

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

C E N T R A L   P I N E   B A R R E N S  
C O M M I S S I O N   M E E T I N G

-----x

EAST END FLOWER FARM  
COMPATIBLE GROWTH AREA  
HARDSHIP WAIVER APPLICATION

-----x

September 17, 2025  
3:23 p.m.  
  
340 Smith Road  
Shirley, New York

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## A P P E A R A N C E S:

JUDITH E. JAKOBSEN, Executive Director

MATTHEW CHARTERS, Riverhead Town Representative

MICHELLE DiBRITA, Brookhaven Town Representative

JENNIFER JUENGST, Suffolk County Representative

JANICE SCHERER, Southampton Town Representative

JULIE HARGRAVE, Joint Planning and Policy Manager

TARA MURPHY, Environmental Planner

JOHN C. MILAZZO, Commission Counsel

ANGELA BROWN-WALTON, Administrative Assistant

1  
2 HEARING OFFICER: Moving on to the  
3 next hearing. We have the Notice of Public  
4 Hearing. Pursuant to New York State  
5 Environmental Conservation Law Article 57  
6 Section 57-0121(9) and the Central Pine  
7 Barrens Comprehensive Land Use Plan, notice  
8 is hereby given that the Central Pine Barrens  
9 Joint Planning Commission will hold a public  
10 hearing on Wednesday, September 17, 2025 on  
11 the matter of an application for a Compatible  
12 Growth Area (CGA) Hardship Exemption.

13 The name of the project is East End  
14 Flower Farm Compatible Growth Area Hardship  
15 Waiver Application. The owner/applicant is  
16 Marcos Ribeiro. The project site location is  
17 the west side of Weeks Avenue, 3,880 feet  
18 south of South Street, opposite Douglas Lane,  
19 Manorville, Town of Brookhaven. The project  
20 site Suffolk County Tax Map Number is  
21 200-589-1-2.

22 The project description is request  
23 for a Compatible Growth Area Hardship Waiver  
24 for the development of a five acre project  
25 site with 96,000 square feet of greenhouse

1  
2 structures and other infrastructure, grading  
3 and excavation of steep slopes. The five  
4 acre site contains pine barrens vegetation  
5 and habitat. It is in the A Residence 2  
6 zoning district.

7           Waivers of the Comprehensive Land Use  
8 Plan standards include the vegetation  
9 clearance limit and open space. The proposal  
10 clears five acres of natural vegetation where  
11 the Plan limits the amount to 35 percent or  
12 1.75 acres. No open space is provided where  
13 the Plan requires 65 percent open space or  
14 3.25 acres.

15           The proposal is classified as a  
16 Type I action pursuant to the State  
17 Environmental Quality Review Act and a  
18 coordinated review was performed. No other  
19 agency objects to the Commission assuming  
20 lead agency.

21           The notice goes on to say that the  
22 hearing will be held on September 17th at  
23 3:00 at the Wildlife Refuge. A copy of the  
24 application is available for review at the  
25 Commission Office, 624 Old Riverhead Road in

Westhampton Beach.

We have to put the appearances on the record, starting with Mr. Charters.

MR. CHARTERS: Matthew Charters, designated representative Town of Riverhead.

MS. DiBRITA: Michelle DiBrita, designated representative Town of Brookhaven.

MS. JUENGST: Jennifer Juengst, Deputy County Executive representing the County.

MS. SCHERER: Janice Scherer, designated representative, Town of Southampton.

MS. MILAZZO: Julie Hargrave.

MS. JAKOBSEN: We'll start with Ms. Hargrave.

MS. HARGRAVE: Thank you. The commission has received the draft staff report and the applicant as well. I'll just briefly go through the staff report and the exhibits.

Again, this is East End Flower Farm the Compatible Growth Area Hardship Waiver application. The applicant and owner of the

1 site is Marcos Ribeiro. The project is  
2 clearing and development for agricultural use  
3 on five acre site on the west side of Weeks  
4 Avenue in the A Residence 2 zoning district.  
5 That's the two acre residence zoning  
6 district. This is a Type I action pursuant  
7 to SEQRA Regulations.  
8

9 This five acre site is entirely  
10 wooded with natural pine barrens vegetation  
11 and peaked slopes. Most of the habitat is  
12 composed of pitch pine oak forest. Most of  
13 the trees on the site are multi-stemmed oaks  
14 and a heavy understory of blueberry,  
15 predominately.

