

Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead, held in the Town Hall, Riverhead, New York, on Tuesday, January 30, 1979 at 7:30 P.M.

Present: Allen M. Smith, Supervisor  
Francis E. Menendez, Councilman  
John Lombardi, Councilman  
Antone J. Regula, Councilman

Also present: Henry S. Saxtein, Town Attorney  
Peter S. Danowski, Assistant Town Atty.

Absent: George G. Young, Councilman

Supervisor Smith called the Meeting to order at 7:30 P.M., to hold a public hearing and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

PUBLIC HEARING - 7:30 P.M.

The Deputy Town Clerk submitted affidavits of publishing and posting of public notice on a Public Hearing to be held January 30, 1979 at 7:30 P.M. at Town Hall regarding: proposed amendments to Article 108 of the Code of the Town of Riverhead relating to signs.

The affidavits were ordered to be placed on file.

COMMUNICATIONS

Supervisor Allen Smith, 11/8/78 - short history of restrictive sign ordinances. Filed.

Nore Winter, 11/17/78 - recommended alterations to the sign code. Filed.

Supervisor Smith: "Ladies and gentlemen this is a special meeting of the Town Board. It is for the purposes of those wishing to testify either for or against some proposed amendments to the current zoning ordinance of the Town of Riverhead as the same relates to signs. If you have not clipped it out of the News-Review, the public notice, there are special reprints of what is proposed up here at the front, you're welcome to come up and get a copy and use it as you will.

If the past experience is any dictates with reference to the numbers of people who will testify this evening, there will be a number of you that would like

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedSupervisor Smith continues:

to talk about what is proposed or what you might wish to see changed in what is proposed or what you might wish to see changed in the existing ordinance.

With that in mind, we would like you, to as you testify, please come forward, use the microphone, please be mindful of Mrs. Edwards, give your name and address before you testify and we would ask you to keep your comments to five minutes. When each person in the room has had the opportunity to use up that five minutes, we will come back to whom ever might wish to speak further than the five minute allocation. I think in that way we'll be able to at least get the import of everyone's view and if someone wishes to go beyond the five minutes, we'll give you that opportunity after at least everybody's had one bite at the apple. Would someone like to begin? Someone's got to start."

Mr. Garsten asked a question but was inaudible.

Supervisor Smith: "You can discuss these proposals, you can comment on what is proposed here, or you can make additional suggestions if you would like."

Patricia Stark, 892 Pond View Road, Riverhead; "Mr. Supervisor, Members of the Board, I believe the sign ordinance is one of the most important steps in revitalizing Riverhead, and I would like to make further recommendations to these amendments that were made by Nore Winter here in November. I would like to see the change of method of calculating the area of signs to be allowed in the fact of buildings to relate to the frontage of the building. One square foot of sign per linear foot of building front is often used and a maximum of 100 square feet. Number two, allow small scale production signs in the downtown commercial district, Main Street, Polish Town, etc.,. A good maximum size for these signs would be four square feet on one side.

I also believe that signs do not bring business to you and someone made a phone call tonight that couldn't be at the meeting and said one of the most thriving businesses in Riverhead is Kratoville's and they don't have any sign at all and if you take a look at the signs in Riverhead that are simple and easy to read. One of them would be the Allied Optical Sign, the Wicker Shop, the Village Inn, Harvard Shoe Store, Metropolitan Life. These are legible, easy to read and they are in very good taste. You don't need a sign 100 square feet to bring business to you. Thank you."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Ma'am. Would someone like to be next?"

Marty Rothberg, 177 Peninsula Path, Riverhead: "In the proposals I didn't see anything in the part about wall signs. I was wondering if some possible proposal could be made where the situation such as my stores where there is no wall or no physical way of hanging it on the front wall where the signs are sitting on the roof now because the front of the store doesn't really have a wall. It just has what you call a phony overhang and a window and there would really be no other place to put it except on the roof."

Supervisor Smith: "Mr. Rothberg, have you examined the mansard roofs of diagrams D & F? Does that solve your problem?"

Marty Rothberg: "I see D & F, except what happens if the front in F can't physically support it?"

Supervisor Smith: "Is that what you have now Mr. Rothberg?"

Marty Rothberg: "It's just a phony thing. Where there's really nothing to hang it on except the roof."

Supervisor Smith: "I mean that's what you have there and the design that's show there would be permitted."

Marty Rothberg: "In other words, some how the sign would have to be — well right now we have angle, but the signs are sitting on the roofs. It's sort of sloped like that, but I assume that part was made to support a sign."

Supervisor Smith: "For the purposes of a hearing, you want the ordinance to reflect that identification signs can be attached to a mansard roof?"

Marty Rothberg: "To the top of the roof where it is not physically possible to do it as shown in here."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "All right, we'll take that into consideration Sir."

Marty Rothberg: "Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Anyone else that would like to comment?"

