

Summary of Comments on Local Laws Amending Chapter 117 Lighting, Chapter 223 Building Construction and Chapter 271 Zoning

Number	Date of Comment	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
BB-1	7/23/2017	Bill Burton	People should have a grace period before implementation to get submissions in under current laws	The local law will indicate the date that provisions become effective.
DC-1	8/7/2017	Daryl Colwell	To the extent that a homeowner removes 1 tree, that homeowner should be required to plant not less than 2 new trees of like=kind/size in its place. If space doesn't allow for a 2-for-1 replanting on the homeowner's property, then a portion of the re-planted trees may be located somewhere else within East Hills. With increased carbon emissions, our environment is becoming more critically dependent on trees. Trees are the only known offsetting factor for global warming. The air we and our children breathe depend on trees.	Tree code to be updated at a later date
DG-1	7/21/2017	Donna Gooch	Are we getting a head start on the new forms as they will need to be hand and ready to go as soon as the new legislation is filed with the DSS?	Yes - these are being prepared and will be available prior to code changes being implemented
EMOUNA-1	Transcript	Mr. Emouna	I personally think maybe we are understaffed here or the building permit process is extremely slow.	NP&V can provide recommendations for expedited review options upon request.
JM-1	8/8/2017	Jaclyn & Edan Matalon	I am against any proposed changes to the zoning laws in East Hills. We moved to 109 Crescent Lane in order to expand our home with our growing family. It is unfair to pass legislation that will cause housing prices to drop.	Changes are not reducing allowable FAR or maximum home size.
JS-1	7/23/2017	Joel Sheinbaum	Code modification pages 3 and 4 to allow placement of a shed must limit the size and placement of shed and must prevent the shed from being placed in front or side of a house. It should be kept away from the back property line by at least 20 feet and a color approved by the Village.	This suggestion would be very restrictive.
JS-1	8/2/2017	Jenny Somekh	Remember that every change has to be acceptable upon even the smallest lot any stills. A lot that is between 80 and 95 feet in width, will be forced to have a narrow and deep home, with narrow rooms, which is far less desirable.	Narrow lots are the exception - there is always true hardship that is not self created and ZBA relief if warranted.
JS-2	7/23/2017	Joel Sheinbaum	I am concerned about more than one family occupying a house or a house being used for commercial purposes.	Not a zoning issue
JS-2	8/8/2017	Jenny Somekh	Also I was just discussing with a friend about these changes and there is nothing on the website I can find in notices or anywhere. If there are proposed changes they need to be emailed to the entire village and or sent flyers as well as added to the website!	Up to the Village Trustees how matters are communicated.
JS-3	Transcript	Joel Sheinbaum	(same comments)	See above 2 boxes
JW-1	8/1/2017	Jeffrey Weinbaum	As a resident who has been impacted by the change in zoning laws when I renovated my house and went before the tree committee when I had to remove trees, it is my opinion (in addition to my concern that the village is becoming too restrictive) that these committees are very thorough and before any project moves forward, all necessary concerns are addressed. With this said, I am against making any major changes to our zoning laws.	Comment noted

Summary of Comments on Local Laws Amending Chapter 117 Lighting, Chapter 223 Building Construction and Chapter 271 Zoning

