

**Planning Commissioner's Written Comments  
February 14, 2012**

**Bethpage Village (Z1100032)**

**Ms. Board.** I would encourage the applicant to prepare examples of single family homes on small lots. If there is, indeed, a demand for this type of housing, then we should provide the developer a means to provide it.

**Ms. Brown.** Voted to deny. Only one multipurpose field and 1 tot lot is committed for 1,300 units.

Very uncomfortable with no comments to lot size.

Last TIA was done in 2007. I believe new TIA should be done.

We had no information on how many children this request has and what the impact on our schools are.

I understand the applicant only wanted to change a lot size comment but the request gives the developer a blank check on lot size in this area.

**Mr. Harris.** I support the request from the applicant.

**Mr. Jones.** Based on what was proposed I have reservations about reducing the minimum lot size. However, based on other provisions in the UFO the applicant may find themselves developing a lot size within the original 6,500 square foot based on market conditions.

**Mr. Smudski.** In general, this type of development has many advantages, including reducing shopping and office trips, and providing, hopefully, affordable housing. This would make a development such as Meadowmont.

**Rev. Whitley.** I voted to approve.

**Ms. Winders.** I voted to approve removal of minimum lot size because developer needs the flexibility to offer additional housing options. Small lot single family homes can be attractive and functional.

**Ms. Mitchell-Allen.** I voted to approve.

**Mr. Martin.** No, did not understand no minimum lot size. Concerned about the appearance of development due to no minimum lot size.