

## 3.0 HUMAN ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

### 3.1 Vehicle Traffic, Transportation and Roadways

A detailed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was prepared by Nelson & Pope (N&P) for the proposed project, and is contained in **Appendix F-1**. In addition to the traffic analysis of the existing traffic conditions and impacts of the proposed project (e.g., roadway conditions, accidents and intersection capacity analyses), the scope for the DEIS required additional analyses in the TIS, related to:

- public transportation resources;
- existing congestion on Brook Street and Montauk Highway from traffic bypassing the congestion at the Heckscher Spur interchange with NYS Route 27 (Sunrise Highway);
- the influence on traffic conditions at the nearby LIRR grade crossings;
- the Oakdale Merge;
- parking availability at the Sayville LIRR Station and in municipal lots in downtown Sayville; and
- school bus -related transportation impacts.

The TIS provides the information outlined in the final scope. The following material in this subsection has been taken from the TIS.

This report summarizes the results of a detailed investigation of the traffic impacts associated with the development scenario(s) by reviewing the area's existing roadway characteristics and traffic conditions, estimating the vehicular volume and traffic pattern that will be generated during peak hours, and analyzing the effect of the additional volume on the surrounding roadway network. **Figure 3-1** shows the Study Area and Study Intersections.

**Appendix F-32** contains a memo prepared by the Town's traffic engineering consultant (L. K. Mclean Associates, P.C.; LKMA) to the Town Principal Planner, confirming that the methodology for trip distribution, background traffic growth rate, peak analysis hours and projected no-build and build horizon years proposed by Applicant's traffic engineer was acceptable and conformed to the final scope. The memo concluded:

In summary, based on the forgoing, and subject to any conditions set forth in our findings, the proposed methodologies are acceptable for the purposes described.

One aspect of the final scope was clarified through further assessment and correspondence between LKMA on the behalf of the Town and N&P. **Appendix F-43** contains an e-mail from LKMA approving the Applicant's traffic engineer request to not prepare 5- and 10-year post-construction analyses in the TIS, as *"...unnecessary given the comprehensive nature of the analyses already being prepared, and the fact that such analyses were not required of other major developments in the area."*

### 3.1.1 Existing Conditions

#### Roadway Conditions

This section of the report provides an overview of existing transportation conditions including roadway inventories, transit facilities, pedestrian amenities, existing traffic volumes, accident data, traffic signal timing plans and intersection geometries.

*New York State Route 27 – Sunrise Highway* is an east-west principal arterial under the jurisdiction of NYSDOT. In the vicinity of the proposed project, Sunrise Highway is a controlled access highway with continuous 2-lane service roads that parallel the 3-lane express roadway. The section of Sunrise Highway closest to the project site was last counted by NYSDOT in 2003 which recorded an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) of 113,159 vehicles per day (vpd) and the current forecast AADT is shown as 108,939 vpd on the NYSDOT Traffic Data Viewer (NYSDOT TDV), an online interface with an interactive map containing state-wide traffic volume data. Approximately 2 miles west of the project site on Sunrise Highway, as the highway traverses a section of the Connetquot River State Park Preserve, is a bottleneck section known as the “Oakdale Merge”. The environmentally sensitive nature of the adjacent wetlands imposes width constraints resulting in the 2-lane east and westbound service roads merging with the 3 express lanes of the highway. Delays are common on this section of Sunrise Highway during weekday AM and PM commuter peak periods. The Oakdale Merge begins around Exit 46 in the eastbound direction and around Exit 47A in the westbound direction. The AADT volumes for this section of roadway were 120,274 vpd ([vehicles per day](#); 2003 count data: NYSDOT) and forecast to present day with an average of 115,750 vpd.

*New York State Route 27 South Service Road (NYS Route 906C)* is a one-way eastbound roadway under the jurisdiction of the NYSDOT. In the vicinity of the proposed project, the South Service Road has 2 travel lanes and provides controlled access to Sunrise Highway with traffic signals at intersections with local arterial and collector roadways and stop control on adjacent local roadways. Exclusive turn lanes are frequently provided at signalized intersections. The AADT on this roadway varies considerably by location- approaching Smithtown Avenue the AADT is 4,115 vpd, approaching Lakeland Avenue the AADT is 15,326 vpd and approaching Johnson Avenue the AADT is 9,515 vpd. This roadway is primarily fronted by commercial properties. The posted speed limit is 35 mph in the vicinity of the site. [In the vicinity of the site the horizontal alignment of the roadway is slightly curving, and the vertical alignment is slightly rolling. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in fair condition.](#)