Number	Date of Comment	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
JW-2	8/1/2017	Jeffrey Weinbaum	This is not to say that I am not in favor of requiring updates such as outdoor lighting on new construction and maybe a buffer between driveways, if there is room. But requiring circular driveways may be going too far. And requiring circular driveways on all new construction may, in itself, create the "cookie cutter" look that the Village is trying to avoid.	Code is not requiring circular driveways, it is providing standards for those who want them
JW-3	8/1/2017	Jeffrey Weinbaum	Regarding lighting, too much light becomes light pollution and that is not a good thing.	Comment noted
MF-1	8/9/2017	Mor Fryman	I am very upset to hear that zoning laws might be changing. I bought my house with the full intention of growing my family which means I would need to expand. With these proposed zone limits, I will no longer be able to do so. What attracted me most to east hills is the family friendly component and how great the housing situation is. Please do not make it harder for people to expand their homes to make room for their families.	Comment noted
MG-1	7/25/2017	May Gazmo	In an R-2 Zone, there could be a major impact to the second level of a home that would need to now be 2 feet smaller than the 1st level (1ft on each side...total of 32 feet in aggregate). After speaking with several builders, I understand that this change could impact the reinforcements needed to hold the 2nd level and may require steel beams for support. As you may already know, this would significantly increase building costs and make it almost impossible for someone such as my family to afford the house we wanted to build.	If a substantial improvement, would not be a significant increase in building costs. However, the revised code includes an exception for substantive improvements that build upon an existing structure and if requirement would mean setting back less than 18" - this will be an allowable encroachment as long as building still complies with the 75% rule for exterior wall interruption.
MG-2	7/25/2017	May Gazmo	...reconsider the overwhelming majority of the village residents opinion in conducting a resident wide survey	Up to the Village Trustees how matters are communicated. In this case, additional time for written comment, refined code sections to be posted and another public hearing to be held.
MG-3	7/25/2017	May Gazmo	...the board meeting last week was very poorly attended by residents of East Hills. Perhaps social media is the best platform to address such issues these days. You might want to consider utilizing that medium for communication in the future.	The Board extended the comment period, has scheduled a public meeting to review the changes, and will announce the date for another public hearing on the local laws.
MK-01	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-7 Definitions ..ADD ... ADD "House Number"	See requirement of the State Building Code
MK-02	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-122 or Article XI Provisions Applicable ... ADD "House Number shall be clearly visible from the street of a contrasting color, of a minimum size of (say) 4" numbers. (EMT Fire Dept has to find the house)	Addressed in ARB Design Standards
MK-03	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Article XXV and 217-118 (etc.) should be written for and linked to <u>all</u> districts in a text that would allow future connections to public sewers (which could happen in certain areas, while in others "alternate septic systems" could be more cost effective) They should be written to promote the installation of new "alternate" septic systems.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-04	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Attach to the future building permit application a graphic of the permit process, when, where and how documents get received, circulated passed through personnel and returned to the applicant, so staff can accept complete documents, log activity and applicants can see where they are in the process. (often documents are returned to the applicant who does not know what to do and time passes.)(see attached file prepared some years ago)	New application form and packet will help to streamline. Flow chart to be included. Log system can be explored at a later date.

Summary of Comments on Local Laws Amending Chapter 117 Lighting, Chapter 223 Building Construction and Chapter 271 Zoning

Number	Date of Comment	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
MK-05	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108 -- Noise, sound, pollutants etc. should be applicable to all districts.	Noise restrictions are in the Industrial District - may need to be relocated to another section. To be reviewed at later date.
MK-06	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-11 Fences ?? Why 7'	NP&V did not do a review of fences for this project. We did look at fence requirements of other Villages - specific to vinyl fencing and provided comments. The Village should provide direction on how NP&V should proceed. Separate effort.
MK-07	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Document requirements listed for the ARB should be modified and applicable to the BZA (the text for the ZBA is sparse)	ZBA code needs additional language requirements for submission.
MK-08	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	I think thought should be placed for parking structures, which might be requested in the future	Commercial only - this has not come up with the ZTR Committee or the Board - matter for future consideration
MK-09	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Should restaurants be required to have refrigerated garbage?	Commercial only - this has not come up with the ZTR Committee or the Board - matter for future consideration
MK-10	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	217-128.2 A last line should those words be deleted as a typo	This has to do with tag sales -not something that was reviewed - need input from the Village.
MK-11	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Article XIV Village Fees...ADD to (3) Building Permit "or \$7500 less than the total if an "Alternate Septic System" is installed. (That splits the potential cost) This gives incentive to move to new technology and can be used as a part of the MS\$ process.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-12	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	ADD a section that requires the Village to <u>archive</u> the location, depth, fluids, technology of any form of geothermal well located in the Village.	Code to be considered at later date. Will add to the survey standards and plan requirements to locate where the geothermal locations are on a site.
MK-13	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-143 ... pools.. A, ADD a provision that denies "cabañas". Historically the ZBA has only given a handful. This would make it clear - B. Ground steel reinforcing in pools and pool decks	A. Included in accessory structures. B. Needs specific review.
MK-14	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Pool drywells should be redefined to allow new technology that does not need such a large drywell	Provisions in the code for rain gardens added as part of the drainage strategy for a site - designed and certified by a qualified design professional. Inserted in Article XXIV
MK-15	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Some language should be included regarding "hot tubs"	Included as accessory site feature in Table 1B.
MK-16	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Article XIX Dish Antennas needs to be revised (they are not 8' diameter and not on the ground anymore)	Language updated
MK-17	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	Article XXA & XXII (I guess this is out of sequence so the whole document does not have to be reprinted)	R-A District was not part of this study
MK-18	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-297 Is Dec 1 right I don't know if they are all finished by then	Related to pick of leaves - a subject not part of this study - need additional input to modify
MK-19	7/23/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-287 should include language promoting the use of alternate septic systems (see building fee revision suggestion) and a "stamped" engineering requirement for alternate septic systems.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.

