

## **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED ROSLYN LANDING TOWNHOUSES (BITI)**

**July 11, 2006  
Bryant Library, Roslyn**

**[based on a summary provided by Leonard Shaw, HHPC Roslyn Representative]**

Here are some of my notes from the BITI DEIS public meeting held on July 11, 2006:

The number of attendees was about the same as for the previous meeting, at which Eric Swenson made the HHPC presentation. Mayor Durkin announced that that meeting would close the review, except for a 30 day additional period for written comments. (He was acceding to requests from some interested parties for more than the usual 10 days.)

Mayor Durkin opened the comments with requests that the developers provide:

- detailed landscaping plans by a landscape architect, along with details about that architect's credentials
- site cross sections on N-S and E-W lines to better show the grading slopes
- detailed review of site lines and view corridors, as well as comparisons of those with existing ones
- add traffic analysis for off peak periods
- business model: financing plan, banks involved, developer's track record, specifics of development's impact on Village's economy

Janet Insardi read an excellent letter from the Coalition to Save Hempstead Harbor. I did not take notes, but much of what she said was said by others whose words I summarize below. Her presentation also referred to the Master Plan's goal of encouraging recreational use of the harbor, while BITI and Forest City Daly developments only promote viewing the harbor while effectively precluding use for launching and storage of un-powered boats. She and others pointed out that the Village was deficient in not having revised the 1996 Master Plan, as required by that plan, after it had been in force for 5 years. The review is especially needed in view of the recent designation of the lower harbor as a significant coastal fish and wildlife habitat area and the new state stormwater regulations. Additional comments focused on the project's density, stormwater controls, impacts on the village's sewer system and impacts on the harbor, traffic and air quality, impacts on archaeological resources and impacts on fire, police and water services. [Note that the Coalition's letter is available on the harbor website: [www.HempsteadHarbor.org](http://www.HempsteadHarbor.org)].

The Roslyn Chamber Of Commerce has engaged an attorney (who also has planning credentials, but whose name I did not get) and Norman Gerber, a planner. They also conferred with and said they represented the views of the Landmark Society and Preservation Corporation. They had requested a longer written comment period, partly on the basis that the legal notices for the meetings were deficient since they did not mention that the plan involved rezoning of more than 2 acres (with 200 feet of frontage) from RV (business) to RWD (residential). They noted that the Master Plan called for use of the RV areas for expanded business and parking to maintain the economic viability of the Roslyn. The Chamber of Commerce opposes the rezoning and also proposed variances for taller buildings, less setback from the shore, etc.

BITI proposes 280 parking spaces when only 180 are required for the proposed units. Clarification is requested regarding intent of "visitor parking" areas. Are they only for visitors to the residences? Or any visitors to Roslyn? Will they be metered? Who will maintain them??

The secondary access road onto Bryant Avenue is problematic for traffic flow and safety reasons. If the number of units is reduced by limiting residential units to areas currently zoned for them,

with no bonuses, perhaps that secondary access is unnecessary, or might be limited to emergency access.

The DEIS should give details about the tax impact on Roslyn residents for village costs related to upgrading the sewage system to handle the additional BITI burden.

The DEIS should evaluate more realistic development alternatives in addition to the extreme cases currently mentioned.

Mayor Durkin asked for a comparison of additional traffic that would be produced by using the RV areas for business rather than housing. The Chamber of Commerce's consultants could not give a quantitative answer at that time.

Sylvia Dorskey, chair of the Clock Tower party, said that the Executive Board of that party was unanimously opposed to the zoning changes. (That party is a pretty loose organization but it is clear that lots of residents would support this position.)

Michael Dorskey, chair of the Village Planning Board, read from a letter being submitted from that Board to the Village Board of Trustees. While the latter group has not yet submitted the BITI plan for review by the Planning Board, the Planning Board thought it appropriate to give its thoughts on the BITI DEIS, which they think is deficient in many respects:

- the alternatives compared are insufficient, particularly in not evaluating possibilities for development with no zoning changes or variances
- it should quantify hardships that seem to require zoning changes
- the traffic study ignored problems of making left turns onto Bryant Ave when approaching it from Hillside or Remsen (points opposite where the proposed secondary access road meets Bryant).
- no landscaping plan or reference to existing trees. Many of those would require permits for removal that is implied by the plan.
- more data is required to support the estimates of school children likely to enter the schools from the new units - including identifying similar developments that are the basis for the estimate.

I asked Mayor DURKIN what plans the Village has for initiating the overdue Master Plan review that was mentioned by so many speakers. He replied that within a few months they hope to engage planning consultants to coordinate such a review.

Several other residents spoke in opposition of the development as planned and some expressed dismay that the Village Board seemed to favor the plan despite the strong criticisms. Mayor Durkin re-iterated that the Village Board had not made any decision, and would only do so after all information was available and after it had taken time to carefully evaluate that information.