

If it was legal when it was built, it should be grandfathered if future zoning limits what has been built for new construction or renovation.

I agree with the Town of Brookhaven's practice of "grandfathering" existing structures that pre-date current zoning rules IF these structures complied with the zoning rules in place when they were built.

Everyone should have the same rights to occupy up to 45% of their property. The 35% rule makes no sense given the price of our homes and the limited season we have to enjoy them. If homeowners want/need more decking, they should be able to get it !

With the caveat that the date stays 1981, and does not continue to advance with time.

I think it is very difficult to correct past errors of enforcement

Keep after some of our contractors who will do anything to make it to comply to zoning after the fact. May I remind you of a certain contractor who rebuilt the burnt down house on Oak and Ocean (1997 I recall) and excavated the neighboring dune to get grandfathered in and nothing happened or the same contractor who illegally dredged sand from the bay in front of 59 Walk and was reported and still nothing happened. FIPPOA cannot be so blind what is happening in our community not reacting. Your credibility and to be nice to every one does not hold.

Our community is located within a National Park. The National Park was created to protect the Island from overdevelopment after residents of the Pines and other communities successfully fought Robert Moses' plan for a highway through the Pines. The "grandfathering" rule was mandated by the federal government to stop overdevelopment on Fire Island. The Federal government relies upon Brookhaven to enforce the federal rules. Brookhaven does not have the legal right to ignore these rules. In addition Brookhaven it's own statutes for Fire Island that mirror and sometimes amplify the federal rules.

If it is an "existing structure that pre-dates current zoning rules" what would you propose? That existing structures built prior to 1981 be illegal?

Structures are often built according to code but for various reasons sign-offs are not obtained. Then the code or INTERPRETATION of the code changes and what was done is no longer legal. Not enough members of the Building Department understand Fire Island Pines as a community, and how the island is used. We are a community that uses LP gas requiring gas tanks, we have garbage that needs to be protected from wildlife, we have wagons to store, etc. A while back they wanted to include access walks as lot coverage, assuming we could walk along grade to our homes. Obviously not familiar with topography, vegetation or wild life.

As long as the project met the codes in effect at the time of construction, the building should be considered grandfathered.

I have seen neighbors tear down a house then it burns down and still they are able to keep the grandfathered footprint even though it is new construction.

At another property a neighbor built to the property line, did all the work himself on weekends and no one ever has enforced his illegal extensions. Somehow the house managed to get sold< I do not know the status of the c of o. It is a dangerous situation in both cases in the event of a fire.

It is also a problem when grandfathered decking is replaced by a one or 2 story structure the fire safety of a house verses a pool and deck that is close to the neighboring house is very different risk.

Why aren't NEIGHBORS NOTIFIED when there is NEW construction, even with permits????

Grandfathering seems a bit lenient. Minor infractions should be allowed.

I think that all homes should be reevaluated...as some shady building practices existed prior to 1981.

The whole process is a sham !!!

What ever happened to 35% lot occupancy.

Money talks - but in this case - Money stinks and is destroying our lovely community.

We are beginning to look like Queens

Without "grandfathering", the majority of homes in the Pines would be illegal to use, subject to injunctions by the Town and the the feds, and subject to condemnation by the NPS.

We ourselvss have a grandfathered structure, and I don't feel like reconstructing it - that's why I only "somewhat disagree." Selfish.

I believe all permits should be filed prior to construction

Cleanup contractors messes along FIB, including Walter Bosses enclosures and that big Silver truck etc. They are eyesores.

There was no building permit and it was not grandfathered

it should only be grandfathered if it is not a variance and there are no objections from neighbors. There should be a brief public notice and barring no objection the town should grandfather reasonable renovations - However the property owner should pay a significant fee or fine (greater than the cost of getting permits in the first place). We need to discourage build now permit later by making it a more expensive option but we don't want to undo or discourage prudent improvements to properties

There needs to be accountability of builders who build out-of-code. It is impossible for owners to understand the details of all the codes and the builders have decades of working with the codes. It is also part of their "professional" duties.

I think the enforcement is mostly arbitrary, depends on what inspector is on, what contractor he/she is working with, what side of the bed they got up on that day, and probably a million other variables that do or don't have anything to do with the question. Certain contractors seem to be able to do whatever they want.

This practice encourages violations of law and discourages compliance with applicable building and zoning laws.

I bought my house in 2006, and was told that all decks passed zoning laws, but was told that at the closing - how do I know if that's correct ?

Grandfathering is fair and appropriate.

Although I have not filed for a permit, I did inquiries through an expediter. I find it strange that, to my knowledge, there is no easy way to do online research about the rules. My understanding from others who have done permitting is that the rates charged by expeditors are very high, seemingly unreasonably so, for routine matters that do not even involve variances. It is also my impression that many contractors routinely do things which they know are wildly (not just a little bit) at variance with

zoning, but do so if the customer requests it.

This town is Dodge City. If you know the "right" people, and wink the right way, and you can get a permit. Almost all permits are granted in the dead of winter when no one is around or able to attend a "hearing".

It would be silly/onerous to retroactively apply building code requirements on structures completed before the codes even existed.

The permitting process is quite frustrating, with no clear way for homeowners to pursue the process themselves. We are forced to rely on Michelle Quatralo or someone else to complete the process for us. As far as violations levied on a particular property, there is no communication from Brookhaven when this happens. For example, my house had a violation which I had no knowledge of until under contract for sale. When I attempted to contact Brookhaven for more information, I got constant runaround, and never a clear answer as to when and why the violation was levied. The violation ultimately cost me the sale of the house.