Summary of Comments on Local Laws Amending Chapter 117 Lighting, Chapter 223 Building Construction and Chapter 271 Zoning

Number	Date of Comment	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
MK-20	Transcript	Michael Kosinski	Is there some leverage in there when they provide structural information that can't work?	The plans examiner can request more information or calculations to show load path, all these different things so if they feel in their interpretation that something doesn't seem to work. There are also guidance documents in the building that talk about what size joists, the span, things like that, span tables.
MK-21	Transcript	Michael Kosinski	Regarding site accessory structure: Where are they, when you can have them, when they can't have them, distance away from lot lines?	New table for site accessory features, Attachment 1B in the back of code.
MK-22	Transcript	Michael Kosinski	They don't have to come before the Board of Appeals for walls all the time?	New standards for surveys we be part of the checklists. Need survey data for Building Department to accurately determine slopes and height based on these calculations.
MK-23	Transcript	Michael Kosinski	...(If) filling in the backyard and make it level, and it impact the guy down below.... So you have kind of addressed it.	Yes. Addressed in code.
MK-24	Transcript	Michael Kosinski	...the other issue is the water budget. If somebody submits their drawing and they say they are going to use X amount of water for their irrigation, that design is on the plan. ...So that might be helpful to know that. ...It's an evaluation process. In other words, they design the irrigation system. It's on the plan when you submit it. Then they come to the water district for permits, and the engineering has been done. And it can be checked, but it doesn't have to be through the engineer. And the systems today can either be hugely inefficient or spot on. And spot on is a very funny term because they can be one head is the head that governs the amount of water. So you get the plants in the area working great. That's the driest spot. The other plants are now being over-watered.	Separate issue, Village to provide input if desired.
MK-25	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	In the definitions - Lot Coverage there is the term "pool houses". The ZBA has only allowed a few of this sort of accessory structure in all the years I've been on the board. There have been recent requests on big lots. Does the BOARD want this to be an allowed type of accessory structure.	Not part of this study - direction will be sought from Trustees
MK-26	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	"Shed" - Should there be some relief of the setback lines as sometimes they fill the backyards. The ZBA has been asked for relief.	Setbacks provided in Table 1B
MK-27	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Fire pits, bbq's What are they	Site accessory features - now defined and setbacks provided.
MK-28	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Define "professional" to be used for accessory use allowances. Compare it to "Home Occupation" with regards to signs.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-29	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	"Athletic court" should some how be defined so as not to be a part of a driveway.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-30	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Coverage-Rear yard impervious	Clarification made where rear yard measured in definitions and figure.
MK-31	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Is there a link in rear coverage that limits what lots can have a pool or not. The ZBA has always "said" that some lots can't have a pool. What about lap pools or those that stream water. Can they be allowed everywhere if they are small.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.

Summary of Comments on Local Laws Amending Chapter 117 Lighting, Chapter 223 Building Construction and Chapter 271 Zoning