Edward Goodfield, Edwards Discount Center, East Main Street, Route 58, Riverhead; "I would like to comment on Mrs. Starks remark that signs are not important, that people can find you without signs. This is very untrue. Signs are very important if they were not important people would not spend millions and millions of dollars on them throughout the United States and the rest of the world.

I would also like to ask what is being proposed for stores such as mine which have frontage on several streets and have been restricted to only one sign. My building is visible on all four sides and originally when I built the building we only had two signs which we thought was enough. The signs we do have now, I think are neat, orderly, and unobtrusive and the only reason that we added any signs was that of the request of the customers. We had many customers come into our place of business and say that they are unable to locate us through the lack of identifying signs so we added two more signs, so now we have signs on all four sections of the building.

According to the ordinance, some of those signs will have to be removed and I don't think it's quite fair."

Supervisor Smith: "Have you examined, Mr. Goodfield, what has been published here?"

Edward Goodfield: "I got a quick glance through it, but I couldn't find anything in glancing through it quickly that was pertaining to that section."

Supervisor Smith: "Specifically then, Mr. Goodfield, your testimony is that you'd like us to examine your particular situation at Edwards Discount Center and see whether or not any of the proposals made here would permit you the signs that you have at that location."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Edward Goodfield: "Correct. Not only in my own situation, but anyone in a similar situation that would have the same conditions."

Supervisor Smith: "All right. In your particular situation, not attempting to try to deal in the hearing with each and every specific location in Town, you have four exposures that will probably permit you under one or more of these proposals four wall signs, each of which could be 10% of the total wall area. I would imagine that when you take your curb frontage from 58 on around onto 25, that you would have in excess of 300 linear feet. If that were true, than you could possibly have two free standing signs each 32 square feet in size under one of these proposals and or one larger sign of let us assume that you have 450, I believe are the numbers, one sign that would be 64 some feet."

Edward Goodfield: "Okay. Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Yes Sir."

Reuben Ryan, Calverton; "I am particularly interested in directional signs because they're needed in my business. I operate a motel and I'm pleased to notice that the Town has admitted that they would like to encourage the tourist business because it is probably the most pollution free, dust free, cleanest type of business you can have in a community and people just don't mind the intrusion of strangers coming through the village. This can bring a lot of money into the Town. Now I think I've said before, motels tend to do that. They bring in a lot of people, they do spend money, they go home after their little stay, no doubt they shop all around the village and I'm mentioning this not soliciting any of your business, but just for the reason I think they deserve special attention. Ordinarily signs along the road might bother some people, let me tell you they bother me. They're expensive. I have vandalism that knocks them over. Now I have the Town Board threatening to chain them down and torch them down and we feel they are an extension of the business.

If you've been out of Town at all, you'll notice from here to Florida, you're glad to see those signs, of course, you're also glad to see that they are out of your state. Well in any case to serve a purpose and I'm just suggesting that it would be very essential that you give some special consideration. I think I have mentioned

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedReuben Ryan continues:

to this Board before and to each of you severally and dependently that if you ask me, for example, now to move my directional signs, that is a constructive eviction. I mean if I move them, I lose them. They're very difficult to get sites. Now, I have lost some of my sites and they'll not be occupied again and if I get permission to put a sign on a farm, you can well imagine the farmer doesn't want it in a corner and in the front and any other place it's absolutely going to ruin the value of the site to him and to me. I can't go there.

So if you actually insist on that, you're putting us right out of business and I guess you very well know that. Also to the limitation on signs one on the road possibly two, I think certainly is very bad, you might as well eliminate them all. We have a situation where people go by in a vehicle quite rapidly, they'll miss one, won't be able to read it perhaps and then they'll catch to the next one. This is the way that business works. If you think one sign is adequate, it certainly isn't and if it were, we would be very happy.

But I think it's necessary especially in a Town like Riverhead or at least down in the west end of Riverhead where I am near the Wading River area, we are by-passed by the thru-way, people coming, most of all our business comes from the thru-way, up the west, New Jersey, Connecticut, New York through the Queens area they get off the expressway and it's rather difficult to find my spot especially at night.

I would appreciate the Board considering the fact that we should be allowed a number of signs even as many as six or seven on different roads and we'd be happy to comply as much as we can to make them presentable and to locate them where they're not offensive to people who are annoyed by these kinds of things, but must remember we're talking about 400 or 500 rooms in this Town and they're bringing in a tremendous amount of money into the Town. If you want to preserve a tax base, you can help doing it that way. If you want to destroy this tax base and turn some of your motels into get the business where you can sort of a deal, which I know you don't like, this is one way of heading them in that direction. So I'd appreciate your very careful consideration."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Mr. Ryan. Anyone else?"