I have a house built before 1981 that I bought in 2008. I bought it (unfortunately) without a current building permit. I am still working with expeditors (?) to try to get my certificate of occupancy.

If a home pre-dates the 1981 enactment of current zoning laws and it has a valid Certificate of Occupancy for the existing structure(s), then the property should be considered grandfathered as it was in compliance with the zoning code at the time of the issuance of the C of O. However, if a property was built after 1981 (or before 1981 but has no C of O) and it does not have a valid Certificate of Occupancy and is not in compliance with the current zoning laws, the property would need to follow the current building/zoning laws/codes.

Not a chance!

Depends on the reasoning behind the request and the aesthetics. A neighbor of ours had a pesky person who cause an uproar over a few feet in height.

Should be brought up to code before a permit is issued

What is the point of zoning laws, if projects that do not conform to codes end up with permits? All this does is penalize those who play by the rules, and encourage others not to. Architects, builders, and owners who proceed without permits should be penalized.

I assume this means the property owner would be applying for a variance. The variance should be granted based on the specific project and its impact on neighbors.

I think it would depend on the extent that it does not conform. If it's minor and neighbors have expressed no objections then I would grant a permit.

The most egregious and greedy examples of people building new additions and pools that violate their neighbors privacy almost always go unenforced. It seems that the richest people in the Pines are most guilty of this as they always seem to be able to "buy" their way out of the problem. I can think of two really bad examples of this on Bay Walk East. Relatively minor violations that do not upset their neighbor should not be enforced. But it seems that massive new wings or pools that block a neighbor's views or invade his privacy should be.

I feel that as long as your neighbors are OK with an expansion it should be allowed.

Use hearing process.

I agree to fines to the OWNER who completed the work without a permit. They should not apply to subsequent owners of the property, no matter how they came to own the property, through bank financing, private financing, etc.

Depends on what does not conform and the related facts and circumstances.

It should be evaluated on a case by case basis, and decided by a board approval, not a single individual.

Significant penalties, including fines, deconstruction and or complete removal of offending structures would discourage construction that does not conform to zoning or building codes.

Why even bother the question when certia contractors are totally in bed with Brookhaven!

Key here is "current codes". This is always changing. Folklore has it that at one time home owners were allowed to add 100 sq. ft. each year to their structure without a building permit. Along the way there have been other interpretations of the code or revisions of the code that override previous areas of the code. The biggest gripe I have with the current code that if you alter your home and add more than 50% sq. ft., it is considered new construction and falls under a completely different area of the code. An existing house that is 400 sq. ft. can only add less than 200 sq. ft., but a house that is 1500 sq. ft. can add up to 750sq.ft. This devalues smaller structures and makes it more difficult to sell. There should be a sliding scale and not a fixed percentage depending on the existing structure.

Tear down any unapproved construction. That is the ONLY fair solution!

Depends entirely on the individual project

Zoning needs to be strictly enforced to preserve the Pines.

It depends on how drastically construction violates the codes. Some lots can tolerate more overbuilding than others. Destroying someones views should not be tolerated but the recent case of someone in violation because they were overheight by a few inches was ridiculous. Generally, we should be able to build higher. Setbacks from the walk are not as important as setbacks of the side yards. Lot covage codes should be less restrictive.

grant a permit for a project that is illegal?

whose pocket are they in?

that`s like robbing a bank and once you get caught having the authorities re-write the laws to say that bank robbers get tax breaks for gasoline use in the get away car.

If there are zoning rules, they need to be enforced prior to any renovation/construction. Doing something after the fact never works.

For minor infractions it seems acceptable

The owner should be given every opportunity to rectify all violations and the builder should be fined accordingly and lose his license. If the owner has not rectified all violations within a specified time limit, the assumption would be he was part of the scheme to knowingly violate and he should receive major fines periodically and banned from using the house until all violations are eliminated. The tools could be injunction or seizure by the Town, not the Feds.

don't understand under what conditions this might occur. need examples.

Brookhaven holds up the permit process so the homeowner must move ahead with the construction so they have use of the

house.

Depends on the structure that does not comply: a deck vs. a guesthouse built on a property line. Current rules on decks (structures) vs. patios (not) don't make much sense to me. Also, conflicting Brookhaven requirements can make it nearly impossible to use the permissible lot coverage (reconciling setbacks, avoidance of wetland borders, etc.)

case by case within reason

subject to an opportunity for neighbors to object

One must conform to the codes in existence at the time the project was built (post-1981) or currently.

Every project is different

Many houses are built without concern to the zoning with the attitude of we'll bother about it when we sell. We have always obtained permits but I would say 80% of construction is done without same.

the only way to enforce the law is to enforce it. if the law is unrealistic, it should be changed. otherwise it should be enforced and the building done which is not in compliance should be required to conform to the law

I support the process of variances.

Really should be case by case, in my opinion.

these would have to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, as if requests for variances were being submitted post-construction. No one answer would apply to all cases.

Building codes are there for a reason, and if the reason is safety, the codes must not be set aside. Buildings are now being raised too high with total disregard for zoning regs. Ditto fences, pools, walks, and set backs.

too often Brookhaven is willing to grant a variance because the property has already been built, legal or otherwise removal

It depends. If safety is not an issue and aesthetics have not been complained about (after suitable notice) and allowable size has not been violated -- give the permit.