Number	Date of Comment	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
MK-32	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Dog Kennel - in the past the ZBA used to get cased for "dog runs". There was controversy over what type of "floor" was appropriate relating to dogs that dig and the cleaning of the run. We seem to have forgotten about these cases as none have come before the board in a long time. They are out there. ** I see it in R district "fences". Ok but is there any research to guide the ABA if it gets another case.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-33	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Family - cohabitation is on the rise. There was just published articles about NYC housing, brand new apartments for cohabitation. Bedrooms for multiple unrelated people with shared living rooms, kitchens, etc. Is there a lock on more than one family in a residence. I believe they do exist in VEH	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-34	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	There is an idea in certain places that allow an "accessory structure" to proved a living place (with plumbing) for parents. Is it allowed or denied.	Not part of the study - however, per code use appears to be permitted in R and R-1 Districts.
MK-35	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	"Lodge House" What??	Not clear what the question refers to.
MK-36	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-252 Family Guidance Center. Just thinking. Has anyone been three to see if they occupy the third floor, which they were. Can't no sprinters or exits. Years ago when I went through the "sprinkler" was attached to a domestic water line. (firetrap)	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-37	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	272-43 ...than 90' for which no more than 1 (add single width ???) garage door shall face the front yard.	New requirements for setbacks
MK-38	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-35 What? and this is in other zones.	Site accessory features
MK-39	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	What about "temporary structures" in resident zones.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-40	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Street opening fees - how do water and gas utilities random opening needs fit into this.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-41	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-140 swimming pools, add something about hot tubs/spas	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-42	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	271-144 Can we eliminate these (my opinion)	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-43	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Fences - can we eliminate the use of pressure treated posts. Historically the ZBA used to require metal posts with brackets to hold wood fencing. They are still standing.	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
MK-44	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Define who goes first ARB or ZBA	Part of building procedure - needs discussion
MK-45	7/27/2017	Michael Kosinski	Impervious yard coverages as tabulated seem ok but I have not done the research that N&P did to come up with these values. Will some complain that it is too stringent, there's the ZBA	We looked at many many examples for different zones. Will apply to new and substantial improvements. Also, rear yard is measured to the closest point of the house to the rear line. This has been clarified with a new figure.
MK-46	8/2/2017	Michael Kosinski	Plastic fences must not be allowed any front yard (at a minimum)	Not part of the study - may be considered at a later date. Comment for future consideration.
NS-1	8/8/2017	Nissim and Nili Somekh	I don't believe that it has been publicized enough to give a fair chance for all of the community members to understand how these proposed changes will affect our property value as well as the desire for new people to purchase in our neighborhood. I propose that there are more meetings held for residents to truly understand the changes and we can all come together on a fair proposal that will benefit the greater needs of our community.	Up to the Village Trustees how matters are communicated. Many ZTR meetings that were open to public held - more recently, no meetings, NP&V has been working on the code with the Village building, committee and Bill Burton. Comment period was extended and another meeting scheduled for September 12th. Another hearing on the local laws will be held.

Number	Date of Comment	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
NSS-1	8/10/2017	Navon & Sharon Somekh	I recently attended the by-law meeting that was held in July. I am disappointed in the way the meeting was presented. There was no prior notice of this meeting. I only heard about it from a friend, who also lives in the neighborhood. On many other occasions, emails and Facebook notifications are issued to make residents aware of the happenings in the village.	Comment noted
NSS-2	8/10/2017	Navon & Sharon Somekh	In regards to the topics discussed at the meeting, I feel that putting more restrictions on already strict building codes can hurt the prosperity of our village and in turn, hurt the value of our homes negatively. There are rules in the new building code that need to be looked at thoroughly and explained to us, the residents, more in depth.	Comment noted
NSS-3	8/10/2017	Navon & Sharon Somekh	The outside company that was hired to do the analysis should hold additional meetings with a more in-depth explanation as to the changes in the building code. Most of the village residents do not have any knowledge in building codes and do not understand most of them, myself included.	Comment noted
NSS-4	8/10/2017	Navon & Sharon Somekh	However, there was one topic that came up during the meeting that I feel should not and cannot be implemented. Changing the side yard set back to 32 foot on the second floor of a house, in an R2 zone versus a current 30 foot setback should not be changed for just 2 feet. Having to leave 1 foot of a difference on each side between the 1st and 2nd floors, will just result in a significantly higher construction cost and not look any different from outside. That's just a small change that I noticed and understood. However, there are other changes that I could not understand through reading the new code.	Addressed in revised code.
NSS-5	8/10/2017	Navon & Sharon Somekh	A thorough explanation through meetings will benefit the residents very much. I understand that this has been worked on for a long time and I appreciate the hard work that was put into it. I just feel that, us, as the residents should have a little more input on these changes, as it will affect us as well.	Comment noted
PRESTON-1	Transcript	Mr. Preston	No other Village or town in Long Island requires a side yard total of 40.	This is the current setback for R-1 and is not proposed to change.
PRESTON-2	Transcript	Mr. Preston	If you take 50 off of 110, you are down to 60, and all of a sudden now you cannot build that center hall with decent sized rooms as required based on the value of the buying of the land.	This was reviewed; no changes proposed.
Rapp-1	Transcript	Mr. Rapp	...my only concern with a lot of talk about second floor setbacks, and this is more in regards to renovations on existing homes than anything is that you already have very stringent inclined plan slope requirements.	Code changes since July 20th modified for R-2 (to be manageable for narrow lots)
Rapp-2	Transcript	Mr. Rapp	...it was 18 inch minimum between the garage and door.	Code modified to remove the absolute 18" minimum but must meet the requirements for supporting structure and distance to accommodate structural members.
Rapp-3	Transcript	Mr. Rapp	Eventually are you going to have the brochures or the codes in the book that you can buy?	Yes - there will be packages with instructions prepared.