16 Again, this is in the two acre  
17 residence zoning district. The pine barrens  
18 land use plan defines clearing based on the  
19 zoning district. On this site the clearing  
20 limit is 35, which would be 1.75 acres, and  
21 the open space requirement is 65 percent or  
22 3.25 acres. The proposal seeks to clear the  
23 entire site, which does not conform to the  
24 clearing limits and open space standard.

25 The proposal is to develop and to

1  
2 clear the whole site for agricultural use and  
3 clearing all of the natural vegetation  
4 habitat and steep slopes on the site. There  
5 is also a significant amount of excavating  
6 and grading for the project to construct  
7 three large structures or three primary  
8 structures, including a 30,000 square foot  
9 greenhouse, a 10,000 square foot barn, and a  
10 56,000 square foot hoop house; all of these  
11 are in the exhibits and the site man.

12 The structures are shown in the site  
13 plan, which is in Exhibit C. The project  
14 includes other construction, including  
15 utility extension, parking lot, concrete pad  
16 for a dumpster, six foot retaining wall on  
17 the Weeks Avenue frontage, and two curb cuts,  
18 one on the north and one on the south side of  
19 the site on the Weeks Avenue Road front.

20 Again, this is a Type I action  
21 because the site is adjacent to a 15 acre  
22 block of natural Town owned open space on the  
23 south side. On July 18th the Commission  
24 coordinated for lead agency. Brookhaven Town  
25 and the Health Department responded that they

1  
2 did not object to the Commission assuming  
3 lead agency. Actually, we need to do the  
4 lead agency declaration later.

5 The application discusses a few  
6 precedent setting matters, including a  
7 project the Commission -- two projects the  
8 Commission approved in the past: Metz Farm  
9 and Finks Farm. The application and  
10 applicant does acknowledge the differences,  
11 some of the differences in those  
12 applications.

13 Finks demonstrated that the site was  
14 cleared and farmed as recently as the 1980s.  
15 And we have added into the record an aerial  
16 of Finks Farm in 1994, which shows that is  
17 cleared. So, that was, again, allowed to be  
18 cleared in 2017 to 90 percent, because they  
19 demonstrated that it had historically and  
20 relatively recently had been farmed and  
21 cleared.

22 In Metz, the decision explained that  
23 the applicant was only allowed to clear an  
24 area previously farmed and cleared and  
25 undergone successional re-vegetation. The



1 forested area has remained intact.

2  
3 So, I'll go through some of these  
4 additional items. There are some pretty  
5 steep slopes on the site that, again, will be  
6 cut and excavated to develop the project site  
7 and construct the proposed structures. The  
8 surrounding land use is predominately, again,  
9 Town open space adjacent on the south side  
10 and the west side. There's mostly  
11 residential uses in the study area, and there  
12 are a couple of nonresidential uses,  
13 including a children's daycare and industrial  
14 metal workshop and Christmas tree farm.

15 So, again, the applicant is required  
16 to demonstrate conformance. As the material  
17 explains, at least two standards the project  
18 does not conform with: The clearing standard  
19 where the applicant seeks to clear 65  
20 percent, more than -- to 100 percent, but 65  
21 percent more than they're allowed, and does  
22 not set aside the 65 percent open space.

23 We're not sure if the applicant  
24 conforms or not with the fertilizer dependent  
25 vegetation limit; that needs to be clarified.

1  
2 There is proposed planting of a line of  
3 non-native arborvitae on the north side of  
4 the site that's not really consistent with  
5 the standard for native plants for the site  
6 plan either. And that provides a very  
7 limited buffer to the adjacent residential  
8 uses on the north side.

