.5

2.2

that -- both of those functions are in some villages given to Planning Boards.

In the Village of Plandome Heights we have not regulated site plan as a subject matter for the Planning Board. So in essence the only function that the Plandome Heights Planning Board has is to consider subdivisions; that is, the taking of one lot and dividing it into more than one lot. It can also include partitioning, which is the relocation of property lines between properties.

This village is largely built out in the sense of parcels in the village in relation to our zoning code. There are a couple of -- a few parcels that theoretically could be subdivided in the future as of right, but there are not many. And I can tell you that I became the village attorney -- I believe it was 2006. And I recall in that period of time three, perhaps four times when the Planning Board actually had business.

So you have years that go by between matters that require the attention of the

Planning Board. And logically people who are serving in that capacity on the village
Planning Board don't have the opportunity to maintain a fresh awareness of what the function requires.

And so when things do pop up again before the Planning Board, infrequently though that may be, that requires sort of a long track to get back on course and recall what the function is. You're a small village. You have a Board of Trustees that's comprised of seven people, which by the way is rather unique. Most village boards have five people.

mentioned in what I read that flow out of that. Do we have enough volunteers to handle those roles? There are need for volunteers, and yet it seems almost wasteful to take the five Planning Board members and two alternates to the Planning Board, have them commit to give time to the village, commit to take the training to be up to speed and then to have those skills go stale. And then

those people are effectively not able to serve on other boards and volunteer in other ways.

So that's where we are. As I noted in what I read, it was 2004 when you established the Planning Board. Your village established subdivisions as their role. And with the time that's gone by and seeing the history of things, the board has been considering making a change to streamline the process.

MAYOR RISCICA: First I think it's important for the residents to understand what is involved in evaluating a subdivision request and what things like "as of right" mean. What sort of criteria can the board consider? Because I think that's very important to the dialogue here.

We have an ARB, an Architectural Review Board that's allowed a wide latitude of judgment. This design would not fit within our community and we want you to change it. And we can argue back and forth about that. But ultimately the independent residents on that board bring their judgment led by a

1.5

2.2

really outstanding leader in -- a really outstanding leader. And the community benefits from that.

The Zoning Board gets to evaluate zoning requests in light of the track record and history that we have in the village in light of the perhaps particular circumstances of the individual family. They have unexpectedly gotten triplets and they really want to stay in the village and need to expand the house. And perhaps that enters into somebody's determination from the standpoint of judgment and community input.

But Planning as I understand it, and I'm not an attorney, Planning has an entirely different set of rules and requirements that I would like you to review. And I would like you to review how those rules and requirements sit with the members of the Planning Board who have pressure from the community and want to have an impact on the Planning Board.

MR. PRIOR: Sure. The Planning Board looks at a project, a proposed subdivision,

only when it is zoning compliant, either because the property can be subdivided from one into two theoretically because the property itself once divided by two has sufficient lot size frontage and lot area to become subdivided without the need for variances.

Or alternatively it comes to the Planning
Board -- a subdivision comes to the Planning
Board as legally compliant with zoning
because it already has obtained whatever
zoning variances might be required if, in
fact, subdividing one into two would create
one or more substandard lots.

MAYOR RISCICA: Let me stop you right there for a second, Chris.

What are the chances -- and then, Ed, you can weigh in on this also if you want. What are the chances of someone who wants to subdivide getting a variance out of our Zoning Board?

MR. PRIOR: Well, that's a hard question to answer.

MAYOR RISCICA: Does Ed want to weigh in

1.5

2.2

on this?

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: I can. Sure.

Any time we get any kind of an application that comes in, first thing we do is look at it even on a preliminary basis purely for zoning. The third — the 12 years I've been here, we've only had one case come before the board or come to me with a two-lot subdivision, which is the one that's most recently been submitted and under construction over at Summit.

If I can, the project -- the location and all the requirements to meet a minor lot coverage --

MAYOR RISCICA: But, Ed, my specific question -- and I want you to get into all of that when you have your presentation. My specific question is counsel made the point that the Planning Board only gets something once it's either zoning compliant or has an appropriate variance. And my question is:

What are the chances of our Zoning Board issuing a variance to a property that it knows would then go to subdivision?

1.5

2.2

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Slim and none.

MAYOR RISCICA: Slim and none would be my guess because our Zoning Board, unlike our Planning Board, can exercise different judgments. And the Zoning Board would know intuitively that subdivisions are not popular in the village. And, therefore, they would rarely, if ever, grant one. Our — the current membership of our Zoning Board would probably not.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Absolutely.

Absolutely.

MAYOR RISCICA: That's all that I wanted at this point, but that's fine. But I want you to get into some depth. Thank you.

Chris, go on please.

MR. PRIOR: So again the subdivision only comes to the Planning Board when you got something that's legally compliant, or in the unlikely scenario that the Zoning Board granted a variance to permit it to go forward on a subdivision basis. The Zoning Board — again remember as the mayor described before, the Zoning Board is being asked by a property

owner to allow that property to be developed in a way that it does not comply with our zoning code. They're asking us to vary the law so that they can do something that the code doesn't permit. That gives that board more discretion in terms of saying no than a Planning Board has when it's faced with an application for subdivision or partitioning when there aren't any zoning issues.

A frequent consideration for Planning

Board members and the community -- I say this

practically -- it's a consideration as oppose

to the legal standards of consideration -- is

whether a subdivision on my block around the

corner in my community is going to impact

things from a population density standpoint.

There are too many people already in the

community or we have a proper balance. One

more or two more families or houses will be a

problem.

That comes up quite a bit, at least in conversation from residents during subdivision applications, which I hear in all of the villages that I work with. But that

is not an issue that's ever before the

Planning Board. That's an issue that's first

before the trustees who determine what zoning

is in a community. When they establish the

size of lots, they're controlling density

that way.

It indirectly can come before a Zoning

It indirectly can come before a Zoning
Board if a Zoning Board is being asked to
grant variances that would permit, for
example, a subdivision where there's
inadequate lot size for a subdivision. But
the Planning Board, if it gets into that game
and decides to make decisions based on the
density of population, is going into an area
that it has no legal authority to regulate.
This is an impermissible reason for a
Planning Board to take an action.

So what does the Planning Board look at?

The New York State Village Law sets forth the considerations that a Planning Board is entitled to look at and should look at when evaluating a subdivision application. It looks at the following issues. Can the land been used safely for building purposes? Can

1.5

2.2

that occur without danger to health? Can it occur without peril to fire, flood, drainage or other menace to neighboring properties of the public health, safety and welfare?

The Planning Board can look at whether flood hazards would be aggravated by a proposed subdivision. They will see whether the proposed subdivision conforms with the village map and comprehensive plan. In our village that's the zoning codes and the body of decisions made by the Zoning Board and the Planning Board.

Is there street frontage that satisfies village code? Can the property be improved in a way that's reasonably in conformity with existing topography? Can it be approved by — with minimal effect on existing grading, cut and filling so that we can retain natural contours to the extent possible? Can we limit stormwater runoff in this project? Can we conserve natural ground cover and soil?

These are the considerations that the law permits a Planning Board to look at. And one thing that I've noticed over time is that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

many of the issues that are before a Planning
Board can be addressed by applicant through
engineering. Sometimes it can be very
expensive engineering.

But lots of the issues before a Planning Board can be addressed through engineering, which is why a Planning Board which is typically made up of lay persons, at least in the context of engineering, they will have an engineer in addition to the building inspector guide them in their review of a subdivision plan that's presented to them to see if all the factors that I just described can be dealt with -- and with issues of egress and ingress into the property, the ability of fire emergency vehicles to get to the property, the availability of utilities, water, sewer, waste disposal, slopes and grading, preserving trees and natural growth and the quality of the soil.

Again, these are factors that are before the Planning Board. They're relevant.

They're actually required considerations for the Planning Board. And there are things

1.5

2.2

that are engineering sensitive, building department sensitive. And often Planning Boards are best served by being guided by the village engineer and the village's building department.

When issues do come up before the

Planning Board -- again, you know, density is

not one of them. But when issues come up

about the feasibility of the soil, is it

stable enough or are the grades appropriate,

typically an applicant is going to come in

with its own engineer to make the case

because a -- somebody who owns a construction

company comes in and makes the case is not

really making the kind of points that the

Planning Board needs to hear.

So these sorts of topics, these issue that are before a Planning Board, they're dealt with by engineering experts on the applicant's side, which are then also addressed by an engineer that the village has engaged for the project.

So one of the points that I'm trying to make here is a lot of this is much more

make here is a for of this is made more

objective and fact based. And whether it can be resolved is a factual based answer, which is different than a Zoning Board which has, again, more discretion. Because each time it's asked to grant a variance it's being asked to lift the burden of the law off of a property owner.

The Mayor made the point earlier with

The Mayor made the point earlier with respect to the village's Architectural Review Board. That board too just by the nature of its work is — there is a more subjective element in terms of aesthetics and design. And it has its own code that's sort of built in an element of subjectivity.

Planning Board in your village must look at in doing subdivisions. Those are the factors that whatever board has the chore would have to look at. And whatever board has the chore, whether it's the Trustees or whether the status quo is maintained and it's the Planning Board, the heavy lifting -- I mean the decisions are always the board's. But a lot of the intelligence that the board gains

1.5

2.2

comes from experts who are working on these applications both for the applicant and for the village.

MAYOR RISCICA: So, Chris, let me ask two things. One, to put it into specific relief in a way that residents can understand. So I'm on the Planning Board. I have a subdivision in front of me. I don't like subdivisions, okay. My neighbors don't like subdivisions. I live in a 1,638 square foot home on Winthrop Road and I don't want a 45-or 4,800 square foot home near me. I don't think we need one more family in this community. And I'm not going to vote for this. What's your reaction to that?

MR. PRIOR: I have a couple of reactions.

No. 1, if that sort of viewpoint that you described is something that the Planning

Board member has before the application even comes before him or her, that should disqualify that Planning Board member hearing the application. Because what you described to me is a person who is not able to act impartially on a subdivision application

before the -- before its -- before the

Planning Board, which is charged with dealing

with that stuff on an arbitrary -- on an

objective and not arbitrary basis.

1.5

2.2

MAYOR RISCICA: I want to be clear.

I'm not describing some, you know,
theoretical resident which is out of the
mainstream. I'm trying to describe a person
in a position to absorb community input and
express it into the planning process in a
good faith way. I'm not trying to describe
somebody who's not intelligent or
knowledgeable. I'm trying to describe
somebody who is absorbing the community input
and expressing it into the Planning Board
process. I just wanted to make that point
before you continue, but go on.

MR. PRIOR: Okay. And my answer is the same. That person that you just described with that value set should put themselves on the Board of Trustees and make decisions on density in the village, because you can't do it through the Planning Board by denying a subdivision application because you feel that

1.5

2.2

way or because your neighbors feel that way.

One of the issues I see with Planning
Boards in villages that I deal with all the
time is of a number of thankless jobs that
village residents can take on, I think a
Planning Board's job may be the most
thankless because I think a lot of people
feel the way you just described.

MAYOR RISCICA: I know. That's why I'm describing it. Yeah.