Edward Purcell, 962 East Main Street, Riverhead:  
"Now as far as I'm concerned, on this sign ordinance, I feel as though it's a good idea as for making a historic

PUBLIC HEAIRNG - continuedEdward Purcell continues:

area, per se downtown Riverhead, and may be downtown Wading River. Now that would be perfect for what you have now. The way the sign ordinance reads so that you would keep that area as specific tourist areas. Now once you go up on Route 58, now as far as I'm concerned there is very little other than try to get rid of their off-premises signs, very little that would be obtrusive to that normal people that would go up there because that's primarily a shopping area by car. Now down street, that's different that's walking traffic. That in itself you don't need a large sign. You don't need alot of signs. But once you go in an area that's all mobile, it's a better idea to limit the signs only for the off-premises.

All on-premises signs as far as I'm concerned should be up to the business themselves. Now you can limit for what I propose for shopping centers to be allowed only a directory sign, but where you — if I remember right, in the ordinance the way you have it proposed that they are allowed 2 by 3 signs or is it 2 by 8. Anyway I would allow them 4 feet horizontally on these two signs whether it be 30 feet long or 5 feet long and only be allowed that one directory sign in front of the shopping center. Now if it's on the business itself right where the business is located now, that should be up to what they feel the building is worth. But where the owner owns his own property such as these car dealers they may have — they may deal with five or six different type of cars. Now whether they have a 500 foot frontage or it's a 50 mile an hour zone, they can't be allowed to just one 4 by 8 sign if it's only a certain speed limit, they should be allowed to what they feel the sign will bring in in money.

Now the way it reads now, you're going to hurt the business in Riverhead and as far as I'm concerned, we have enough trouble with lands being taken off of tax rolls because of businesses going out or creating a park or whatever or a parking lot that you have to try to improve and bring in more businesses. Now in some areas this would be fine to limit all the signs, but as far as — I work in a deli at night and I talk on this because I get time, and alot of people they cannot see what you're trying to prove by limiting signs in an area such as Route 58 or up in 25 up in Aquebogue or out in Wading River because this is not really as far as they're concerned and myself a strict tourist area.

Now we are even in a Suffolk County Master Plan as of a few years ago. Riverhead as far as I understand was supposed to be an urban area to where this would be primarily a shopping area more than tourist and right now we don't really have many beaches as do the east end on the south fork for the tourists because that's primarily what

## PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Edward Purcell continues:

Long Island is. It's a tourist area for the beach goers for the summer. Now in Riverhead, you just don't have it. You have a few beaches and a lot of the beaches are only for Town Residents. We don't have any beaches where out-of-town residents can go as to where on the south side you do have some open parks. Riverhead the only one we have is Wildwood, for my understanding. So as far as I'm concerned, you're not really going to have that much tourist other than possibly in the downtown area or possibly if you want to create a historic sector down in Wading River down by the pond in that general area there. But for the Town in normal, for most of the Town, as far as I can see, you are not really — it is not a tourist area.

Now maybe some people have other ideas but from what I understand from working in the deli and I work as a bus mechanic and I from being in Riverhead all my life, people just don't understand what all this fuss is about signs on their own business property. Now if it's a road sign, it's different entirely. A lot of people don't like them. I don't like them. They're big, they're terrible to look at, but if it's on their own premises, it should be their own idea what they want because it's their property and it's as simple as that." Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Mr. Purcell. Anyone else?"

Before speaking, Stanley Hagler presented a picture to the Town Board.

Stanley Hagler, Riverhead; "Supervisor Smith, Members of the Board, I own property in Riverhead and I've had a family business in Riverhead for over 40 years. In fact, this year we're celebrating our 40th Anniversary. We've remodeled three times and we're in the process of remodeling soon. As a member of the Townscape Committee, I'm in essence in favor of the sign ordinance. However, I have to disagree with Pat and I must say I also — I'm not in favor of it being retro-active. Many stores including Richard York Shoes have remodeled in Riverhead when Riverhead was on a down slide. Now the Town is turning around, many areas are showing signs to be proud of. But to force stores like Richard York Shoes, I have to name a few, Villella Brothers, Rose Jewelers, Swezey's, McCabes and the newly remodeled Village Inn to change their signs was not the intent. I don't think of the Townscape Committee and I hope it is not the intent of the ordinance. I've shown you a picture of Richard York Shoes and I want you to refer to the newspaper that the News-Review put out Alternate A, Subdivision D under gas stations. This would allow in my interpretation, let's take the example, Shell

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedStanley Hagler continues:

to show their identification sign. It would also allow them to put a sign over each bay such as lube, oil change, or car wash. I submit that if this is adopted, then Richard York's identification of Stride-Rite, Red Cross Shoes, and Florshiem should also be permitted. Many of your parents and maybe even yourselves and the people in the audience know our store for many years as the Red Cross Shoe Store, the Floreischeim Shoe Store, the Stride-Rite Shoe Store, depending upon the gender. These identifications are of tremendous value to us and you must agree at least I would hope so that the forcade of the picture that you have viewed is an aesthetic asset to the Town of Riverhead. I thus submit that the sign of this nature should not be illegal and I hope that you will consider my comments in viewing them and in viewing the picture. Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Mr. Hagler I can't scale it off from the picture I would guess that the 10% provision that is part of alternate C for wall signs might make yours legal."