9 Again, we went through the precedent.  
10 I'll just get to the end to the items  
11 requested for the applicant to review on the  
12 record today and the hardship criteria and  
13 how they can address the hardship criteria,  
14 including the self-created hardship and that  
15 they cannot realize a reasonable return when  
16 the property was recently purchased within  
17 the calendar year. There are a number of  
18 other items on the -- again, to demonstrate  
19 the site, how it is unique from other sites  
20 in the CGA and the study area. If they have  
21 considered alternatives, such as other sites  
22 or other distinct farmland that would not  
23 exceed standards, rather than converting pine  
24 barrens to farmland.

25 The applicant mentioned yesterday to

me on the phone that the area was cleared for a cordwood, but in the recent past, if you see in Exhibit H, an aerial of the site in 1994 it is completely wooded. So, that, again, distinguishes it from the other hardships where clearing was allowed for agricultural uses. This has not been demonstrated that it was cleared in the recent past or for farming in the past.

Just to go through the exhibits. Exhibit A is an aerial of the site. You can see that it's a long, narrow site perpendicular to Weeks Avenue and adjacent to the Town open space.

Exhibit B contains a number of photographs of the site showing its wooded condition and some of the adjacent nearby uses in the study area.

Exhibit C is copies of some of the site plan sheets, including showing the three buildings side-by-side. Again, the entire site would be cleared and significantly graded for this project. It's hard to see on this, but you might be able to see some of

the steep slopes on Sheet SP2 on the eastern half of the site.

Exhibit D shows a little clearer --

MR. MILAZZO: Just going back to the exhibit with the elevations. It looks like the elevations on the north -- the southeast side of the property are up in the 90s. And then the floor elevation of the proposed buildings in that area are 79 feet and 68 feet and 62 feet. So, the site ranges from moving from Weeks heading westerly along Weeks in the 60s. In the southeast corner, it gets up into the 90s, and then as you go further back it's in the 60s again.

So, it looks like some sort of hill in the middle of the property and slopes up and then down. All of the proposed floor elevations of the structures are 60 -- are less than what exist today. 62, 68 and 79, ironically. Yeah, that's fine. The 79 is 20 feet less than the existing grade in that area. Thank you.

MS. HARGRAVE: Thank you.

Exhibit E contains the map of the

study area showing the adjacent open space and the development in the study area, again, mostly residential uses.

Exhibit F is the applicant's explanation of conformance or not with the standards.

Exhibit G is a narrative from the applicant on the precedent items.

Exhibit H is a map of the 1994 condition of the site, the project site, Eastern Flower Farm.

Exhibit I is the Metz Farm project site showing the area that was previously cleared and, again, was allowed to be cleared. That decision was tied to a site plan that limited the amount of clearing and where it could be cleared, based on historical clearing.

Exhibit J is the Finks Farm site.

That's all I have. If you have any questions.

MR. MILAZZO: Is the property in an Ag District?

MS. HARGRAVE: No.

September 17, 2025

14

MR. MILAZZO: Agricultural District.

MS. HARGRAVE: No.

MR. MILAZZO: They are constructing three, at least three structures, building three structures?

MS. HARGRAVE: Yes. 96,000 square feet of structures.

MR. RIBEIRO: Can I address the Commission?

MR. MILAZZO: Judy will ask whether there are any questions.

MS. JAKOBSEN: Do any of the Commission members have any questions for Julie?

MS. SCHERER: Do you know how much coverage the building represents on the five acres?

MS. HARGRAVE: 96,000. So, it's a couple of acres at least.

MS. SCHERER: So, it's 44 percent, if my math is right. Is there a coverage requirement, Brookhaven, for agricultural structures?

MS. DiBRITA: Doesn't come with the

site plan. Agricultural uses are exempt with the site plan.

MS. SCHERER: It's about 44 percent coverage.

MR. MILAZZO: 42 to 44.

MS. SCHERER: Five acres times --

MR. MILAZZO: I did 1,200 181. The dimensions of the property divided by 92.

MS. SCHERER: Somewhere in that range. 42, 45 percent.

The clearing is 97 percent?

MS. HARGRAVE: 99.9 percent.

MS. JAKOBSEN: Are there any other questions for Julie?

(No response was heard.)

MS. JAKOBSEN: We can hear now from Mr. Ribeiro.