MR. PRIOR: And they're welcome to feel that way. And I understand it. And, you know, I live on a block in a village and I think it's quite fully developed. And I would be upset if there was a subdivision on my block. I don't think there any are that are able to be legally subdivided right now.

MAYOR RISCICA: In the interest of time I am going to interrupt you so we can kind of move the meeting along. I'm sure the residents want to speak. But in the interest of time, what you just said is a very good reason why the Board of Trustees should not want this role --

MR. PRIOR: Yes. That's a good point.

MAYOR RISCICA: -- and doesn't want this
role.

MR. PRIOR: Yeah.

1.5

2.2

MAYOR RISCICA: In fact, some have advised that it gives us deniability to let the Planning Board approve the unpopular subdivisions rather than us. So there are -- so there is a clear argument that the Board of Trustees would not want this role. And then I'm going to ask you the second question. And it's a critical question.

The law requires because of what we just discussed that the Planning Board members regularly take training. Are you aware in our village if our members on the Planning Board regularly take required training? And what is the village's reaction to that?

MR. PRIOR: I don't believe that the village board members do take formal training. The training that they take essentially comes from me when we do meet.

And that's how the village has been basically dealing with this rather than having --

MAYOR RISCICA: For the information of the residents. In the last subdivision Chris arranged, partly at my request a separate executive session meeting of the Planning Board -- 2 hours -- simply to review this kind of information with the Planning Board members since they normally don't deal with subdivisions and they don't possess the training.

And I would suggest that's the reason that we're here. The Board of Trustees is concerned about those two facts. And, Chris, unless there's something else you want to add, I would really love to hear from Ed Butt, because I know he's personally involved in this. And he's got his eye on the horizon. And he knows what there is in the village. And if you have something else to say, I would love to hear it. If not I would love to move on to Ed so we can move on to the residents.

MR. PRIOR: Let's hear from Ed.

Thank you.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Thank you.

II

1.5

2.2

MAYOR RISCICA: Mr. Butt, the floor is yours. And I will just by way of introduction say that the village is very fortunate to have Edward Butt as our building inspector. He is a very practical and helpful guy. And he is a building inspector for more than just our regular village. He does Plandome Manor also. And he's a working architect. So he does projects in the town and other villages. So he has a great breath of experience that we should all have great respect for and are fortunate to have him.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Thank you, Ken. Good evening everyone.

I just wanted to, I guess, throw my two cents into some of what's being proposed this evening with respect to the removal of the Planning Board. There are a couple of factors in this. I've been the building inspector here for about a dozen years now, and we've really only had one case ever come before this board.

The zoning in the Village of Plandome
Heights is rather restrictive in order to

build a subdivision or a second home because we have some very restrictive issues, one of which is 100 foot wide or 90 foot wide front yard. That's very restrictive. A lot of our older homes, especially in the Bournedales and so forth are not that wide.

So there's a whole section of the village, actually a substantial amount of the village, to the point there's really only two homes if you look at them just basically on a map that could potentially be subdivided.

And even then those two would be somewhat difficult in nature anyway and potentially not make a lot of sense.

So, again, there is a reason for the practice. Because a lot of people might have even looked at these developers who know every nook and cranny around here. They realize these areas are not developable from that case. The only thing is that a lot of these developers that are coming in now, they're looking at knockdowns. They're looking to knock any house down, build a new one. That kind of thing. Get about as big

1.5

of a home as they possibly can.

1.5

2.2

But we have a lot of restrictions in the village. And because of that even some of the newer homes that have been built in this village have really been sort of proportionally in keeping with the rest of the village. I don't think we've really seen anything that I would consider a monstrosity in this village. Everything has been done in respect.

And we have a very active, very critical Architectural Review Board when it comes to how they look at a lot of these buildings.

And, you know, I think when you think about this, a lot of times in larger subdivisions if you're looking at 10-, 12-lot subdivisions that I've been a part of in the past, they start to talk about the architecture and things like that. But you have an Architectural Review Board. A lot of the towns don't.

So one of the duties -- and I think Chris can chime in on that as well -- is in the larger projects sort of in North Hempstead

1.5

2.2

you will see some comments from the Planning Commission, but they don't even have an actual hearing, a Planning Board, but a Planning Commission that might offer some suggestions about designs and things of that nature. But we have an Architectural Review Board. So we actually spend a lot of time on these new houses, hours of time in here discussing how these buildings should look.

Other than that, I mean when it comes to

Zoning and it comes to a subdivision it's, you know, it can be built or it can't be built. And if it can and it can meet all the criteria that Chris spoke about before as far as what needs to be reviewed -- you know, this is not like we have a -- it's not a very difficult bar for those criteria to be met and set a trap as far as traffic and ingress and egress. But again it's all sort of controlled by the Architectural Review Board.

That being said, I just think it's a large burden to be asked to be around for something that may not happen for years again. And I think that it certainly can be

1.5

2.2

handled within the confines of what we have as an Architectural Review Board because that would have to go before the Architectural Review Board.

And like I said prior, if it's something that would need a variance, I just can't imagine that the Zoning Board would actually allow something like that to happen. And again, you know, a lot of these things, everything is publicly noticed. It's all out there. Someone is — and I'm sure, you know, we can get the word out if there's somebody that concerned about anything like that. That's why we have these public forums: both Architectural Review Boards and BZA.

So I really think that the -- there's no lack of control by not having a Planning

Board in place in this village for what the purposes are in the future of what is about to happen.

MAYOR RISCICA: So, Ed, thank you for that. And I would remind you that in the one subdivision that we looked at in the last 20 years, one of the issues that the residents

1.5

2.2

had -- and it's an appropriate concern. I shared it when I heard it, which is why I asked for the study. And that is if we approve one we're opening the floodgates for subdivisions.

So I asked you to do a study. I asked the building department, you and your people, to do a study of properties in the village that could be subdivided without a variance, which we now agree is unlikely to something. And maybe it would be helpful if you shared with the board what that is, what the results of that was.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Yeah. I went through them all. And -- there are actually only two properties that can be subdivided.

I don't know if I need to describe where they are or anything. But they're both on -- they're both -- have access from Plandome Road, which presents a whole other case too. Because anything you do on Plandome Road would require approval from the county in addition to that. And that's a very large undertaking as well.

But even if that's the case, it's only —
it would be those two homes that are on that
area. I think they're over on Plandome Court
side. But again it would require knocking
down another home. You wouldn't be able to
keep it. You would have to do some major
work to the project — to the property. And
I just don't think it's in a real desirable
spot. So — so, you know, it's really —

MAYOR RISCICA: And I would add to what
Ed said. There's actually four. There's
actually four properties that are eligible.
One is the Shelter Rock Church, which is
highly unlikely to change its profile from a
church. And the second is one of the — that
beautiful Duke house that you see as you
enter Plandome Court from the north. And
that is a magnificent historical
architecturally beautiful home with a
separate grandfathered—in carriage house that
served as an apartment. It is highly
unlikely that would ever — that someone
would tear that house down and subdivide
that. So that only leaves two of the four

that would be available. 1 So in our village's future two of the 2 3 four available subdivisions -- properties that are available to subdivide legally will 4 5 come up at some time or may come up at some time. And they both legally meet the 6 7 requirements on the face of it. So that's in 8 the village's future one way or another. 9 And, Ed, did you have anything else that 10 you wanted to add? 11 BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: That's really 12 it. If anybody has any questions --13 MAYOR RISCICA: I have a question for 14 you. 1.5 You do projects in the town. What --16 does the town have a Planning Board for 17 subdivisions or the --18 BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: The town does 19 not have a Planning Board for subdivisions or 20 even changes in use. It actually all goes 21 through the Board of Zoning and Appeals. 2.2 MAYOR RISCICA: So correct me if I'm 23 wrong --MR. PRIOR: Subdivisions in 24

unincorporated areas of the town, both North 1 2 Hempstead, Hempstead and Oyster Bay, they go 3 -- they also go through the Nassau County Planning Commission, Zoning Board for 4 5 whatever -- Zoning Boards like this. But the Nassau County Planning Commission handles the 6 7 subdivisions in unincorporated areas. 8 MAYOR RISCICA: Are they actively involved in the subdivision decision? 9 10 MR. PRIOR: There are hearings before the 11 Nassau County Planning Commission. They meet 12 I think -- is it twice a month, Ed? 13 BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: It is. But on 14 a double lot, on a two-lot subdivision 1.5 usually we -- a lot of times they will defer 16 back to the town's Planning Board. 17 MR. PRIOR: They will waive jurisdiction? 18 BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: They'll waive 19 jurisdiction. Yeah. They almost always 20 waive jurisdiction. 21 MAYOR RISCICA: Ed tells me that he's 2.2 doing one right now. And the oversight is limited to the Building Department. And I 23 think there is a cutoff of over four units 24

and four units and under. But, yes. And I think that's the procedure, for four units and under.

MR. PRIOR: Four or fewer is called a minor subdivision under the county.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Right.

MAYOR RISCICA: And we couldn't have a major subdivision in our village. There's just no plot of land like that. So for all intents and purposes the Town of North

Hempstead has no independent Planning Board for the types of subdivisions that we -- that would exist in our village. Is that a true statement?

MR. PRIOR: Yes.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: That's correct.

MAYOR RISCICA: All right. If there's nothing else to add there, then I would like to open very briefly to the trustees if they have any comments. And I would like to start with Norman, because Norman took it on his own initiative to identify villages that don't have a Planning Board right in our backyard.

1.5

2.2

Norman, did you want to comment on that?

TRUSTEE TAYLOR: Well, the only comment I

made was -- by looking up the villages and

noting that quite a few of the surrounding

villages that are right next to ours do not

have Planning Board. But also the fact -- I

think it's also important. We don't have any

commercial property in our village. And I

think that plays into it a little bit. These

other villages that don't have Planning

Boards, a lot of them do a substantial amount

of commercial property.

And I think basically the lawyer and the building inspector have basically covered everything very thoughtfully. And I have nothing more to add to that.

MAYOR RISCICA: Can you see what's on the screen, Norm? Is this the list of villages?

TRUSTEE TAYLOR: Yes.

MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. And we have Katie went on to go -- actually go into their village code to see -- to see what they do and how they describe it. And village after village legally has their Board of Trustees

1	serve as the Planning Board. It takes
2	different forms. And you can certainly read
3	this right off of our website. But village
4	after village is does exactly what we are
5	suggesting to the residents. So I just
6	wanted to point that out.
7	Any of the other trustees have anything
8	that they want to bring up? Dan.
9	TRUSTEE CATALDO: No further comments at
10	this point. I think everything has been
11	raised.
12	MAYOR RISCICA: Al.
13	TRUSTEE SOLOMON: Nothing.
14	MAYOR RISCICA: Diane.
15	TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: I'm in total agreement
16	with what Ed Butt has said. So at this time
17	right now, no. I have nothing to add.
18	MAYOR RISCICA: Aida.
19	TRUSTEE FERMAN: I'm fine. There's
20	nothing to say.
21	MAYOR RISCICA: Gus.
22	TRUSTEE PANOPOULOS: I'm fine also.
23	MAYOR RISCICA: Did I leave anybody out?
24	TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: No.

MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. So I want to quickly, just to introduce them into the record, go through — you know, one of the duties of the Planning Board process — I'm sorry. The public hearing process is we hear from you. We hear from you in this setting. And we hear from you because the record is open for your input before and after the meeting. Send us email. Send us hate mail. Send us love mail. Send whatever you want to send us. If you have a point of view, we're anxious to see it. And frankly we learn a lot from it.

So we got this from Mayor Merenda over the weekend, which you may have seen on our website. We got this from Judy Taylor last week, which you may have seen on our website. We have been popular in The Manhasset Times. Rose is here with us on this call.

And I will point out that the Planning
Board president, Chairman of the board, Jim
Madison, who I've spoken to extensively over
time, he is not here because he's -- as the
article says is in full agreement with this.

Bart objected to the time of the meeting.

And the civic association sent us a fairly detailed and thoughtful expression of their point of view that the board should not be disbanded.

And the crux of that point of view is that an independent board has inherent value on its own and should be preserved. And we got another email from Mayor Merenda. And I'm having trouble getting back to my page. Okay. And we had another quote from Jim Madison in The Manhasset Times. Same quote actually. So that's available.

John Jeffrey and I had an email exchange.

Really I appreciate John's taking the time to do that because he challenged me. And he challenged me hard. And he made me think.

And I enjoyed responding to him. And John and Mrs. Endrizzi both encouraged me to put more information out, that there was not sufficient information out. And I appreciate that guidance also because I did try to respond to that. Maybe I haven't succeeded, but I have certainly done my best.

1.5

2.2

So I appreciate John and Mrs. Endrizzi making the suggestions. Here is from Dennis Sears. Arlene, you can log Dennis in. He joined the meeting while counsel was speaking. 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 forever if we don't limit it. 1.5

1

2

3

4

5

6

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

So we're up to -- I'm going to stop the screen share. And we're up to resident inputs. Again we have 31 participants on the call, so we're going to start out by limiting the time for resident comments to 3 minutes. And I will gladly liberally expand that if there's not 31 people that want to make comments. But if there are, we will be here

So you can raise your hand, and I will call on you in the order that I see them. And I look forward to your comments.

CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: I see Rosemary's hand.

MAYOR RISCICA: I see Camillo raising his hand. So he doesn't -- okay. So I'm going to ask him to unmute. And then I will go to Rosemary because I saw Mr. Camillo first. So folks aren't comfortable with the hand raise

feature, but we'll review that again.

1.5

2.2

But Mr. Camillo, we're happy to hear your comments.

MR. CAMILLO: Well, thank you very much again. My name is John Camillo. I reside at 66 Shore Road in the village.

First of all, I would like to thank you and the members of the board for bringing this issue to our attention. I think it is an important issue. I've kind of read all the comments that have been submitted thus far. And I think there are good points that have been raised on both sides of the issue.

But I have a simple question, one that might offer a possible solution to the issue. Has any consideration been given to incorporate the functions of the Planning Board into either the Board of Zoning Appeals or the Architectural Review Board which would maintain the independence of the issue and incorporate it into another separate committee or limited Planning Board committee?

MAYOR RISCICA: It's John?

MR. CAMILLO: John. Yes. 1 MAYOR RISCICA: All right, John. I think 2 3 that's a good suggestion. I think that's something we can think about. If I were a 4 5 member of the ARB or the BZA, I probably wouldn't want this burden. As a member of 6 7 the Board of Trustees I'm not sure I want it. 8 But I'm not sure that they would want this burden. But we will look at that. 9 And what we saw in some of the other 10 11 villages is they had advisory boards. And 12 they had other ways to deal with this issue 13 that we have never considered. So we have 14 information on thinking about doing other 1.5 configurations that we have to digest. And 16 we'll include that one as one of them. 17 Thank you. 18 MR. CAMILLO: Thank you very much. 19 Appreciate it. 20 MAYOR RISCICA: Thank you. 21 Rosemary, I promised that you're next. 22 So I have to first find you. Okay.

Rosemary, you're right there. Okay. So I'm

asking to unmute.

23

24

1.5

2.2

And Rosemary, thanks for driving the crowd. We have a lot of interest here.

MS. MASCALI: Well, I also want to repeat that I want to thank you for all of the information and the presentations today. I found the presentations by yourself and the lawyer and the building inspector very informative and helpful. So I thank you for that. I also just want to make a comment that we from the civic association — by the way, Rosemary Mascali. 36 Bournedale Road South. I should have identified myself. I'm sorry.

But we at the civic were concerned at the beginning of this because we felt at the beginning we kind of heard about it within plenty of time for this public hearing, but we felt this was an important decision and didn't really understand why it was happening in the middle of the winter in the middle of a pandemic.

So I feel that the -- the village is now fully informed that this is going on. You're sharing a lot of information. And discussion

1.5

2.2

of the pros and cons is happening, which is what we really wanted most of all, which is to make sure that this was been being done thoughtfully and not, you know, in a rush. I also realize that there's only a couple of properties in Plandome Heights that will be affected by a Planning Board because we are mostly built out.

But what occurred to me is every piece of property in this village since 1929 had the benefit of, you know, being — having an independent organization. It was mentioned that the Planning Board was put in place in 2004, but I think that was just when codification was done. And that was the date. I think the Planning Board, from what I can tell, has been in existence since the beginning of the village. I'm not sure about that. So I said but for those two properties and the neighbors around those properties, you know, maybe they should benefit from having an independent board as well.

We also checked with Plandome and Plandome Manor. We feel strongly about an

independent Planning Board and --

1.5

2.2

CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: You're at 2 minutes.

MS. MASCALI: Just one more point was that it's not just our properties. But when something adjacent to us which is -- which would be Plandome comes up, that we comment on that as part of the Planning Board as well. And they choose to have an independent board, having an independent -- I guess would be consistent with that.

I made a lot of, you know, the other points from the various input we got from our civil members in the loan documents, so I won't go into repeating all of that. But those were my major points.

MAYOR RISCICA: Great. And, you know, I want to say a couple of things, Rosemary. I want to say once again thanks for driving people out. And I take responsibility for the fact that I've communicated with the village better than I did on this one. And my intention — and I told the board this in September and October when we were talking

1.5

2.2

about it. My intention was to put out a winter newsletter introducing the topic over the Christmas holiday. And frankly I got COVID lazy because one day runs into another and I just never wrote it.

And when I spoke to Mrs. Endrizzi who is an important voice in the village and then when I spoke to John Jeffrey, they pretty much took me to task, that I usually give the village more information and more knowledge.

And I really ought to patch that up. And I've done that. And it was never any intention to do anything otherwise. And frankly we were surprised by there being any opposition or even interest in the issue.

But that's fine. I normally communicate a little more proactively than I did this time.

And I've tried to catch that up. And I had one other point, but I forgot it.

MS. MASCALI: By the way, Mary is not feeling well. That's why she couldn't be on the call today.

MAYOR RISCICA: I hope that she feels better.

Okay. The next hand that I see is
Hillary Haber. So, Hillary, I will ask you
to unmute and go right ahead.

MS. HABER: First of all, I would like to
thank you all for all of your hard work and
efforts that I see. You have all put in a
lot of time and study into this matter. My
concern here or just question is I feel out
of the pros that have been discussed of
merging or having the trustees take over the

MAYOR RISCICA: And that's fine, Hillary.

And we can have a little back and forth.

job of the Planning Board, what are the cons

of that? None of that was mentioned at all,

to play devil's advocate.

The suggestion was made that an independent board brings a certain independence that is desirable. The ARB and BZA make decisions. They don't discuss it with us. I mean, if I hear about something that the residents are concerned about, I may talk to a member or one of the board members and just find out what's going on. But we really have no say or no input. In the

1.5

2.2

Planning Board the matters are so few and they're so large that we hear about it anyway.

I'm not responsible for the court. I'm not a responsible for the building department. I'm not responsible for the ARB or the BZA. But I'm the mayor. And I hear about it. And the buck stops here. So this is an area where, you know, we do hear about it. And the key issue is independence.

And the question is, you know, what does that -- you know, what is the critical requirement here for independence? We know what's going to come before the board. Two subdivisions over time are all that's really available unless the Zoning Board gets generous, which is an independent board. And I don't think that they would do that. But that's up to them. So there's only two items ahead of us. We know where they are, what intentions are there.

And I do remember my point on Rosemary. She brought up the concurrent jurisdiction. And we have very limited latitude on the

1.5

2.2

concurrent jurisdictions also. We were very successful in the one or two that did come up. The Planning Board was insisting on landscaping that mitigated the issue a little bit. So we did play an important role in that. Is that necessary to be independent, or can that be done by the trustees? And how do you manage a stable of seven volunteers in a village our size?

So I'm happy to entertain anyone that wants to list to me the advantages of it.

Because quite frankly I'm not looking for more work. But I -- you know, I'm not the right one to ask that. And Roseann is raising her hand. So unless Hillary --

MS. HABER: One more comment.

MAYOR RISCICA: Go ahead.

MS. HABER: Just that I have -- as a 27-year member of the village I am happy to volunteer any time that might be needed of me, as it was stated in the bill that there were difficulties perhaps in getting volunteers. I just wanted to say whether it be on the Planning Board or anything else, I

Board of Trustees - Inc. Village of Plandome Heights - 2-1-21

1.5

2.2

am happy to be a volunteer as a long-time member of this village.

MAYOR RISCICA: Hillary, I just wrote your name down.

MS. HABER: Sounds good.

MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. I'm going to go move on to Roxanne. Roxanne is a member of the board -- the Planning Board. So I'm anxious to hear from Roxanne.

Roxanne, you have to -- I'm asking you to unmute. You have to agree to that, because otherwise we can't hear you.

MS. FITZIG: Okay. Roxanne Fitzig. 70
Bournedale Road South.

Well, the only member -- as a former member of the Planning Board I was really very disappointed the way you handled this, Ken, and because I was dismissed from the board before we had a hearing. And also I want to say that I think you think very poorly of all the members, that most of them were in the -- were in the board by thinking that we are in incapable of following instructions or thinking independently from

1.5

the rest of the other people. We ask only questions. We were doing our due diligence to find out exactly what was going on.

I also feel that getting volunteers has never been a problem. One of the reasons I went to this board is because I knew that I could only do -- be called just a couple of times in a couple of years. I've been on the board for over 20 years. And I was called only four times. So to me and other volunteers, that will be good because I knew what I was getting into it.

The other thing that you mentioned that it's going to cost too much to the village, we have to get engineers and the lawyers.

The people on the board, the trustees, will also be asking the same question. So I don't see why there would be more money to this.

And my third point is I think there could be a conflict of interest by having people on the board, that they are land developers or that they are real estate people.

And with that I will say that you have done always a good job. But this time I  $\,$ 

think you missed the point. I'm also very disappointed -- and I don't think Planning Board members -- former members are not here. And I don't know if it's because they couldn't get in or whatever the problem is.

That's all that I wanted to say.

MAYOR RISCICA: Roxanne, let me answer you very directly. And I appreciate your forthrightness in saying what you just said.

I'm sure that wasn't particularly fun for you.