*New York State Route 27 North Service Road (NYS Route 906D)* is a one-way westbound roadway under the jurisdiction of the NYSDOT. In the vicinity of the proposed project, the North Service Road has 2 travel lanes and provides controlled access to Sunrise Highway with traffic signals at intersections with local arterial and collector roadways and stop control on adjacent local roadways. Exclusive or shared turn lanes are frequently provided at signalized intersections. The AADT on this roadway varies considerably by location. Approaching Johnson Avenue, the AADT is approximately 11,240 vpd, approaching Lakeland Avenue the AADT is approximately 15,345 vpd and approaching Smithtown Avenue the AADT is approximately 4,980 vpd. This roadway is primarily fronted by commercial properties. The posted speed limit is 40 mph in the vicinity of the site. [In the vicinity of the site the horizontal alignment of the roadway is slightly curving, and the vertical alignment is slightly rolling. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in fair condition.](#)

*Montauk Highway (CR 80)* is an east-west minor arterial roadway under the jurisdiction of the (SCDPW) with an AADT of approximately 16,000 vpd. Montauk Highway is known as Main Street as it traverses downtown Sayville. The majority of Montauk highway in the study area provides one travel lane in each direction but the westerly section of Montauk highway near Brook Street provides one lane in each direction separated by a two-way left-turn lane. Exclusive turn lanes are provided at key locations and intersections. On-street parking is permitted in designated areas. This roadway is primarily fronted by commercial properties. The posted speed limit is 40 mph west of Munson Lane, 35 mph between Rollstone Avenue and Munson Lane and 30 mph east of Rollstone Avenue. [The horizontal alignment of the roadway in downtown Sayville is straight, and the vertical alignment is slightly rolling. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in fair condition.](#)

*Lakeland Avenue* is a north-south roadway which exists as CR 93 north of the Sunrise Highway North Service Road and is under the jurisdiction of the Town of Islip to the south. North of Sunrise Highway, Lakeland Avenue is classified as a minor arterial roadway and has 2 travel lanes in each direction separated by a two-way left-turn lane with a posted speed limit of 50 mph. Exclusive turn lanes are provided at key locations and signalized intersections. The northern section, which has an AADT of 26,580 vpd (NYSDOT), provides access to NYS Route 454 and connectivity to the Long Island Expressway (LIE) as well as the Ronkonkoma Train Station. North of Sunrise Highway, Lakeland Avenue is primarily fronted by commercial uses with a few residential properties mixed in. South of Sunrise Highway, Lakeland Avenue is considered a collector roadway and provides connectivity between Sunrise Highway and downtown Sayville. There is one travel lane in each direction with a posted speed limit of 30 mph. South of the LIRR grade crossing, the roadway becomes known as Railroad Avenue. On-street parking is prohibited on Lakeland Avenue but is permitted in designated areas on Railroad Avenue. The southern portion of Lakeland Avenue has an AADT of 18,290 vpd (N&P data) and the section of Railroad Avenue has an AADT of 13,285 vpd (N&P data). [In the vicinity of the site the horizontal alignment of the roadway is straight, and the vertical alignment is flat. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in good condition.](#)

*Terry Road/Tariff Street* is a local collector roadway that provides connectivity between the South Service Road and Lakeland Avenue. The section west of Durham ~~Place~~[Durham Road](#) is known as Terry Road and has a northwest/southeast orientation with an AADT of 2,323 vpd (N&P data). The section east of ~~Dunham Place~~[Durham Road](#) is known as Tariff Street and has an east/west orientation with an AADT of 3,718 vpd (NYSDOT). This roadway is fronted by residential properties and has a posted speed limit of 30 mph. It is striped with a full double yellow barrier line as well as white shoulder markings to form travel lanes that are approximately 12 feet in width. ~~No dedicated~~[Dedicated](#) bike ~~lane is~~[lanes are not](#) provided. Generally speaking, the shoulder area is of varying width, but narrows and does not provide space for on-street parking. **However, there are some sections with a wider shoulder area that can accommodate vehicles.** The roadway is primarily without curb or sidewalk, but these features may be present intermittently. There is all-way stop control present at two intersections and traffic signals are present at Island Boulevard/Smithtown Avenue as well as the Lakeland Avenue intersections, which are the western and eastern limits of the roadway, respectively. [In the vicinity of the site the horizontal alignment of the roadway is straight, and the vertical alignment is flat. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in fair condition.](#)

*Bohemia Parkway* is a north/south local roadway that provides connectivity between the South Service Road and Terry Road. Bohemia Parkway extends south from the South Service Road for approximately 0.9 miles with the southern terminus at Mobile Street. The west side of the roadway, north of Terry Road, is fronted by residential properties and the opposite side is fronted by the project site. South of Terry Road, both sides of Bohemia Parkway are fronted by residential properties. The pavement width is approximately 28 feet in width and pavement markings are not present. There is curb and sidewalk provided on the west side of the roadway, north of Terry Road, with no sidewalk and sporadic curb south of Terry Road. **No parking restrictions are posted, and the speed limit is 30 mph.** [In the vicinity of the site the horizontal alignment of the roadway is straight, and the vertical alignment is flat. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in fair condition.](#)

