

ID	Start time	The Chapter That You Ar	Your Comments	Name2
215	10/14/23 16:08:56	Letter of Resignation	<p>As one of the three members of CPAC who resigned on 9/23/2023, I want to record important points from our letter of resignation:</p> <p>“On September 8, without having shared it with CPAC, the CPTF and the Town’s consultants released the 166 pages of a draft plan (Draft Plan) and scheduled a public hearing on September 23. The 36-page last chapter “Future Land Use Plan and Implementation” was released on September 19.</p> <p>The Draft Plan does not adequately reflect the years of work, data, and public opinion—from surveys, focus groups, meetings and submitted comments to CPAC. Some of the suppositions are contradictory to data, discussions, recommendations, as well as community opinion. The Draft Plan also includes items that have not been previously introduced or discussed.</p> <p>Much of the language in the Draft Plan is new or differs significantly from the draft chapters that were worked on by the CPAC and CPTF. Some language that we understood was being included is not there. Although we are told that this is an evolving process, we have no evidence of a willingness to change the tenor of the document or restore a meaningful role for CPAC. (Indeed, having the consultants meaningfully engage with us would be outside their contract.)</p> <p>The Draft Plan openly makes no attempt to reflect the entire Shelter Island community. Rather, it stigmatizes the large percentage of Islanders whose tax bills are sent elsewhere. It is our opinion that, in significant respects, the Draft Plan does not serve the interests of the entire community.</p> <p>We can no longer be affiliated with this drafting process, or with an end product that disregards years of hard work by CPAC in conjunction with the Shelter Island community. We have appreciated the opportunity to be a part of this committee, the chance to get to know each member of the CPAC and the Task Force, as well as our interaction with the public. We have learned a great deal about this island and most importantly the concerns and aspirations of members of our community.</p> <p>At this time, we feel we can better serve Shelter Island by expressing our views as members of the public. Accordingly, we respectfully resign from CPAC, effective immediately.”</p> <p>Benjamin Dyett Lily Hoffman Petra Schmidt</p>	Lily Hoffman
158	9/25/23 19:22:56	1. Vision Statement	<p>What do you mean by a more equitable and livable community? I join in the statement regarding the comprehensive plan issued by Shelter Islanders for Clean water and Responsible Zoning, which elaborates on the comments I made personally and on its behalf at the hearing on the draft plan. That statement (the “SICWRZ Statement”) can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/compplan and will be reproduced in full here and referenced in comments to subsequent chapters of the current draft plan.</p>	Sandra O’Connor
188	10/13/23 17:28:30	1. Vision Statement	<p>“YELLOW LIGHT” THE COMP PLAN</p> <p>We recognize the need to update the 1994 comprehensive plan to serve as a road map for the Island’s next 10-20 years, the hard work that has gone into the current effort, and that there is much good in the draft. Nevertheless, there are key flaws both in the process that is being pursued and in the substance of the current draft that call out for meaningful further review by the comprehensive plan group and the public.</p> <p>Flaws in the process</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of environmental review - As we have maintained for well over a year in letters to the editor of the Reporter and e-mails to the comprehensive plan group, a new plan should be informed by a comprehensive environmental review to examine potential adverse impacts to the environment, including how much more development our fragile sole-source aquifer can bear and how much more traffic our ferries and congested roads (like in the Heights and Bridge Street) can bear. 2. Top Down Process -The current effort has been driven in a top-down matter with limited community involvement. Almost 75 Islanders served as members of either the comprehensive plan task force or advisory committee that generated the 1994 plan. Today, the task force consists of: two Town Board members and one member of the Planning Board, none with prior experience preparing a comprehensive plan, and an advisory committee that, in light of three recent resignations, has shrunk to 6 members from its original 12. 3. Flawed hearing - [The September 23, 2023] hearing was flawed in many respects: (a) it did not appear to comply with the Town Law requiring that a draft plan be available for the public at least 10 days in advance; (b) releasing 166 pages of the draft two weeks, and another 36 pages several days, beforehand was not fair to the public; (c) departing from the practice to hold zoom or hybrid meetings shut out many Islanders who were unable to attend because they were ill, infirm, or off-Island; and (d) it was unreasonable to seek input from some 140 attendees before critics had expressed their concerns and to reduce feedback to red or green dots (when yellow would have been more appropriate for the many elements that need more analysis or discussion), Post-Its, and written comments on poster boards. 4. Rush to enact a plan -The task force and consultants are rushing to get the plan enacted by the end of the year before the current board leaves office. The consultants’ contract assumes this. The 9/14/23 Reporter editorial 	Stephen Jacobs

189	10/13/23 17:34:17	1. Vision Statement	<p>1. Insufficient concern about over-development - The draft does not recognize the history of proposals that would have destroyed the island as we know it - a proposed bridge to the North Fork, plans to develop Mashomack, a proposed condominium development in Hay Beach with Venetian-style canals - or the clear and present dangers we see all around us. It lacks any meaningful analysis of what development would further the interests of the Island as a whole, including what jobs would be created for residents, as opposed to what would benefit special interests, particularly deep-pocketed off-island developers who have been buying up property all around us and, indeed, on the Island.</p> <p>2. A municipal wastewater system for the Center - The plan clings to the notion of a municipal wastewater system in the Center despite the facts that the School, the biggest contributor to the nitrate problem, successfully installed a much less expensive I/A system over the summer and Dr. [Christopher] Goble, the leading authority on Island water, demonstrated that the system the town proposed is unnecessary and would be a huge waste of taxpayer money.</p> <p>3. Island-wide public water - This is included in the plan without any consideration of (a) how many neighborhoods need or want public water; (b) residents' evaluation of Suffolk County Water Authority's recent takeover of the West Neck system; (c) what such a system would cost (it only references a 2005 estimate that the total cost would be \$28 to \$35 million and a capital cost per household of between \$8,500 and \$16,000); (d) how much users would pay monthly for public water; or (e) other possible ways to provide good water to those who lack it, like reverse osmosis systems.</p> <p>4. Limiting House Size - The plan contemplates both imposing limits on the construction of gigantic houses and significantly reducing the size of what can be built on a 1-acre lot. The public needs to discuss (a) how to balance property rights with the need to protect the environment and the character of the island; (b) how best to close loopholes in the Code; and (3) how to change the practice of the Town Board granting special permits to get around the Code. Notably, a judge last month noted that the Town Board had previously granted 38 of 38 applications for special permits to build oversized houses and, without opposition from the Town, ordered it to grant a special permit for construction of over 12,000 square feet of furnished space and another almost 4,000 square feet of unfinished space.</p> <p>5. Loosening zoning in the Center - Despite the identity of who would benefit most from this, the idea deserves full discussion, including whether a zoning change could be used to facilitate affordable housing without inviting other types of housing that would benefit a developer, but not the community.</p> <p>6. Inadequately protecting the Near Shore and Peninsular Overlay - The plan resists public pressure to clearly disapprove of any expansion of all so-called non-conforming uses (businesses in residentially zones areas) in this most environmentally sensitive area.</p> <p>7. Replacing a strict noise ordinance - The plan proposes replacing the objective noise ordinance with an "equitable" approach, rather than better enforcing or strengthening of the current ordinance.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS</p>	Stephen Jacobs
190	10/13/23 17:36:33	1. Vision Statement	<p>continued from prior comment:</p> <p>Suddenly, the task force and consultants are seeking to reengage CPAC now that it has shrunk to six of its original 12 members and lost those most critical of its trajectory. This hasty attempt to manufacture the appearance of getting adequate public input will not make up for the failure to have given CPAC or the public a meaningful opportunity to be involved in the process since mid-March when the consultants were hired to complete the plan before the end of the year.</p> <p>Simply put, it is now too late to generate a plan that is adequately supported by data, professional analysis, and public support before a Town Board takes office the beginning of next year. It bears mention that, if the Town Board had not suspended the comprehensive plan process for many months, a plan could have been generated, subjected to meaningful CPAC, environmental, and public review, and properly enacted before the end of the year. But that's not what happened.</p> <p>The tabulation of red and green dots and comments on Post-Its on the poster boards cannot meaningfully reflect the views of the public or even those who attended the meeting (whose views were sought before they had the opportunity to hear from critics of the draft). Although I obviously had strong views on various elements of both the process and substance of the plan, I did not utilize any of the dots or Post-Its because I did not believe they could successfully capture my view of the multitude of often-complex issues contained in the more than 200 pages of the draft plan. Indeed, the consultants' summary of the poster boards resorts to trying to interpret what many of the dots were intended to convey. A probably well-intentioned, but flawed, method of getting more than a superficial sense of public opinion this was.</p>	Stephen Jacobs
204	10/14/23 7:16:11	1. Vision Statement	<p>Guiding Principles (p.8) "Maintain a vibrant year-round community that meets residents' economic and social needs."</p> <p>What are examples of high quality community services?</p> <p>Guiding Principles (p.8) "Motivate and enable upcoming generations to be a part of Shelter Island's future (including its town governance) ..."</p> <p>What's stopping the current generation from being part of Shelter Island's future? I would argue TIME. Holding down a job (particularly off-island) (often in a two-income family) and raising a family consume's all of one's time — well into one's 40s.</p>	Sandra O'Connor

205	10/14/23 12:21:49	1. Vision Statement	Although draft mentions the 2021 public survey, we are told to find it on the Town website. The survey results should appear in the text of the draft and be discussed. It is the only large scale public survey to date!	Lily Hoffman
218	10/15/23 9:14:22	1. Vision Statement	Great guiding principles. I think the emphasis on protecting public natural resources, promoting resiliency and infrastructure improvements in the face of climate change and supporting a year-round community are all very important.	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
224	10/15/23 10:41:41	1. Vision Statement	On Page 7, the concept of "sustainable capacity" is mentioned. "A planning challenge is to ensure that the growth which results from being attractive does not destroy what makes the island desirable or EXCEED ITS SUSTAINABLE CAPACITY." So how is this "sustainable capacity" defined? In Chapter 3, Page 30, Figure 4 - Development Potential Analysis, shows substantial development potential in various parts of the island. How do we know when we have exceeded our "sustainable potential?" What is the process to define this, and then to incorporate this into our Town Code and zoning? Because if we do not have a process to define this, it is subjective and one Islander's idea of "capacity" may be different from another's; also, it is highly vulnerable to the influence of various special interests. This will require environmental, traffic, and other types of analysis to come to agreement.	Natasha Stowe
148	9/21/23 10:01:00	10. Utilities, Sustainability & Resilience	Commenting on Sept 20 Working Draft: 10.2. A Recommends "establishing a small group to investigate energy independence and resiliency". I think we want to do this so as to maximize coordination among the GOC/Town Board activities and our ETIPP participation. Ideally the same group operating in both activities rather than creating an additional "moving part" in the overall process. 10.6. B Calls for "hardening and improving communication systems". I would add the same explicit recommendation for the Town's electrical system.	Steven Sanders
175	10/4/23 13:19:15	10. Utilities, Sustainability & Resilience	We need more renewable energy. We also need storage to get us through emergency power outages. After studying this with the input of Gordian Raacke of Easthampton and their advisors it is my understanding the best way to apply solar to Shelter Island is individual roof top solar. We do not have large parking lots or plentiful open fields. It would be the least intrusive way to gain a sizable source of solar power. We need to find ways to help promote incentives for individual home owners to do so. People could be tied to a community grid they could source their power from by paying into it. Also a mini grid would give us more security.	Penny Kerr
200	10/13/23 17:52:48	10. Utilities, Sustainability & Resilience	See my comments to Chapter 1 and the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/compplan . The following portions of the statement are particularly relevant: 2. A municipal wastewater system for the Center - The plan clings to the notion of a municipal wastewater system in the Center despite the facts that the School, the biggest contributor to the nitrate problem, successfully installed a much less expensive I/A system over the summer and Dr. Gobler, the leading authority on Island water, demonstrated that the system the town proposed is unnecessary and would be a huge waste of taxpayer money. 3. Island-wide public water - This is included in the plan without any consideration of (a) how many neighborhoods need or want public water; (b) residents' evaluation of Suffolk County Water Authority's recent takeover of the West Neck system; (c) what such a system would cost (it only references a 2005 estimate that the total cost would be \$28 to \$35 million and a capital cost per household of between \$8,500 and \$16,000); (d) how much users would pay monthly for public water; or (e) other possible ways to provide good water to those who lack it, like reverse osmosis systems.	Stephen Jacobs
202	10/14/23 6:59:59	10. Utilities, Sustainability & Resilience	Existing Infrastructure and Public Facilities / Solid Waste Management (p. 153) Please verify that the Town accepts #5 plastics. There is not a designated bin for them.	Sandra O'Connor
214	10/14/23 16:04:11	10. Utilities, Sustainability & Resilience	In the opening statement about aquifer and water, REMOVE prejudicial and opinionated language and check facts p.151 The GSWMP of 2020, is NOT an adequate guide to ground and surface water management. pp. 157, 161+. It should not be relied upon or be in the appendix. A new study is needed!	Lily Hoffman
233	10/15/23 11:45:04	10. Utilities, Sustainability & Resilience	Support the goal of 70% of Shelter Island's electricity from renewable energy by 2030 and 100% by 2040. Shelter Island is uniquely vulnerable to climate change and sea level rise. With that in mind we should seriously consider limiting additional shoreline development, bulkhead replacement and hardening. I support the goals of creating sustainable construction and design standards, a Coastal Resilience Plan and the appointment of a Town Recycling Coordinator.	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
142	9/11/23 18:14:44	11. Future Land Use Plan and Implementation	Is there a "Chapter 11. Future Land Use Plan and Implementation"? If yes, when will it be published?	Greg Toner
134	9/11/23 8:24:41	2. Growth, Change & Demographics	Good morning, Chart 10 on Chapter 2 is not correct. Our Pre-K - 12 student population last year was 188 (listed as 173) and this year is 190. Our school population has actually increased from last year to this year. Last year's student population count and the prior years listed on the chart also do not reflect the Pre-K population in our school, yet the chart is labeled Pre-K -12. The state website you may be using may be listing K-12. I think it would be more accurate to include the Pre-K populations. If not, the label of the chart should be fixed. Thank you.	Brian Doelger, School Superintendent