In the first place I want to apologize for the communication that I sent to the members of the Planning Board. I tried to send a message -- send a communication with one message, but a different message was received. And that's my fault. And I accept the blame for that.

I've gone back and read it because of the letter that the civic sent. I went back and read my communication to you. What do they mean? What I -- the timeline unfolded here by the board setting the meeting. I hadn't sent out a communication. The clock is

1.5

2.2

running. And I need you to know. Move quickly.

So my first call was to Mrs. Endrizzi, a long-serving member of the Planning Board and someone whose opinion I value greatly, because I didn't want her to read the legal notice in the paper. And my second call was to the Planning Board Chairman, Jim Madison, because I didn't want him to read it in the paper. And I just didn't have time to call every member.

So I prepared an email that was intended to tell you that we were planning to move forward on an item we had discussed before, which was the merging of the Planning Board into the Board of Trustees. I've gone back and re-read that. And I understand that you read that as we disbanded the board. That is just not true.

That can't be done without a public hearing, a local law, an agreement of the trustees. And you are not removed from the board. You are a member of the Planning Board, as are the other members. So -- and

1.5

2.2

that's not your fault in misunderstanding.

I went back and read what I wrote. And it was not the message that I meant to send, which is we're putting this idea forward. You heard from me and not read it in the paper. And that came across as, thank you for your service and have a nice day. That was not the message.

No. 2. I want to be very clear with you, you know, man to man, if you will. I think very highly of Roxanne Fitzig. I know you as somebody who is a long-term resident and who cares deeply about the village. And I've seen you in action on the Planning Board caring deeply about the community. And I would say there are better venues in the village for you to serve than one that is as frustrating as the Planning Board.

That's what I would say. But I have no disappointment in your competence or your caring. In fact, I think very highly of you, Roxanne. And that's what I would say. And perhaps that's not enough at this point. But I feel the way I feel about the Planning

Board and I don't apologize.

1.5

TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: Can I say something?

Roxanne, when -- first of all, I've been
a trustee for 5, almost 6 years now. And
there's been one Planning Board issue since
I've been a trustee. And Chris Prior attends
99 percent of our monthly meetings. And we
meet monthly. And sometimes we talk more
than monthly as a -- as a board.

We are informed -- I'm not saying anything. I know that you had that Planning Board. But we're informed of everything that the Planning Board in this particular case everything that was going on. I felt like I was on the Planning Board with you at that time. Maybe not agreeing with some of the decisions, but I felt like I was there.

So I'm not saying that this is something that I'm gladly accepting. But it's happens so rarely. And we were informed so much of every event, that that's why I'm willing -- if it happens this way I'm willing to take it on, even though it's just another pain in the neck.

So I just wanted to share that with you. 1 2 MAYOR RISCICA: I want to give Roxanne 3 back her time and ask her if you have anything else to say. I apologize if I 4 5 offended you. Believe me. The last person in the world I want to offend is Roxanne 6 7 Fitzig. 8 MS. FITZIG: What do I -- it's okay. You 9 know you don't have to apologize, Ken. 10 MAYOR RISCICA: Well, I've re-read my 11 email. It sounds like I dismissed you. 12 That's what --13 MS. FITZIG: But in effect you did. You 14 said the board is dismissed. But, look, I'm 1.5 not offended. You came to this conclusion. 16 And you decided. You want to do this. It's 17 just that you didn't handle it right. But 18 maybe we should have an advisory committee so 19 that people feel that we as members of the 20 community, we also have a say. The board,

things. The nomination again.

the trustees had elected to nominate -- the

the Mayor. So I mean, you change those

people on the Planning Board are nominated by

21

2.2

23

24

1.5

2.2

But I think having a second or third committee or board advisory role would give more — would care more about the community and be able to say something that the trustees are not completely doing all the paperwork, looking at the plans or following the — what other people in the community are saying that is happening, you know, is going to be happening when a subdivision is done.

MAYOR RISCICA: And that's fine. And I will add that to the options that John

Camillo suggested as something that we need to consider. I think that's a -- I see other villages doing that. I think Flower Hill is going to do that. I talked to their mayor.

And I see that as something that we need to consider. So thanks for bringing that up.

MS. FITZIG: Thank you.

MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. We have another hand raised. This time it's Laurence Haber. So I will ask you, Laurence, to unmute yourself.

MR. HABER: Can you hear me okay?

MAYOR RISCICA: Yes.

MR. HABER: Laurence, L-A-U-R-E-N-C-E. 1 Haber, H-A-B-E-R. I sent a message to the 2 3 group. Who determines if a variance is allowed or not if it's not a right? 4 5 MAYOR RISCICA: The building inspector is 6 actively involved in looking at what the 7 variance is. Is it a nominal variance? Is 8 it an egregious variance? How does it relate 9 to other variances that we've granted? And 10 if it's something that he thinks our Planning 11 Board won't approve, he will frankly counsel 12 the applicants and tell them this isn't going 13 to see the light of day, you might want to change it, or you can have your meeting. 14 1.5 MR. HABER: Who has the authority to 16 approve it? 17 MAYOR RISCICA: I'm getting there, 18 Laurence. 19 And then the matter goes to the Zoning 20 Board. And the Zoning Board has the sole 21 authority to do that. They don't ask my 22 permission. They don't even tell me they did it. 23 24 MR. HABER: That's a totally different

1	board?
2	MAYOR RISCICA: Totally different
3	independent board, yes. And they're very
4	active. They meet at least five times a
5	year. And they're knowledgeable because they
6	have experience in regular activities. So
7	they have a different experience in dealing
8	with matters. And Gene O'Conmor who runs the
9	board has been on the board since the flood.
10	MR. HABER: Who decides on the board's
11	dissolution?
12	MAYOR RISCICA: Which board? The
13	Planning Board?
14	MR. HABER: The Planning Board. Who will
15	decide on that?
16	MAYOR RISCICA: That's a decision for the
17	Board of Trustees.
18	MR. HABER: And the mayor is included in
19	the Board of Trustees?
20	MAYOR RISCICA: Yes.
21	MR. HABER: And how many people are in
22	the Boad of Trustees?
23	MAYOR RISCICA: Seven.
ı	

1	And it's a majority vote, I guess?
2	MAYOR RISCICA: Yes.
3	MR. HABER: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Mr.
4	Butt may know this. I apologize for
5	bothering everyone else. But we know there
6	was the two Summit decisions. And at the end
7	of Summit I heard rumors that there might be
8	another division.
9	BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Not without a
10	zoning variance, because the lot width isn't
11	wide enough to be able to be compliant.
12	MR. HABER: So that would require a
13	variance
14	BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Yes, it would.
15	MR. HABER: by the Zoning Board?
16	BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Yes.
17	MR. HABER: And is that up for discussion
18	now or is that
19	BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: I haven't seen
20	anything presented to me regarding that lot.
21	MR. HABER: So there's no one asking for
22	that as far as you know?
23	BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Not even a
24	question.

MR. HABER: All right. Thank you. 1 BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: No problem. 2 3 MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. I see George McCarthy has a question. 4 5 So, George, I will ask you to unmute 6 yourself. 7 MR. MCCARTHY: Yes. Hi, Ken. Thank you 8 for the thorough meeting tonight. I want to just go back to the other 9 10 subdivision meeting, just understand. There 11 were old members on that Planning Board. At 12 the beginning of that hearing there were old 13 members that were on. And then there was new 14 members that were put on. Can you go through 1.5 that process of how that occurred, why it 16 occurred? 17 And also I had actually never really seen 18 a mayor be at every single one of those 19 meetings. There's no other meetings that you 20 -- I've never seen you out at except for 21 those Planning Board meetings. So those were 22 my questions to you. And then the general question is that 23 24 we've brought up all these other villages.

1.5

2.2

How many villages have one zone? And I don't really know of any other villages that just have one zone. We have the one residential zone which obviously does not — it's — you know, we have a smorgasbord of property. We have all different kinds of shapes and sizes. For the most part they're standard over at the Bournedales.

But how many of those villages that we described have just one zone? And would having just one zone, would that present problems, let's say, for Planning if, let's say, Planning — if land became so valuable in this village that there would have to be a partitioning? Let's say somebody bought a few of the lesser price homes and wanted to put up and wanted to repartition, which would also be a function of a Planning Board, you know, three or four of the homes and then put up two or three luxury size homes. So that could be something that could happen outside of the realm of what's as of right as well.

So those are my sort of three things that  $I \,\, -- \,\, I \,\, \text{wanted to understand though about the}$ 

process that happened at the beginning of people being taken off the board and being 2 3 put on the board at the beginning of this last --4 5 CLERK-TREASURER DRUCKER: You're at 2 6 minutes. 7 MR. MCCARTHY: Thank you. 8 MAYOR RISCICA: Arlene, that's very 9 interrupting because he thinks you're saying 10 3 minutes and he's cutting himself off and he 11 still has another minute. 12 Were you finished, George? 13 MR. MCCARTHY: Yeah. I'm okay. 14 MAYOR RISCICA: Let me ask answer your 1.5 question quite specifically. 16 Mrs. Endrizzi was on the Planning Board 17 and resigned. I don't know if it was 2014, 18 2015, 2016. Somewhere in that range she 19 resigned. And that resignation triggered a 20 discussion at the time because we were having 21 trouble filling other spots in other places. 2.2 And we have a Planning Board that has no activity before it. So we decided that -- a 23 deliberate decision that we would not fill

24

Maryann Endrizzi's empty seat, okay.

1.5

2.2

So we started out with a vacancy. In addition we had two vacancies in the alternates. So we had three vacancies in a seven-member board. And lastly we had one member whose term was up on April 1st. And her term was not renewed. So that's four openings on a seven-member board.

So this board, me as mayor who appoints and the board who ratifies, had to scramble to put four new members in place. But no one was removed. No one was removed. We had a vacancy. We had an expiration of a term. We had two open alternates. That's what happened.

And what was your second question?

MR. MCCARTHY: Well, I was just wondering
why you attended every single meeting.

MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. Why I attended every meeting. I attended every meeting because the village attorney told me as mayor that there were issues that -- going on that warranted my attention. And I think it would have been -- I would have been derelict as

1.5

2.2

mayor if I didn't attend. And so I attended.

I agree with you it's unusual. I almost

never attend board meetings. But I attended

because of issues that I was sensitized to by

the village's attorney.

And on your third question about single zone, you know, if Ed or Chris wants to weigh in on that, I have no knowledge on that.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: I am happy to answer that.

Just so you know -- the good thing about it is that the one zone that we have, because it is one zone, it's very restrictive. It actually probably nullifies and creates probably almost 50 percent of the homes as nonconforming the way they currently are.

That being said, it really creates in most cases a lot of times people want to put additions on the home, they do have to go before the Zoning Board. And the Zoning Board is relatively active for that reason.

So there's not a lot that can be done in this village for the most part with -- in most areas without having to have some Zoning

1.5

2.2

Board involvement or being able to be very restrictive to what they can and cannot do based on that single-zone requirement.

