

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE

PLANNING BOARD

Village Hall  
196 Central Avenue  
Lawrence, New York

October 2, 2014  
7:33 p.m.

APPLICATION:           Nayman  
                          21 Herrick Drive  
                          Lawrence, New York

P R E S E N T:

MR. NOAH FLESHNER  
Acting Chairman

MR. ALLEN DORKIN  
Member

MS. JACQUELINE B. HANDEL  
Member

MR. THOMAS V. PANTELIS, ESQ.  
Village Attorney

MR. MICHAEL RYDER  
Building Department

1           CHAIRMAN FLESchNER: Calling this meeting to  
2 order of the Planning Board. Jackie Handel,  
3 Noah Fleschner and Allen Dorkin. Attorney --

4           MR. PANTELIS: Thomas Pantelis. And  
5 Mr. Ryder who is the building superintendent.

6           May I, with the Board's permission, just  
7 indicate one or two things about procedure.  
8 Counsel may want to -- for the applicant may want  
9 to take note. We have a three-member Board  
10 tonight. It is a five-member Board constituted,  
11 and therefore, to take action and approve an  
12 application you must have a unanimous vote of the  
13 Board, not a majority of those voting. And under  
14 certain circumstances certain applicants may  
15 choose not to proceed, but we'd like to just, you  
16 know, give you an indication on that, and you can  
17 explain that to your client.

18           MR. HOPKINS: I'll explain to my client.

19           CHAIRMAN FLESchNER: Have we established  
20 legal posting?

21           MR. RYDER: Yes, we did, Mr. Chairman. Proof  
22 of posting is in the folder.

23           MR. PANTELIS: Mr. Ryder, maybe you can read  
24 the legal notice.

25           MR. RYDER: Sure, gladly.

1 Notice is hereby given that the Planning  
 2 Board of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence will  
 3 hold a work session beginning at 7 p.m., followed  
 4 by a public meeting on Thursday, October 2nd, 2014  
 5 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue,  
 6 Lawrence, New York, beginning at 7:30 p.m.

7 The application is Nayman, of 21 Herrick  
 8 Drive, Lawrence, New York, owner of the premises  
 9 known as Section 40, Block 181-2, Lot 880, Lot  
 10 881. Applicant -- excuse me -- applicant proposes  
 11 to re-subdivide and separate existing merged lots  
 12 consisting of 19,171 square feet into two separate  
 13 lots. Lot one consisting of 9,171 square feet and  
 14 unimproved, and Lot two consisting of 10,000  
 15 square feet and improved with an existing  
 16 residence.

17 The applications and accompanying exhibits  
 18 are on file and may be inspected at the Village  
 19 Office during normal business hours between 8 a.m.  
 20 and 4 p.m.

21 CHAIRMAN FLESCNER: Okay. Does the  
 22 petitioner wish to add anything to the petition  
 23 that we have in front of us?

24 MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
 25 Board. Good evening. My name is Michael Hopkins.

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 I represent the Naymans in this matter before the  
2 Board of Zoning Appeals and obviously tonight as  
3 well. My address is 100 Quentin Roosevelt  
4 Boulevard, Garden City, New York 11530.

5 I think the petition contains all of the  
6 germane information, but Mr. Chairman, with your  
7 permission I'd just like to perhaps highlight a  
8 couple of things.

9 Number one, the property that is the topic of  
10 conversation tonight was actually subdivided  
11 almost twenty years ago.

12 Number two, that subdivision existed until  
13 approximately the time that Mr. Nayman acquired  
14 the property approximately a year or so ago. What  
15 happened, Mr. Chairman, simply was that the  
16 attorney at the time representing him as a  
17 purchaser, instead of taking two deeds and  
18 maintaining the distinct and separate ownership,  
19 took it and treated it as one deed and so  
20 theoretically everything merged. That which had  
21 been two parcels and could have been legally  
22 subdivided, now became one parcel.

23 We then went to the Board of Zoning Appeals,  
24 as I'm sure you're aware, and sought certain  
25 variances in front of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 The Board of Zoning Appeals approved the variances  
2 subject to the Planning Board approving the  
3 planning subdivision.

4 I point out to you that most of the variances  
5 sought several months ago which were granted were  
6 picked up because certain things were being  
7 sought, they pre-existed. But when you go for a  
8 variance they pick up everything in the property.  
9 So a lot of it already existed, as a practical  
10 proposition.