MR. RIBEIRO: Marcos Ribeiro. East End Flower Farm owner/operator, second generation farmer in the Town of Brookhaven, Southampton and Southold.

Right off the bat I wanted to clarify the project scope; it is incorrect. The project scope is 10,000 square foot barn and

1 a 30,000 square foot greenhouse. The area  
2 outlined adjacent and labeled as 56,000  
3 square feet is a modular hoop house area.  
4 What does that mean? It means that it is a  
5 designated area that complies with the Town  
6 of Brookhaven Town Code so that I'm nowhere  
7 within 40 feet to a lot line, which is,  
8 again, from the Town Code of the Town of  
9 Brookhaven. So, I outlined that area not as  
10 a construction area, but as an area to kind  
11 of let you know this is where our hoop houses  
12 will be, which are temporary in nature. So,  
13 that's not a structure whatsoever.

14 Will grading take place? Absolutely.  
15 The property, as referenced before, needs  
16 major grading. So, that being said, I'm  
17 going to rewind a little bit. I'll keep it  
18 factual and short. The history of the farm.  
19 The farm was established by Mr. Weeks back in  
20 1864. Going forward it was part of a much  
21 larger farm, much larger farm plot. From  
22 then it was mainly managed as agriculture and  
23 it was logged for cordwood, which was a big  
24 business at the time. According to records,  
25



up until 1926 it was still a viable business. After that it looks, going back to the satellite imagery, back in 1947 it looks like the property started to re-vegetate on itself. If you look at satellite records, previously the property is very sparsely covered, patchwork of forest. So, that's what I established there. So now I will kind of go through some of the concerns. That's the historical context of the property and conditions.

First on the question of the hardship. Although I purchased the property this year, the hardship is inherited with the land, not necessarily the operator. Without relief, it cannot reasonably support a viable farm operation on a minimal footprint necessary consisting of agriculture. As per the Town of Brookhaven Town Code, the code itself considers a farm operation to be no less than five acres in size.

I acknowledge that the project does not fully conform to the vegetation standards. Under Suffolk County's own

1  
2 preservation law, farmland is considered open  
3 space. By entering this property into  
4 productive farm use, the project is fully  
5 consistent with the County's open space and  
6 farmland preservation goals. Legal  
7 references are Suffolk County Code Chapter 8  
8 Farmland Development Program.

9 Farmland preservation under the  
10 program is treated as part of the County's  
11 open space. New York State Ag and Market  
12 Law, Section 301, Subsection 4 define  
13 agriculture land use and agricultural  
14 production defined as open space, which  
15 Suffolk County adopts its farmland policies  
16 from. County planning documents often lists  
17 open space preservation as including  
18 farmland.

19 Going forward, to address some of the  
20 other concerns down the list. Regarding the  
21 fertilizer dependent vegetation. The only  
22 vegetation that I have proposed is a row of  
23 green plicata, which is a courtesy to the  
24 five neighbors to the north. If the  
25 Commission thinks I shouldn't plant them, I

won't plant them. Fertilizer dependent.  
I've seen a few do very well without any  
fertilizer.

On habitat impact. I recognize this  
is a direct loss in acreage. I'm willing to  
provide mitigation measures, including  
natural potential off-site contributions;  
that could be a possibility.

Alternatives that were considered. I  
have considered all of them. I looked again  
this morning to prove a point. Find me five  
acres in the Town of Brookhaven that's  
cleared that can be farmed for less than \$1  
million, please. I can't find any in  
Southampton. I can find some in Riverhead.  
So, alternatives were considered for many  
years. This is three years considering many  
alternatives, kicking tires and trying to  
find a way.

A reduced scale option to determine  
the economically nonviable productive  
farming. However, I remain open to design  
modifications that are strict in  
environmental conformance without undermining

the farm operation itself.

MS. SCHERER: What is the nature of your agriculture? What are you growing?

MR. RIBEIRO: I grow very diverse crops. We grow annuals, perennials, vegetables, micro greens, Cannibis, Hemp. We're quite the mixed operation.

MS. SCHERER: That will be on the site.