MR. MCCARTHY: With regards to people going on and off the board with regard to the vacancies, why was it that in keeping with the beginning of that meeting we had -- we had certain people that were on? Wouldn't it have been a little bit more smoother if you had kept the people that were on the board to continue on for the continuity and the independence point of view than to introduce new people at the beginning of that meeting?

MAYOR RISCICA: There was nobody removed from the board. One person's term was up.

And it's a 5-year term. It's not -- it's a 5-year appointment. It's not an appointment until the end of this matter. It's a 5-year appointment. And that's all that I'm going to say about that. I'm not going to talk about personnel matters. I appoint and people -- and the board has to ratify.

And --

MR. MCCARTHY: I'm trying to understand

the independence of the board in the past and, you know, how things would be independent in the future. I'm concerned about the independence. And --

MAYOR RISCICA: I understand that. But you're asking me to get into the specifics that get down to personnel matters. And I'm not going to discuss that. That's not an appropriate thing to discuss in the public.

And I would ask Chris to weigh in.

MR. PRIOR: Yeah. The topic for this public hearing tonight is whether or not we are going to transition the function of the Planning Board to the Board of Trustees.

That's the topic. So getting into specifics on who served when, I don't see that as being relevant to -- I hear Chuck's point as to how it is relevant.

But here is what "independence" means.

It means that the Mayor, with the consent of the trustees, appoints somebody to the board, one person every 5 years who serves a 5-year term. The person is independently sitting in that board and able to make decisions in that

function without worrying about a re-appointment the following year. That's what "independence" is. That's why it exists. But that's about all that I have to say on that.

MR. MCCARTHY: My first two questions had to do with, you know, the presence of the Mayor there and the independence of the people that are on that board. And also then the people that were put on the board in — really it's not so much the actual persons and the personnel, it's the timing of it and the way in which it was performed. Maybe you should have put the person on way before prior in the year. I don't know. Maybe a half a year before. I don't know exactly when the dates were.

MAYOR RISCICA: I told you we made a conscious decision not to staff the Planning Board. When Mrs. Endrizzi resigned we discussed perhaps just letting the board members drop off with their expirations and not populating the Planning Board. It's hard to get quality volunteers here. That board

1.5

takes seven members. And they never meet. 1 They never meet. Almost never meet. 2 3 But the reason that we had to scramble for members is because the board had gotten 4 5 into a state of inadequacy because its inactivity prompted us not to fill seats. So 6 7 we had to fill seats. There's nothing 8 mysterious about that. 9 MR. MCCARTHY: So the inactivity had to 10 do with the whole situation? It didn't put 11 people on because of logic? 12 (Whereupon, the court reporter asked for 13 clarification.) 14 MR. MCCARTHY: I was saying that the 1.5 logic is that the board not being a --16 filling the functions or filling the function 17 of the positions, do you think that had 18 anything to do with the outcome of the board 19 being successful? 20 MAYOR RISCICA: I don't know what you 21 mean when you say the "board being 2.2 successful." MR. MCCARTHY: Well, you're not filling 23 24 the positions because your feeling is that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

it's very difficult to fill these positions. And I don't know all of a sudden where new positions would come from that everybody would be -- but you would be dealing with the same population of people. By not filling it it's a self-fulfilling thing. Then that board will not -- because it's not filled in its positions in time or whatever method that was done, that it ends up creating a bad situation for that particular board. MR. PRIOR: If I can jump in.

The board -- the trustees were looking at a Planning Board function that was not being used hardly ever. When one of the Planning Board members retired -- and the Mayor thinks it was 2014. I suppose that could be right maybe -- with an inactive board there was no urgency to fill that position. And the thought was this: Board never has any business. If these terms just come and expire and we never renew them, what difference does it make?

Then came a subdivision which had enormous attention by the village community. It became necessary I think in the board's eyes to make sure that they had a fully complimented board so that a decision could be made by a fully completed board. And the Mayor attended meetings because he understood that there was an extreme public resident attention on the matter and it behooved him to be following what was going on.

MAYOR RISCICA: I just want to add to that.

1.5

2.2

In addition -- in addition to not filling the seat because it wasn't there, it was then that we started discussions 2000 and whenever that was, do we really want a Planning Board?

Do we really have to have a Planning Board?

Should the Board of Trustees take this function on? So that's part of why we didn't fill the seats. So now does that create a self-fulfilling prophecy? If that's what you want to believe, that's okay.

I'm telling you that the intention of the board at the time was to do something to resolve this incongruity that multiple people are required to be on that board. Multiple

1.5

2.2

Multiple people don't take training. And, therefore, we have a board that has very limited experience and very limited training. And that has bothered the board for -- since at least that time. And we're dealing with it now. Why didn't we deal with it then? Because it's not urgent because it doesn't have any business.

And you've mentioned on multiple occasions that I attended the Planning Board meetings. I want to make sure it's clear to the residents who are here that the village attorney suggested to me that the village interests needed to be looked after. And because there were things happening and interest involved that warranted my attention, he brought that to the Board of Trustees. And the Board of Trustees asked — concurred with Chris that I should attend the meetings and report back to him, and I did, in the interest of the residents who are on this call.

And if that gives someone a concern about

the independence of the board, I would 1 counter that you need to consider the board 2 3 is operating with people that do not have subdivision experience and that do not take 4 5 training, and that those two factors together add up to a risk to the residents that the 6 7 Mayor was asked to at least observe. I 8 didn't interfere. I observed. So that's 9 why. 10 MR. MCCARTHY: You spoke at those 11 meetings. 12 MAYOR RISCICA: I'm sorry. 13 MR. MCCARTHY: You spoke at those 14 meetings. 1.5 MAYOR RISCICA: I'm a resident. I'm 16 allowed to speak at a Planning Board meeting. 17 I said I didn't interfere, meaning I didn't 18 interfere with their deliberations. I spoke. 19 Yes. I am a resident. I had a point of 20 view. Yes. 21 MR. MCCARTHY: Do other villages do the 22 same thing that we did whereby we take members off and don't put them on because we 23 24 feel as if it's defunc -- is that a practice

that other villages do?

1.5

2.2

MAYOR RISCICA: You would have to ask other villages.

MR. MCCARTHY: We have a lot of information about the other villages. I'm just wondering if you had any information about that.

MAYOR RISCICA: You would have to ask other villages. You can certainly do a study and let me know what you find. We're not going to.

Okay. I would ask -- I think, Chuck, you've made your points. And if you have something else you would like to bring up, that's fine. I believe that I've answered them as truthfully and as faithfully as I can. And I think we need to see if anyone else has any questions, unless you have something new that you want to bring up.

But I attended the board -- I attended the Planning Board meetings at the request of the village attorney and the trustees. And that's why I was there. And I didn't interfere in the deliberations. I may have

24 interfere in the

1.5

spoken once or twice. And I may have spoken to try to clarify things when people were talking. And I populated the board to fill a vacancy, to fill an expiring term and to fill two vacant alternate positions. That's what I did.

Anything else, Chuck?

MR. MCCARTHY: No. That's it. Thank you.

MAYOR RISCICA: I have Hillary and Laurence. And I believe you're unmuted, so go ahead.

MR. HABER: I just had a question regarding the Zoning and Architectural Review Board.

You mentioned that -- or someone
suggested that perhaps they can take over the
duties. So, you know, if they're willing -so it's -- they remain independent of the
mayor and trustees. So is that something
that's going to be considered or just
something that's just going to be heard and
not done anything about? Can you hear me?

MAYOR RISCICA: I'm sorry. There was

Board of Trustees - Inc. Village of Plandome Heights -

2-1-21

some chat in here, including some from you. When I saw it was from you I -- can you just restate the question?

MR. MCCARTHY: Sure.

The Zoning and Architectural Review

Boards, someone suggested perhaps they can

take over the responsibilities of the

Planning Board. Of course that's more work

for them. And it's a volunteer group. I

realize that. But if they're willing to help

maintain the independence of these decisions,

we won't know unless they're asked.

MAYOR RISCICA: Ed, you worked with both boards. Why don't you weigh in on that with your feeling about Planning going to ARB and BZA.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: Well, it's sort of in essence kind of does that already now.

Not that -- that's kind of the whole point of this is that there's really -- it's sort of like an unnecessary overlay that really doesn't do any additional service to the village, you know.

I mean, when there is a subdivision or

24 I mean

1.5

2.2

1.5

2.2

whatever, when it comes to things like zoning, it gets addressed with zoning. When it comes to things like landscaping and things where a Planning Board may have some input, that's clearly addressed in any new home that's ever done in the village that doesn't have to go to the Planning Board.

So those items are not uncommon to the Architectural Review Board to review those particular issues if it were to be part of -- even if it did come as a subdivision.

Because if it came as a subdivision to the Board of Trustees, it would still ultimately have to come back to the Architectural Review Board, at which time they would have a lot to say about the landscaping.

So, you know, the checks and balances are still there. It's actually just an additional layer that almost creates a conflict more than anything else with the Architectural Review Board and the Zoning Board in my opinion.

MAYOR RISCICA: Chris, did you want to weigh in on that? I really have no opinion

Board of Trustees - Inc. Village of Plandome Heights - 2-1-21

1.5

on it. And I'm not adverse to asking them.

But I think I know their answer. Certainly I wouldn't pick to have this task.

MR. PRIOR: Yeah. I described it earlier as a thankless task. Whether the Zoning

Board would want to take on a subdivision —

first of all, I would have to figure out if

the laws would permit them to take it on.

Zoning Boards are given specific powers under the New York State Village Law. It might be able to be expanded, but I'm not so sure that it is.

The ARB is a busy board to take on this task. Nothing is different in terms of their unfamiliarity with the special rules that apply to a subdivision. So any board that's doing this would be taking on the thankless task of invariably upsetting neighbors who don't want a subdivision. And would they want to take it on? I don't know. Is that a solution to be contemplated? Look, we're having a public hearing to hear what people are proposing, what their thinking is. And some thought can go to that.

MAYOR RISCICA: No. I think the answer 1 2 to your question is that we will take this 3 suggestion. We'll stir it into the mix and see if it gets any traction. Maybe Ed will 4 5 talk to the heads of both of those boards because he regularly interfaces with them, 6 7 see if they have an interest in doing that. 8 And so that's the purpose of the public 9 hearing, is to hear from you as to what your 10 interest is. 11 MR. HABER: When will this be decided? 12 And is there any urgency, or can it wait? 13 MAYOR RISCICA: I think, you know, 14 there's an old saying: How long do a man's 1.5 legs need to be? And they need to be long 16 enough to reach the ground. So my answer to 17 you is, long enough to reach the ground. We 18 have been talking about this as a board for 19 years. 20 MR. HABER: This is only a recent 21 public --22 MAYOR RISCICA: I understand. So you will let me finish. 23

We have been talking about this as a

24

2.2

board for years. There is a real legitimate issue here if you listen as a resident that we are entrusting -- I appoint them. I am entrusting residents who are -- who don't have experience with subdivisions and aren't taking training to make decisions on the board, that if they get them wrong, I as the mayor have to go to you and say, I have to raise your taxes to pay for the litigation to get us out of this. Okay. That's the responsibility that I have.