191	10/13/23 17:37:35	2. Growth, Change & Demographics	See my comments to Chapter 1 and the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/compplan . ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS RE CHAPTER 2 Although the School Superintendent has commented that the enrollment data is incorrect, school enrollment remain a concerning subject because the school, in its entirety, is a critical part of the Island. Loss of any part of it would be a terrible blow to the Island and Islanders of all backgrounds. Attention should be given to understanding and addressing why many families who live here send their students to school off-Island. Data on that would be helpful. I also recommend consideration of whether to build some affordable housing units with more than two bedrooms with the hope that it would increase school enrollment more than the one- and two-bedroom units currently contemplated.	Stephen Jacobs
206	10/14/23 12:24:04	2. Growth, Change & Demographics	*Although there is a disclaimer re 2020 census on full time population, a sizable gap still remains. p. 12. *The chart of seasonal pop - Table 2, p. 13- omits Short-Term rentals. *Except for pop. trends, BFJ only compares SI with Suffolk City. They need to compare SI to similar affluent communities when discussing age, income, household size and shape. etc. By using ONLY Suffolk City, they come up with a picture that supports their call for more affordable family homes. * School Superintendent pointed out data on school registration was incorrect. * There is no evidence that more affordable housing would attract more students to the school! Very hypothetical!	Lily Hoffman
219	10/15/23 9:25:12	2. Growth, Change & Demographics	I wonder how much seasonal population Shelter Island can reasonably and sustainably support without added infrastructure for water and sewage. If the population is 12,000+ during the summer months – is that a number that the Island's aquifer alone can support? If not, should the town look to limit or discourage seasonal population? The school age population decline is seriously troubling. What does it mean for a community that young families do not choose to or cannot raise children here?	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
127	9/9/23 7:02:04	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	1. Within the business zone along 114 particularly outside of the center, bridge street and the heights, new development has been predominately service yards and service yards with "butler" type buildings. The percentage of lot coverage is close to 100%. These types of light industrial uses are not addressed in the zoning code in terms of screening requirements, parking limitations in the front yard and equipment storage in the front yard. There is no light industrial zones on the island and many new business fall into this category serving the maintenance and construction industry. The island should acknowledge this condition and develop site design standards to abate the negative visual impact of this type of development on tourism, and surrounding residential properties. 2. The island has a significant amount of vacant commercial property along 114 the vast majority of which is owned by one landlord that is unable to find and maintain tenants despite a favorable business environment. The condition compromises the impression the island makes upon visitors and the lack of "available" commercial real estate limits the availability of goods and services on the island. The island needs an approach to addressing its vacant storefronts along 114.	Michael Shatken
137	9/11/23 16:21:27	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	There are no goals listed in the chapter. When will they be available	Kathleen Gooding
143	9/12/23 14:48:59	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	Shelter Island does not have a steep slope ordinance and should adopt one to prevent damage to the island's environment. Steep slope development disturbs the natural course of drainage, large swatches of natural vegetation and causes stable land masses to be replaced by unstable conditions. This is particularly critical in the near shore overlay where bluffs adjacent to tidal wetlands are disturbed. As development is no longer guided by long standing practical understanding of the danger of undermining steep slopes and practical considerations for the cost incurred, legislation must be developed to prevent this type of development because property owners with water front properties are no longer satisfied with stairs to beaches below bluffs they are building on the bluff to obtain direct access to the water. Case in point the planning board recently issued a letter of approval for construction on the steep slope on 11 Serpentine drive without mention or consideration to an 18 foot cut into the base of this particular bluff.	Michael Shatken
144	9/13/23 6:53:00	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	This sections indicates that shelter island has traditionally been a place that balances property rights and zoning. The accuracy of this statement of "balance" is questionable. Please drive along 114 particularly the center and see the type of land development that has taken place. Consider the equipment yards and concrete trucks in the front yards of business that are not grandfathered exceptions but development that has gone through the island process of zoning reviews, Consider the 37 instances that the town board has issued special permits for houses in excess of 6000 square feet and that a state court judge has recently based upon these actions over ruled our large house moratorium. The notion that shelter island is balancing zoning interest and property rights is unfortunately an inaccurate representation of a key issue. Not only is this statement untrue the island has institutionalized the practice of ignoring commonly held zoning principals and has a special permit process allowing for largely unstructured site plan reviews and it zoning code does not include common to most community design standards such as parking ratios, landscape buffers and detailed submittal requirements. To be fair shelter island land use practices are unbalanced and strongly weighted toward property rights at the expense of zoning, the environment and character of the island. This practice kinda worked historically when development was slow paced and any business or ratable on the island was a positive thing but now within the initiatives of this plan the time has come to rethink the implications to the character and environments.	Michael shatken
146	9/15/23 9:06:43	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	Very concerned about the vacant buildings on 114. Would like to see more integration of the arts community in perhaps solving this issue working with the town — perhaps the arts community could raise money with the town for this, and get a grant to take over one of the spaces and make it a meeting place for the arts. We already have a music camp, I historical center and a wonderful library, but in a culture which is arguably becoming increasingly visual, an arts community center would make a lot of sense. It would be good to have an arts advocate as someone to liaison between the arts community and the town with such issues where we might come up with some really good creative solutions that are also great for the economy and cultural strengths of Shelter Island.	Roz Dimon
157	9/25/23 9:59:35	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	Excellent detail and provides good overview of island areas and those with future potential. I do think that it may need some additional tweaking as some properties not shown as developable could be, such as a large parcel before recycle center going south on right owned by one our our long time "locals". A note should be made that these figures can and should be updated as required so they remain true. Really nice work	Don DeVries

160	9/26/23 10:19:13	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>One concern with land use and zoning is that the Center district is becoming the place where many projects are being proposed (sewage treatment, “work force” housing, and industrial business that truly change its character. The Center is also residential and has always been. I don’t see enough protections for home owners in the area as Rt. 114 goes through a major transformation. It is taking on an industrial look and feel. Many large trees have been removed in the last 10 years alone.</p> <p>The Center is and has been the seat of government, the school, library, church, cemetery, police, fire dept., legion/community hall, playgrounds and athletic fields. For the last century it has had only small businesses with small storefronts</p> <p>It is a true municipal center. Safeguards and limits could have been put in place in the 1990s but were not. It is my hope the new plan addresses this issue. That is not to say it should look like Front Street in Greenport or Main Street in Sag Harbor with buildings sharing walls.</p>	Penny Kerr
171	9/29/23 17:37:57	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>Only two thoughts I have, one pertains to I’m sure are many properties that do not meet minimum lot size as pre existing. I assume this makes them non conforming I expect. Do we indicate that any way. I may have missed it. The second is, does plan discuss or mention potential for some small “townhome” development based on land size, ie if a three acre parcel could support a six or 8 town home complex, each town home 1200 sq ft plus garage.</p>	Don DeVries
178	10/8/23 15:41:54	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>For every application for a mansion, (large) house, or addition to an existing house, especially in near shore area, - the owner should be required to have their well tested for depth, (water inventory) quality etc. before any permit is issued.</p>	Karen Kiaer
180	10/8/23 15:54:42	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>Please see my comment in Quality section #9 about historic houses. Should be in Zoning section also.</p> <p>Like Nantucket, the Island should have a "Tree Warden". A professional arborist who inspects lots before any construction to identify historic trees, rare specimens etc. to prevent the cutting down and removal of historic and rare specimen trees.</p>	karen Kiaer
192	10/13/23 17:39:38	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>See my comments to Chapter 1 and the “SICWRZ Statement,” which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/compplan. The following portions of the statement are particularly relevant to zoning, whether contained in this chapter or sprinkled through subsequent chapters:</p> <p>1. Insufficient concern about over-development - The draft does not recognize the history of proposals that would have destroyed the Island as we know it - a proposed bridge to the North Fork, plans to develop Mashomack, a proposed condominium development in Hay Beach with Venetian-style canals - or the clear and present dangers we see all around us. It lacks any meaningful analysis of what development would further the interests of the Island as a whole, including what jobs would be created for residents, as opposed to what would benefit special interests, particularly deep-pocketed off-Island developers who have been buying up property all around us and, indeed, on the Island.</p> <p>4. Limiting House Size - The plan contemplates both imposing limits on the construction of gigantic houses and significantly reducing the size of what can be built on a 1-acre lot. The public needs to discuss (a) how to balance property rights with the need to protect the environment and the character of the island; (b) how best to close loopholes in the Code; and (3) how to change the practice of the Town Board granting special permits to get around the Code. Notably, a judge last month noted that the Town Board had previously granted 38 of 38 applications for special permits to build oversized houses and, without opposition from the Town, ordered it to grant a special permit for construction of over 12,000 square feet of furnished space and another almost 4,000 square feet of unfinished space).</p> <p>5. Loosening zoning in the Center - Despite the identity of who would benefit most from this, the idea deserves full discussion, including whether a zoning change could be used to facilitate affordable housing without inviting other types of housing that would benefit a developer, but not the community.</p> <p>6. Inadequately protecting the Near Shore and Peninsular Overlay - The plan resists public pressure to clearly disapprove of any expansion of all so-called non-conforming uses (businesses in residentially zones areas) in this most environmentally sensitive area.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS RE CHAPTER 3</p> <p>This chapter should end with at least references to all the zoning changes recommended for at least consideration, rather than sprinkling them through subsequent chapters and identifying them all (or at least most) in the Chapter.</p> <p>11</p>	Stephen Jacobs