Stanley Hagler: "Well I would hope so, Mr. Supervisor, but will that negate the fact of more than one sign on the building. I have had comments with the Building Inspector and we don't seem to come to an agreement as to a proper interpretation. I hope yours is the proper one."

Supervisor Smith: "I believe the way that we have worked with it to date the 10% would be that area encompassed by a line, a circle, or a square that would be drawn around the perimeter of those projections and the area of that if it was less than 10% would comply. We'll have to have somebody take a look at it."

Stanley Hagler: "I thank you for your consideration and it does fall within those bounds especially if it is adopted in the manner that Mrs. Stark mentioned of using the outer wall perimeter of the building level. Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "The other thing about Richard York that you forgot to mention that you are in favor of having two signs, one in the front, and one in the back, right?"

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Stanley Hagler: "Oh yes, I certainly am. I didn't think I'd have to comment on that."

Supervisor Smith: "I realize we didn't have a closing yet."

Stanley Hagler: "There is a sign in the back and we hope that it will be much nicer in the future."

Supervisor Smith: "Trying to encourage Mr. Hagler to open up to the rear, and work it with him on that."

Stanley Hagler: "Well I hope that that all goes through and you'll see a back entrance and hopefully a handicap ramp so that people will be able to get into the store in the back. Thank you."

Don Wald, 69 Further Lane, Riverhead: "I also own a business here in Riverhead. One thing that I've noticed in the proposed amendments is a sign committee and I think having attended many many meetings over the last few years that this is the ultimate and importance to everybody. I don't really believe that a Town Board, a small group of people, should dictate to a business man what is good for his business. It's very easy for someone to say well signs don't mean anything, maybe they don't, but maybe they do too. And if it's a great expense to a businessman if he feels he wants to put a sign up as long as it's in good taste, he should be able to do such, not be told he can't. I think that a sign committee is of the utmost importance because I keep listening to people getting up here and talking and whoever said big is bad, or big is good, or small is beautiful, or what. But I think if a committee is appointed, a representative committee with business people in this Town, residents in this Town, perhaps some people from the Town Board and a business man can go to this committee and say look this is what I have in mind, is it in good taste, is it not in good taste than that's going in the right direction. However, in reading this, everything that it says about the sign committee says if, if there is a sign committee then it will do this — my main question is will there be a sign committee if these amendments are adopted."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "That's why we propose it as an alternative Sir. There was discussions as a result of the prior meetings where it was suggested that such a committee might be a good idea and you have one person speak tonight in favor of that particular proposal and it will be kept in mind by the Town Board."

Don Wald: "Thank you very much."

Supervisor Smith: "Anyone else?"

Shirley Smith, Route 25, Calverton; "I would speak to the Supervisor and Members of the Town Board and more in particularly those of you that are in business in the Town of Riverhead. Through the Community Development Office, there is indeed a committee to review proposed signs for which grants will be given upon the approval of the committee and I think in addition to that, what Mr. Wald just spoke about, is indeed another adjunct needed for the interpretation of the sign ordinance. I think there should be no argument and I don't refute what Pat has said, but I think there should be no argument that signs do serve a purpose and we're talking about taste and that's a very difficult thing to legislate, and we do indeed want for no small measure of time to feel that we're trying to legislate taste, but you cannot speak before a group like this without using examples and one that comes immediately to mind which is probably one of the largest businesses on Route 58 and one of the busiest. I can't tell you how many feet across the road front — but it has nine letters across the front of it's white forcade that says Rolle Bros. There's no other sign on the property.

We are working very hard with the Townscape Program and if those of you that are here that are not aware that there is such a program in the consideration of re-doing your sign for business that you can come to the Community Development Office and seek a review with qualified people that we have sign designers that are on our committee that you can seek their expertise of these matters and so that this is just hopefully pointing out to you that there is an office within this Town Hall that's here to help you and there are some volunteers in this community that are trying very hard to make it a very very beautiful place to live and all the people that come to Mr. Ryan's hotel will come to Riverhead, remember it to be a very special place and indeed come back again and tell others to come with him. Thank you."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Mrs. Smith. Mr. Ryan you've had one bite of the apple, let's give everybody a chance."

William Miller, North Wading River Road, Wading River; "Mostly I have a question. I'm in the Real Estate business down in the old village. At present I have a sign on Route 25A and one on Route 25. I used to have about ten signs up, but I gradually lost them over the years. I can't see in that ordinance here where there's any provision for anybody in my type of business to have a sign up. If my signs go down, people are going to zip through 25A and 25 and they'll never know I live there."

Supervisor Smith: "There is provision in the ordinance Mr. Miller for — Mr. Danowski two off-premises directionals?"

Peter S. Danowski, Jr., Assistant Town Attorney; "One and permission for a second one."

Supervisor Smith: "And the other with reference to real estate is your for sale sign Mr. Miller."