So I have a weight on my shoulders. And the board has a weight on their shoulders. And they said, you know, there's so little business there coming forward, why don't we just do it ourselves. We don't want to do it ourselves. We're not trying to take away your independence. It's independence over two potential subdivisions. We know where they are. We know they're as of right. And so it would be very difficult to oppose. So there's -- you know, to my way of thinking there's a lot that's already, you know, gone through here.

1.5

2.2

Now, your specific question is: When is this going to be handled? We've got a lot of information in this public hearing. I hear there's still a desire among the community to have some independence to the board. I hear that loud and clear.

And I think our board has to, you know, digest that and figure out how it wants to be. And I think the board has given us some suggestions on how to configure this situation. And I think the board has to discuss this and discuss, you know, what's going to be. And as I've looked at the other villages large and small, I've seen some very creative approaches to the issues here, including having an advisory board — this, that and the other thing — something that deals with the independence desire and the efficiency desire.

So the answer is we have a lot to digest.

We're going to digest it as we can. We're

going to digest it as individuals. We're

going to digest it in meetings. Our next

meeting is in March. In March we have to

approve a budget which is a big item for our agenda. So this item may or may not even be on the agenda for March. But it could be.

We could maybe have a meeting 2 weeks

from now, discuss it and come up with a point

of view and decide what we want to do in

March. Or it may go until April. April is

the annual meeting. Very busy meeting. Not

a lot of room for something new like this.

So it might be May. Might be. I don't know.

Might be March too.

What I can promise you is that whatever
we do on this will include communication from
me about what our thinking is and what our
plans are. That will be more in advance than
the communication I gave you on this one
which I believe is — has been adequate
certainly legally, but the community wants
more. And I accept that. I fully accept
that. It's my normal style.

So we could act. This needs to be acted on. We've been talking about it a long time. We can't just push the can down the field. So it needs to be acted on. And it will be

as soon as is practical. And it will be shared. What we're going to do will be shared with the community so that if they want to weigh in another time, we'll have the ability to have you weigh in another time either in writing or attending a meeting or whenever you would like.

We're not, you know -- we're holding this meeting to hear from you. We're hearing some things from you that we need to digest. And we're motivated to act. And we have obstacles in acting. So sometime in the next month to 3 months I would think we would have. Is that clear or was I too wordy?

MR. HABER: Well, I understand that you're not acting on this in the next week or so. But my concern — one of my concerns is that a neighboring property of mine got approved shortly after I moved here 30 years ago. And that got approved to be split up. And it wasn't as of right. It was the property line was too close to the — whatever.

MS. HABER: Too wordy.

The point is it got approved. And it was 1 turned down three times prior to my coming 2 3 here. And the division had been turned down three times. And then it was approved 4 5 apparently like a pocket veto where they 6 didn't act on it in a timely manner. And 7 then it got approved automatically. So that 8 seemed very questionable to me in terms of 9 its responsibility. So I don't want that to 10 happen again to someone where something gets 11 approved because something wasn't acted on properly. So is that still here? 12 13 MAYOR RISCICA: And you're comfortable 14 with me telling you that I have -- that our 1.5 Planning Board is populated with people who 16 have very little experience with subdivisions 17 and training? Given what you just said, 18 you're comfortable with that? Because I'm 19 uncomfortable with that. I need to see 20 something change. 21 MR. HABER: I'm only exploring issues. 2.2 didn't say that I'm comfortable with the decision. I'm exploring issues. 23 24 MAYOR RISCICA: And I respect that. I

1.5

2.2

completely respect that. I do. I can't --- obviously I can't comment on what happened
30 years ago. But I'm trying to make sure
that we have a process in the village that is
the correct process.

MR. PRIOR: I will just throw in. What

MR. PRIOR: I will just throw in. What you're referring to still exists in the law. Planning Board in the context of subdivisions, unlike Zoning Boards with variances, can find themselves in a default approval situation by not acting on a timely basis under the law. So, yeah, that remains a risk that requires diligence on the part of the Planning Board and its counsel.

MAYOR RISCICA: And I'm well aware of that, which is why I populated the board.

I see Mrs. Mascali has another question.  $\label{eq:second} \mbox{I'm happy to take that question.}$ 

MS. MASCALI: Just -- my question in and around training. There's been a lot of discussion back and forth. Let me just get my video back on. There's been a lot of discussion back and forth about the level of training of the board members.

Whose responsibility is it to abide by
the law which says 4 hours -- as I understand
it to be 4 hours a year? Is that something
that the village clerk tracks and let's the
members know and they refuse to do that, or
-- because I would think this is something to
consider for all the Board of Trustees
included, that if there's some training
that's required by law to do, you know, the
functions that people have signed up for.

And there's, you know, a -- take the

Planning Board or the BZA or the ARB or the

-- I believe the required training is the BZA

and the Planning Board. At least that's what

I looked up. Then who's following up to make

sure that that training is happening, and

who's responsibility is it to make sure that

that's happened? Is that you as the mayor?

Is that them individually as board members?

Under the law the responsibility is that of the board members. The repercussions are you can be removed from the board for not taking care of the training obligation.

MR. PRIOR: It's Chris.

That's where the obligation lies. 1 MS. MASCALI: From a management 2 3 standpoint it would be then the mayor or the trustees to refuse them if they're refusing 4 5 to take the training? This is a management issue, isn't it? 6 7 MR. PRIOR: It's --8 MS. MASCALI: If the people aren't training it's ---9 10 MR. PRIOR: It's a discretionary move to 11 remove a Planning Board member or a Zoning Board member who doesn't take the --12 13 MS. MASCALI: Right. But have they ever 14 been notified that if you don't take the 1.5 training -- I mean, I was a manager at my 16 job. Whatever. And you have a performance 17 plan. And you measure people on it. And if 18 they don't do it, you give them a warning. 19 And if they don't do it, you fire them. So 20 ultimately it becomes a management issue, 21 right? 22 MR. PRIOR: Well, in this village what's happened is the land use boards have 23 24 essentially been using the input from counsel

1.5

2.2

to provide the training. It's just that in the context of the Planning Board, since it meets so infrequently, that the information gets stale and it gets kind of force fed when an application comes up every 5 years or so. You know, the board hasn't been moved — the Board of Trustees has not been moved to remove any land use board members for not taking formal training elsewhere.

MS. MASCALI: Well, I found, you know, the presentation that you gave leading up to here pretty informative. And you did that in about 15 minutes. So is it not efficient then maybe every 4 years or so for you to give a couple of hours training so everybody is brushed up and it's fresh in their mind? Is that a viable approach?

MR. PRIOR: I gave you a really bite size summary of the issues. There are many, many, many issues. I provided the board with a -- I think it was an 8- or 10-page memo in terms of what was relevant here: SEQRA issue, timing issues, the default approval issue that was mentioned a short while ago. There

is a lot to it. And that lengthy memo was followed by 2 hours of an executive session meeting with the board to communicate that to them. It's complex stuff. It's very detailed and complex stuff.

MS. MASCALI: And if it got transferred to the trustees, you would do it for the trustees too, wouldn't you?

MR. PRIOR: Sure.

1.5

2.2

MAYOR RISCICA: You know, I just want to weigh in a little here to enhance what Chris said.

We included it on the index of documents.

And we didn't discuss Chris's memo in 2018 to the Planning Board end of February. That would be — that would be a little over 30 days before one of the member's terms was expiring and did expire. And Chris put this 11-page document together explaining the legalities and the laws and the situation related to the issues that a Planning Board has to consider.

And included in his  $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$  and this became the training document. Included in his

document is legally relevant criteria for subdivision review which contains the items that we talked about before. And it goes on about SEQRA and this, that and the other thing.

So this document -- 11 pages -- became the method by which the village attorney satisfied me as the mayor that he was

other documentation.

1.5

2.2

remediate -- this memo was part of a 2-hour meeting that satisfied me that he was remediating the lack of training by training the people now in connection with this filing and with this documentation supplemented with

So that's how it's been managed. It's been allowed to occur. And it's been managed with, you know, on-the-spot training when it happens.

MS. MASCALI: Just in time training?

MAYOR RISCICA: Is that right? Is that

right? It's not the way that I would like it

to be.

MS. MASCALI: Well, he just said that he would provide the same training to the

1.5

2.2

trustees. Because as he said, it's a -- it's unusual, kind of technical, you know, specific kind of stuff.

MAYOR RISCICA: There's no doubt that the trustees would need similar training, yes, and that we would have to either take the training that's legally available or we would have to take --

MS. MASCALI: Remedial? That was my -MAYOR RISCICA: We're doing remedial.

That's not the best answer. But if he's, you know, giving them the information, they need to know the parameters, basically the frame work that they have to make the decision.

And they can't have their own little biases.

And this is the framework. Then if you could -- it would seem to me if you can get residents who -- we have a lot of smart people in our village who are critical thinkers that can get the just-in-time training around that and you have people willing to serve, then that would give us the independent board.

From what I've heard -- and I don't mean

to, you know, put any appearance or threat of -- not threat or accusation of impropriety, but the reasons that I've heard talking to people of why having an independent board and why the law says that no trustee can serve on that independent board is to avoid the appearance of impropriety. And trustees are elected officials. There's people that could perceive they were elected for a different -- and the appointment's for a 5-year term.

It's a longer term. Provides continuity.

So, you know, it balances against the two properties. But you said it yourself. The two properties are coming up. And they -- you know, there's not much that's going to stop them. So you kind of created a sense of like, okay. We know where he's laying.

But those are the facts. When you look at the legally permissible objections, for example, in Chris's memo -- I'm not sure that Ed or Chris are aware of any of them which -- any of them going in. We're not studying it. It's not coming up. So that's it.

I'm not sure how much independence -- I'm

not sure how much independence protects the village. And I hear the issue. And I want to be responsive to the issue. And I'm also a little concerned that this board apparently doesn't have that level of trust from the community. MS. MASCALI: Well, you know --

MAYOR RISCICA: I'm just saying you're -you're speaking candidly and I'm speaking candidly.

MS. MASCALI: True. But when you put something like this in place, it's not just the current board that's affected. It's the future board because it's in place then. So, you know, I don't think it's a question of the trust in the current board. But, you know, your legal -- putting a new law in place that is saying every future board is going to be that as well.

MR. PRIOR: If I may.

Any board that acts on a subdivision application needs to comply with the law that applies to reviewing subdivision applications. And if they don't they are

1

2

exposed to Article 78 lawsuits challenging 1 2 them on acting improperly in a decision. 3 MS. MASCALI: Right. And we as the residents pay those lawsuits. 4 5 MR. PRIOR: Yes. Yes. MS. MASCALI: That's the point. Exactly. 6 7 That's the point. 8 MR. PRIOR: We're in violent agreement. 9 MAYOR RISCICA: Yes. We're in violent 10 agreement on that. 11 MS. MASCALI: Right, on both sides. On both sides, right? On the side of a Planning 12 13 Board that does something that's whatever, 14 there could be some lawsuit. But on the 1.5 other side the trustees -- and there's 16 lawsuits that say there was some favoritism 17 or something like that, that could also be. 18 And that's more what I heard is the argument 19 of an independent board is to avoid lawsuits 20 to the village. Interesting you're looking 21 at it from the other side. The Planning 2.2 Board does their thing too. But you would hope that our attorney would protect the 23 24 Planning Board from doing stupid things.