MR. RIBEIRO: No. We have 120,000 square feet of greenhouse.

MS. DiBRITA: What are you planning on the site?

MR. RIBEIRO: Various stock. Micro greens, some more perennials, some more annuals. I already have a dedicated build-out facility for Cannibis, which I have no intention of bringing here at this time. I know that is always a concern for everyone. I have worked with Janice on other projects, and that was a concern there. Some arborvitaes, some other things. Sunflowers next year.

So, we're a mixed operation. We kind

1 of go with the market trend and pricing  
2 chains. As you see, this year would have  
3 been a good year for tomatoes. I didn't do  
4 tomatoes.  
5

6 Any other questions at this time?  
7 I'm going to keep going, if that's okay.

8 The site is unique, the property is  
9 unique that it is situated in a controlled  
10 environment. It's unique because it allows  
11 me to control the environment better than if  
12 it was just wide open. So, the trees being  
13 around the property provides some protection  
14 from the wind and the bad elements. So, the  
15 limited clear farmland availability in  
16 Brookhaven, that is an issue. I checked  
17 again this morning and there were none  
18 available.

19 So, precedent setting concern.  
20 Previous approval will not set a general  
21 precedent tied to the property's unique facts  
22 for agricultural purpose hardship evidence  
23 and environmental safety. Relief requested  
24 is narrowly tailored to site-by-site specific  
25 because of the unique slope of the property.

Once graded, it will protect the site from environmental factors.

Habitat loss. The project will result in a direct loss of acreage, which I acknowledge. I have made comments to potential mitigation to include working with the Commission on expanding natural buffers. I'd be open to the area -- if you look at the map you have. Is there a way to go back a slide or two?

In front of the property you can see that there is the barn, the greenhouse, the hoop house area behind that. I would be open to adding some buffers around where the hoop house area is, as long as it doesn't -- as long as I can clear lot line to line. Where the greenhouse and barn is, that would be good, because I don't want trees falling on my greenhouse or the barn. But heading to the west, since it's just a designated area, I would be open to working with the Commission on how we could potentially work towards a common goal for buffers on the southwest and the north there. I would be

1  
2 open to doing on-site pollinator habitat and  
3 exploring off-site contributions to maintain  
4 regional habitat connectivity.

5 SEQRA. Since I was able to kind of  
6 clarify the actual coverage of the lot, my  
7 understanding is that it's an unlisted action  
8 and not Type I. Not that that, in itself, is  
9 a negative declaration. I just wanted to  
10 clarify that, because of the square footage  
11 coverage we might be unlisted, not Type I.

12 MS. SCHERER: It is adjacent to Town  
13 open space.

14 MR. RIBEIRO: Which is on 12 acres.  
15 I looked at the survey and I saw 12. Julie  
16 stated 15.

17 MS. HARGRAVE: The designation gets  
18 elevated when adjacent to other open space.  
19 Based on the disturbance, you exceed that by  
20 two and a half acres. You're going to five.

21 MR. RIBEIRO: Understood. So, we  
22 discussed the availability of cleared  
23 farmland. Again, I wanted to do resident  
24 buffers. We potentially do a larger natural  
25 buffer on the north side. I was open to





1  
2 remain viable as a farm. With approval, it  
3 will serve as a model for balancing  
4 agriculture, environmental stewardship in the  
5 Compatible Growth Area. Thank you so much.  
6 Any other questions at this time?

7 MS. JAKOBSEN: Any questions from the  
8 Commission members?

9 MS. SCHERER: You're saying there's  
10 no viable way that you can farm and maintain  
11 35 percent uncleared area on this site?

12 MR. RIBEIRO: So, 35 percent is 1.75  
13 acres. Can someone on the Commission point  
14 to less than two acre farms that's viable to  
15 me? Can you name them?

16 MS. SCHERER: I'm asking you.

17 MR. RIBEIRO: When I run the numbers,  
18 it's a hardship. I'm seeking a financial  
19 relief from this hardship, because it's not  
20 economically viable. If you start putting  
21 pen to paper, it won't be good.