William Miller: "In other words I've got to do like some of the brokers do is just plaster the country with a lot of little signs, that I haven't done in the past because I thought it looked like hell frankly. I had my common signs, gave my name, my address, my phone number and I didn't put a lot of for sale signs on everything in the country. I'm going to have to do it if I can't have just an advertising sign up."

Supervisor Smith: "Mr. Miller what I said to you . . ."

William Miller: "I can have two signs."

Supervisor Smith: "Which is what you have at the moment. Right?"

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

William Miller: "I have 30 foot square signs which has been legal in the other Towns in the other County's for a long time. I could probably cross the line into Brookhaven and put one up now, with permission, but I hate to have to go out of the Town to advertise my business in Riverhead."

Supervisor Smith: "Mr. Miller I think if you'll sit down with Mr. Danowski, we can deal with your specific problem. I don't know that the off-premises directional has a size to it, does it Peter?"

Peter S. Danowski, Jr., Assistant Town Attorney; inaudible.

Supervisor Smith: "You're probably talking about a free-standing 32 square foot sign."

William Miller: "It is 32. I didn't read it in here and I just read it all through again."

Supervisor Smith: "These are the added amendments that's permitted today."

William Miller: "It's in there."

Supervisor Smith: "No it's in here."

William Miller: "Oh I didn't get the advantage to look in that. I just read this."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Sir. Anyone else?"

Irwin Garsten, Pres. of Garsten Motors, Thompson Street, Shoreham; "I've been a resident of Suffolk County for 22 years and I've been in business in Riverhead for 22 years. Mr. Supervisor, Town Officials, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to speak to you with two hats if I could tonight. My first hat is as a member of the committee that reviewed the sign ordinances. And the other hat is as owner of Garsten Motors so I'll get the other hat later."

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedIrwin Garsten continues:

First of all the chairman of the committee was Ed Patterson and he is ill and he couldn't attend tonight otherwise he would have been here speaking for the committee. The committee met approximately eight times over a period of over two and one-half, three months. Our committee members were Greg Villella, from Villella Shoes, Bob Knotoff from McCabes, Gerry Heingartner from Kinney Chevrolet, Leo Sternlicht, Riverhead Motors, Tom Hart, J.J. Hart, myself and Ed Merz, Suffolk County National Bank and Ed Patterson, officer of Photo circuits. The committee during their meetings had in attendance at various times the following people, Ed Goodfield from Edwards, Ann Heinz, President of Chamber of Commerce, Joe Lopez from Circle Motel, Pete Danowski our local lawyer, Reuben Ryan, Art Kaneff, and Bernie Eisenman. Bernie is an officer or member of Broadway Maintenance, and Art Kaneff is the owner of an outdoor advertising co. Reuben, you know is the owner of the Wading River Motel and Joe Lopez the owner of Circle Motel.

During the meetings, we perused the ordinances from the Towns of Brookhaven, Islip, Smithtown, Hempstead, and East Hampton. We also read the Vision Report and the Townscape report. The Vision report was quite lengthy. I personally went through it at least six times. From all this the committee made recommendations that are printed today in the News-Review. We feel very strongly about what we recommended and we appeal to the Town Board to accept our recommendations as proposed. We honestly feel that what we have there is a compromise as to what would be good for the Town with reference to signs. That says a committee report.

Personally I'm very pleased with a lot of things that have been happening in the Town the last couple of years. But I personally feel that the Town is treading on the edge of anti-business legislation with reference to what they're proposing, what we have already existing and what the Town is proposing in the News-Review. Signs are important. A few people have said that, otherwise why would people make the investment they do make in signs. Why would people advertise. It's a form of advertising. I don't think we can afford to do anything in this Town that's anti-business. You say well why do we have a sign ordinance. The sign is ugly, it's too big. I mean, so let's look at the road, let's look and see what we see down the road.

Well if you want to talk about being ugly, the ugliest thing you can see on the road is a utility line pole sticking up. Well right now my signs can compete favorably with the poles. If I reduce them to what you

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedIrwin Garsten continues:

propose or what the Town proposes, the poles and the utility lines are going to overwhelm my sign. I mean before we start taking down some of these signs maybe we ought to consider some of the other things that are polluting the atmosphere, polluting what we're looking at. Big is not necessarily bad. I agree with a lot of things personally that was in the Vision Report. I do feel that they took into consideration the size of the sign based on how fast the cars were going on the road and that was a good consideration because otherwise it would become a safety factor. I do think that the Town has to look upon Route 58 in a different way and any other highway area in a different way than they would.

Main Street doesn't have free standing signs. Buildings are next to each other. Consequently, it's more important to develop a theme, a look to an area. On Route 58, the buildings are far apart. Architecturally it's not as important to try to blend them into one look. But you're trying to blend them by governing the size of the signs too much to too an extent based on what we have now and based on what you're proposing.

Well to sum it up, please consider the committees report. The committee spent a lot of time and it would be a shame not to take their recommendations into consideration. Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Mr. Garsten and thank you for your work on this topic. I realize for many of you it was a first step into such things and it's appreciated. Someone else?"