Otherwise, require a reasonable remedy (not going crazy over 6 inches or something) and THEN issue the permit.

don't think Brookhaven should condone construction done without a permit; but if they are going to accept work done to code, there should be stiff penalties; there is no reason in the world to accept work not done to current code

I would agree that the homeowner should be allowed to pull a permit to legalize the property under today's zoning and building codes. It is my belief that if the house does not have a valid C of O, and/or it is not in compliance with the building/zoning codes, a homeowner should not be permitted to apply for a variance. Rather, the homeowner should be permitted to file for a permit under the current building/zoning codes. It is my belief that this methodology will encourage compliance with the codes and discourage "illegal" building and try to legalize later.

Not sure of the intent of the above questions

If current noise & light pollution regulations were policed and enforced, we'd have no problem with group houses, larger structures, or closer neighbors... but blaring music, raucous 3AM parties and blinding spotlights have become too familiar blights in the Pines.

Strictly enforced regulations with real penalties (fines/court appearance) might assure the inconsiderate self-entitled minority doesn't ruin Pines living for the considerate majority who act with common courtesy.

Don't really understand the need for many of the above amendments. Current Brookhaven code says a "structure" is anything constructed in or upon the land (which includes, decks, ponds, houses, sheds, dry laid patios and even rocks. The statute could be paraphrased as "if God didn't put it there, it's a structure." 35% is the limit because 65% is necessary to sustain the Island plant ecology, and the ecology holds the island in place, which protects Long Island from the Atlantic. Current Federal rules and town statutes dictate 35% lot coverage. If that was just understood and respected rather than being illegally "parced" for short term personal wants, zoning issues would be greatly simplified and the Island and our property values would be protected.

Some of your questions are not really adequate for this survey.

Corner houses have deep set backs on two sides (front and side), pushing the house closer to the neighboring houses at the interior side and rear. The setbacks should be shortened along the walkways (front and side) FOR DECKING ONLY, allowing the property to direct use and socializing away from neighboring homes.

does this exist on the ocean side? i'm confused on what the purpose of this is.

I agree with a 30' buffer without the planting requirement

I think it would depend on the size of the lot and what percentage of is is required to be a buffer

There should be a buffer zone but there is no reason for it to be planted if the owner prefers an open vista.

Fences. You failed to ask about height restrictions on the height of fences in the front of the home. We are getting walled in .

There should also be some regulation on how far out into the Bay people should be able to extend their bulwark. Why limit the buffer zone when all one needs to do (withing reason) is to build the bulwark further into the bay! Limiting buffer zones alone is creating a loophole.

I generally disapprove of the zoning regulations requiring that a building be 5 or 10 or 30 feet from the lot line. I think every lot is different, some require that structures be set to one side or front or back, closer to lot lines. Some flexibility is needed. The 35% coverage rules also need more flexibility, in particular where decking is concerned. Wood decks count, but paving stones and anything "temporary" does not. I don't see how wood decks and or walkways are any more permanent than stone work. Now with higher base floor levels, it will be more difficult to use ground level stone for exterior space

The bayfront bulkheads should be removed to allow for the natural sand flow on the bay beach. And only is this would return the bay sand flow.

Please be specific as to what you mean by "Buffer zone". A buffer zone between adjacent properties, or between the land and the bay?

The problem is that I don't think it is right to tighten zoning on people now, creating a wierd situation where older properties increase in value because they were aggressive, and people who didn't do so suffer. I also don't like the mentality that Brookhaven views this permitting process as a money machine. My issues is that current zoning does not seem to be enforced, that's the problem. I don't want change, I just want things to be done in compliance with current requirements, because most of the excessive building appears to be people violating existing rules.

control over fences built out to the bay should be included

It is my belief that a bayfront owner should not be treated any differently than an "inland" owner as far as the treatment of how the property is to be "used". We should all be treated in the same fashion; as long as the bayfront owner is in compliance with all waterfront filings/permits, etc. The "buffer zone" will greatly diminish the property owner's ability to build/renovate bayfront houses as they will need to be in compliance with set-back rules, lot coverage, etc.

It is my belief that FINS knows more about the preservation of the national seashore than I do. That being said, it is my belief that if a homeowner wants to install a pool on the oceanside of their property and the new pool is being installed where a deck currently exists, the pool installation should be considered. However, if a homeowner wants to install a pool in the dune and there is no existing deck, a pool should be installed in the boardwalk side of the house.

If people want to take this risk, I don't see the problem for the community.

Owners should be able to take the risk if they wish to have a pool on the Ocean side.

Given that every pool on the ocean is on the south (ocean) side of the property, good luck getting people to move their pools.

This seems elementary - why allow further compromise of the dune integrity for swimming pools? I still remember the Pines prior to the '93(?) storm, and it did seem like the areas with the most pools on the ocean sides of oceanfront houses were the ones that got the most damage.

An alternative might be to require a construction on pilings so that they are less likely to be damaged in a storm.

I would first have to know the basis for the FINS position before I can formulate an opinion. The preamble to the question fails to educate on that point.

Does it really matter if a pool is in the front or back of a home. Let the ocean front home owners have the pool on the ocean side.

If some idiot builds a pool on the beach side then loses it in a storm, what do I care? Except for the temporary sight blight, it doesn't affect me.

the risk of losing the pool in a storm is an economic risk for the owner to undertake.

there should not be any pools or decking on or directly abutting the dunes!