207	10/14/23 12:34:24	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>Several unwarranted assumptions in this chapter: "protecting open space and limiting growth can further drive-up prices and restrict access to the Island to all but the wealthy" (p. 21). Well, what a shame to waste Central Park! Also lets be more accurate, housing costs are affected by national and regional trends!</p> <p>And on p. 22, "The lack of public water supply and wastewater systems requires continued large lot development, lessening more compact growth patterns, as are typical in other areas."</p> <p>Although the draft critiques current zoning (p 27), the draft provides NO DATA on whether the public wants to change what you refer to as "large-lot "development, and/or "suburban patterns" of one dwelling/acre or one dwelling two acres?</p> <p>There is also no clear explanation of "hamlet style" or compact growth patterns? The latter could obviously include subdivisions whether clustered or not!</p> <p>Overall the entire draft favors density and tries to link density to affordable housing.</p> <p>However, density means more development whether commercial or residential. Density is NOT necessarily linked to affordable housing as we well know.</p> <p>The chapter gives little if no attention to issues of over-development or the impact of development and/or over-development on our aquifer as compared to the current 1994 Comprehensive Plan. Why not? Surely our water situation is not less threatened today?</p> <p>The chapter does not give adequate attention to protecting the Near Shore Overlay. Many have spoken to this point so I won't say more here.</p> <p>Most importantly, this key chapter has not end with a list of action items or list of proposed zoning changes. All the other chapters end with a list of proposed actions.</p> <p>BFJ tries to argue that zoning changes are cited in the relevant other chapters so its not needed here. But it's quite clear they don't want us to see a list of proposed changes so they scatter them!</p>	Lily Hoffman
220	10/15/23 9:50:43	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>I think characterizing Shelter Island as rural is a bit of a stretch. Shelter Island since the 50s and 60s like the rest of Long Island has followed suburban growth patterns and is filling in to be almost completely built out. With the exception of Mashomack Preserve and Sylvester Manor, there are no large-scale open spaces, very little agriculture and 95% of the residentially-zoned land is reserved for single-family zoning that creates a car-dependent suburban sprawl.</p> <p>Single-family zoning is exclusionary by definition and a primary cause of the current national housing crisis which is also impacted here by seasonal and second-home demand.</p> <p>One and two-acre zoning reduces density but then increases the cost of the land and consequently the prices of the homes that will be built there.</p> <p>The town should consider creating denser areas of the island that support multi-family living and other housing options if we want to sustain a year-round population here.</p>	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
235	10/15/23 18:19:11	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>At the CPAC meeting on 10/13, Meg read one comment from the Board on Chapt 3- Built Environment, Land Use and Zoning," which proposed: "Hotels/hospitality properties should have their own zone." She then discussed this and said it was a very good idea.</p> <p>This is another example of an ENTIRELY NEW ZONING CONCEPT- an example of another spot zone--being introduced into the Comprehensive Plan. By one person? Perhaps even added to the Board by members of our Task Force, since Meg admitted that people have been allowed to write on the Board, after the 9/23 public meeting--i.e. during the last two weeks.</p> <p>What's Up? Given the number of new zones discussed such as Marine Zone, Hotel Zone, it looks like Shelter Island is conducting a marketing campaign directed at developers!</p>	Lily Hoffman

236	10/15/23 19:51:46	3. Built Environment, Land Use & Zoning	<p>The discussion at the CPAC meeting on October 13 referred to spot zoning and potential hospitality/hotel zones basically for the first time. In three years of meetings and hundreds of pages of draft chapters (including a Zoning chapter with action items), there is no mention of new zoning hotel or hospitality districts. (Apparently there was a single anonymous reference on a display board at the public forum on September 24 that has resulted in the incorporation of a new suggestion for the Comprehensive Plan). Both the Task Force and some CPAC members referenced numerous display board comments and Islander opinions opposing “spot zoning,” but BFJ consultant’s vague and unhelpful comment that Islanders “don’t understand” what spot zoning means was inappropriate and almost insulting. As recognized by the Task Force and CPAC, a majority of residents at the public forum and otherwise, don’t want nonconforming businesses in residential neighborhoods (on Shelter Island these are mainly hotels/restaurants with nightlife) to have their own “zones” ---that could promote expansion of footprint, structures, and uses without oversight. As discussed at the meeting, the concept of hotel or hospitality zones is extremely vague. Without carefully drawn restrictions, public discussion and full vetting of particular locations and activities, as well as likely increased enforcement requirements to control traffic and noise, new commercial zoning districts truly become an invitation for commercial development. Our existing Zoning regulations do provide regulation of some problems created by the nonconforming uses: these regulations to an extent preserve the quality of life for the residential neighbors. Our existing Zoning regulations therefore should not be replaced by fuzzy language in the Comprehensive Plan that could result in detriment to those neighborhoods that contain nonconforming businesses.</p> <p>Disturbingly, BFJ advocates the ability of the Comp Plan to authorize spot zoning and thus legalize in advance the elimination of restrictions on expansion of nonconforming businesses—the BFJ result benefits the profits of usually just one business to the detriment and burden of many residents, under the guise of matching our zoning to our land use. BFJ should stop its advocacy that fails to comport with Islander views and indeed contravenes established New York zoning law that disfavors the expansion of nonconforming uses. We wonder why BFJ would take this position.</p> <p>Some members of the CPAC and potentially the two Task Force members completely understood the difficulties raised by inclusion of the new “hotel zone” concept and our Town government will hopefully continue to exclude this idea – and leave our existing regulation intact.</p> <p>I further refer this Task Force and CPAC to several letters previously submitted by the Shelter Island Association, an organization that represents ten neighborhoods, including the largest HOAs. These letters include the SIA letter dated September 2021 that discussed spot zoning and more recently, a letter dated October 6th pleading for restriction of commercial development in the environmentally fragile NSOD. SIA requests have not received a response from the CPTF or CPAC, nor has any draft of the Plan recognized the majority view expressed in these letters.</p>	kimberly noland
128	9/9/23 8:01:52	4. Housing	<p>1. The introduction of public water allows for increased density by variance per the Suffolk County Department of Health Services of four dwelling units per acre which the comp plan indicates shall never be allowed. As a point of reference for density this is approximately the density of the older neighborhoods in the heights. Within preference surveys conducted as part of the Peconic Bay Region Housing Act advisory board the strong preference was expressed for community housing above retail in the center. For this type of housing to be viable a density of 4 dwelling units exception will be necessary to support this type of development.</p> <p>2. The construction of community housing with associated unit sizes of approximately 850 square on town owned land should also be subject to a density of 4 dwelling units per acre to address affordability due to land cost and recognizing that the size of community housing units is less than half of the size of market rate housing. In terms of creating viable community housing neighborhoods and having enough units to support shared amenities the 4 units per acre density is preferred and comparable square foot density to all other housing on the island.</p>	Michael shatken
138	9/11/23 16:22:53	4. Housing	The proposed goals for limiting the size of houses are fairly complicated. House size is a touchy issue in this Town and should be open for more discussion and input. I am not aware of any community input sessions or surveys about house size during the CP process. It deserves it’s own information and discussion workshop.	Kathleen Gooding
152	9/23/23 8:18:24	4. Housing	This is an excellent document. The inclusion of a sentence like this: "It is important to affirmatively state that if public sewers and water supplies are built, the residential density of existing residentially zoned areas should be maintained, and should never exceed 2 units per acre." should allay any fears associated with a central sewer district. Short of mandating I/A systems (which seems onerous), this seems the most responsible public solution to cleaning up the groundwater in the Center.	Edward Brennan
155	9/24/23 8:29:04	4. Housing	Unfortunately, this section begins with “key finding” that is insulting to those of us who spent years living off-island, working toward the time when we could live here full time. That we were not interested in or indifferent to town government or organizations perpetuates stereotypes about “non- locals.” How can you have a “key finding” without adequate data? When I read this, I immediately thought that it didn’t bode well for the slant of the entire report and colored all of my reading after that.	Linda Hacker-Toner
159	9/25/23 19:31:27	4. Housing	Goal 4-4 (p. 48): Near Shore Overlay District references do not track Town Code Section 133-12, which refers to Near Shore and Peninsular Overlay District. See also the corresponding Ch. 11 Goal 4.4.A. recommendation (p. 7). It may occur in other chapters.	Sandra O’Connor
169	9/27/23 11:34:58	4. Housing	Housing Prices and Affordability (p. 30): “The Town requires a special permit for houses over 6,000 square feet, which may temper interest in building bigger homes.”	Sandra O’Connor
181	10/8/23 16:01:11	4. Housing	The first half of this statement is misleading and at odds with the Town zoning code. Subsection C.(1)(a) of Sections 133-6 (District A), 133-7 (District AA), and 133-10 (District C) restricts permitted residential uses to one-family dwellings with a SFLA (square feet of living area) under 6,000 square feet. Therefore, a special permit is required for 6,000 and over — not over 6,000. Also, this restriction applies to ALL dwellings with sleeping quarters on the property in the aggregate, e.g., a primary house and a guest house. And, it is not limited to new construction. For example, if you built a house with SFLA OF 5,000 square feet, and down the road you decide to finish the basement which will have SFLA of 1,500 square feet, a special permit would be required, because the total SFLA is now 6,500.	karen Kiaer
183	10/10/23 23:42:09	4. Housing	As there are over a thousand ADU’s on the island. The town should encourage owners to come forward to bring their ADUs up to code without penalizing them. The recent grant by the CDCLI should extend for ADU work required. The online application has many flaws and should be simplified.	Sandra O’Connor
			The first key finding states, “ ... the heavy seasonality of housing means that many owners may have less ability or interest in supporting the year-round needs of Town government and management.” What are you trying to say? Why is it relevant? What’s the impact? Where’s the data supporting it? No other key finding contains a statement like this. As a second homeowner, I’m offended.	