Michael Gyscek, Farmingville, Legislative Chairman for Long Island for the New York Sign Association; "A number of the manufacturers who are members on Long Island we have about seventy members, have asked us to say something concerning the ordinance on their behalf and that's the reason for us being here tonight. First of all, let me say in general, that we've done a lot of work with other Towns in Writing ordinances. We just finished with the Town of Brookhaven and it looks like in February, this month, they will be passing their new sign ordinance which we feel is a very beneficial ordinance. Both to the municipal governments — to the user and the manufacturer we feel that is the essential thing in all ordinances is that they are fair to all parties that are involved in this. Yesterday, we were told this — we have not had a chance in detail to go through the proposed recommendations or changes through the existing ordinance, but I have gone through a few and I would just like to, if I can, to get a few clarifications. Is that possible?"

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "Mr. Gyscek why don't you raise those sections that bother you and I can do this for you, rather than take up the audiences collective time with specific problems, if you have such things you can discuss them with Mr. Danowski, who is the special attorney on this matter, and the Town Board will give you a period of time, let's say a week to specifically put in writing whatever suggestions or changes you might wish."

Michael Gyscek: "That's what I'm referring to as far as specifics. But I have a couple general things."

Supervisor Smith: "Why don't you give us the general and deal with Mr. Danowski on the specifics?"

Michael Gyscek: "In reading through the proposals, the only, the major situation that I see which we've come across before is the Sign Review Board. Generally Sign Review Boards are of no major problems except in the scope that's listed here. It says to read a quote from the paper Sign Review Board for review and recommendation based upon considerations of illumination techniques, color, the signs purposes and any other considerations aesthetical or qualitative character as they deem necessary. It seems to us that in the manufacturing business, that what we are trying to do here is legislate taste — an individuals taste especially as to, for instance, color and techniques. We feel that these particular things are a taste matter and that to try to legislate them and to dictate them is in come degree an infringement on a persons freedom of speech and freedom to carry on his business as he chooses fit."

Supervisor Smith: "My Gyscek your recommendation then is that you would not like to see such a committee."

Michael Gyscek: "That is correct, and I would like to have the opportunity to, like you said, to in writing state our views concerning your ordinance and to submit them to you for your consideration."

Supervisor Smith: "Yes, Mr. Gyscek. The gentleman is Mr. Danowski, after the hearing is over you speak to him."

Michael Gyscek: "Thank you very much."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "Yes Sir. Anyone else?"

Peter Jacks, North Fork Signs, Southold; "I see something in this paper it says a sign on a building wall facing upon a public street shall not exceed 20% of the total area of that wall. Is this an error? Were we talking 10% or 20%?"

Supervisor Smith: "That's Alternate A. That is is the Chamber of Commerce proposal. The existing ordinance says 25% and the Alternate C says 10% if I'm not mistaken."

Peter Jacks: "I'm looking at Alternate A. I would suggest rather than give 10% or 20% of a total building area you would go the way Southold Town, Southampton, and Brookhaven. Give two running feet of sign per one foot of building frontage."

Supervisor Smith: "So you'd rather than taking the exposure, take the lineal frontage on the street."

Peter Jacks: "It seems to be better because if a building is three or four stories high, than the sign would be larger?"

Supervisor Smith: "That is true under what is proposed here."

Peter Jacks: "But the person that is renting the ground floor is renting it by the lineal foot. I just wanted to make that one point. I'd like to say one thing, I can live with any sign ordinance you fellows work out, but you've been three years at it and I think it's time you hammered it out and got it finished so I know where I stand."

Supervisor Smith: "You're not alone in that feeling Mr. Jacks."

John Latona, with H.C. Williams Co., 113 Griffing Avenue, Riverhead; "You'll have to excuse me I have been

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedJohn Latona continues:

just brought in in this and I noticed that going over your proposed sign ordinance that there's no provision there for off-premises signs as we call them billboards. And I was just wondering if there is a committee that I could meet to possibly air my views on that."

Supervisor Smith: "You can. Billboards are not permitted on the existing ordinance or on what is proposed. If you would like to voice your case before the Townscape Committee, that can be arranged."

John Latona: "And I would just like to add under the highway beautification act, this is a federal program. Billboards have been permitted to exist under the 300 square feet area in certain areas. I would like the Town Board to know that if they don't already. And another fact, an economical fact which is very important to the Town here, H.C. Williams presently employees approximately 16 people residing in the County and if we are forced out of this business these people would be unemployed. So I'd like the Town to consider that as well.

Just one other point, we always considered ourselves a service business in doing very important public service to the County, we presently serve two hotels in the area, the game farm, a circus, several banks and also political — Republicans and Democrats when they run for public office. Thank you very much."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Mr. Latona. If you will speak to Mrs. Smith or Mrs. Stark they will arrange for you to meet with the Townscape Committee."

Carole Kempermann, 157 Sound Avenue, Baiting Hollow; I'd just like to have a little clarification on Alternate A, on whether or not, where it says the maximum size and the speed limit, is that going to be approved or not approved or are they discussing it?"