11 This particular parcel, I'm sure you're  
12 familiar with. Oh, I should point out too, what  
13 we did was we put an additional 1,000 square feet  
14 on the parcel which is presently improved. The  
15 parcel which is vacant had a reduction of 1,000  
16 square feet; it's now I think 9,050 feet, plus or  
17 minus a little bit. The reason for that at the  
18 time was to mitigate some of the variances that  
19 were being sought by the Naymans. Nevertheless,  
20 the parcel which is proposed to be split off, the  
21 undeveloped parcel, is legal in every sense of the  
22 word, fully compliant with your code in every  
23 sense of the word, and this would be considered I  
24 think down in the Village of Lawrence as a minor  
25 subdivision, not a major subdivision. There

1 aren't going to be any roads put in. There are no  
2 easements that have to be worried about, none of  
3 the things that you confront when you have a  
4 larger subdivision, as a practical proposition.  
5 The parcel will be representative of so many of  
6 the parcels in the area, the proposed split-off  
7 parcel, the undeveloped parcel.

8 So quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, if you have  
9 any specific questions, or members of the Board,  
10 I'd be delighted to answer them, but I think I've  
11 highlighted that which is important.

12 If I may just point out one other thing. To  
13 subdivide a property is an asset to people. Some  
14 people when you see big parcels, they may not have  
15 \$100,000 in the bank, but what they have is that  
16 extra parcel that's otherwise code compliant, and  
17 some people do that in lieu of buying stocks and  
18 bonds, they have a parcel. So this is actually a  
19 valuable asset, and I would -- as a matter of  
20 fairness and equity, it seems to me to be unfair  
21 because of the inadvertent merger, not a  
22 deliberate merger, an inadvertent merger back when  
23 this property was acquired that it should result  
24 functionally in the forfeiture of the value of  
25 that land to my client. So I'd respectfully

1 request, Mr. Chairman, that the relief be granted,  
2 and if you have any questions I'd be delighted to  
3 answer them.

4 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Thank you.

5 MR. PANTELIS: May I ask a question from a  
6 legal standpoint?

7 MR. HOPKINS: Yes, sir.

8 MR. PANTELIS: You've indicated that there  
9 was a subdivision in 1994.

10 MR. HOPKINS: Yes, sir.

11 MR. PANTELIS: Or thereabouts. Were deeds  
12 conveyed at that time and the lots officially  
13 subdivided?

14 MR. HOPKINS: That is my understanding.

15 MR. PANTELIS: Have you submitted or do you  
16 have copies of those to submit to the Board?

17 MR. HOPKINS: I don't have them tonight, but  
18 whatever you would request, Mr. Pantelis. I've  
19 tracked down --

20 MR. PANTELIS: Let me just ask Mr. Ryder  
21 something. I seem to remember but I don't have it  
22 in my file, at some point earlier and perhaps  
23 prior to Mr. Hopkins becoming involved, were deeds  
24 submitted to us which showed the original  
25 subdivision and then the fact that it became

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 merged when Mr. Nayman purchased it?

2 MR. HOPKINS: Well, we certainly can provide  
3 the deed when it was acquired, that's easily done,  
4 and the other deeds I'm sure we can get them, and  
5 if it's necessary that you feel to complete the  
6 record I'll supply them within 72 hours maximum.

7 MR. PANTELIS: Well, I think we're going to  
8 go on certain representations, that's my  
9 understanding, if I may indicate that to the  
10 Board, and I know in fairness to Mr. Hopkins some  
11 of this may have occurred before he did, and we  
12 may want to ask Mr. Nayman just to confirm those  
13 events since he would be a little more familiar.

14 Do you want to give your name and address on  
15 the record.

16 MR. NAYMAN: My name is Matt Nayman. I'm at  
17 21 Herrick Drive, Lawrence New York.

18 My wife and I actually submitted a variance  
19 application in February, and we had gotten a call  
20 from the Village of Lawrence not knowing that the  
21 property was merged at that time. We were in  
22 complete shock. And at that time we gave history  
23 of title to Lawrence, the Village of Lawrence.