193	10/13/23 17:41:49	4. Housing	<p>See my comments to Chapter 1 and the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsl.com/complan. The following portions of the statement are particularly relevant:</p> <p>4. Limiting House Size - The plan contemplates both imposing limits on the construction of gigantic houses and significantly reducing the size of what can be built on a 1-acre lot. The public needs to discuss (a) how to balance property rights with the need to protect the environment and the character of the island; (b) how best to close loopholes in the Code; and (3) how to change the practice of the Town Board granting special permits to get around the Code. Notably, a judge last month noted that the Town Board had previously granted 38 of 38 applications for special permits to build oversized houses and, without opposition from the Town, ordered it to grant a special permit for construction of over 12,000 square feet of furnished space and another almost 4,000 square feet of unfinished space).</p> <p>5. Loosening zoning in the Center - Despite the identity of who would benefit most from this, the idea deserves full discussion, including whether a zoning change could be used to facilitate affordable housing without inviting other types of housing that would benefit a developer, but not the community.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS RE CHAPTER 4</p> <p>The draft fails to focus sufficiently on promoting needed affordable housing as opposed to other types of housing that would have little or no benefit to the community as a whole, but would increase demands on the our resources and infrastructure. For example, it does not suggest, as it should, that loosening zoning in the center for housing should be limited to allowing affordable housing. It does this only in connection with allowing four units per acre in a business zone.</p> <p>This concern is completely different from what is described in the consultants' summary of the hearing where it poses the straw man question: "Can affordable housing be made without the interest of the developer and in the public interest only?" Of course, affordable housing will benefit a developer; otherwise, a developer would not be interested in building it. The proper and compelling concern is that, in many places, in Chapter 4 and elsewhere, concepts raised in the draft plan open the door to development that has little or nothing to do with affordable housing or that would otherwise provide a benefit to the town greater than the burdens or risks that would accompany the development.</p> <p>This chapter also contemplates public sewerage and water, which are problematic, as addressed in my comments to Chapter 7. In so doing, it highlights that, unless there is no preferable alternative, public sewerage and water open the door to development the type of unwanted development referenced above.</p> <p>The contemplated "tailored zoning approach" for Sylvester Manor deserves close public scrutiny from multiple perspectives. What would be the benefit to the Town? Would it constitute legally impermissible "spot zoning"? (It is notable and concerning that both lawyers who were on the comprehensive planning advisory committee resigned and no outside lawyer has apparently ever been involved.) Would such a "tailored approach" open the door to other major Island players, such as Gardiner's Bay Country Club, getting their own tailored zoning approach that would benefit them greatly, but the Town little or not at all?</p>	Stephen Jacobs
208	10/14/23 13:13:26	4. Housing	<p>* Divisive, invidious, and inaccurate use of "off-island taxpayers" to distinguish between year round residents and units and others, throughout the chapter.</p> <p>* Fails to point out that rise in housing costs follow regional and national trends! Assumes SI housing problems are unique to island, which they are certainly not. Although draft uses the 30% of income rule for criticizing housing costs on island, please note that housing costs are over 30% nationally and affordability is a problem everywhere!</p> <p>* Statement on p.43, proposes an Open Door to changing zoning in the name of community housing: "A comprehensive review of the Town Code is needed to ensure it is consistent with the goal of increasing year-round community housing opportunities....Ongoing or longer-term priorities include developing and implementing design standards for community housing, considering the potential for apartments over stores and offices, and supporting the establishment of a Community Land Trust."</p> <p>* The Goals --1-5--are all controversial and require public discussion; at best be listed as possibilities.</p> <p>Goal 4:1--Establish limit on size of new house- The specifics require public discussion.</p> <p>--Address illegal conversions: the Town needs to discuss enforcement as well as reducing house size</p> <p>--Density& Water: The draft includes part of our CPAC recommended language: "If public sewers and water supplies are built the resident density of existing zones should be maintained" BUT then adds "not exceed 2 units per acre" which is double current zoning. It also excludes from the restriction rebuilding on small lots, and using cluster subdivisions which also adds density. And it suggests additional housing types and densities in business zones. P.45 Basically the draft only gives lip-service to our recommendation. The DRAFTS FOCUSES UPON WAYS TO INCREASE DENSITY!</p> <p>Goal 4.2. The draft states: "consider second floor apartments above businesses in B and B-1 zones (P.45) and "consider 4 units/acre in business zone, if affordable housing and infrastructure included". P 46. We need to know how this will affect nonconforming uses in these areas.</p> <p>Goal 4:3 Identify sites for year -round rental housing and design them so they can EXPAND 47. Do we want to build-in expansion?</p> <p>Goal 4:4: Like many statements this starts off saying one thing, and then says the opposite! States that we Maintain and strengthen code regulations in NSOD by limiting size, height, density of structure. BUT THEN Suggests maybe a "small-lot ordinance to standardize the procedure for pre-existing nonconforming. This opens the way to developing nonconforming sites.</p> <p>*Goal 4:5. *Although this item starts off by stating the need to "strengthen subdivision ordinance to create more open space," it backtrackd to suggest a strategy of utilizing subdivisions to require land for affordable housing . p. 49</p> <p>Planned Development District for Sylvester Manor and possibly elsewhere. Never discussed. How did this spot zoning sneak into the text?p.49</p> <p>First Right of Refusal: It suggests giving Town right of first refusal on key lands, to protect public interest, whether in non profit, public or semi public ownership. N.b. Putting the town option before Community Preservation Fund does not sound like a good idea to me! P.49</p>	Lily Hoffman

221	10/15/23 10:12:32	4. Housing	<p>I support all the town's efforts to create affordable housing on the Island. It's a big complex issue with a multitude of factors. Creating and subsidizing affordable year-round housing here should be seen as an investment in the infrastructure of the town and should be supported for both workers and seniors on the Island. Market-rate options are currently out of reach.</p> <p>A big issue, noted in this chapter is that seniors do not have smaller homes or apartments to downsize to, that might otherwise be vacated for growing families.</p> <p>Creating a Community Land Trust would be great as an intermediary non-profit and long-term steward of sustainable year-round housing options – what role would the Town have in this?</p> <p>I also support the housing size limit. Let's make it smaller than 6,000 square feet - it should include all built space, not only "living space". Let's stop allowing teardowns to increase the size and price of homes on the island.</p>	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
225	10/15/23 11:06:30	4. Housing	<p>Page 35 references a discrepancy in the number of "total housing units" and states that it should be "kept in mind." The discrepancy is greater than 10%, and given the importance (to the Comprehensive Plan, and to Shelter Island) of this basic metric, what steps are being taken, what is the process to actually analyze the various data sources and get to the actual number of total housing units?</p>	Natasha Stowe
227	10/15/23 11:12:53	4. Housing	<p>On page 49, there is an action item related to Sylvester Manor's long-term housing needs. "It is an ongoing challenge for Sylvester Manor to find housing for workers, given the high cost of living and housing on the island." A suggested approach, a Planned Development District (PDD), is mentioned.</p> <p>But what about the workforce housing needs on Shelter Island for other not-for-profit organizations, and for the businesses on the island? Don't some of the hospitality businesses, hotels and restaurants, and perhaps other non-profit organizations, house workers on the island, and how has this been handled by the island's existing Town Code and zoning? What about workforce housing for J1 Visa holders and other temporary summer workers? I suggest that the Comprehensive Plan should be looking holistically at workforce housing, in addition to this item about Sylvester Manor.</p>	Natasha Stowe
130	9/9/23 16:48:50	5. Economy	<p>The "center" hub of the B1 zone concentrates a high number of functions including most island services: some retail, historically some housing, the school, municipal services, library and the community center, post office and recreational fields. It is the one island location besides the heights, bridge street area that has the potential to be a pedestrian mixed use 'place' on the island. A strong preference for community housing above retail was expressed by residents during the development of the housing plan. It is important to understand that the density of this type of development is not foreign to the island, similar in fact to the bridge street heights area and could be quite wonderful experientially. This type of development will require unique design standards and a lot of nurturing by the business community. Imaging a Fedi's type deli, a coffee house, co working space and luncheonette with apartments above on vacant land adjacent to the library. To rezone this property to be the same as that supporting the other development on 114 would be a tragic missed opportunity and lack of vision. I recommend that this area be zoned to support this type of smart growth.</p>	Michael shatken
194	10/13/23 17:44:19	5. Economy	<p>See my comments to Chapter 1, the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/complan, and my additional personal comments to Chapter 4. The following portions of the statement are particularly relevant:</p> <p>1. Insufficient concern about over-development - The draft does not recognize the history of proposals that would have destroyed the Island as we know it - a proposed bridge to the North Fork, plans to develop Mashomack, a proposed condominium development in Hay Beach with Venetian-style canals - or the clear and present dangers we see all around us. It lacks any meaningful analysis of what development would further the interests of the Island as a whole, including what jobs would be created for residents, as opposed to what would benefit special interests, particularly deep-pocketed off-Island developers who have been buying up property all around us and, indeed, on the Island.</p> <p>5. Loosening zoning in the Center - Despite the identity of who would benefit most from this, the idea deserves full discussion, including whether a zoning change could be used to facilitate affordable housing without inviting other types of housing that would benefit a developer, but not the community.</p>	Stephen Jacobs
209	10/14/23 14:12:21	5. Economy	<p>The Key Finding on p. 52, "Business is concentrated in a few key areas and existing zoning does not always support their viability" sounds suspiciously like Noah's comment about the need to make the zoning conform to current land use.</p> <p>This is dangerous for SI. Most of the island's businesses are NONCONFORMING USES in otherwise residential districts. if these areas formally become business zones, or marine zones, or any such zone, residents will have LESS protection. The draft does not disapprove of the expansion of such businesses even when they are located in the NSO.</p> <p>The Draft proposes: *Make B1 into B zone. "The B-1 zoning provisions limit non-residential uses to civic-related and professional (office) uses, which constrains the types of tenants that can occupy existing buildings; providing more flexibility in permitted uses may help to fill some of the vacant commercial spaces in the Town Center." We could ask, Who Benefits i.e. who owns the land? Also do we really want to open Town Center to all the the types of uses allowed in a B district?</p> <p>Proposal: "Heights/Bridge St.require specific design provisions so that if the area is redeveloped, there will be design guidelines separate from zoning." This could be tricky! Although mentioned as a unit, the Heights and Bridge St are in fact separate jurisdictions, the Heights being residential, and part of a private community that has spent millions to build infrastructure. I'm uncertain about how design guidelines separate from zoning would work!</p> <p>Proposes: Town Center. Draft states that "many want more pedestrian friendly multiuse town center, including businesses and housing, while addressing water quality concerns".p.58. Remove the "water quality concerns which keeps sneaking in!</p>	Lily Hoffman

133	9/10/23 16:20:29	6. Transportation	The incidence of bridge traffic passenger vehicles and truck traffic has increased due to navigation systems providing alternate routes to avoid traffic. With license plate readers it should be possible to charge bridge traffic vehicles a surcharge on ferry passage. In addition congestion pricing on the ferry should be studied. Congestion of ferry traffic waiting on local streets causes pollution and disturbance to local streets in the heights.	Michael Shatken
147	9/20/23 12:28:55	6. Transportation	Page 10. The North Ferry has two loading dock not three on the Shelter Island side.	Andrew Reeve
153	9/23/23 8:46:46	6. Transportation	Two comments: 1. Ferry numbers have nearly doubled since the last comprehensive plan was written. It is about time we put together a comp plan that reflects the significant changes reflected by those numbers. 2. A 30mph Island wide speed limit to me is absurd and virtually unenforceable. Our police do a great job keeping things in check. For problem areas like for instance St Mary's Road, additional enforcement might be necessary.	Edward Brennan
163	9/26/23 12:15:40	6. Transportation	Yes, our roads are shared by multiple users - cars, bikes, joggers, etc. The Summary of Key Finding states. "Roadway safety remains a priority" yet the draft plan completely FAILS to mention the most dangerous user of our road ways! I referring to the landscape trucks and trailers who regularly park, not on the shoulder, but right on the road only a foot or two from the yellow line. They seem to think that just because they put their flashers on or set out a traffic cone, they are immune to traffic code! Traveling north on S. Midway from Tarkettle to Smith Street today, I encountered 3 parked landscape trailers parked completely in the road, two on my side and one in the oncoming lane. I stopped and literally and blindly inched around them as sight in both lanes was completely obscured. I called the police at 1153 to report the hazard. You are welcome to look at my dash cam footage. This is what sparked me to write this email This was the 4th or 5th time this year I have had to call about this. Other times they were parked by the bend on S. Midway near Tarkettle Road and once at the top of their on Little Ram. I am a very defensive driver and being forced to blindly go into the oncoming lane is nerve wracking. I have been lucky so far but someday someone is going to get killed. This would be tragic, especially since the Town seems aware of this problem. I strongly urge the Comprehensive Plan be modified to address this potentially deadly problem. Thanks! Peter	Peter Reich
186	10/13/23 11:37:28	6. Transportation	Some corrections to page 73 of the 9/8 draft: A North Ferry crossing takes 8 minutes. At North Ferry boats arrive every 10 to 15 minutes. North Ferry has raised two landing areas and will raise the remaining two landing areas in the next two years. The exploration of a passenger only ferry during off-hours should consider the quality of life aspect of additional late night and early morning traffic.	Bridgford Hunt
195	10/13/23 17:45:30	6. Transportation	See my comments to Chapter 1 and the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/compplan . ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS RE CHAPTER 6 While the draft acknowledges how traffic on the Island has been increasing, it omits a data-centered analysis of how much more traffic certain already congested areas, like Bridge Street and the Heights, can bear. Nor does it consider the effects of increased traffic or expanded hours on the ferries and of any resulting costs that would be ultimately paid by their customers.	Stephen Jacobs
210	10/14/23 14:24:26	6. Transportation	*Develop and adopt a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program- LWRP. p. 78. What is this? This has not been discussed prior to appearing in draft. Seems to have major implications for waterfront development! See also reference in Ch 8.	Lily Hoffman
223	10/15/23 10:39:04	6. Transportation	We should improve the shoulders of roads so that they are an even width and clear of obstacles throughout the island for walking and bicycling safely. There are many many roadways which have no shoulder at all, the shoulder varies in width and trees and shrubs are overgrown all of which force people into the road. Many areas of the island would be suitable for sidewalks or a path on the side of the road that people could use to get around without the use of a car. I also applaud the idea of Complete Streets as planning guideline for our roadways! A 30mph speed limit is a good idea throughout the island as well. There's no reason to speed up to 40mph in a few sections of 114 – it often feels like off-island cars are using the island as a highway to get to the North and South Forks, I don't think we should encourage that in any way. A bus or jitney service around the island is also a great idea – why not allow the Suffolk County Bus service to run across and on the island?	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
228	10/15/23 11:26:10	6. Transportation	Bicycling infrastructure -- page 74. The focus in this draft Plan is on Route 114, but there are many other roads on Shelter Island where a "defined shoulder," such as you see on North Cartwright, could be implemented more easily than on Route 114. These changes would help Island workers who commute by bike, local residents doing errands by bike, as well as recreational cyclists - making it safer to cycle and avoiding conflicts with automobiles. In addition, the suggestion has been made to make New York Avenue one-way for autos, and that would enable the addition of a "defined shoulder" potentially for cyclists and walkers. A holistic, strategic view of how to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians, informed by what other communities have done (including signage), should be part of this Comprehensive Plan.	Natasha Stowe
234	10/15/23 17:25:41	6. Transportation	Goal and Recommendation 6-5 Improve both on- and -off Island transportation options This is a solution in search of a problem. You should live somewhere else if you need 24-hour access to the mainland. How would this be paid for? Where would the ferry be docked? What percentage of the Island population does this serve?	Sandra O'Connor