MR. PRIOR: I do the best I can.

1.5

MAYOR RISCICA: And he did. And he did.

And he did. We appreciate him very much.

Chris is just the right tool for that job

because he has the patience and the wisdom to

communicate effectively. He did his job,

including advising the mayor.

John, are you -- John Jeffrey, are you trying to ask a question? Yes? Okay. So you don't know how to raise your hand. I have somebody named "Phoebe" who just entered the meeting, but she doesn't -- she is muted and she doesn't -- she's not coming up to unmute. And John, I think he's been trying to ask a question for a while. So I ask you to unmute. If you agree to that you can have the floor. Once again I want to thank you for what you did in encouraging me to be more forthcoming and more transparent. I thank you very much.

MR. JEFFREY: Well, I appreciate your responding so timely.

Ed, I just have -- when you say there's duplicate duties between the Zoning Board and

2.2

Planning Board -- so I went to the Summit

Avenue Planning Board meetings. And a lot of

meetings were the engineer reports about -
you know, there was this cliff side thing.

You know, X number of feet from the potential

houses.

So is that a Zoning Board? That isn't what they also consider? Those engineering reports and everything that I heard that night, that wouldn't be part of the normal zoning variance deliberations?

MR. PRIOR: Typically not. A Zoning
Board is being asked whether an applicant can
have a 10-foot side yard setback when the law
requires 30. And so there are other factors
that are relevant there. I suppose it's
possible that engineering might come into
play, but it's not typically something that
would come up in the context of a variance
from the zoning law application to a Zoning
Board.

MR. JEFFREY: So if you need a variance for this particular case -- I don't know, the size of the backyard. Maybe you didn't need

a variance after all. 1 BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: There were no 2 3 variances. MR. JEFFREY: No variances? 4 5 BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: There were no variances needed. 6 7 MR. JEFFREY: So in that case a Planning 8 Board came in with the additional oversight, 9 including the engineering reports, on how the 10 drainage and everything else would work? 11 MR. PRIOR: They had the primary 12 oversight over the subdivision. 13 MR. JEFFREY: On the training issue. Ed, 14 kind of like you, I'm a CPA, so maybe I'm 1.5 kind of nuts and bolts a little bit. But 16 seems to me if the training is required it 17 should be accomplished. And if the Planning 18 Board member doesn't do it -- or he should 19 understand that's one of the requirements to 20 stay on the board every year -- then they 21 should be kicked off. But if it moves to the trustees it's 2.2 sounded to me like we still wouldn't be 23 24 sending any of the trustees to this 4-hour

training. We will get the good input from counsel. So would you envision somebody from the trustees attending this 4-hour session or not?

MAYOR RISCICA: Are you asking Ed or me?

MR. JEFFREY: I'm asking you, Ken. I'm sorry.

MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. So let me comment on the first part of that, the first part of that.

I have a board that rarely meets. And I suggest to you that if I go to my Planning Board members and say, I need to see a certificate that you attended this 4 hours of training, I would find more, not less, resignations and people unwilling to serve. So it would be very difficult to populate a board and enforce the training requirement, which is the reason, as Rosemary tagged in, we utilized this remediation approach.

I learned about the training requirement

-- I'm not on the Planning Board. I never

was. I was never on the ARB. I learned

about this training requirement during the

whole Summit process. And I learned about it from the village counsel. And I learned about the remediation process from village counsel.

1.5

2.2

I didn't know any of that beforehand because I'm not responsible for that board.

I don't interfere with that board. And I -- you know, I have enough and a lot to do. So I learned that recently. And would the Board of Trustees be required to do the 4 hours a year of training? Yes. Would they do it? They would probably elect to have remedial training with Chris.

But I would say unlike a Planning Board member who might not hear from the village for 3 or 5 years, the Board of Trustees meets every month. And we have things going on in and around the village every month that we discuss. And some of those are zoning and planning matters in our village or in other villages.

And so we have a more current working knowledge. We're not properly trained.

Don't mistake me. We're not properly trained

Board of Trustees - Inc. Village of Plandome Heights -

2-1-21

1.5

2.2

either. But we think that the remediation in our case is building on a base of knowledge that somebody who isn't called on to consider a matter for 5 years doesn't have. And that's how I would answer that question. And your question is totally appropriate and thoughtful.

MR. JEFFREY: So the Planning Board -forget about landscaping or maybe that's the
-- I don't think this should go to the
Architectural Board at all. I think that's
totally wrong.

But to the extent as we look into the issue of whether some of the Planning Board matters can move into the Zoning Board which is independent, if we can isolate those things like if it's -- what the Planning Board does other than landscaping. So if it's the engineering or whatever the higher level of expertise is needed, to me logically it would be in the Zoning Board. So I would be interested if that's legally possible and what the view would be.

MAYOR RISCICA: It's certainly closer to

1 zoning than it is ARB. MR. JEFFREY: Yeah. 2 3 MAYOR RISCICA: We agree with that 100 percent. We don't want to talk about how 4 5 nice it would be if it really shouldn't be built. Zoning is more focused. 6 7 MR. JEFFREY: Planning Board has five 8 members, two backups? What if it went to 9 three with two backups? MAYOR RISCICA: I think it's legally 10 11 required to be five. 12 MR. JEFFREY: Okay. That's fine. Okay. 13 So I think basically it does come down to a 14 trust factor. My interactions with Ken have 1.5 been very positive. I don't know every 16 member of the board. But ultimately it is. 17 Now, again, you know, the old "trust but 18 verify." So I think it is good to have an 19 independent body. Maybe advisory would get 20 us there. But ultimately it's whether we 21 trust the board or not. And I'm fine with that. But I wouldn't mind some division of 22 23 responsibility or oversight. 24 MAYOR RISCICA: I hear you loud and

1 clear, John. 2 MR. JEFFREY: Thank you. 3 MAYOR RISCICA: And you pressed me pretty hard. And I appreciate that because, you 4 5 know, this is a community. And, you know, we're here to serve everybody. So thank you. 6 7 MR. JEFFREY: Okay. 8 MAYOR RISCICA: Elaine, I see you trying 9 to get into the meeting, but I cannot unmute 10 you for some reason. Maybe you want to sign 11 back in and we'll try better to call on you. But I have no ability to unmute you right 12 13 now. And I would appreciate hearing from 14 you. 1.5 Chuck McCarthy, are you trying to raise 16 your hand? 17 TRUSTEE CATALDO: This is Dan. 18 There is a question out there from one of 19 the residents. And it says, will the 20 residents be able to vote on this issue? 21 Maybe again the --22 MR. PRIOR: I can respond to that one. The answer is no. Under New York State 23 24 law there are only specific items that can be

put to the vote of the residents. This is 1 2 not one of them. Adopting local laws is 3 strictly something the Board of Trustees has to do. The public hearing is mandated by law 4 5 as the way to permit public involvement, expressing their views. But they do not have 6 7 a right to vote. And the board -- this board 8 doesn't have the authority to let them vote 9 on that. 10 TRUSTEE CATALDO: Thanks, Chris. 11 MR. PRIOR: Sure. 12 MAYOR RISCICA: Elaine, if you can hear 13 me, you need to sign out and sign back in 14 again because I can't unmute you, so I can't 1.5 allow you. I simply have no ability to allow 16 you to ask your question. And if you can't 17 get in video, then maybe try -- maybe try 18 audio. Right now I have no option to unmute 19 you. 20 Chuck McCarthy has another question, 21 so --22 MR. MCCARTHY: I just wanted to make one comment without getting into the details. 23

I used to live in the Village of Baxter

2.2

Estates. And they did -- for things that happened there they -- the Board of Trustees was a little bit -- they got into their positions because of political reasons, not -- I'm not saying this is our board, but I did come from that village.

And I know that our -- Chris was the attorney over there, whatever. So things -- although we might have a great amount of trustees right now and yourself, Ken, you know, we're making a decision for all time. And that I've seen it firsthand and the people that are on the trustees, things get rammed through, and there's not a lot of analytical process.

It's a completely different type of
people that are here in Manhasset versus
whereas Baxter Estates -- but they were -they did not have a Planning Board. And
there were some issues that didn't quite have
to do with the normal processes of -- you
know, a lot of it was very political. People
were on their board for reasons that maybe
weren't for the best interest of the general

public. I just wanted to state that. That's
all.

MR. PRIOR: Chuck, I'm still the village attorney at Baxter Estates. I'm not sure what you're referring to, and I don't want you to explain it either. But what you're saying is not something that I recognize.

MR. MCCARTHY: Well, okay. Then as a resident -- maybe as an attorney you didn't recognize it. But as a resident I had experienced a number of things that had to do not so much with maybe people that were on -- they were in both capacities. They did things and, you know -- maybe they should or shouldn't have done. Maybe it was viewed from your point of view as something okay to do. But from a resident's point of view I wish we did have a Planning Board.

And does Baxter Estates now have a Planning Board?

MR. PRIOR: They do now.

MAYOR RISCICA: Chris has the dubious distinction of being the lawyer for Baxter Estates in adopting a Planning Board and the

lawyer for Plandome Heights in considering
merging the Planning Board. So Chris is on
both sides of this issue.

MR. MCCARTHY: Chris, why do they have a

Planning Board now?

1.5

MR. PRIOR: I'm not the -- the thankless nature of the job.

MR. MCCARTHY: Okay.

MAYOR RISCICA: Something for this Board of Trustees to consider along with the independence issue. This is a thankless job that no one would want. And I'm open.

Believe me I'm open. So I take the -- I take the input in the spirit that it's given.

It would be a lot easier, a lot easier not to be a Planning Board member. A lot easier. But only if things -- if something else changes. Because I think any of the board members could speak to the fact that the last subdivision, the only one in 20 years, was difficult for the village. And the board asked me -- the board and counsel asked that I help Chris bring appropriateness, bring it to the most

appropriate that it could be. And it was. 1 2 So I'm happy to go back to the trustees 3 and talk about how we don't do this. And in that process I will be looking forward to 4 5 hand raisers who want to do this service and are qualified to do this service. That I 6 7 welcome as input to this public hearing. And 8 that would help me go to the board and say, 9 you know, we can preserve the independence and staff the board in this manner and move 10 11 forward. 12 MR. JEFFREY: John Jeffrey. 13 So I'll volunteer. 14 MAYOR RISCICA: That's okay too. 1.5 MR. JEFFREY: I volunteer to be on the 16 Planning Board. 17 MAYOR RISCICA: All right. That's --18 we'll take that. 19 MR. JEFFREY: But only if I take the 20 educational requirement. 21 MAYOR RISCICA: What. 22 MR. JEFFREY: Only if I'm required to 23 take the 4 hours of training. 24 MAYOR RISCICA: All right.