24 MR. PANTELIS: I seem to recall that it may  
25 have passed through my hands, and I think we



1 should note for the record that our understanding  
2 is that there were two separate parcels pursuant  
3 to that subdivision, and they were inadvertently  
4 -- and we're still trying to figure that one out  
5 -- combined in one deed. Somebody saved paper at  
6 great expense to you.

7 MR. HOPKINS: I'm afraid Mr. Pantelis' point  
8 is well taken. This is just simply something  
9 that's slipped by, and quite frankly it's been  
10 very, very costly to my client even up to this  
11 point in time.

12 But if there's anything else, Mr. Chairman,  
13 I'd be delighted to answer it.

14 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Does anyone else wish to  
15 speak? Please come up and introduce yourself.

16 MR. DAVIES: My name is Sam Davies, 2 Manor  
17 Lane, Lawrence, New York. My property is  
18 contiguous to this property.

19 MR. PANTELIS: When you say contiguous, on  
20 what side would that be?

21 MR. DAVIES: To the rear.

22 MR. PANTELIS: To the rear. So are you on  
23 Herrick Drive?

24 MR. DAVIES: No, I'm on Manor Lane.

25 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: He's on Manor Lane.

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 They are back-to-back neighbors.

2 MR. DAVIES: Back to back. I spoke in front  
3 of this Board in 1995 when Mr. Hoffman requested  
4 division of the property. At that point I made  
5 some -- I believe all of it's in the record, I  
6 believe still in the minutes from 1995 from that  
7 meeting. I spoke about the character of the  
8 corner, the beautiful forest type of look that the  
9 corner had. At that time I even submitted a  
10 petition from neighbors saying how beautiful the  
11 property was. We really had no problem with the  
12 division, I mean, and Mr. Hoffman was granted the  
13 division afterwards.

14 My point there was that that's an irregular  
15 lot, and any structure that would be built on  
16 there should conform to the code that the Building  
17 Department has here in Lawrence, and that really  
18 no changes or variances should be allowed for that  
19 property going forward because that would be in a  
20 certain way overbuilding that irregular corner.

21 I made all these objections then in 1995, and  
22 at that time, and it's in the minutes, the Board  
23 agreed with me and put into the record that they  
24 were not going to -- I don't know what the  
25 terminology is, allow or let the Zoning Board, you

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 know, give any variances for any new construction  
2 that would be on that property.

3 You know, as far as the division, Mr. Nayman  
4 has every right to divide his property, and I  
5 believe the Board will, you know, believe the same  
6 thing. The only question is the overbuilding of  
7 that property and the fact that it's right behind  
8 my house and will go from one house and a  
9 beautiful piece of property to edifices. So  
10 that's the only request that I have from the  
11 Board.

12 MR. PANTELIS: So you're asking, sir, just to  
13 be clear, that if the subdivision were granted  
14 that some type of condition be placed on the  
15 application as it appears it was in 1994, that  
16 variances not be sought in construction or granted  
17 in construction with the subdivided lot?

18 MR. DAVIES: Correct. Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Thank you. Would the  
20 petitioner like to comment on that?

21 MR. HOPKINS: Yes, indeed I do. These are  
22 all issues that have been raised by Mr. Davies at  
23 the Board of Zoning Appeals. There was back -- by  
24 the way, the hearing was in fact in 1994, and  
25 there was something, I always thought it was

1 odd, I'll be very blunt, in the relief that was  
2 granted. I just had it here and then I must have  
3 put it aside for a moment. If you would be kind  
4 enough.

5 By letter dated December 14, 1994, the Board  
6 of Zoning Appeals said that there would be no  
7 further zoning variances granted to either lot  
8 granted by the subdivision. Quite frankly, I  
9 think that's ultra vires, is the expression. It's  
10 beyond the legal ability of the Board to do that.  
11 And I would certainly suggest, Mr. Chairman, that  
12 to put a limitation of that type that the property  
13 can only be used as per law is fine because the  
14 law would say in words or in substance that you  
15 have a right like any other citizen of the United  
16 States of America to come before the Board and at  
17 a different point in time when circumstances are  
18 different perhaps to ask for a variance. And I  
19 really don't know whether or not this Board has  
20 the legal authority to condition the subdivision,  
21 certainly, the Board of Zoning Appeals did not, on  
22 the inability to at least seek a variance. It's  
23 not the same thing as being guaranteed that they  
24 would get the variance, not in any sense of the  
25 word. So I would respectfully request that that

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 not be made a condition of any subdivision relief  
2 you grant here tonight.