132	9/10/23 14:48:02	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	The tidal wetlands surrounding the island serve to protect water quality of the bays and provide resilience to rising sea levels and storm events. These wetlands are under attack from a number of factors. In the case of redevelopment of properties in the near shore overlay district, it is common practice to grant variances and allow house construction to encroach into the 75 foot wetlands buffer and 100 foot buffer areas. Mitigation for this is type of redevelopment is typically addressed by the installation of upgraded swimming pool covers and IA septic systems required by other triggers. Second there is no means to ensure turf grass lawns are not extended into naturally vegetative buffers and wetlands following the issuance of a CO. The overriding consideration on the island is not protecting the bays and wetlands. It is protecting property rights. The time has come to act responsibly as a community and require any development which takes place on properties adjacent to wetlands to restore wetlands buffers in a significant way as a condition of development.	Michael Shatken
135	9/11/23 10:34:50	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>It seems to me that there are a few sentences regarding water supply that could be somewhat misleading as they are likely based on historical precipitation and consumption patterns and they may not sufficiently emphasize that the supply differs widely based on geography.</p> <p>Characterization of water supply has to be accurate as it is core to the Comp Plan.</p> <p>Comment as follows below.</p> <p>Chapter 7 - first summary of findings.</p> <p>Current : "While the quantity of Shelter Island's water supply is sufficient for its needs, the quality of the water is highly vulnerable to contamination, and significant actions are needed to preserve it. ."</p> <p>Suggestion for clarity and accuracy:</p> <p>Historical precipitation patterns have generally allowed for regular recharge to Shelter Island's aquifer and provided sufficient water supply for residents needs. However, changes in weather patterns and prolonged drought, together with significant increases in consumption could challenge water supply, especially in low lying areas. The quality of water is also highly vulnerable.....</p> <p>Chapter 7 /Page 11</p> <p>Current draft:</p> <p>All of the wells on the Island together draw an estimated 260 million gallons each year, of which 95% is returned to the aquifer via onsite septic systems. Recharge through rain and snowfall is estimated to provide an additional 4.4 billion gallons to the aquifer; water not absorbed into the aquifer flows into surface water bodies or into surrounding salt-water bodies. While this suggests an abundance of fresh water, it is not distributed evenly to all areas of the Island. There are thinner aquifers in the peninsular areas like Montclair Colony and the Ram Islands. In addition, there is a seasonal pattern of aquifer drawdown during the summer months, accompanied by 90% of the recharge happening between October and March.</p> <p>Suggestion for clarity and accuracy:</p>	Sean Davy
139	9/11/23 16:28:18	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	The goals promote and island-wide infrastructure for both public water and wastewater. This has been a very controversial topic. Many people on the island are not in favor of either unless they are specifically dealing with problems. I think to mandate future administrations to a concept that is extremely expensive and unnecessary on many parts of the island, and is unwanted by many residents on the island is short-sited to say the least. A separate community workshop should be scheduled just for this topic.	Kathleen Gooding
141	9/11/23 17:19:03	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	Goal 7-1 - Which version of the GWSMP document is to be included in the Comprehensive Plan? Feb 27, 2020? March 20, 2020? Version adopted by the Town Board May 29, 2020? Why is the version intended for inclusion in the Comp Plan not found on the Comp Plan website (at least I could not find it).	Greg Toner
149	9/22/23 12:59:40	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>There is almost no comment on Lawns. Not do they only waste our precious ground water, the fertilizers used inevitably seep to our fresh water supply, but also to our bays, where many of our baymen face the extinction of their prime source of income, the SCALLOPS. There should be a law against clearcutting of our oaks in private property, to make lawns. If not feasible, new owners should receive a warning about this issue.</p> <p>Orhan Birol 23 Bay Shore Drive</p>	Orhan Birol
150	9/22/23 16:15:08	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>Could you confirm identity of the report described in 7.1.A as the "2014 Shelter Island Watershed Management Plan"? WAC website has a document file called "5 Leggette Brashear 2014 Watershed Rpt.pdf". Title on the cover page is "Hydrogeological Data Review And Evaluation for Shelter Island New York".</p> <p>Does Chapter Eleven have all of the potential actions listed in the Watershed Management, and if not are they all considered to be "adopted" when the Comp plan is voted on?</p>	Greg Toner

161	9/26/23 10:45:05	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>Water issues should be addressed at their source. No one part of the island should be sacrificed for other parts of the island to handle waste water. People have invested their lives and legacy into their property and it is not fair to anyone to ask them to live next to a facility that is handling thousands of gallons of liquid sewage daily that is piped there from another part of the island.</p> <p>If a "neighborhood" has water quality issues it should be addressed in that neighborhood. I/A systems are very efficient and effective for sewage. Reverse osmosis, charcoal and other filters do an excellent job on filtering potable water.</p> <p>The Town needs to limit development based on real data from an extensive geological survey by a hydroGEOLOGIST, not a hydrologist. The hydroGEOLOGIST has a far more extensive education in geological processes and water. I hope the Town is clear about this distinction.</p> <p>Before we start moving large quantities of water around the island at great expense we need to KNOW and understand our water table. We also need real data made available to the public as to the true numbers on nitrates and other pollutants. I have requested that information in the past and had little response. Most of the data I have from is from Town Engineer John Cronin's survey. The Rt. 114 center showed nothing over legal limits and only projections over the next 50 - 100 years. We need more information before we start any major project.</p> <p>Are we willing to pipe water to shoreline restaurants that serve hundreds of people daily and then let their liquid sewage seep into our surrounding bays. These are questions that need to be addressed.</p>	Penny Kerr
168	9/26/23 13:03:07	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>Nitrex System vs I/A</p> <p>Every time the Nitrex system is explained to me it is described as being highly effective at removing nitrates from the waste water (in the high 90th percentile), that it's effluent is nearly clean and that it will have a minor effect on the waters it would reach (examples being Coecle's Harbor for last year's proposal and Gardiners Creek for the latest proposal this year). They claim one I/A system on a neighboring house would bring it up to ZERO discharge into these bodies of water.</p> <p>When it has been proposed to install it on school property, or the Fire Dept. land, or the field by the horse farm on Smith St. it is said to be too polluting. These last locations are far closer to the high nitrate sources. The problem would be solved in a localized fashion and the nitrate laden sewage would not be moved into a different neighborhood.</p> <p>I want to know which one is correct. Is it a nearly clean effluent discharge from the Nitrex System - or is something too dirty to place near the nitrate source? It can't be both. It's either clean or it is not.</p>	Penny Kerr
176	10/4/23 13:28:19	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>I think it is of utmost importance to maintain local ownership of our natural resources. We must keep home rule. Our water belongs to us and should never become a commodity that we buy from an outside company (ex. SCWA). We gave them managerial control of the West Neck system to our peril. The management contract the Town signed gave them a lot of leeway and I have grave concerns that they will expand it claiming necessity. By expanding the West Neck System SCWA can in a round about way start pumping large quantities of water from one part of the island to another. We must be vigilant!</p>	Penny Kerr
177	10/8/23 15:33:04	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>As part of the action recommendations in the CP - regarding Aquiver and water protection, I encourage a requirement for a full environmental study to be scheduled and completed before the C. plan is adopted. In addition, a spreadsheet completed of the 11 Island wells showing a comparison of the water levels and quality on a year-by-year basis - going back to when the data started being collected; with a projection out for the next several decades.</p>	karen Kiaer
196	10/13/23 17:46:45	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>See my comments to Chapter 1 and the SICWRZ Statement, which can be found at https://www.cwrzsl.com/compplan. The following portions of the statement are particularly relevant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of environmental review - As we have maintained for well over a year in letters to the editor of the Reporter and e-mails to the comprehensive plan group, a new plan should be informed by a comprehensive environmental review to examine potential adverse impacts to the environment, including how much more development our fragile sole-source aquifer can bear and how much more traffic our ferries and congested roads (like in the Heights and Bridge Street) can bear. <p>In connection with the 1994 comprehensive plan, a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) was conducted. Now, the town is trying to avoid such a study, which the New York State Division of Governmental Affairs recommends. The new consultants' contract expressly contemplates finding that it is not necessary. Whether or not a GEIS is legally required, it makes no sense to do a long-range plan for our future without a comprehensive environmental review based on current data and analysis.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A municipal wastewater system for the Center - The plan clings to the notion of a municipal wastewater system in the Center despite the facts that the School, the biggest contributor to the nitrate problem, successfully installed a much less expensive I/A system over the summer and Dr. Gobler, the leading authority on Island water, demonstrated that the system the town proposed is unnecessary and would be a huge waste of taxpayer money. 3. Island-wide public water - This is included in the plan without any consideration of (a) how many neighborhoods need or want public water; (b) residents' evaluation of Suffolk County Water Authority's recent takeover of the West Neck system; (c) what such a system would cost (it only references a 2005 estimate that the total cost would be \$28 to \$35 million and a capital cost per household of between \$8,500 and \$16,000); (d) how much users would pay monthly for public water; or (e) other possible ways to provide good water to those who lack it, like reverse osmosis systems. <p>ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS RE CHAPTER 7</p> <p>Unless there is no preferable alternative, public sewerage and water open the door to development that has little or nothing to do with affordable housing or that would otherwise provide a benefit to the town greater than the burdens or risks that would accompany the development. In at least most instances, there appear to be preferable alternatives.</p> <p>The plan should make clear that addressing drinking water problems without addressing septic problems is an incomplete solution that will not protect our aquifer or bays.</p> <p>The plan should endorse a change in the current Town Board's apparent goal of avoiding full environmental review of environmentally sensitive projects wherever it can and arguably even where it legally cannot. It should begin requiring applicants to fund independent unbiased environmental reviews by an expert of the Town's choosing. A current case in point is the Gardiner's Bay Country Club's pursuit of an additional six millions gallons of water from the aquifer for irrigation.</p>	Stephen Jacobs