Oceanside pools have no negative impact on beachgoers. If code is based on erosion issues created by pools then I would consider a restriction. Otherwise it's none of our damn business what an oceanfronter does. I am not an oceanfront house owner. Let's not become code Nazis controlling every aspect of our existence.

If such an amendment, it should be placed only on structures purchased after a specific year... but this would adversely affect the value of properties for owners who currently own these properties. One has to be careful not to devalue homes with some of these amendments.

It is the owner's risk to build on the ocean side and long as it keeps within their 35% lot coverage.

It really depends how the house sits on the lot and where the vacant space on the lot is. I think people would be better off having the pool in jeopardy than their house.

This puts pools on the NORTH side of the house....not very useful or private.

Your questions are too general they have to be related to the actual location of the house in question however rules cannot be written on independent properties there should be a requirement of setback, distance to next property or bay/ocean as a general

guide line. Not one rule fits all but can be amended pending or general outlier of the Pines even if it has to be board walk specific.

I think it is important to understand the purpose of the current rules. Private property exists on Fire Island because the Secretary of the Interior has suspended condemnation of private property within the National Park as long as we operate under the rules. These rules are being ignored in great part because we have become divorced from their purpose and therefore view them as an adversary rather than an ally. We come here because of the beauty preserved by these rules.

The noise it would bring to the community would not be appreciated

If there is noticeable leakage or odor.

My understanding is that FIP has cess pools, not septic systems, and that cess pools by their nature pollute ground water which at FIP is not a source of potable water.

Many old septic tanks set above ground and are uncovered. This is a definite health hazard.

I have neighbors whose septic tank overflows every summer; they do minor repairs when it does but never solve the problem, so I know that every year untreated sewage is seeping into the ground. Does the current system mandate any kind of environmental report from the plumbers who make the fixes? If not, I think there should be some mandated tracking of this pollution.

Who inspects this? Do you need to file a permit to put a new septic tank in?

There is also ground water pollution from detergents and things other than human waste flushed into the septic systems. This isn't like in the city. Here, we live next to what we flush. Also, too much fertilizer and pesticides are being used to sustain non-native plants. These are also getting into the ground water.

Never heard or seen such a control!!

We should develop some plan for helping owners to monitor their septic systems, so that they function properly. We also have the problem of homes that have 4, 5 and 6 bedrooms and B&Bs (that are illegal and we all know about them, but let them exist) and what they do to the environment with so many people using the septic system on a site.

Doesn't SCWA test water quality regularly and ensure that our water supply is safe? Is there reason to believe they aren't performing this responsibility?

The Health dep't. recently allowed a septic system in the harbor area to be installed that virtually covers the entire lot except for the center which contains a small house. I hate to think about how bad the whole harbor area will smell in a few years.

Long Island and Fire Island sit on a huge aquifer containing literally thousands of years of water supply. The pines has about 600 units. The rest of Long Island is connected to central sewage systems. It would be nearly impossible to contaminate the aquifer with a few bad septic systems on Fire Island, nor would the cost of central sewage treatment on Fire Island be warranted.

What are the alternatives?

Some systems seem to be poorly maintained

if the health department looked at all the septic systems; I am afraid the department would condemn a good portion of the

island due to the water table.

give examples. Sand is pretty good filter. commercial areas stink sometimes and they should have engineered septic systems.

I've never heard of any test by the department for "effectiveness."

there are sometimes terrible smells

I'm unaware of any problem, but if there is a problem or potential problem, we should look at addressing it.

If our drinking water is coming from a spring right on the Fire Island itself, we should all be very concerned about maintaining the health of the groundwater.

The expansion of dwellings accompanies larger septic systems. This in turn savagely deteriorates the island's very fragile ecology.

Tragically, there seems to be no turning back.

Houses are used only ~5 months of the year; so not sure if this is really an issue?

If we don't filter the water we drink on Fire Island, we get stomach aches and don't feel well. Persistent pattern. Coincidence? Maybe but we don't think so.

I am not aware of any issues with the septic systems in The Pines. If there is a problem, then a system for testing of the septic systems should be explored.

this is an issue that is pervasive but not many people are aware of it; thank heavens our water supply is artesian

share houses can provide entry level accommodations for a younger population

It is my belief that we all have diverse life experiences that we all choose to live the way we wish to live. If a homeowner wants to have a share house they should be permitted to do so; without penalty while adhering to the zoning codes. The "illegal apartments" in the community I don't support due to fire safety issues and possible over-crowding. My concern with share houses is that sometimes (certainly not in most instances), the "shares" may not exhibit the same "pride in our community" and may not treat it the same way that "full time residents" (renters and owners) do.

Share houses sustain the community. While it's nice to have residents "in residence", it is unlikely that the Pines and its businesses would thrive without renters.

Come on, the idea of prohibiting group houses in the Pines seems to me just ridiculous. It's the way things are done here. As long as noise violations are dealt with, it should be allowed.

Group shares are quintessential to the experience of a summer in the pines.

This is what allows the majority of the diversity found in the community. If shares were not available, property values would decrease, and the community would have to try to become more like the Hamptons, which I would not consider to be a good thing.

Almost all rental houses are shared. I have been told there are persons renting 1/16th of a share. Without shares, houses could not be rented which would be deleterious to the community.

financially beneficial for businesses and property values. Not for conservation or the environment.

It depends on the house - some share houses are rowdy and noisy and are very disturbing to their neighbors.

Noise is my major concern, especially late into the night. Large group houses that are rented have absolutely no respect for

neighbors. Enforcement is totally ineffective.