3 On the other issues with regard to the  
4 garden-like appearance of that parcel, it's true,  
5 and it's sad in some ways. When property gets  
6 developed, however, it changes; and as they say,  
7 that property is a valuable asset. This is one of  
8 the things that we all tend to forget because we  
9 like the beauty of things. And of course,  
10 Mr. Davies would be at liberty to purchase the  
11 parcel and keep it as garden like, but then that  
12 would be his asset and his money, not the Naymans'  
13 asset with their money.

14 So again, I would respectfully request that  
15 there not be any attempt to limit the sub -- or  
16 condition the subdivision on the requirement that  
17 there be no application for zoning relief in the  
18 event that some person in the future should become  
19 the owner of the property and seek it.

20 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Just to go on the  
21 record.

22 MR. HOPKINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Where as you feel we  
24 shouldn't be putting a restriction on it, would  
25 the petitioner be willing to voluntarily agree

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 that if that property is built on, it should not  
2 be built other than to code at that time?

3 MR. HOPKINS: This is the first time this has  
4 come up. If you could give me two minutes I'll  
5 step outside and we'll be right back.

6 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Certainly, please.  
7 Thank you.

8 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

9 MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Chairman, I did speak to  
10 Mr. Nayman about that, and we would be opposing  
11 and not consent to it. Again, there's no present  
12 intention to do any development on the property,  
13 and it's as likely as not that the properties will  
14 be sold five, ten years from now whenever the  
15 family gets to big or they move on, and it will  
16 appear just as it does at the present time.

17 But at the same time, I repeat that it's  
18 inequitable, it's inherently unfair to ask  
19 Mr. Nayman to bear the financial burden, because  
20 if one goes to sell the property to a third party  
21 in the future and says, oh, by the way, you come  
22 in with a large family, because we were just  
23 talking before, I grew up in this area and the  
24 families are getting larger and larger and larger  
25 as time has passed, and to say that you can

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 purchase this and build a house but the house may  
2 only be able to handle two children, certainly not  
3 three or four, I think that's absolutely  
4 inequitable. Again, I repeat there's no current  
5 plan to develop the property.

6 MR. PANTELIS: All right, we understand your  
7 position.

8 MR. HOPKINS: Thank you, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Has the petitioner done  
10 any traffic flow based on the possibility of  
11 building a house on that property?

12 MR. HOPKINS: No, there have been no traffic  
13 studies, but I'll point out something critically  
14 important. This was in the ordinary course of  
15 business referred to the Nassau County Planning  
16 Commission, and the Nassau County Planning  
17 Commission, as I understand, referred it back for  
18 local determination. Central Avenue is a county  
19 road, if memory serves me correctly. If it were  
20 concerned, the county would not have referred it  
21 back for local determination.

22 MEMBER HANDEL: It's Broadway.

23 MR. RYDER: Broadway.

24 MR. HOPKINS: Broadway, I'm sorry.

25 MR. RYDER: And it is a county road.

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 MR. HOPKINS: But if the county were worried  
2 about traffic movement by one more house on this  
3 road, believe me, they would have held onto it and  
4 did that and they would want to find out what the  
5 heck is going on.

6 MR. PANTELIS: Another factor that would  
7 relate to the ultimate development of the property  
8 is that in order to get the curb cut on Broadway  
9 they will have to get permission from the county  
10 as well. So that may be kind of a predestined  
11 sort of answer.

12 MR. HOPKINS: Exactly. What Mr. Pantelis  
13 says is very accurate. The county, if there were  
14 to be a curb cut sought, it would have to be  
15 approved by the county, and you have to deal with  
16 the county which is not an easy thing to do. So  
17 but in answer to the question there's been no  
18 traffic studies, traffic flow studies at all.

19 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Do you have any  
20 comments, Jackie?

21 MEMBER HANDEL: Is it fair for me to ask you  
22 are you planning on selling this property now or  
23 keep it?

24 MR. NAYMAN: I have no intention to sell it.  
25 As Mr. Hopkins pointed out, it's more like an



Nayman - 10/2/14

1 insurance policy. In our variance we just asked  
2 to have a bigger house. We don't plan to do  
3 anything on it.