197	10/13/23 17:48:15	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>continued from prior comment:</p> <p>It should be noted that the much-relied on Ground and Surface Water Management Plan was enacted in the early stages of the Covid era with virtually no public discussion. I know and respect many of those involved in generating that plan, but think that it needs a fuller discussion and fresh look that takes into consideration more recent water test results, an updated review of the relevant technologies, a survey of Suffolk County Water Authority customers, and consideration of the costs that would be incurred by the town and residents in connection with any options discussed.</p> <p>Links should be added (if necessary to the Comprehensive Plan page of the Town website) for the 2005 Water Supply Alternative Study and the 2020 Suffolk County Sub-Watersheds Wastewater Plan referenced on page 90. A link is already provided for a third document referenced on that page.</p>	Stephen Jacobs
211	10/14/23 14:29:02	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>the outcome towards public water/waste-water systems. P.80.</p> <p>Assumes Water Quantity not a concern--that the supply is sufficient for the island need. P.s 81.</p> <p>Too blanket a statement: What if GBCC gets to withdraw millions of gallons to keep fairways green and what if we have projected increase in density of housing and commercial entities? This would certainly impact the aquifer and water withdrawal, especially from near shore properties.</p> <p>Statement that Water quality is a concern--"highly vulnerable to contamination and significant actions needed to preserve it." P. 81, p. 89.,90 Again too blanket a statement. We need data on specific vulnerability. Data that exists is old and out of date.</p> <p>We need up-to-date- Data: Given that water is the most important concern for the island, [see survey] there is a need for a comprehensive environmental study --a full SEQRA--by experts, as well as data on water useage from homeowners. At present, there is little reliable data, existing studies are old and do not acknowledge existing conditions, or new technologies (i.e. the 2020 Ground and Surface Water Management Plan).</p> <p>Goal 7-1: This Draft plan relies on 1920 Ground and Surface Water Management Plan GSWMP which was enacted by the Town Board early in the Covid era with little or no discussion and is now obsolete. We need a new study by experts that considers both current environmental conditions and the costs of contemplated options!</p> <p>Waste-water and Water systems: 7.2.; 7.3; The draft proposes a costly and controversial centralized waste-water treatment plant supported by current Town Supervisor and Town Board. It also advocates for public water systems including consideration of an Island-wide public water system. Why? Because commercial and residential development hinges on adequate water systems. If they provide the water and waste-water connections, the developers will come! And then, what happens to our fragile aquifer? Note, the School, in the interim quickly and efficiently installed its own I/A system. CPAC members piously criticized this proposal and succeeded in change the wording to "Consider" from "Plan and Develop," but interestingly, this Draft uses BOTH wordings. The intent is clear.</p> <p>Clarify the following terms, not previously discussed: ---Wellhead Protection Zone p.96. ---Water Protection Zone--p.97</p>	Lily Hoffman
226	10/15/23 10:56:57	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>Most of Shelter Island was allowed to develop in the 50s and 60s with a major lack of infrastructure for safe, drinkable water and sewage. Those decisions to rely only on well water and septic systems have left us where we are today with major problems throughout the island.</p> <p>I support all the efforts to bring safe clean potable water to the entire island and to manage waste including upgrading and partnering with the Heights sewage plant to stop its discharge into Peconic Bay and creating a long-range plan for a public water utility on Shelter Island.</p> <p>I support the town regulating and banning fertilizer, herbicide and pesticide use on the island.</p> <p>I also fully support restoring tidal and freshwater wetlands throughout the island.</p>	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
229	10/15/23 11:33:54	7. Natural Resources & Water Quality	<p>Deer. Page 103 states that the public should be educated on the "advantages and disadvantages of deer populations." The text that follows mentions no advantages. Deer on Shelter Island cause vehicle collisions, extensive ecological damage to gardens and forests, and tick-borne diseases. Remove the words "advantages and" from the headline for accuracy.</p>	Natasha Stowe
136	9/11/23 12:10:32	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	<p>Consider the replacement of the anchorage area at reel point and shell beach with a mooring field. Many advantages include the generation of income, it controls the capacity of the area preventing over use and it generates income for bay men with the seasonal maintenance of the ground tackle, and it is kind to the bottom maintaining sea bed,</p>	Michael Shatken

162	9/26/23 12:13:01	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	<p>Dear Members,</p> <p>I would like to submit the following comments upon review of the Draft of Chapter 8 in the Plan:</p> <p>Pump out Boat p. 13 of 16</p> <p>Inspection of vessels in Island waters to determine whether holding tanks are present and functioning properly should be performed on a regular and increased basis.</p> <p>When testing indicates elevated levels of enterococcus, next level testing should be conducted to determine whether the bacteria is from a human or animal source. Without that information the testing is a waste of time and money since it does not provide us with the information necessary to establish remedial steps.</p> <p>2. Docks p. 14 of 16</p> <p>The current Town Code does not take into consideration the extremely diverse nature of the Island's shoreline. One set of criteria is inadequate to address the needs and requirements of each portion of the shoreline, which consists of creeks, bays, harbors and open waters, with respect to depth, exposure, currents, wave action, wind, shoreline protection, erosion, preservation, boat traffic, navigation, vessel size, obstructions, property setbacks, fishing, swimming, general recreation, marine life, environmental protection and aesthetics.</p> <p>3. Aquaculture p. 15 of 16</p> <p>The last sentence of the last paragraph of that section is incomplete. It should read, "...where unchecked expansion of aquacultural endeavors could create issues, primarily with navigation."</p> <p>4. Habitat p. 15 of 16</p> <p>As a member of the WMAC, I was not aware that a formal policy decision had been made to transfer the mooring permitting process and management from the WMAC to the Harbor Master.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration, Bill Geraghty</p>	Bill Geraghty
164	9/26/23 12:17:23	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	<p>I think something fell out in the editing of Ch 8 re Open Space.</p> <p>The first "Finding" (p. 105) addresses parks and open space and urges their maintenance and effective utilization. But, in the Goals section (pp. 112-118) the goals are all about bays and waterways.</p> <p>There is not even a suggestion that the Town's program of parks and beaches be continued, let alone maintained and effectively used. As a result, there is nothing in Ch 11, Implementation and Action Plan.</p> <p>This omission is unacceptable.</p> <p>Ed</p>	Ed Shillingburg

165	9/26/23 12:19:39	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	<p>Key Findings Comments</p> <p>There has NOT been an increased use of West Neck anchorage. For the past 10 years it often reaches capacity on peak weekends. Most days of the year it is empty. What HAS increased is the number of boats anchored OUTSIDE of the anchorage area. That needs to be addressed with tickets issued, not just repeated warnings.</p> <p>Seaplane traffic - under CFR's (Code of Federal Regulations), prior to transitioning to or from flight, a seaplane is considered a vessel (boat) and is subject to complying with ALL pertinent maritime regulations which includes Chapter 40-8 F. states speed limit is 45 mph in Town Waters, unless a lower limit is specified. All seaplanes, except some small ultra lights like Tom Cronin had, have a rotation (transition) speed well in excess of that. A Cessna Amphibious Caravan, which is often seen in our waters, has a rotation speed of 70 knots. That means that plane is doing over 80 mph in the water before taking off. That is 35 mph above the maximum speed limit in Town waters. Code is there, again, it is just a matter of enforcement. Chief Read can easily pull up that data and let know know how many tickets have received tickets for speeding. I suspect none. The question needs to be asked, why not?</p> <p>Goals and Recommendations</p> <p>Moorings</p> <p>The number of permitted moorings is actually DOWN from 20 years ago so no immediate need to convert fields to grids at this point. Besides reviewing applications, the WMAC should be concentrating on cleaning up and proposing to the TB some changes in the mooring and dock codes.</p> <p>One thing to possibly consider would be to let some commercial entities with internal grids, such as SIYC or CHMB, manage their own moorings. For example, SIYC has +/- 100 moorings in large grid and that grid has specific, defined boundaries marked by 5 buoys installed by the Town. Charge them whatever that actual number is today, say 100 x the current commercial rate per year regardless of how many moorings they actually have. Not sure what current commercial rate is but if \$300/year, the Town would bill them \$30,000 annually. If they want to change to more small boats, such as Dough Dishes and have 125 moorings or want more 60' boat and reduce to 75 moorings, they still pay that same annual fee based on the current number of moorings today (100?) x current rate, they just have to keep all boats within the defined boundary. If they want to use all the same type ground tackle with a shorter scope and can squeeze in more boats, that is their prerogative. The advantage to the Town for this would be significantly reduced administration and inspection costs. 1 permit to process vs. 100. No need to inspect to see if Town permit numbers properly displayed on mooring. If 2 boats bump into each other because moorings too close, the Town has no liability since they didn't supply the specific locations.</p> <p>Moorings Gear - mandating any specific gear may open the Town up to liability should it fail. Coecles Harbor Marina's moorings with conventional anchors and chain have the BEST field of eelgrass in all of Eastern Long Island. I certainly wouldn't mess with that!</p> <p>The Town should be run like a tight ship business but should NOT be in business! Leave commercial moorings with the current operators who have the infrastructure and manning. The cost to buy and maintain tackle, another person, another boat, etc for Town moorings will just end up making government bigger and costing the taxpayers more. And don't even think about placing that burden on current mooring permit holders! While super busy 8-10</p>	peter reich
166	9/26/23 12:20:44	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	<p>Speed Limits and Wakes</p> <p>While there are some occasional excessive wakes in inside waters, the excessive wakes in outside waters has become exponentially worse over the past few years. My 15' Boston Water was swamped twice this summer and our new, larger ferries have even take green water over the deck. It is a function of 3 things, larger and larger boats, more and more horsepower, and less operator experience. People who have never owned a boat can plunk down \$2.5 million on a new 50' boat and we have an instant Rodney Dangerfeild from Caddy Shack! This is not unique to SI, it it a major problem up and down the eastern seaboard. The code is there, again, education and enforcement are the answer. So may tickets get dropped or reduced to minimal amounts so there is no deterrent. I think a meeting with TB, Harbor Masters and our judges is needed to find out why more offenders aren't ticketed and why fines are reduced. What is keeping enforcement from happening? Is it lack of signage or poorly written code? If so, this thing can easily be corrected. A joint meeting may help identify why we can't effectively deal with the problem.</p>	Peter Reich
167	9/26/23 12:24:21	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	<p>Docks</p> <p>I laugh when I read, "should the Town limit the size of boats and docks?" The Town often does but no one knows about it!! Numerous dock permits have been issued with boat restrictions, including length, beam, and no rafting. I'm probably the only one who remembers that when Costello bought Island Boatyard and issued permit for them to do all the dock work, they were limited in boat size and number of boats, both which have been exceeded. Don't believe me, go get a copy of the permits from Amber Wilson. I only point this out to prove that no one knows about these restrictions! I suspect that none of the Town Board, WMAC members, Harbormasters, nor the Walshes are aware of this. They have been good stewards of the property and I personally don't have any problem with that not being enforced since no one knows about it. When I was on the TB, I proposed and volunteered to create a database of all docks and bulkheads with OA lengths widths floating dock, whether electric or water, dated aerial photos, etc. but got no support from other TB members. The database would also include things like any boat restrictions. It should be available to the public to view. The Harbormasters and Building Inspectors would easily be able to see if anything change from permitted, whether to the dock itself or the attached boats. I would be willing to help with that if desired. Taking advantage of volunteer instead of hired personnel helps out taxes down. Also I don't think Online Mooring is necessarily the best thing to use for this.</p>	peter reich
185	10/11/23 0:45:30	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	<p>Goal 8-2 (page 118)</p> <p>Review use of beaches by off road vehicles to protect the beach environment.</p> <p>The Town Code currently prohibits off-road vehicles on public beaches or parks. Public beaches include Shell Beach and our two bathing beaches, Crescent Beach and Wades Beach. Where else should they be prohibited? Both this recommendation and the one above it are missing from Ch. 11.</p>	Sandra O'Connor