I expect all property owners to be responsible for what happens on their property. If there are multiple dwellings than so be it, but all residents have to abide by noise, garbage regulations. There is always concern about fire, maybe as long as everyone takes responsibility, the more eyes the better.

Share houses are the foundation of this community. They provide an ever changing pool of potential residents. I feel share houses have the same responsibility to the community as home owners, and the landlords have the responsibility for policing that. But on the whole share houses are very beneficial.

Unless we want the Pines to become a community of old men, we need share houses - the cute youngsters can't afford to come out here on their own. They need lots of housemates.

They are our live decorations, certainly more attractive than the mangy deer. We should encourage them to spend summers in the Pines, and if it means some inconvenience (noise, too little body hair, etc.) that's the price we pay.

it's part of the makeup of the island and it is the thing that introduces people to the island and creates both commerce today and a pool of interested buyers in the future. Odds are that 90% of existing homeowners started out in shares.

Share houses are the backbone of the rental community in the Pines. They are a necessity for the economy of the Pines.

Does anyone actually believe they are a detriment? It's hard to believe people would want the Pines to become all owner-occupied compounds. How banal!

It's a history of the Pines that, for better or worse, seems to be here to stay

This is an issue that deals with zoning. If an area is not zoned for a multiple dwelling, but we allow it, should we then allow someone to open a commercial property and sell groceries on Fisherman's Path. If FIPPOA takes a stand on an issue that has to be applied equally to everyone and objectively.

Just because it is a multiple dwelling or share house doesn't make it any of the above. I know owner occupied houses with no shares that have more parties, more garbage, more noise and are more disruptive to the neighbors than share or multiple dwelling houses.

Share houses bring much needed revenue to all Pines commercial activities.

These questions are not proposed the right way. There is difference between having a multiple dwelling (two units or more) or for rental purposes cramming in as many as possible. The questions do not take that in the survey. Maybe I want to have to have kitchens, one kosher or have space for vacationing friends without having them in My Kitchen, every day.

Share houses create future home owners. But like everything else, it is in our best interest to effectively regulate within our community.

For many people, getting into a share house is the only way of getting to enjoy FIP. For many years I took a share in a house with good friends. After taking a break from FIP, I was able to come back as a home owner. FIP is very expensive for most younger people, and it's the younger people that become future property owners. The youth would never understand FIP, if they weren't able to rent a share in a house of friends, and the community would become more closed. Every community needs an influx of new life to keep it exciting and fresh. Of course, the pace in which that influx happens should be a healthy one.

While I do not like being around group/share houses, I think they benefit the local economy and property values overall. We need some but we need to be careful that they do not overrun the Pines.

Loud but necessary

We all know that the benefits or detriments of group houses depend on the behavior of the particular housemates. Some groups are good for Pines life, some are monstrous. The monsters have to be taught that considerate behavior is required not only by the rules of polite society, but -to a degree- by Brookhaven law. We are tired of having to play the complaining neighbor over & over, when a house is blasting music that can be heard blocks away. Is it too much to ask the police to actually police once in a while? We need the Pines equivalent of a beat cop - give him a cart.

I think the issues of noise, garbage, etc. should be dealt with more seriously (why are there still houses that just set garbage cans out with no fencing around so the deer can knock them over almost weekly, for example. Why aren't there stricter rules about outdoor speakers, which provide most of the noise pollution?) but I don't think that blaming the problems on group houses or houses with small apartments is the answer. There are good and bad group houses, good and bad neighbors in two family houses, and good and bad neighbors in single family houses. Consistent enforcement of the codes for all should be the solution.

Studio dwellers are typically much quieter and respectful than conventional shareholders. People take studios because they do not want to be in the fray!!!

Anyone who thinks these are issues has not been in proximity to Pines Bluff. You can go by there day and night and you can't even tell if someone is staying there! These questions sound curiously like someone who has a B & B on the harbor wanting to edge out Pines Bluff. There are share houses and owner's homes that are far more guilty of infractions if you chose to call them that. Someone playing Streisand Opera or Hip Hop can be a bit rattling as can queens screaming GIIIRLL at the top of their voices but.... that also adds to the fun of The Pines. And.... B & B's give people the opportunity to visit off season, they see how lovely it is and they become potential home buyers.

The present B&B's should not be allowed to continue.

B&Bs are not legal in FIP. Why are they allowed to exist? FIPPOA should urge Brookhaven to enforce the current code.

To me the biggest issue here is the impact of a business on neighbors in what have been believed to be residential areas, so while I am not opposed to legalizing B and B's, I think there should be stricter zoning for them requiring bigger lots, more buffer zones, etc. In my part of town lots are small and houses are close together, so a business would have a direct impact on all neighbors. But in places with more land and distance between dwellings, this might not be such a problem.

I don't see much of a difference between a share house and B&B. The B&B's I'm aware of are very well run and better organized than many share houses. The Pines does not have adequate hotel options so B&B have filled that market space.

Proprietors of B&Bs have an interest in running orderly houses that appeal to customers. We don't want to live near disorderly houses, so B&Bs tend to be good neighbors.

B&B's can be nice but depends on if they have on-site management who cares about the community. A few nicely run B&B's would be acceptable.

B&B's must be legalized, monitored and shut down where not permitted. If there was a B & B next to my house, legal or illegal, I never would have purchased it. To let them exist randomly throughout the town could be damaging to the peace and enjoyment of any neighborhood. Making them legal, and regulating them closely could benefit the community, and the guest

who visit. It not fair to a homeowner, who purchased his property away from the commercial district, to one day learned that his neighbor has turned the house into a B&B! It bothers me that this town of expensive real estate turns a blind eye to illegal B&B's.