4 MEMBER HANDEL: Are you planning to do  
5 anything with the piece of property closer to the  
6 corner, take out any of the growth in there now or  
7 just keep everything the way it is?

8 MR. NAYMAN: More or less status quo. We  
9 might take out some shrubs so the kids could run  
10 around.

11 MR. HOPKINS: I know there's a big tree  
12 there. Isn't there a big oak tree?

13 MR. RYDER: It's a beech.

14 MEMBER HANDEL: I've been there. I went to  
15 see what it looks like.

16 MR. NAYMAN: There are three beech trees on  
17 the property. That's actually how I got the  
18 house, if you wanted to hear the quick story, but  
19 there's some overgrown things on the house that we  
20 might take down. Our intention was never to take  
21 down the huge beech tree.

22 The way I originally was able to buy the  
23 house was I knocked on the Hoffmans' door April  
24 15th of last year, and I said -- I knocked on the  
25 door, she says can I help you? And I said, I just

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 wanted to know, I waited all year for this tree to  
2 bloom. I grew up in the neighborhood. I've been  
3 living here for 35 years, and it's magnificent,  
4 and she invited me into the house. I was in there  
5 for an hour and a half. And as I was walking out,  
6 I said to Mr. Hoffman if you ever thought of  
7 selling this house I'd love to buy it, and he  
8 nearly fell back and he said we were going to put  
9 it on the market after -- Mr. Hoffman was living  
10 in the house for 82 years. It's the house that he  
11 grew up in. It was his father's house. They had  
12 given me the full tour and told me everything  
13 about the house, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.  
14 And so our intention is not to take down the tree,  
15 you know, maybe some of the bushes because it is a  
16 bit overgrown. We made improvements in the  
17 backyard, taking out the dead wood and so on and  
18 so forth.

19 MR. HOPKINS: That, by the way, Ms. Handel,  
20 was a question of the Zoning Board as well. It's  
21 a great question.

22 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Allen, any questions?

23 MEMBER DORKIN: No, I'm good. I think you  
24 covered mostly everything.

25 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Yes, Mr. Davies.

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 MR. DAVIES: I just want to raise this point.  
2 The fact that the property was merged, all right,  
3 they're seeking to redivide and they have the  
4 title, whatever, so is this sort of going back  
5 retroactively to the redivision before or is this  
6 something completely new?

7 MR. PANTELIS: No, what happened is that the  
8 prior subdivision lapsed by virtue of the merger  
9 of the two properties again in one deed. So this  
10 Board is looking at a new subdivision application  
11 which it has to evaluate according to whatever the  
12 present standards are.

13 According to Mr. Ryder and the review by the  
14 Building Department the proposed lot is a  
15 complying lot. The other lot which anticipates  
16 some construction has already received the  
17 variances from the Zoning Board which you're aware  
18 of, subject to the subdivision taking place. So  
19 it kind of all wraps up.

20 Now, whatever the prior Board did, and I do  
21 agree that it is kind of odd and buried in  
22 history, that the Zoning Board was involved in  
23 this process, and I think we've already discussed  
24 this that the imposition of a condition  
25 prohibiting a variance would not pass muster, and

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 we understand your reluctance to volunteer such a  
2 condition.

3 MR. HOPKINS: Thank you.

4 MR. PANTELIS: If you did volunteer it --

5 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Then we'd accept it.

6 Then we'd be in unanimous agreement.

7 MR. PANTELIS: Does anybody want to add  
8 anything else? And the Board can deliberate if  
9 they choose.

10 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Does anyone want to make  
11 a motion to accept or reject?

12 MEMBER HANDEL: Yes. I make a motion to  
13 accept the application as it exists.

14 MEMBER DORKIN: I second that motion.

15 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: You second the motion.

16 MR. PANTELIS: Mr. Ryder, are there any  
17 conditions? I will add a proposed condition in a  
18 moment. One of them is that there are -- that the  
19 deeds for the properties which have been approved  
20 for subdivision be conveyed within six months and  
21 submitted. First of all, you have to record them  
22 in the Nassau County Clerk's Office, and that  
23 copies of the deeds be submitted with the  
24 subdivided surveys so that the Building Department  
25 files it correctly.

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Pantelis, I believe the  
2 protocol down here too, Mr. Ryder, correct me if  
3 I'm wrong, that this now has to be approved or  
4 ratified in some fashion by the Board of Trustees.