22 MS. DiBRITA: What's the minimum  
23 amount?

24 MR. RIBEIRO: Brookhaven says it's  
25 five acres.

1  
2 MS. DiBRITA: Minimum you need  
3 cleared.

4 MR. RIBEIRO: That I need cleared?

5 MS. DiBRITA: In order to make this a  
6 viable project for you, what is the minimum?  
7 I know you're asking for lot line to lot  
8 line. What is your -- what is the minimum  
9 you would need?

10 MR. RIBEIRO: Well, I guess what  
11 would work would be, like I described  
12 previously, having the greenhouse, from the  
13 back of the greenhouse all the way to the  
14 street cleared, lot line to lot line. And  
15 then with the designated hoop house area,  
16 that could be a buffer. So, almost 40 feet  
17 could be a buffer of natural vegetation  
18 remaining intact, and just that central  
19 portion where we would have the hoop houses.

20 MS. SCHERER: The hoop house gets  
21 removed in the fall?

22 MR. RIBEIRO: If you look up the  
23 New York State Ag and Market law, a hoop  
24 house is a temporary structure in nature and  
25 gets moved. This doesn't work, we need ten

1  
2 more, we'll add more. We don't need that,  
3 let's take it down. By its nature, it's a  
4 temporary structure. Whereas, the 30,000  
5 square foot greenhouse is a glass greenhouse  
6 that is going in and not moving, god willing.

7 MR. CHARTERS: You said it was an Ag  
8 production prior?

9 MR. RIBEIRO: It was by Mr. Weeks.  
10 The name Weeks and North Weeks.

11 MR. CHARTERS: Prior use was for  
12 agriculture, which you said was 1926?

13 MR. RIBEIRO: It lasted until 1926.

14 MR. CHARTERS: 99 years ago.

15 MR. RIBEIRO: It was a long time ago.  
16 I haven't seen a timeline for establishing  
17 farms not being a farm. Yes, it was a long  
18 time ago.

19 MS. SCHERER: You also need an  
20 irrigation well.

21 MR. RIBEIRO: No. So, what I have  
22 decided to do, I found out more about the  
23 property behind that property, and the water  
24 quality is very poor there, very, very poor,  
25 because of whatever happened with Brookhaven

1  
2 National Laboratory. I will not be drilling  
3 a well. I will get a two inch hook-up to the  
4 city water, proposed.

5 MS. SCHERER: And then do we need  
6 some kind of letter of availability from the  
7 Suffolk County Water Authority?

8 MR. MILAZZO: That's ministerial.

9 MS. SCHERER: Do we get that as part  
10 of the review?

11 MR. MILAZZO: Julie can answer that  
12 better than I can.

13 MS. SCHERER: If you have no other  
14 oversight.

15 MR. MILAZZO: When you say, "I'm open  
16 to a 40 foot buffer," you're showing a  
17 building that's 100 feet wide on a lot of  
18 180. "I'm going to get my hoop house  
19 building and I won't clear end-to-end but  
20 I'll still grade down the middle."

21 MR. RIBEIRO: Correct.

22 MR. MILAZZO: Will you need retaining  
23 walls on the side?

24 MR. RIBEIRO: There is a  
25 specification for what retaining walls look

1  
2 like. Obviously, it's hard to see on these,  
3 but I believe Julie has a large copy. The  
4 plans are kind of big. There's a detail for  
5 a retaining wall. It's done right. There's  
6 native vegetation in between any of the  
7 terraces.

8 MR. MILAZZO: What does the property  
9 look like to the south of this?

10 MR. RIBEIRO: Wooded.

11 MR. MILAZZO: The property to the  
12 west of this?

13 MR. RIBEIRO: That is the property  
14 that's owned by the Manorville Fire  
15 Department. Breslin actually owns that  
16 industrial subdivision just to the northwest,  
17 but west they carved all the roads, because  
18 the water is contaminated, all the gravel  
19 roads back there. They put new equipment  
20 back there.

21 MR. MILAZZO: Wooded. Is it clear?

22 MR. RIBEIRO: It's not. It has been  
23 cleared recently to allow for the gravel road  
24 and new equipment to be placed to monitor the  
25 water quality.

MR. MILAZZO: And the northwest?