Before you post this Bed and Breakfast question you should identify what that entails.

B&B's should be permitted only in a commercial zone near the harbor. They should be closely monitored for safety.

The only problem I have with B&Bs is the fire safety for the guests and that their construction conform to the same code requirements as a single family home next door.

The B@B on Crown at Ocean Walk creates extra traffic and takes away from the residential atmosphere of the neighborhood. They seem to have been granted variances last fall that has turned it into a hugh structure (to accomodate more and more guests), and which obviously greatly exceeds the 35% rule. This should never have been permitted in the first place!

The geography of our community is quite different from the mainland and our property sizes are relatively small. This should taken into consideration. B&B's are valuable to the community but should be kept in an area that will be zoned as such. I am not sure the coops would be have to be surrounded with 9 "Madison B&Bs".

I live next to one and didn't know it until owner told me. Noise has NEVER been an issue. The fact that survey asks about increase in pedestrian traffic scares me. Is the presence of people now considered a cause for alarm and something to complain about? There was a slight increase in foot traffic, but its always a joy to see and hear fellow gays out on the island having a good time celebrating life after working hard all week and year. Let's not turn the town into a morgue for the sake of a few killjoys who want the whole town to be their private domain.

I think B&B's are fine and probably good for the Pines in that it allows people to sample the Pines. I believe when people spend a weekend in the Pines, they will want to come back as a seasonal renter or owner.

I am concerned about noise and zoning. i believe B&B's will try to get approval for over building on their property and that's not acceptable to me.

B&Bs that are well managed are less of a problem than many of the large share houses where there is no supervision.

I have no objection to B&B's if they were licensed, inspected for safety and fire concerns, and run with a certain degree of class as befits the Pines.

I think with appropriate oversight and a limit on the number of B&B's they are a good addition to the community. They will operate covertly even if we don't permit them. Better that they are permitted, liscenced, taxed and expected to follow some rules for the benefit of their guests and other residents of the pines.

Having an owner occupied b&b is a good thing.

I believe that one already exists on the property that sits ocean front directly in front of my property and I think it is a nuisance. I also believe that it would adversely affect my property value and am very concerned about this.

if B&B's are competing for the business in the Pines there will be a standard set by the customers and if Brookhaven oversees the safety issues there should be no problems.

I live beside a b&b now and they r hyper-responsible neighbors...good people and there has never been an issue with any quest

It would depend on the degree to which the management could influence noise, traffic, etc. from guests. The size of the B&B (number of guests) would also make a big differenc.

Already live near one and They are Great neighbors. They are the type of owners that I would like to see more of in the pines. No noise and they run a tight operation.

Its been my experience that B&Bs operate with much regard to their neighbors and the community. Legalizing them would enable the institutionalization of that behavior.

See above comments about noise, garbage etc.

Why are the ones that exist now permitted? Why have rules if they are blatantly ignored? The fact that they are known to exist (and they freely advertise) and nothing is done about them PROVES that this community conversation about rules is WORTHLESS. Why bother arguing the nuances of new/old rules if the rules are ignored and there is no consequence. I think the community should come up with a method of enforcement before bothering to continue to make rules that are not enforced.

B&Bs are better than a share house, but I'd rather have an owner as a neighbor than a share house or B&B. B&B customers and renters do not respect the island as much as owners.

Depends on the establishment. I might be quite pleased if the share house next door to me were to become a hight quality B&B.

I've visited, and spoken with owners of, properties next door to B&Bs, and it does not seem like a plus, in most senses that I can understand.

As long as noise rules are observed, I have no problem with a B&B.

It depends on how it is managed. Rules on noise & safety need to be enforced.

The only issue is noise, and surely that can be dealt with. The idea of "inspections" sounds like a recipe for graft and nonsense.

To my knowledge, the existing B&Bs are good neighbors and provide a service which the Pines needs.

And it does.

Cheapens the area

I believe that all homeowners/business owners have to follow the current zoning/building codes; nobody/no business is exempt and nobody/business should get "preferential treatment" It is also my belief that the commercial properties (including bed and breakfasts) should be contained to the commercial district, not residential areas. One of the many reasons we come to The Pines is that we are a beautiful residential community, not a transient "hotel" area. We may not often know all residents, but we certianly "recognize a friendly face" when we are out and about. I would not like to see B&B's legalized in The Pines unless they are located in the "downtown/commerical district"

I would grandfather the ones that are there. But not allow lots of them -- maybe half a dozen.

changing the commercial district boundary should also include a plan for dealing with parking of vehicles by commercial owners

One of the reasons we come to The Pines is for the natural beauty and lack of commercial/business "interference". We go to the beach to "get away" from the commercialism, to escape and have a totally unique experience from our lives "in the city/mainland" We all make a choice to come to The Pines and accept the limitations it has as far as "conveniences" go; but that is what the attraction is....quiet/beautiful - so if the price we pay for that unique experience is a bit of inconvenience - it is well worth it.

Do not support commercial expansion

B&Bs are illegal and they should be closed and the owners should be fined. The commercial area is sufficient for our community.

A vibrant commercial district is essential to the vitality of the community.