5 MR. PANTELIS: I'm not aware.

6 MR. RYDER: I'm not aware of that as well.

7 MR. HOPKINS: It's actually on the handout on  
8 subdivisions.

9 CHAIRMAN FLESchNER: Yeah, I believe unless  
10 they've changed it the Board of Trustees at  
11 meetings has to approve the Planning Board  
12 decision. It's a rubber stamp. Unless they  
13 changed it. That's what they used to do. It's a  
14 rubber stamp thing.

15 MR. PANTELIS: It's interesting, that's what  
16 the handout says. I am a little surprised because  
17 of the fact that as far as I understood that this  
18 Board was vested with Planning Board powers. Is  
19 this a code requirement, Mr. Ryder?

20 MR. RYDER: I'd have to look, Mr. Pantelis.

21 MR. PANTELIS: What we're going to do is  
22 we're going to take that under advisement. If the  
23 resolution has to be submitted, we will do that.

24 MR. HOPKINS: Right.

25 MR. PANTELIS: The condition that will

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 accompany that recommendation or that  
2 resolution --

3 MR. HOPKINS: That's absolutely fine.

4 MR. PANTELIS: -- will be that the deeds be  
5 recorded in six months and copies of the deed, and  
6 the new surveys be submitted to the Village.

7 MR. HOPKINS: That's all I was trying --  
8 Mr. Chairman, the six months is fine with my  
9 client. But the trigger date for the measuring of  
10 the six months, if in fact that has to go before  
11 the Board of Trustees, should be the Board  
12 resolution.

13 MR. PANTELIS: We have no problem with that.  
14 With respect also, the Board is ready to vote on  
15 this.

16 CHAIRMAN FLESCNER: Subject to any and all  
17 conditions.

18 MR. PANTELIS: Right. Well, that condition  
19 then will be subject to referral to the Board of  
20 Trustees as necessary by code.

21 I would also ask that the Board prior to  
22 voting on this make a motion with respect to  
23 SEQRA, the State Environmental Quality Review Act,  
24 and I would recommend that the Board adopt a  
25 negative declaration of environmental

Nayman - 10/2/14

1           significance, meaning that there is no  
2           environmental impact.

3           CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Thank you, well spoken.  
4           All right, so let's withdraw the motion for a  
5           moment, okay. And let's make a motion, please, to  
6           in effect state that we feel that there is no  
7           environmental problem in granting this  
8           subdivision. Do we have a motion?

9           MEMBER HANDEL: I will make a motion.

10          CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Thank you. Do we have a  
11          second?

12          MEMBER DORKIN: Second.

13          CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Second. All in favor?

14          MEMBER HANDEL: Aye.

15          MEMBER DORKIN: Aye.

16          CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: So that carried.

17          Now, you can remake your motion, please,  
18          which is to grant --

19          MEMBER HANDEL: I make a motion to grant the  
20          petition as it has been applied for or submitted.

21          CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: With the condition --

22          MEMBER HANDEL: With the condition that the  
23          deeds be brought to the Planning Board within six  
24          months, the advertisements in the paper.

25          MR. RYDER: That the deeds be conveyed within

Nayman - 10/2/14

1 six months to Nassau County.

2 MEMBER HANDEL: Be conveyed within six months  
3 to Nassau County.

4 MR. RYDER: And surveys.

5 MEMBER HANDEL: And surveys submitted.

6 MR. RYDER: As well and submitted to the  
7 Village of Lawrence.

8 MEMBER HANDEL: And submitted to the Village  
9 of Lawrence.

10 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Do I have a second?

11 MEMBER DORKIN: You have a second.

12 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: I have a second, and  
13 I'll have a third. All in favor?

14 MEMBER HANDEL: Aye.

15 MEMBER DORKIN: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN FLESCHNER: Aye. It's granted. The  
17 meeting is adjourned.

18 MR. HOPKINS: Thank you, sir.

19 (Continued on the following page.)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MR. NAYMAN: Thank you very much for your consideration. I really appreciate it. Now I could sleep.

MR. RYDER: Nice meeting you.

MR. HOPKINS: Thank you, Mr. Pantelis.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

\*\*\*\*\*

Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case.

*Mary Benci*

MARY BENCI, RPR  
Court Reporter