Supervisor Smith: "Mrs. Kempermann that's what we're here for. If you are either in favor of it or against it."

Carole Kempermann: "Just to speak in favor of it, I have two businesses on Route 25 the outskirts of Riverhead, and not that people go speeding by, but I think people from

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

out of the area would be traveling along the road would see the sign and I think if it's too small, maybe they wouldn't. As it is now, I kept the sign down, of the Village Cross Roads, and just kept it more or less, and a lot of people say they don't even know we're open for breakfast.

Now they're kind of in doubt about a lot of things of the place. But we're afraid to go ahead with anything until we know what the actual amendments will be as far as the Carving Board where 32 square feet without the scroll work, the lit part of it is okay, but we're in doubt whether the unlit part will be part of this or not as far as the speed limit goes."

Supervisor Smith: "With those specific references again on specific signs, if you'll speak to Mr. Danowski, maybe he'll shed some light on those."

Carole Kempermann: "Okay, thank you very much."

Supervisor Smith: "Yes Ma'am. Anyone else?"

Reuben Ryan: "I forgot to mention that I think the suggestion you have there about assessing an annual \$100 fee for off-premises signs. Am I correct on that?"

Supervisor Smith: "I believe that was in the chamber proposal."

Reuben Ryan: "I think that would be a serious and unfair penalty. If signs are permitted, penalize them. Businesses have enough operating expenses. I know we have our problems and I think that would be a very unfair penalty. If you're going to permit a sign, let's say it has a permit and so be it. One other little item that's very serious, if there's any intention to say go to install signs and measure off and say now you folk have to move this big sign back a few feet or five feet or so, this could be a tremendous hardship on what might amount to hundreds of signs on-premises and I think it would be totally unreasonable to date back after people have made plans."

Supervisor Smith: "As I've said to you before in hardship situations that is why we have the Zoning Board of Appeals."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Reuben Ryan: "As I said to you, too Mr. Smith before, it's ridiculous to ask us to leave our places of business now and go in with signs that we do have and get on the schedule and load their schedule and then sit it out. We have things to do. Why don't you frame the ordinance in such a manner that you'll accept these signs. Your men can check individual signs as they wish and say okay this makes sense, leave it along and approve it. These signs are not being moved around weekly, they're being put there permanently. Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Anyone else, first or seconds?"

Edward Goodfield: "I would just like to make some additional comments before the evening is over. I've been sitting here listening to comments from various people and a lot of things have come to mind again. What I have been stressing, since I got involved in this since the ordinance was first brought to my attention, I want to stress that I am not only concerned for my own needs and my own business, but I'm concerned for every businessman in the community of Riverhead, and as I've been stressing and as I realize and a lot of other people do not realize is that every business is different. Every business has different needs. The comment was made by Mrs. Smith about the business on Route 58 merely having a sign saying Rolle Brothers. Well that business is unique. It's a farm equipment business and everybody in the farming business knows where it is and what it is, but with businesses that have a diversification of products and ways the public is not aware of what they carry or where they are and they have to bring this forward to the public.

Now I and a lot of other businessmen in the community have spent a great deal of money for signs and we would not have spent this money for signs if they were not needed. As I mentioned in my earlier discourse, I added signs because the public requested signs. They said we don't know what you carry. We don't know exactly where you are and I wouldn't have gone out and spent this additional sum of money if I felt it wasn't necessary.

Now I think that that committee that was mentioned before, is a very important thing for the Town, for the Town Board, and for the members of the business community and I think the committee should be composed of various businessmen from various types of business so that they can bring forth the needs of their individual types of businesses and put them forth to this committee and we can straighten out this mess that we have gotten ourselves into. And I think if the committee, the business people

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedEdward Goodfield continues:

and the rise and the Town Board work together amiably and understand each others needs and requirements. I think this can be worked out to everybody's mutual satisfaction. Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Sir. Mr. Purcell as you come up to the microphone, I would make mention that the Town Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals have discussed the item of the existing sign and those that would be required possibly such as Mr. Ryan's, where there's certain hardships involved with the existing signs. It has been agreed by the two boards that for the purposes of those applications that the fee and survey will be requirements that otherwise apply to zoning variances will be waived unless up until such time as the survey is found to be germane to the particular application."

Edward Purcell: "Primarily I just want to say in addition to what he said about Rolle Brothers. Rolle Brothers is just primarily a one business business. They don't look for off the road customers. Now everybody else, most of the other business do. Now on the sign maintenance, now what kind of proposal did you have in there pertaining to the upkeep of signs because as far as I'm concerned, that is worse than having a former sign that it looks like a wreck than having a big sign that is kept well. Because there are some signs in Riverhead that are, they look like they should have been thrown away ten years ago, but there are some signs that may have been thirty years old that are large but they are kept up and they seem to make the Town look better. "

Supervisor Smith: "Mr. Purcell I believe that's the logic of the recommendation of the Chamber Committee on the fee requiring an annual fee such that."