I WOULD EMPHATICALLY FIGHT AGAINST ANY EXPANSION OF THE COMMERCIAL ZONING OF REAL ESTATE. THIS MOVE WOULD PLAY INTO THE HANDS OF THE NEW ENTREPRENEURS, AND IRREVOCABLY CHANGE THE CHARACTER OF OUR COMMUNITY.

There has been empty retail space the past few years. Why the need to increase commercial? Fix and rent existing spaces.

I would only approve of a new hardware store anywhere near the harbor or the commercial district. A hardware store contributes to the well being of the houses and decks in the Pines. WE NEED A HARDWARE STORE !!!

Really how much more do we need? Do we want to be as commercial as Ocean Beach?

The commercial district is de facto expanded. Either legalize it or shut down the violators and the violations.

We need more competition, so it should be an important concern as to how much property is owned/controlled by one or related entities. We need a hardware store. It is far easier to plan in advance to bring needed liquor to the island than it is to predict what might be needed when on the island for unexpected repairs. And absence of a hardware store feeds the rip-off frenzies of contractors.

The commercial space should be expanded for all legal uses, i would mostly like to see it all around the harbor. Consider commercial garages along the south side of "FI Blvd between the harbor and the Co-op buildings to provide secured parking for the commercial vehicles. Do not allow them to park elsewhere.

Commercial district is already too large

After the hardware store was tossed out, i am in favor of an increase in commercial space. I would like to see the homeowners association purchase the space/ spaces and run for the Common good of the community.

As long as the increased commercial/office space conforms to the basic look of the Pines, fine with me.

As long as this involves parking and storage for all the vehicles, building supplies and junk scattered around walter and karen's house

When Home Guardian Co. had the zoning changed from commercial to sell the hotel property for co-ops, the Pines lost half of it's business property. The federal guidelines now prohibit any property on F.I. from being rezoned to commercial. If it becomes possible to rezone and make more commercial property available, I think it should be confined to the west side of Picketty Ruff and the south side of F.I. Blvd from Widgeon Walk to Atlantic Walk.

Not sure how much more commercial space would be supported by the community. Hard for some of the current shops to stay in business. Could another restaurant make it?

Need mostly to find a (legal) place for contractors to store their tools/material.

The expansion of the commercial district would be bad for the community.

How about building up instead of out? If proper landscaping coincided with commercializing the east side of harbor then it could be good, otherwise a potential disaster. The east side of harbor would be great for B&Bs.

I find this a strange series of questions. Many of our retail operations do not thrive in the summer months. They do well but not exceptionally well except for restaurants and bars. I feel this is geared towards providing office space for realtors, general contractors, electricians, etc. That being said.... that would be an interesting approach to downtown and keep "main street" more retail.

OK use East side of Pickety Ruff to get rid of unsightly mess in back of stores.

I don't see the need for offices it is easy enough to have a home office. I think there is plenty of commercial space it is just owned by a few people and maybe not being used to the best and highest use at the moment. Or walk through Ocean beach and then go to Point of Woods and see what you would like our community to look like over time.

If there is a need for additional office space it could easily be met by adding a second level to the one story row of buildings on the west of the harbor and/or redesign existing structures. The area behind the wagon rack, the post office area could be used more effectively.

Enough garbage around the commercial area and beyond we already encounter. Better put a stop to the MONOPOLY!

Bigger is not necessarily better. Use the existing commercial property more effectively.

Perhaps allowing for an additional story to the existing structures along the west side of the Harbor is enough. Perhaps those spaces could be sold off as commercial condos? The town is only so big, and the stores are never overwhelmed when we're there. Please, don't let the Pines turn into the Grove!

There has to be a very strong Master Plan/Site Layout Plan

East side of Harbor is vacant land and would have liyyle impact on residences.

A new hardware store, more restaurants, yes - but no more dance palaces, please, and limited lights & signage for all businesses (no billboards on buildings).

I am for commercial expansion but I do not live too close to these new proposed areas. If I did I would vote against it because I would not want a restaurant/bar or food store too close to my house.

The east side of the harbor makes no sense. The most logical would be the area between the Post Office and Fire House on the south side of the Boulevard. It's pretty much commercial already.

It doesn't seem like there is much room for expansion. I think office space would have the least impact on quality of life for neighbors; adding more office space would likely free up space in the current district for retail or restaurants.

How has the need for more commercial space been determined? I do not believe there is truly a demand for more commercial space. The home owners adjacent to any commercial expansion should have deciding input.

I don't think that we need a lot more retail as not many businesses are sustainable over the years. The lack of space makes the rotation easier. I do think that we need a hardware store and if expansion is what is needed to make that possible....

Horace Gifford and a few others produced wonderful homes that one would hope would be preserved. These homes are well designed and the layout is integral to the entire scheme of things but formica counters and the like should not be preserved and only "modernist" homes with architectural merit...

There a couple of people with nighttime lighting schemes and whose accesorizing and/or paint schemes are or have proven to be eyesores and they should be gotten after.

But The Pines is all about diversity or should be.

Protect the modernist houses on a case by case basis by an architectural review board.

Protect all the remaining cottages that gave the Pines its original character and charm.

Since there is no space for comments about the questions below, let me add here that I don't believe that the current review board does an adequate job of dealing with height, set backs and lot coverage issues. I assume that this is a combination of lack of power and small town politics. I would rather see the current system strengthened so that it worked, before I would want there to be another board or an expanded portfolio for this board getting into design and color. It is violations of height and coverage restrictions that are destroying the look and feel of the Pines and hurting neighbors quality of life and investments. I don't think color and material are our big problems. Finally, I think that zoning rules would do a better job of maintaining property values if they were enforced!

