**PLANNING COMMISSION**
**SOUTHAMPTON VILLAGE**
**OCTOBER 6, 2016**

Due notice having been given, the public meeting of the Planning Commission for the Village of Southampton was held in the Board Room of the Municipal Building, 23 Main Street, Southampton, NY on Thursday, October 6, 2016 at 5:00 PM.

Chair Paul Travis, Edward F. Corrigan, and Robert Essay were present.

Chair Paul Travis opened the meeting. Tonight the potential new landscaping and tree regulations will be covered. They have been discussed at length in past meetings and workshops and there is a complied list for review tonight. This list came about as a result of a committee that was formed that looked at the codes in Villages that have been successful in regulation of landscape. The regulations suggested are as follows:

1. Any application for a Building Permit involving exterior site work (including demolition permit) must be accompanied by:
   a. A plan of the existing landscape by a licensed landscape architect.
   b. A plan of proposed new landscape by a licensed landscape architect.
2. The new landscape plan must indicate how drainage is retained on site.
3. If the proposed application to the Building Department shows removal of any trees of 10-inch caliper or more, or disturbs more than 1/3 of the existing landscape, it is subject to the ARB Review.
4. The intent of the regulation is to give authority to the ARB to review landscape plans with particular (but not exclusive) attention to the following goals:
   a. Screening of neighboring properties.
   b. The character of the street and neighborhood should be retained.
   c. Environmental considerations.
   d. Any new hedges on the street should be no more than 8 feet high for smaller lots or on streets narrower than 45 feet and 10 feet for larger lots on wider streets.
   e. Particular attention shall be given to landscape destruction within the non-buildable front, rear and side-yard setback zones.
5. There shall be no disturbance of landscape or clear cutting, other than normal maintenance and/or removal destruction of trees with more than 10-inch caliper for six months before applying for a permit or during the review process. Noncompliance will result in a two-year moratorium on review of any permits for that law.

Chair Travis noted that in regard to the final point, it seems that monetary penalties do not have the same deterrent effect than a moratorium on building will provide. A delay in development would have a stronger overall deterrent effect for violation of the regulation.

Robert Essay noted that he wanted to address point 4, the hedges need to no higher than three feet so that you can see when you are backing out of driveways onto the street. Also, he noted that there needs to be about a car length at the end of the driveway with no hedges. Currently, there is a large problem for driveways with high hedges right out to the street. Edward F. Corrigan mentioned that possibly the existing code for corner hedge heights could be applied to driveways, that would just be an adjustment to the current code.

Also, Robert Essay noted that the 4-foot high fence is also problematic in regard to safety. Edward F. Corrigan noted that driveway gates are problematic as well, the current code could be adjusted to address all of these problems.

Edward F. Corrigan did not like the idea of adjustment to hedge height; he feels that the hedges being pulled back would correct the sight lines to the street. It would have to be the length of a car or truck. The existing regulation for corners could be applied to driveways, as it is a safety issue. There are existing regulations that apply to gates as well. Simplification of current code is the key to the regulations working. It was agreed that the best solution is to have the hedges pulled away from the street by about a car length so that sight lines are clear without needing to regulate the height of hedges.

Chair Travis noted that a third of the existing landscape should be able to be retained without disturbance. That point is addressed in point 3, Studio a/b suggested that regulation and it seems to be the most viable. The Planning Commission is not a regulatory board so the regulations have to be clear and easy to implement and enforce.

In conclusion, Edward F. Corrigan suggested that point 4 – d be removed completely. Chair Travis noted that change.

Chair Travis also reiterated that monetary fines are definitely not working so a moratorium penalty on building would be an effective solution to curb the problem of clear cutting properties. These regulations will hopefully address the current landscape and tree issues that are currently problematic in the Village.

Respectfully submitted by:

JoLee Sanchez

File Date: _____

_____
Village Clerk