MR. RIBEIRO: Northwest is still wooded. Breslin owns it with whatever it's filled with. There is miscellaneous clearings in that. But then, obviously, those two lots to the north, they have been there a long time. The structural steel guy has got five acres, lot line to lot line. That's been there before everyone else.

MS. SCHERER: That subdivision in between is residential homes there.

MR. RIBEIRO: Five homes directly to the north.

MS. SCHERER: That's where you're proposing to put it?

MR. RIBEIRO: Yeah. Right now, the way the water flows -- I have been there when it rains -- the water flows off of the property onto the north right now, because of some of the existing grades.

MR. MILAZZO: How much material are you going to have to remove from the site?

MR. RIBEIRO: Originally I had -- so, the Town of Brookhaven I put in my site plan

1 application, only to find out that I'm exempt  
2 from site plan approval. Originally, 40,000  
3 cubic yards of material. And we have two  
4 other farms that will be receiving, one of  
5 them being East Moriches. During the  
6 wintertime, groundwater is part of the field  
7 height, and in the summertime it drops about  
8 a foot, 16 inches. Technically, we could use  
9 that material.  
10

11 MS. HARGRAVE: Was there a small  
12 amount of disturbance that occurred recently  
13 on the site near the Weeks Avenue frontage?

14 MR. RIBEIRO: Yes.

15 MS. HARGRAVE: What was that for?

16 MR. RIBEIRO: So, I find it to be a  
17 fire hazard. There is a lot of dry material  
18 on the property. Previously, in 2012, there  
19 was fire history in the area. So, I don't  
20 want to be caught up in anything. So, I  
21 would like to clean a little bit of the  
22 property.

23 MS. HARGRAVE: Not right now. Don't  
24 do that right now, while you're in the midst  
25 of the application.

September 17, 2025

32

MR. RIBEIRO: Okay.

MS. JAKOBSEN: Any other questions?

MR. MILAZZO: Do you own this property?

MR. RIBEIRO: Yes.

MR. MILAZZO: Did you buy it recently?

MR. RIBEIRO: Yes.

MR. MILAZZO: Recently. What does that mean?

MR. RIBEIRO: May 8th.

MR. MILAZZO: Of?

MR. RIBEIRO: This year.

MR. MILAZZO: 2025.

MS. JAKOBSEN: Any other questions?

(No response was heard.)

MS. JAKOBSEN: Julie, when is the decision deadline for this one?

MS. HARGRAVE: It would be helpful to have an extension. The decision deadline is --

MR. CHARTERS: October 23rd.

MS. HARGRAVE: Either to the November 19th or the December 17th meeting.



1  
2 MR. RIBEIRO: I would be open to an  
3 extension if we were working towards a common  
4 goal. If we are looking for an extension for  
5 more information and get a denial.  
6 Everybody's time here is very precious. Is  
7 there an interest in the Commission working  
8 with East End Flower Farm and myself for a  
9 common goal of preservation and possibly  
10 making this -- I know lot line to lot line is  
11 quite a bit. So, I guess what I'm asking is,  
12 is the Commission open to working with me to  
13 a certain capacity to come to what would  
14 possibly pass as a hardship, instead of  
15 working towards a goal and then getting a  
16 denial?

17 MS. SCHERER: The people to the north  
18 were notified of this?

19 MR. RIBEIRO: Yeah. They're good  
20 people.

21 MS. SCHERER: You have met them?

22 MR. RIBEIRO: I met two. The two in  
23 the front, I have not met. They haven't been  
24 available when I have been available. But  
25 the other neighbors are -- well, one of them

needs to adjust some of things, but they're, you know. It's agriculture. You look to the Comprehensive Land Use plan, part of it is the agriculture.

MS. HARGRAVE: If you're willing to look at off-site non-contiguous clusters and there is more information you could provide to the Commission about that.

MR. RIBEIRO: No. Can you define, because, obviously, I'm working with a limited budget here. Can you define what a typical --

MS. HARGRAVE: You were offering something.

MR. RIBEIRO: I guess I want to know more where I could maybe try to offer.

MS. HARGRAVE: To meet the standard, if it was off-site somewhere else.