198	10/13/23 17:49:35	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	See my comments to Chapter 1 and the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/compplan . ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS RE CHAPTER 8 This chapter contemplates creating a Local Waterfront Redevelopment Zone and multiple Marine Business Zones. The pros and cons of each such zone must be subjected to public scrutiny. Examples of such zones elsewhere should be considered. Any benefits to the town and its residents, as opposed to the developer involved, should be weighed against the accompanying burdens or risks to the environment and the character of the Island. Considerations would include stress on the aquifer and bays and increased traffic both on land and water. It is no secret that big corporate interests have been buying up marinas in the East End. We need to debate: how much more do we want to become like Sag Harbor, Greenport or Southold?	Stephen Jacobs
212	10/14/23 15:30:47	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	*Goal 8-1 Create a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP). P.112. This has NOT been discussed. What is it? It seems to provide access to grants for "waterfront related projects," ie, more development. *Goal 8-2. Recommends "Create a Marine Business Zone." P.115. NOT discussed. Under current zoning, it would apply to five waterfront areas zoned for business—Coccles Harbor Marina, Island Boat Yard, Town Dock, Clarks Marina, and Bridge St. A Marine District will make these business zones, remove residential protections that now exist, etc. MAKE SURE THAT MARINE DISTRICTS NOT EXCLUDED FROM NSO	LilyHoffman
230	10/15/23 11:14:06	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	My understanding of the Reel Point Study commissioned by the Peconic Land Trust is that much of the erosion of Reel Point is caused by the bulkheads to the north which prevent littoral drift, reflect wave energy, worsen turbulence and increase erosion to the south at Reel Point. The idea that the town should armor or harden Reel Point and Shell Beach to protect the homes and businesses that are within those harbors and who benefit from and took the risk to build or create their properties there expressly because of their proximity to the water seems misguided. The town should encourage natural shorelines and discourage bulkheads and hardening the shore. I support the idea of public rights of way across existing bulkheads and over docks throughout the island! The town should also maintain and keep public access at all its town landings and improve the facilities and parking at town beaches (including Menhaden Lane).	Bran Dougherty-Johnson
237	10/15/23 23:31:09	8. Parks, Open Space & Waterways	Ch. 8 Waterways / Boat Landings and Shoreline Access Points (p. 110-111) Goal 8-2 Prepare a comprehensive inventory and evaluation of shoreline access points and Town landings... (p. 117). This reflects a lack of understanding of the events that caused the Shoreline Access Task Force to be created—a handful of Town Landings and other shoreline access points being overrun and trespassing on private property during the spring and summer of 2020. What is the explanation for recommending "Public Landing" signage at all landings? The map showing Town Landings is not accurate.	Sandra O'Connor
131	9/10/23 9:10:03	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	The lack of a town planner and a functional planning board as well as the general disdain for plans and planning speaks volumes about our island culture. Islanders take pride in the do it your self and local knowledge culture over all of the resources and expertise available in this field. A significant improvement to island governance and land use approvals could be achieved by hiring a town planner. The town board favors locals for committee positions over experience. The result of which is a planning board that ties itself up like a pretzel to find rational for granting wetlands permits and provides no capabilities that traditional planning boards provide as a resource to town government. A planner with facilitator skill would be a tremendous asset. Verse paying big dollars to the town attorney to enforce decorum in town meetings and entering into countless law suits. Finally our town board special permit process, planning board and ZBA would benefit from an opinion document provided by a planner when deliberating granting of permits and variance.	Michael Shatken
145	9/14/23 15:12:36	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	1. The Historic Burying Ground located on the Presbyterian church property should have historic designation. Not only does it have nine Revolutionary patriots but many of the Island's early settlers. In addition, it has the "stone records" of the Island which municipalities are required to maintain. Fire destroyed all paper town records prior to 1881. The cemetery should be on the maps and have more historical information and detail. 2. An Action point should address "demolition" prevention of our 18th-century historic homes. A zoning regulation should be adopted that prevents the demolition of these dozen-plus historic houses and homes.	Karen Kiaer
151	9/23/23 7:37:55	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	We have a state of the art History Center already in place that stores and preserves over 100,000 documents, photos and historical records. They have already done a historical time line, oral histories and have many programs and events in place to educate. Why would we want to spend time and energy duplicating what is already in place. With limited resources, we would be better served by having the advisory board focus on the other activities listed.	Belle Lareau

154	9/23/23 18:43:46	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	<p>There should be better coordinated and expanded mental health services on the Island. The mental health needs of seniors are well-served by the Senior Center when issues come to their attention. Similarly, the school does its best to assist our children. However, there is a gap in services for the the adult (non-senior) population. It is well-known that the use of substances, domestic abuse, financial and housing challenges, and for non-American born residents, language barriers affect significant members of the adult community.</p> <p>It is unusual and commendable that the town hired a social worker to assist with mental health crises and to provide referrals for ongoing counseling. Her hours are extremely part-time and could easily be expanded. In addition, although this has been talked about for years (for her and her predecessor), she has not been given permanent confidential office space to adequately perform her duties. Because her role is not to provide Islanders with mental health counseling, residents must instead find a counselor off Island, which is time-consuming and expensive. Is it possible to contract with an off-island mental health clinic for counselors to come here one or two days per week to provide ongoing mental health services on a fee-for-service basis?</p> <p>The Health and Wellness Alliance is an ad hoc group of mental health professionals who perform no clinical duties. Their role is mostly to expand mental health awareness through newspaper articles and library programs. This is a small group consisting mainly of the Senior Center Director, the former town social worker, the current town social worker, two volunteer social workers, and a liaison from the town board (who is retiring). With support from the town, the group could expand and identify and perform more wellness programs.</p>	Nancy Green
156	9/24/23 16:01:54	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	<p>The list of Rainfall Flooding Exposure locations (p. 72 of the 9/8/23 draft) includes Valley Road. Which Valley Road—the one in Hilo Shores or the one off Rte 114 that becomes Linda Road?</p> <p>The same list does NOT include the 100 ft. stretch of West Neck Road in the valley between property #59 and property #62. When this chapter was discussed several months ago, I asked that this location be added to the list. (I own property #59.) What criteria do the 16 locations that are included meet that the West Neck stretch doesn't? The last time it flooded a highway department employee placed a horse with an amber light at each end (the forecast was for rain to continue into the night) and a TCO placed cones on the center lines of the road and directed traffic at the northern end. In the summer of 2022 during a fast and furious storm, water rose to over 3 feet causing an avalanche of water to crash through my privet hedge (planted on a 3 ft. berm) 10 ft. into my lawn when cars drove through it at the 35-mph speed limit, or more.</p>	Sandra O'Connor
179	10/8/23 15:47:06	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	<p>There are over a dozen historic 18th-century houses on the Island. there should be a "no demolition" clause in the zoning code that would prohibit the demolition of historic homes. Other towns have negotiated giving other property, tax, etc. considerations - to stop owners from destroying historic homes, barns structures, etc.</p>	karen Kiaer
199	10/13/23 17:50:54	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	<p>See my comments to Chapter 1 and the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/compplan. The following portion of the statement is particularly relevant:</p> <p>7. Replacing a strict noise ordinance - The plan proposes replacing the objective noise ordinance with an "equitable" approach, rather than better enforcing or strengthening of the current ordinance.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL PERSONAL COMMENTS RE CHAPTER 9</p> <p>The chapter devotes insufficient attention to town governance, addressing it only on page 133, much less issues that are a concern to many and likely contributed to the lopsided defeat of the Town Supervisor in the Democratic primary.</p> <p>For example, there are no recommendations for increasing public participation in town government and making government more transparent, such as by (a) scheduling meetings at times more convenient to working people, (b) releasing complete sets of relevant documents long enough before a hearing or meeting concerning them so that the public can review them, and (c) making all meetings hybrid, whether or not legally required.</p> <p>No attention is made to avoiding conflicts of interest, or at least the appearance of them, where, for example a committee is headed, or contains as a member, someone who frequently has an interest in matters before the body. In such a case, having the interested person just not vote is not enough; they should not be involved in the presentation or discussion of the issue in which they have an interest, directly or (through a client) indirectly. The plan should address this issue and not pass the buck to the Ethics Board.</p> <p>As I expressed in comments on the initial comprehensive plan survey (before the effort was suspended by the Town Board), there is a longstanding and serious substance problem on the Island that should not be shoved under the rug.</p> <p>While mental health services have commendably been receiving greater attention than in the past, more can and should be done, as noted in Nancy Green's 9/23/23 comment.</p>	Stephen Jacobs
203	10/14/23 7:05:35	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	<p>Arts and Cultural Organizations and Community Events / Annual Community Events (p. 132)</p> <p>Shelter Island Fire Department Annual Chicken Barbecue (August) is included among the events for which a photo will be included. However, this event has not been held for 3 years. It's my understanding there are no plans to revive it.</p>	Sandra O'Connor

213	10/14/23 15:41:24	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	<p>First page (p.120) user key findings we find: "Its become increasingly challenging for those with low or moderate incomes to afford to live on the island, as property values and cost of living rise." REMOVE prejudicial opinions from the text!</p> <p>Goal 9-1. Create a Historic Floating District. The Draft argues that the advantage is greater flexibility in types of land use. This is actually a disadvantage, in that it will expand uses in what are now nonconforming businesses in residential areas, and allow commercial and residential development, while providing much less protection for residents. Creates a new Spot Zone despite disclaimer in draft that the Floating H district won't downzone or alter uses.</p> <p>Goal 9-2. This goal dramatically WEAKENS noise ordinances by suggesting that we replace the current decibel level ordinance, with a "equitable" approach and find days and times when noises can be more/less tolerated! Which businesses have been lobbying for this?</p>	Lily Hoffman
231	10/15/23 11:45:36	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	The Shelter Island Library is a wonderful community resource. However it is closed on Sundays. Recommendation 9.5.B states that library programming should be expanded. While expanding programming is an important goal, there is something more basic that should be considered. In order to accommodate working adults and families with children, the Library should find a way to be open on Sundays - while there is a cost associated with this there would be tremendous benefits for people who would like to access this resource outside of the workweek and Saturdays.	Natasha Stowe
232	10/15/23 11:52:16	9. Quality of Life: Historic, Cultural & Community Resources	Implementation of the Comprehensive Plan - on page 147, and Goal 9.4.B, how to implement the Plan is said to be "the beginning of a process which involves changing conditions, regulations, and procedures in the Town. Sustained town effort and public involvement is necessary to bring the items in this plan to fruition." All the hard work that is going into this Comprehensive Plan is wonderful, but without a strong focus on implementation Shelter Island will not realize the benefits. The consultants can help us learn how other communities have successfully implemented their plans, and our Implementation Committee can learn from those best practices, including frequency and type of meetings, ways to ensure accountability, how to encourage continued public involvement in implementation, what project management software would be most effective, etc.	Natasha Stowe
129	9/9/23 10:43:14	All chapters	I am surprised to find the listing of actual plan statements/strategies are not ordered in some sort of number format, like the multilevel number format used in the Town Code. This would help discussion with the public and government. For example, if i want to comment on a bullet point in the water plan, I now would have to identify my comment something like "I have a question on CHAPTER 7: NATURAL RESOURCES AND WATER QUALITY, Goal 7-8: second action step, third bullet on pdf page 23 of 25, footer page #101". Commenting on "Chapter 7, Goal 8, Action Plan B, bullet 3 'Address Pollution: Take measures to reduce pollution...'" would be much easier.	Greg Toner
173	10/1/23 4:04:58	All draft chapters	Add line numbers to each draft chapter. This will make identifying and reconciling comments easier and more efficient.	Sean Clark
187	10/13/23 14:41:24	Ch. 11 Implementation and Actions / 8.2.C. Prohibit excessive power boat wakes with code regulations and signage buoys.	I support Connor Needham's comment at the 9/23 CP public forum and hearing that limiting boat and engine sizes is not necessary if you designate "no wake" zones — that such limitation would hurt our marinas. I would add, however, that such zones must be enforced. This particular action, as well as part of the action described under 8.2.G. (limiting the size of boats allowed to dock at a commercial dock), would negatively impact the profitability of two long-time, multi-generational family-owned businesses — Coecles Harbor Marina and Piccozzi's Dock. In light of this, I think it would be a useful exercise to review all the actions contained in Chapter 11 for any other unintended consequences.	Sandra O'Connor
201	10/13/23 17:54:04	Chapter 11	<p>See my comments to Chapter 1 and the "SICWRZ Statement," which can be found at https://www.cwrzsi.com/complan and the comments pertaining to the prior chapters insofar as they apply to items the implementation of which is discussed in Chapter 11.</p> <p>There should be a portion of the Comments section on Chapter 11 as there is on the prior 10 chapters.</p>	Stephen Jacobs