1	MR. PRIOR: It's fascinating stuff.
2	MR. JEFFREY: It's 4 hours. Only the
3	Planning Board, Ken.
4	MAYOR RISCICA: John, you will be hearing
5	from us.
6	MR. JEFFREY: All right.
7	MAYOR RISCICA: Elaine. Again, I really
8	can't I can't let you in. I have no
9	option to let you in. So if you're still
10	there I would strongly suggest that you exit
11	and come back in either maybe on a phone
12	line or some other way.
13	I see someone has joined us by phone, so
14	I'm going to unmute them and ask them to
15	identify themselves. Maybe this is Elaine.
16	MS. CANTON: Hi. Success.
17	MAYOR RISCICA: Is that Elaine?
18	MS. CANTON: Yes.
19	MAYOR RISCICA: We saw that number
20	before. And I didn't call on you because I
21	thought, hey, we can let one slip by. I'm
22	sorry for making you wait so long
23	MS. CANTON: No. That's all right. My
24	bad. I didn't think it would be a problem if

1.5

I just called in. But let me tell you, I'm so hungry that I sat here for all of this time without speaking my peace.

I'm Elaine Canton. It's C-A-N-T-O-N.
132 Bay Driveway.

Having sat here through a lot of interesting comments, a lot of the things that were on my mind have already been said, one which was -- that really struck me was the list of villages without Planning Boards, because they were all so different from us.

You know, the villages that are like us are Plandome and Plandome Manor. Floral Park has 60,000 residents. And, you know, if we're going to make a decision, we have to look at villages that are more like us. And Baxter Estates, Sands Point, Lake Success, Laurel Hollow, Port Washington North, they all do have Planning Boards.

I also wanted to say that I keep hearing nobody wants to do this job. It's a thankless job. It's a horrible job. We can't get anyone to do this job. Well, I would have re-upped. Nobody -- you know, I

know it's all in a state of flux. But I
would have re-upped. Nobody asked me. I
can't speak for others on the Planning Board,
but, you know, same thing.

I think that maybe one of the things that the village can do is -- and maybe you do it and I just missed it -- send an email out if you're looking to fill a spot on one of the boards. I think that are a lot of people who are really interested in getting involved, particularly the people who are moving into the village now because they've got many years ahead of them and they're investing in their homes. So just a thought.

And then one of the other things that I was thinking about is if a decision is made to disband the board, then I think it would be helpful and valuable if the trustees had a sit down with the most recent board to just discuss concerns to sort of ensure a peaceful turnover of responsibilities. Having served on the board, there are just things that I could think of and probably some of the other members can think of that it would be good

1.5

for the trustees to consider.

1.5

2.2

And then my final thought -- because I know everybody is anxious to probably go eat like I am. One thing that has occurred to me was that nobody ever asked me if I knew the developer, if I had a relationship with the developer, with the developer's family or anything like that.

And I think that whether there's a separate Planning Board or it's the trustees, I think anyone who has a personal relationship with a developer should recuse him or herself from determining whether or not a property is subdivided or what happened, because it's hard to be impartial. Just a thought.

MAYOR RISCICA: Chris, did you want to comment on the last point?

MR. PRIOR: Well, if you have a relationship with an applicant that prevents you from reaching a dispassionate objective decision on the application, then you should recuse yourself.

MS. CANTON: You should, but not

everybody would. I think --

MR. PRIOR: The law requires that. And if somebody — if somebody is like that, refuses to recuse themself and then votes for it and it's approved, that decision now is subject to attack in an Article 78 for the failure of that person to recuse themself. So the law is exactly where you are on that.

MAYOR RISCICA: So it's in my interest that they do recuse, because I don't want the hint of a reason for an Article 78. That's just tax money that residents have to make up.

MS. CANTON: I agree 100 percent. But what I'm saying is -- make it very clear. I read our code of ethics. And I'm saying make it very clear. I think our code of ethics addresses more if money changes hands. I just think that each member of whether it's a Planning Board or the trustees, if there is a personal relationship, that person should have no objection to signing something and saying I know this person and I'm going to recuse myself or that the -- there should be

language in there so that the board can say, we know you know this person, so you should recuse yourself.

MR. PRIOR: All right. Let me clarify what I said a minute ago.

Knowing a person is not a reason to recuse yourself. In a small village like yours I suspect that in many zoning variance applications — and they're more frequent and so are ARB applications — it is probably quite common for board members to know their neighbor. So that — I don't think that's workable. And the law doesn't support that viewpoint: just knowing somebody.

MS. CANTON: Right.

MR. PRIOR: Is the relationship one that prohibits me from making an objective decision based upon the applicable law?

That's what the rule is. So if your best friends lives next door and you want to make them happy, then you recuse yourself. If the guy across the street you see when you take out the garbage has an application, that's probably nothing to worry about and no need

to recuse yourself.

1.5

2.2

MS. CANTON: Right.

BUILDING INSPECTOR BUTT: What about if somebody is advocating on behalf?

MR. PRIOR: You can't do that. You can't advocate for or against. If you're a Planning Board member or a Zoning Board member or an ARB member you can't advocate for or against the applicant. Your job is to listen to the advocate for and against make their case, and then make your decision based on the legal framework under which you have to operate.

MS. CANTON: Just out of curiosity. What if you're advocating for someone who is working with another board? You're on a board, but you're advocating for someone who's trying to get a variance or approval of a subdivision or something like that.

MR. PRIOR: A Planning Board -- you're suggesting a Planning Board member attending a Zoning Board application to stand up and say, I think you should grant the variance to this guy? Is that --

MS. CANTON: Yeah. 1 2 MR. PRIOR: That's not a problem. 3 MS. CANTON: Okay. MR. PRIOR: That's not a problem. And 4 5 that goes back to the fact that you folks who 6 are volunteering on land use boards in your 7 community don't lose your role as a resident 8 in the community. You're able to, you know, 9 make decisions on things that are not before 10 your board -- to have your opinion considered 11 on matters that are not before your board. MAYOR RISCICA: What about a trustee who 12 13 attends a Planning Board meeting and 14 advocates for a subdivision because as a 1.5 resident he believes it's in the community's 16 interest and his interest? 17 MR. PRIOR: The law permits that if your 18 -- if you say, I am here as a resident, I am 19 not here on behalf of the Board of Trustees 20 and I think this is a good application --21 MAYOR RISCICA: So --22 MS. CANTON: And no money changes hands. MR. PRIOR: If money changes hands, if 23 24 you're getting paid to say that, that's a

whole different animal.

1.5

2.2

MS. CANTON: Right.

MAYOR RISCICA: So, Elaine, I want to thank you for those points. And I want to assure you that you're going to be contacted by the clerk before the week is out to set up a meeting in February on Zoom between the members of the Planning Board who would care to do that and the members of the -- at least the quorum of the Board of Trustees so that you can share the thoughts that you just mentioned that you feel need sharing. That will happen.

MS. CANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MAYOR RISCICA: Thank you.

And, Roxanne, I don't mean to put you on the spot, but you reacted viscerally when -- you had a very obvious reaction when Elaine was speaking about those last points. Is there anything you wanted to add? I need to unmute you.

MS. FITZIG: Roxanne Fitzig.

No. I think Elaine said it all. There's nothing else. I second that.

1 MAYOR RISCICA: Thank you. I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge 2 3 your visceral reaction, which is fine. Okay. John Jeffrey unmute. 4 5 MR. JEFFREY: Just a quick question. You said it's a 5-year term. Is there a 6 7 term limit? 8 MAYOR RISCICA: Not that I'm aware of. 9 MR. JEFFREY: So you could re-up? 10 MR. PRIOR: Yes. 11 MR. JEFFREY: Thank you. 12 MAYOR RISCICA: I don't see any more 13 questions at the moment. 14 Having heard this input, which I think 1.5 has been great, appreciate all of it, all of 16 it, whether I agree or don't agree is not the 17 point. The point is we're here to do the 18 business of the village. That's what we're 19 here to do. And I would like to ask the 20 trustees if they have anything -- having 21 heard this input and testimony if they have 22 anything that they would like to add in 23 comments. 24 TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: No thank you, Ken.

1	MAYOR RISCICA: Okay.
2	TRUSTEE CATALDO: Ken, this is Dan.
3	No further comments.
4	MAYOR RISCICA: Al, nothing? Okay.
5	Aida.
6	TRUSTEE FERMAN: Yes. No comments.
7	Everything is fine.
8	TRUSTEE SOLOMON: Nothing from me, Ken.
9	TRUSTEE TAYLOR: Same.
10	MAYOR RISCICA: Norman and Gus.
11	TRUSTEE PANOPOULOS: No.
12	TRUSTEE TAYLOR: No.
13	MAYOR RISCICA: So if there's nothing
14	else and I'm happy to stay as long as
15	people want to talk about this. I want to
16	just summarize to say I think this was good.
17	I think it was good for the board. I think
18	this was good for the community.
19	I apologize if I didn't put it out there
20	soon enough to get you thinking about it
21	ahead of time. But it's all out there now.
22	It's all out there now. And I would suggest
23	to you that I don't think anyone is fixed in
24	their position here.

You've given us a lot to think about. think the dialogue has been candid and respectful. I know that I've been candid with you. Sometimes perhaps not what you wanted to hear. But certainly I've been candid with you. I have a large 7 responsibility here. And that includes 8 protecting the village and serving you the 9 way you want to be served. That's what I 10 always try to do. 11 So we're going to collect this 12 13 14 1.5

1

2

3

4

5

6

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

information. We're going to talk to Elaine and her group. We're going to do a little vetting with John on his desire to be a -- be a Planning Board member. And there may be a medical exam involved in that.

MR. JEFFREY: That's funny.

MAYOR RISCICA: And we're going to take the information on what we saw the other villages -- how they configure themselves, and the information that the residents have suggested and how we configure ourselves and the thoughts about independence, which I've heard loud and clear. And we're going to

1.5

2.2

stir it into the mix and have thoughtful discussion about what we think we should do next.

I can assure you in some fashion I will communicate with you. I was thinking before this meeting that perhaps I would put together like takeaways. Here's 5 or 10 takeaways that we got from the public hearing and put it out on the website for all to see. But whatever. We will do something to communicate so you know how our thinking is evolving. You won't read in the paper that we just did it and didn't tell you. And we'll go from there.

But in a final analysis we're going to make the decision that we think is best for the village. And you've given us a lot to think about. So I appreciate that. And you've done it in a respectful way. And I appreciate that. And I hope we've been respectful back.

Do we have anything else?

(No response.)

MAYOR RISCICA: So I would -- I need a

1	motion to close the public hearing?
2	MR. PRIOR: Yes. I would like a motion.
3	Yes.
4	MAYOR RISCICA: So I would ask for a
5	motion to close the public hearing.
6	TRUSTEE CATALDO: This is Dan.
7	I will make that motion to close the
8	public hearing.
9	TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: I'll second the motion.
10	It's Diane.
11	MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. All in favor.
12	TRUSTEE SOLOMON: Aye.
13	TRUSTEE CATALDO: Aye.
14	TRUSTEE FERMAN: Aye.
15	TRUSTEE PANOPOULOS: Aye.
16	TRUSTEE TAYLOR: Aye.
17	TRUSTEE SHEEHAN: Aye.
18	MAYOR RISCICA: Aye.
19	All opposed.
20	(No one.)
21	MAYOR RISCICA: Okay. That concludes
22	Jennifer Devlin's portion of this, so you can
23	stop.
24	(Time noted: 8:56 p.m.)