Edward Purcell: "That isn't on on-premises signs. That's only for off-premises. I'm talking about on-premises or on the building which ever you call it. I think that was pertaining to off-premises signs for road signs."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "Let's deal with it the other way then. Mr. Garsten is shaking his head no. What would you recommend Sir in terms of upkeep?"

Edward Purcell: "Well if it isn't upkept as I think he, Mr. Garsten, suggests that they have a sign committee such as the sign committee feels that is has not been kept well up. The Town should be allowed to give them thirty days notice to either contract with either a sign company or do it themselves if they don't want to pay any money out to re-do it themselves and either have it down within thrity days of have them take it down.

Now I think that would be a better addition to the sign ordinance than worrying about, oh the sign is too big. Now it's worse if it's a wreck. Now it can be large but, it's beautiful as Mr. Garsten said. But if it's a small sign and it's a wreck as far as I'm concerned, it's a mistake to even have it there. Thank you."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Sir. We have come full swing for an hour and I have been passing out the seconds so to speak. Is there anybody who wishes to speak. Mrs. Stark you've had one bite at the apple, do you need another?"

Patricia Stark: "I do not own a business in Riverhead. My husband does. I care very much about the way Riverhead looks. We have had many problems in Riverhead and to date or not to date, up until about two or three or four years ago until Supervisor Smith became our Supervisor, and our Town and everyone knows, was on it's way down. We're on our way up. We've made great strides. We have no objection to signs as co-chairman to townscape, there's no objections just as long as they're compatible with the buildings, the design, the color, and as long as they don't obliterate our Town and all you have to do is look west and go through Huntington which was a beautiful town. Unfortunately, the merchants did obliterate that town. You can no longer see the lovely buildings because their signa are outrageous. Look in Coram. To me it is an eyesore. Our Supervisor and our Town Board is trying to prevent that here in Riverhead and that's the only thing we want. We're not asking you to forsake your signs. We're just asking you to do it in good taste."

Supervisor Smith: "Thank you Ma'am. Anyone else?"

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

John Latona: "There was one thing I failed to mention and I'd like the Town to know about it and the public as well. Some of the landlords where I have leases with have been threatened with court action, imprisonment and fines. I would like the Town to take under consideration that they would please hold back such tactics until this sign matter is concluded one way or the other. Because they have said to me we don't want any serious problems. We enjoy the income that we're deriving from having a sign on the property, but they're being harassed and I would like the Town to know that this is going on. I don't know if you're aware of it or not."

Supervisor Smith: "What is occurring is those signs that do not comply with the ordinance. Our being sent notices of violation. Now the law on such things are that by coming in and filing an application for amortization or an appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals, any further follow up on notice of violation and that what I recommend that you do with reference to those tenants that you have who received the notice."

John Latona: "Well I understand that all the signs we have there are about ten questions. They all have permits. Now why would the sign inspector take the position with respect to the private property owners."

Supervisor Smith: "Sir because we have gone through the three-year period since the ordinance was effective against the type of sign interest that you represent and it now comes to the point where if you choose, you can apply for amortization of any rights that you claim in those particular signs."

John Latona: "How long do I have to get these applications in? Because I just received these a few days ago."

Supervisor Smith: "The only thing I can tell you Sir, that your signs at this moment are in violation. I would suggest if you wish to have the building department forebear that you get them in."

John Latona: "All right, thank you."

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedSupervisor Smith: "Yes Sir. Anyone else?"

Marty Rothberg: "I just have one other comment. I ran into some difficulty which upset me a great deal at the previous time with variances etc., with problems of individual businessmen have had with the sign ordinance. If there could be some easier way that the businessman who is limited in time could go before a Review Board without having to practically hire a lawyer, being told needing seven copies of surveys, needing blueprints, needing complicated things, some easier way of perhaps businessmen sitting down with the Review Board, just a simple picture of the sign, I'm sure, it's a very small Town, everyone basically knows what the sign looks like without all these details and simply discussing and say well I have this particular problem and they'll either say well yes Mr. Rothberg, we agree with you, you have a problem all right or no, no. In other words some easier way of doing it."

Supervisor Smith: "You're in favor of Review Boards."

Marty Rothberg: "Well right now you only have . . ."

Supervisor Smith: "Townscape."

Marty Rothberg: "Townscape. You have to go for a variance. But getting a variance is quite — for a non-conforming sign, it's quite complicated. If there is some simpler way."

Supervisor Smith: "We said this evening Sir that we're waiving both fee and survey on that. And if you need somebody to help, Mrs. Tormey is in the back of the room and she'll be willing to help you Sir."

Marty Rothberg: "All right. Thank you very much."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Smith: "All right. Anyone else?"

No one else wishing to be heard and no further communications having been received thereto, Supervisor Smith declared the hearing and meeting closed at 8:35 P.M.

*Elizabeth Edwards*

Elizabeth Edwards, Deputy Town Clerk

EE/vlv