Some of these older houses are fabulous...some lesser so. I vote against this proposal for that reason alone.

I would like to see more review of the commercial architecture.

Shame that architectural preservation wasn't in place to save the old historical community house from destruction.

On the other hand, we don't need a committee of design arbiters ruling on house colors, landscaping or patio furniture. This community was not built on the premise of conformity.

All house exteriors should be limited to cedar (siding or shingle, painted or bare), but under no circumstance should vinyl siding or any other unnatural material be permitted.

Since there is not an additional thoughts area at the end of this survey, I'll use this box. We live within a National Park. We probably don't need more rules, at least until the existing federal rules and town statutes are observed. The federal government currently relies upon Brookhaven to enforce its rules and Brookhaven has adopted special statutes for Fire Island. A relatively few members of our community, by hiring consultants, attorneys and/or expeditors, have been getting pretty much whatever they want and this is having negative impact on the rest of us. When something is allowed once (for instance the "guns & hoses" fence on the Boulevard, others use it as an excuse to get what they want, and "want" has replaced "need" in zoning issues. We could, with peer review, probably resolve many of these issues within this community. Ron thought that could be a roll of the Zoning Advisory Committee but Tad seems to disagree. I believe that unless we work out these issues among ourselves within the existing guidelines, outside forces including Brookhaven, the state and the federal government will increasingly step in.

By the way, what do you mean by landscaping? Do you mean a pond? If God didn't put it there, it's a structure and there are existing rules about structures; 35% max coverage.

All depends the actual historical value. The question is correct as now you can tear down any structure, wall by wall and rebuild a whole new one as long as you do not do it in ine sequence. It's called "Renovation" and I have seen plenty over my past 25 years.

The limitations placed on a house's construction should only be controlled by zoning and its rules. I would not trust a committee to decide whether a house is beautiful or not - or whether it is appropriate for the pines.

More specifically, in terms of landscaping, certain vegetation that is invasive or dangerous to the local ecology should be banned. For example, planting Virginia Creeper or Bamboo.

Just look at the difference between Ft Lauderdale and Palm Springs in terms of having an architectural style and consistancy.

The harbor plan that Hal Hayes proposed should be implemented at some point instead of the 2 carports and secret Post office we now have.

Re Landscaping review by Brookhaven: Let the landscape committee already in place. Its a good job as they already have. Brookhave would be too liable to dictate their own views.

The houses of Horace Gifford are extremely interesting in terms of his approach to architectural geometry inside and out. But interiors are outdated in some cases. We have to make sure that these structures are preserved as much as possible but provide some incentive to owners to allow them to benefit from their investment. I am not sure what that might be.

No area to comment on questions below, so here goes.... stay out of my garden and away from how my home looks. Provide INFORMATION on plants that thrive and are natural to the Pines and multiple resources. In terms of architecture provide guidelines as to the issues with FIP climate, construction based on ground conditions, etc. so that anything built is an informed architectural solution.

This is the most important issue in this survey. We are seeing the demise of some of the most beautiful 70's houses and some 1950's cottages. PLEASE make this a priority!

AND only if the owner agrees

Styles gradually changed over the past 58 years since the Pines first started to be developed. I think the attractiveness of the community is it's variety of styles, all in very good condition.

There needs to be a middle ground here

proper garbage bins or lock ups should be mandatory and homes without them subject to fines - the deer inspired garbage spills are completely avoidable if people kept their garbage in secure bins.

The simple little beach bungalow went the way of the dodo bird long ago. It's too late to start saving them now.

That only benefits people who have already torn down these early structures.

I don't think any intelligent position can be gotten from FIPOA on Architecture at all -- not after that monstrosity Whyte Hall was allowed to be built.

As for the last question of this survey, absent and arbitrary enforcement, which we have now, zoning rules have no meaning. How, then, can one say they have a positive or negative impact?

And why doesn't this survey address the zoning restrictions on contractor equipment outside residential homes and along Fire Island Boulevard? Some homeowners feel the community is run by and for contractors' business, not residential owners.
It's already too late for the good Horace Giffords, the Earl Combs, and several others.

I am strongly against any plantings of Bamboo in the Pines.

More "controls" and reviews is a bad idea so far as design is concerned, in my opinion. We don't need more bosses around telling people what to do, that's excessive. Zoning controls as they exist now, yes, but design controls, no.

question 3.3. Why would there be a penalty if construction conforms? Was construction done without a permit?

Question 3.5. Unless there's a waiver after a public hearing.

Question 5.1. Approve - Wire Mesh; Disapprove - Solid

Question 5.2. 3ft. - Approve; 2ft. - Too Close; 5ft - Disapprove

Question 10.5. Could provide competition for prices at Hotel Ciel.

Do not have an opinion.

Carts in front of co-ops distract property value in pines as commented on by many Pines visitors.

I would like to see the small cottages and bungalows preserved

Most of the predominant architectural style has been destroyed!

Although I am an architectural enthusiast, and personally I respect and admire such architects as Horace Gifford, the "designation" process would appear to me to be a very difficult to implement.

Couple of Suggestions:

* Stricter rules for altering harbor area: New Commercial buildings are terrible and hurting its charm.

* Anyway of widening FI Blvd by a foot or two? Too crowded on weekends, with pedestrians, wagons, electric carts, etc.

* Are you printing all your mailings on recycled paper?

Thanks!

It's a free country. Most people will choose to keep the good aesthetics all by themselves.