Summary of Comments on Local Laws Amending Chapter 117 Lighting, Chapter 223 Building Construction and Chapter 271 Zoning

Number	Date of Comment	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
RB-01	7/20/2017	Richard Brummel	Charge a Demolition fee (see PDF for full comment)	Fees need to be related to the service provided
RB-02	7/20/2017	Richard Brummel	Re-define "Demolition" versus "Renovation" (see PDF for full comment)	Comment noted
RB-03	7/20/2017	Richard Brummel	Impose context-based limits on new house-size by restricting new houses to a 125 percent of original house size (see PDF for full comment)	This is not consistent with the Committee/Board input to have a balance and allow expansions and larger homes and achieving visual quality and minimizing impact on neighboring properties
RB-04	7/20/2017	Richard Brummel	Close the floor-area ratio loophole for houses on "deep properties" (see PDF for full comment)	Not specifically reviewed, however, reviewed plans for a particularly deep site as an example where this may be an issue with Building Inspector, found that while the property was deep, the frontage is not narrow. It is considerably wider than required and the size of the house was limited by the maximum square footage (in this case was 6100 SF).
RB-05	7/20/2017	Richard Brummel	Backyard preservation/restoration (see PDF for full comment)	Tree code to be updated at a later date
RB-06	7/20/2017	Richard Brummel	Moratorium on tree destruction; address disease, replant (see PDF for full comment)	Tree code to be updated at a later date
RB-07	7/20/2017	Richard Brummel	Restrict, don't expand, house- and street lighting (see PDF for full comment)	Code modifications balance the need to expand homes with visual quality and limits on coverage
RB-08	8/2/2017	Richard Brummel	Additional comments related to publicizing.	Comment noted
RB-09	8/2/2017	Richard Brummel	Public opinion survey of East Hills should be conducted regarding the building situation and broken down by longevity of the residence here.	Comment noted
RB-10	8/2/2017	Richard Brummel	Renderings of "allowable" houses should be placed on the web.	Comment noted
RB-11	8/2/2017	Richard Brummel	Summary omitted lighting reforms	Chapter 117 is being revised to address light pollution.
RB-12	8/2/2017	Richard Brummel	Action requires SEQRA review	SEQRA Determination will be rendered prior to adoption of local laws.
RB-13	8/2/2017	Richard Brummel	Need for tree reforms. Should be a moratorium on tree removals.	Tree code to be updated at a later date
SC-1	8/1/2017	Sharad Chopra	We must deter against tree's being ripped down and the current \$200 fine is actually not enough of a fine	Tree code to be updated at a later date
SC-2	8/1/2017	Sharad Chopra	We also need to close loopholes on avoiding planting of trees	Tree code to be updated at a later date
SE-1	8/10/2017	Sivan Erstein	I am requesting that the proposed changes be described in specific terms that are easily understood by the residents at large and ask that the community be given more time to digest this information and comment before a vote is put through.	Additional hearing on September 12th
SOMEKH-1	Transcript	Mr. Somekh	I'm in an R-2 zone....Your setbacks are 30 feet. I('m) looking to make it 36 feet.	Revised in new version of code for R-2 District.
SP-1	8/9/2017	Sharon Portnoy	I am concerned that changing the building code in such a way that increases the cost of building new homes will deter developers from building in the area leading to a decline in our property values.	Comment noted