MR. RIBEIRO: What has been done in the past? Can you give me an example?

MS. HARGRAVE: It was your offer.

MR. RIBEIRO: Like a trade development, right.

MS. SCHERER: Like a Core.

MR. RIBEIRO: It would have to be --

MS. HARGRAVE: Really an extension of the project site if you bought land somewhere else and then perhaps you would meet the standard or if you had a larger project site. It doesn't necessarily have to be contiguous to this site.

MR. RIBEIRO: If it was Core, would that count towards it?

MS. HARGRAVE: If it's not already protected.

MR. RIBEIRO: If it's CGA?

MS. HARGRAVE: Essentially something that you can think about and offer more information to the Commission, maybe address some of these items in writing. It's up to you.

MR. RIBEIRO: Sure, I can reply to the questionnaire and letter.

MR. MILAZZO: I just want to caution you. Julie said explore. We're not encouraging you to get your own independent counsel. Purchasing any property with the expectation that would be acceptable as a

trade, just before you open your checkbook,  
make sure you check with someone you trust  
for counsel on that question.

MR. RIBEIRO: Understood. Thank you.

MS. HARGRAVE: The deadline is the  
next meeting.

MR. RIBEIRO: I believe there is one  
more meeting before. So, you'll decide an  
extension on the next meeting?

MS. HARGRAVE: The next meeting is  
October 15th, and the deadline is  
October 23rd.

MR. MILAZZO: We meet once a month.

MS. SCHERER: You could get us some  
information before the 15th of next month?

MR. RIBEIRO: Yeah.

MR. MILAZZO: The recommendation is  
to hold the record open. If you provide  
additional information, if you submit  
information and bring it back to the  
Commission to review it with him, what his  
offer is. So, there wouldn't be an ability  
to have a decision in October. So you're  
looking at November or December.

Again, you can always have an extension that is longer than a decision is prepared and issued. But if you're asking them to do work, it will be difficult to have also a decision in October.

MS. SCHERER: Didn't you say you wouldn't mind leaving the record open, come back next time, and then decide. We're saying we can't decide that day on the 15th, if you don't give the extension now.

MR. RIBEIRO: I'm open to an extension.

MR. MILAZZO: The applicant is offering an extension to November 19th. Is that fair?

MR. RIBEIRO: Correct.

MS. JAKOBSEN: At this point, do we want to have a motion to --

MS. SCHERER: Public comment.

MS. JAKOBSEN: Jumping ahead again.

Is there anyone from the public that would like to provide comment on this project?

(No response was heard.)

MS. JAKOBSEN: No comments from the public.

Can I have a motion to accept the extension of the decision deadline to November 19th.

MS. DiBRITA: So moved.

MS. JAKOBSEN: Is there a second?

MR. CHARTERS: Second.

MS. JAKOBSEN: All in favor.

(WHEREUPON, there was a unanimous affirmative vote of the Board.)

MS. JAKOBSEN: Any opposed?

(No response was heard.)

MS. JAKOBSEN: Motion carries unanimously.

MR. MILAZZO: You may want to keep the hearing open. If he is going to bring back new material, you have the hearing open.

MS. SCHERER: So the record stays open.

MR. MILAZZO: I wouldn't close the hearing, so he can submit information if he wants to.

MS. SCHERER: Motion to adjourn the

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

September 17, 2025

39

hearing to October 15th.

MS. DiBRITA: Second.

MS. JAKOBSEN: All in favor.

(WHEREUPON, there was a unanimous  
affirmative vote of the Board.)

MS. JAKOBSEN: Any opposed?

(No response was heard.)

MS. JAKOBSEN: Motion carries  
unanimously.

(Time Ended: 4:06 p.m.)

\* \* \*

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

September 17, 2025

40

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, BETHANNE MENNONNA, a Notary Public  
within and for the State of New York do  
hereby certify that the foregoing is a true  
and accurate transcript of the proceedings,  
as taken stenographically by myself to the  
best of my ability, at the time and place  
aforementioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 20th day of September, 2025.

*BethAnne Mennonna*  
BETHANNE MENNONNA