216	10/14/23 16:25:15	Chapter 11	<p>This Chapter 11, "Implementation and Action Plan," released by BFJ on 9/19, just a few days before the Public Hearing on 9/23, consists of a set of action items that raises concerns.</p> <p>Spot Zoning: The Chapter contains new concepts that were not discussed by the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee --of which I was a member-- prior to the document's release on 9/19.</p> <p>4.4A: A small lot ordinance in Near Shore Overlay District [this could increase development]</p> <p>4.5B: Planned Development District for Sylvester Manor and possibly elsewhere</p> <p>6.4B and 8.1A: Local Waterfront Revitalization Program [will access grants for more development]</p> <p>7.4: Wellhead protection zone</p> <p>7.4: Water Protection Zone</p> <p>8.2F: Create a Marine Business Zone [more development - convert nonconforming uses to permanent status]</p> <p>9.1B: Historic District Zone or Floating Historic District Overlay Zone [expand uses, convert nonconforming uses to permanent status]</p> <p>Nonconforming uses and properties: Most of the island's businesses are nonconforming uses in otherwise residential zones. If these areas formally become business zones, residents will have less protection, and uses may expand. The draft does not disapprove of the expansion of such businesses even when they are located in the Near Shore and Peninsular Overlay</p> <p>Merger of B1 and B zones: B1-restricts use to govt or administrative uses. The merger will benefit landowners in Town Center! It may also bring unwanted uses into Center. Vagueness here and throughout, opens way to expansion of nonconforming uses</p> <p>Waste-water and Water systems: Goals 7.2. and 7.3: The draft proposes a costly and controversial centralized waste-water treatment plant supported by current Town Supervisor and Town Board. It also advocates for public water systems including consideration of an Island-wide public water system. Why? Because commercial and residential development hinges on adequate water systems. If they provide the water and waste-water connections, the developers will come! And then, what happens to our fragile aquifer?</p> <p>Lack of an environmental review. Our current plan (1994) required a full environmental review to consider the impact of development on our fragile aquifer, ferries and roads. Present conditions make it even more necessary to require such a review, which our Town is trying to avoid. In fact, the Town's contract with the current consultants assumes that a review will not be needed. Is it wise to make a long range plan that contemplates major changes in land use and zoning without a comprehensive environmental review based on current data?</p> <p>Other zoning changes: Goal 4.2.A. Suggests second floor apartments in B and B-1 zones without any requirements about affordability. It also opens the door to density (4 units per acre for affordable housing). We need to look at this carefully.</p>	Lily Hoffman
217	10/14/23 17:50:07	Chapter 11	<p>This Chapter 11, "Implementation and Action Plan," released by BFJ on 9/19, just a few days before the Public Hearing on 9/23, consists of a set of action items that raises concerns.</p> <p>NEW ZONING CONCEPTS:</p> <p>The Chapter contains new concepts that were not discussed by the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee --of which I was a member-- prior to the document's release on 9/19.</p> <p>4.4A: A small lot ordinance in Near Shore Overlay District [this could increase development]</p> <p>4.5B: Planned Development District for Sylvester Manor and possibly elsewhere</p> <p>6.4B and 8.1A: Local Waterfront Revitalization Program [will access grants for more development]</p> <p>8.2F: Create a Marine Business Zone [more development - convert nonconforming uses to permanent status]</p> <p>9.1B: Historic District Zone or Floating Historic District Overlay Zone [expand uses, convert nonconforming uses to permanent status]</p> <p>Each one of these concepts needs explanation and discussion. For example: what are the pros and cons? What are the benefits to residents as opposed to developers? What examples can we find from other similar communities? There's much development pressure on the East End, particularly Shelter Island and we have to think about how much we want to encourage.</p>	Lily Hoffman

182	10/9/23 11:18:08	Chapter 11 - General Comments	<p>We do not understand all the seemingly unfounded uproar over the proposed document. If we understand this correctly, the Comprehensive Plan is not law but is an overall road map suggesting paths to be considered that may, if determined to be positive actions, be the basis of future law or zoning ordinance. Wouldn't each suggestion need to be vetted and wouldn't each require its own environmental assessment? It seems that some are getting bogged down in details that amount to trying to make all final decisions now rather than working through each suggestion over time as the Comprehensive Plan suggests.</p> <p>Are we missing something here?</p> <p>Please continue to support all the proposed water quality initiatives – the Comprehensive Plan should promote consideration of all options be it public sewers and water districts, small area sewer, and water systems and/or private septic & water systems.</p> <p>Certainly, everyone should do their part and install I/A systems for their homes, but our plan must also recognize that technology is continually evolving and as time goes by, there will continue to be new options for better systems which will lend themselves to providing even better sewerage options.</p> <p>As we understand it, the suggestions in the comprehensive plan do not dictate the outcome of any of these considerations, but rather leave our options open to consider all options to improve water quality for Shelter Island. Please continue to keep our options and our minds open to new ideas, approaches, and technologies.</p> <p>Water supply is a critically important issue. Establishing an Island-wide water district seems a powerful tool and as explained does not automatically lead us to engage with SCWA. Rather it seems it can give us better control over how water supply is handled going forward.</p> <p>Saltwater intrusion is a serious threat and is already a reality to many of us. Consideration of public water systems to provide potable water to saltwater intrusion areas must be a major focus of the comprehensive plan and Town water quality initiatives going forward. Please be sure there are specific initiatives within the Comprehensive Plan to address all aspects saltwater intrusion and the very real need to provide potable water to those who do not have it due to intrusion.</p> <p>Our creeks and bays require our diligent care and consideration. Monitoring estuary water quality conditions is critical to understanding the loss of life in our creeks and bays all of us have noticed over the past years. Dredging to increase tidal flushing and maintain and restore the health of our waterways is of utmost importance.</p> <p>Thank you again for all your efforts.</p>	Alice & Marvin Deupree
184	10/11/23 0:07:51	Chapter 11. Implementation and Action Plan	<p>Goal 8.2.L. Explain why upgrade plans should include "Public Landing" signage. Shoreline Access Task Force should be removed as a Partner, because it was disbanded after presenting its April 2022 Final Recommendations to the Town Board in May 2022 and tying up loose ends.</p>	Sandra O'Connor
172	10/1/23 3:43:57	Implementation and Action Plan	<p>Provide a consolidated list of goals/action items at beginning of each chapter (similar to appearance of Ch3). This will provide greater readability without adding significant length to the chapter.</p>	Sean Clark
170	9/27/23 22:44:24	Overall Plan Draft	<p>Since revisions are going to be made to the draft Comprehensive Plan that was reviewed at the September 23 public meeting, I am requesting that once it has been revised, that it be available in a "redlined" or "track changes" version, so it is possible to quickly see where changes have been made to the text in the draft plan. Because it is such a lengthy document, this will be a big help. Thank you!</p>	Natasha Stowe
222	10/15/23 10:32:15	Several aspects of the plan	<p>It is a bit hard to comment by chapter but here are the thoughts of someone who has been here 52 years. The overall feeling I've gotten is how slanted this all seems toward enhancing business opportunities as opposed to maintaining the things that drew folks here . Marina zones, hotel zones etc. Really? Same goes for changes to the NSO. This should be a non starter. Merging B and B1 zones also seems suspect. And a water district, while sounding good, could also be an invite for development. I realize there must be a balance, but this plan surely seems weighted towards the enhancement of business opportunities as opposed to the well being of residents . I'd like to highlight a favorite issue of mine. Turf watering , automatic and other sprinklers,especially in NSO. I understand that there are times , like a new build homeowner starting a lawn , a lawn redo because of cons, grubs, whatever, but on the whole, all this type of irrigation should be banned on an island like ours with yearly drought issues. I live in a NSO and my water quality has been impacted several times by all the lawn watering etc near me. This spring, a new neighbor planted 41 trees on the road side of his house, all of which were irrigated.This is just wrong.</p> <p>Enforcement of any law here is also a big issue and goes hand in hand with the above.</p> <p>I recently was in a house under construction in my neighborhood. An older house was demolished, which I have no issue with, but its replacement is gargantuan, with an additional guest house. And we all can't imagine what water usage will be necessitated to " restore"the landscape totally wrecked in this process.</p> <p>As to affordable housing- I am truly in favor and see the necessity, but the scale should not be too large and the 114 corridor seems like a good idea.</p> <p>Sorry to not follow the chapter model but it's easier to comment this way.</p>	Connie Fischer
140	9/11/23 16:34:43	The Public Hearing	<p>A public hearing is scheduled for September 23 at 12:15. Most were under the impression this was an educational workshop so people could learn about the plan and ask questions which might influence future drafts of the plan. I understand two public hearings are required, To use this educational workshop as one of the public hearings seems very premature and unfair to the public--to say the least.</p>	Kathleen Gooding

174	10/3/23 20:42:54	This is in reference to Chapter 2 - demographics -- and also Chapter 9, Quality of Life, and Chapter 11 action items	<p>This is a longer version of the statement I made at the Public Workshop on 9/23:</p> <p>The demographic information and trends provided in Chapter 2 show a remarkable and disturbing increase in poverty (household income of less than \$26,200 for a family of 4) on the island, along with a drastic drop in households with children under 18 and a significant rise in the senior population.</p> <p>As the chapter notes, \$26,200 is a national number and in fact the definition of poverty for Suffolk County should be more like \$55,000 for a family of 4 (page 17) -- if we were to use the \$55,000 number, we would have far more than 12.4% of Islanders (Chart 9, p. 18) which dramatically increased from only 1.7% in 2010!</p> <p>However, as presented, the data does not appear to explain the nature of poverty on the island in a way that would enable targeted responses. For example, it is unclear whether the increase in seniors is an increase in seniors in poverty, vs. seniors who are wealthy part-time residents.</p> <p>Another example is that the percentage of students at the school with "economic disadvantage" has more than doubled, to 35% since 2014 (16%), and given the relatively small number of households with children (Chart 2, p. 14) and the declining percentage of children under 18 (Chart 6) from 17% down to 9% since 2010 - the percentage of children in poverty may be extremely high, but it is not possible to confirm that with the data presented.</p> <p>We have other "markers" of poverty which have not been incorporated in Chapter 2 -- the number of Islanders on Medicaid (revealed as part of the problem with the pharmacy not filling their prescriptions for a period of time), the number of Islanders using the Food Pantry and the CAST truck, and there may be others.</p> <p>If 12% (probably an undercount as noted above) of the island is in poverty, it seems to me it is very important to better understand if that is young children, teens, seniors, single people, families, working people, disabled people, etc. FROM A DATA POINT OF VIEW</p> <p>FROM AN ACTION POINT OF VIEW It also means there is not NEARLY enough attention to this in the Comprehensive Plan, where there is a brief section in Chapter 9, Quality of Life, about Seniors Services and Programs (p. 135) which does not explicitly reference seniors in poverty, and another section buried under the heading of "Mental Health and Other Social Services" (page 139) which briefly mentions the Food Pantry and CAST (with a typo to be corrected - CAST stands for "Center for Advocacy, Support and Transformation," formerly "Community Action Southold Town" not "Communist").</p> <p>Right now the Action Items are confined to the heading of "Public Health" where services for Seniors are mentioned without mention of seniors in poverty (9.6.A, page 32).</p> <p>Additionally 9.6.b (p. 32) "Address Food Insecurity" is the ONLY reference to the poverty on the island, and it consists of a mishmash about how "organizations" should "collaborate."</p>	Natasha Stowe
-----	------------------	--	---	---------------