*Sterling Place* is a local northeast/southwest roadway that extends east from Terry Road for approximately 450 feet with its eastern terminus at Carrie Avenue. The south side of Sterling Place is fronted by residential properties and the north side is fronted by the project site. There are no pavement markings present and the roadway is approximately 25 feet wide. Curb or railroad tie front the properties on the south side of the roadway only. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. [The horizontal alignment of the roadway is straight, and the vertical alignment is slightly rolling. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are good condition.](#)

*Carrie Avenue* is a north/south local dead-end roadway, approximately 32 feet wide, that extends north from Tariff Street for approximately 2,000 feet. The south side of the roadway is fronted by residential properties and the north side of the roadway is fronted by the project site. Pavement markings and sidewalks are not present, but curb is provided on both sides of the roadway. No parking restrictions are posted, and the speed limit is 30 mph. [The horizontal alignment of the roadway is straight, and the vertical alignment is flat. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in good condition.](#)

*Chester Road* is a north/south local roadway, approximately 34 feet wide, that extends north from Tariff Street for approximately 0.8 miles and there is a short, northern east/west section approximately 200' long, which provides connectivity to Lakeland Avenue. The southern and northern limits of Chester Road are controlled by stop signs but there is a traffic signal detection loop present on the eastbound approach at Lakeland Avenue, which operates on a delay that cycles the signal at Gibbons Court to provide gaps on the main line during peak periods. Pavement markings or sidewalks are not present, but curb is provided on both sides of the roadway. No parking restrictions are posted, and the speed limit is 30 mph. [The horizontal alignment of the roadway is straight, and the vertical alignment is flat. The pavement and pavement markings on this roadway are in fair condition.](#)

Descriptions of each study intersection, summarizing lane configuration, traffic control, pedestrian accommodations, and other features are presented in the TIS; a more detailed summary of the study intersections is contained in Appendix A [in **Appendix F-1**].

### Accidents

The most recent three years of accident data for the study intersections and roadways was obtained from the NYSDOT's Accident Location Information System (ALIS). This data was reviewed and analyzed. The accident data is contained in Appendix D [in **Appendix F-1**]. The study locations are as follows:

- Smithtown Avenue from North Service Road to Island Boulevard/Terry Road
- Terry Road/Tariff Street from Island Boulevard/Smithtown Avenue to Lakeland Avenue
- Bohemia Parkway from South Service Road to Terry Road
- 11<sup>th</sup> Street from Bohemia Parkway to Lakeland Avenue
- Carrie Avenue from Marion Street to Terry Road
- Lakeland Avenue from North Service Road to Montauk Highway
- Depot Street from Greeley Avenue to Lakeland Avenue
- Montauk Highway from Garfield Avenue to Hiddink Street/Hanson Place
- Johnson Avenue from North Service Road to South Service Road
- Hiddink Street from Railroad Avenue to Montauk Highway
- Montauk Highway at Brook Street
- Montauk Highway at Cherry Avenue
- Cherry Avenue at Brook Street

The continuous roadway sections listed above, account for all intersections within the stated limits. Within the study area, there were a total of 263 accidents from March 2014, through February 2018 (3 years). No fatal accidents were recorded during the study period. Table [31](#) [in **Appendix F-1**] summarizes the accidents by severity and in an effort to minimize the size of the table, locations that did not experience any accidents during the study period were omitted.

As can be seen from Table [31](#), a majority of the accidents, 67% (175), involved property damage only, 33% (88 accidents) involved injury and 0 accidents resulted in a fatality. The locations with the highest number of accidents are Lakeland Avenue at North Service Road and Lakeland Avenue at South Service Road, which experienced 20 and 19 crashes respectively or an average of 6.7 and 6.3 accidents per year. A majority of these crashes resulted in property damage only, 60% at the North Service Road and 63% at the South Service Road. The location with the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest number of crashes is Lincoln Avenue and Hiddink, with 11 accidents or 3.7 per year. Again, the majority of accidents (72%) resulted in property damage only. Within the study area, only 7 locations experienced 3 or more crashes annually.

Table [42](#) [in **Appendix F-1**] summarizes crashes by type to highlight locations that may experience a frequency of a specific collision type that is susceptible to correction by engineering measures.

A review of Table [42](#) indicates that the three most prevalent accident types were rear end accidents (25%), right angle accidents (19%) and other/unknown type accidents (12%), followed by overtaking accidents (11%) and accidents involving parked vehicles (10%).

Due to the relatively low accident occurrence at a majority of the study locations, the 7 intersections or roadway segments which experience 3 or more crashes annually were selected for further analysis. When determining which intersections to select for further analysis we considered crash experience criteria within the Federal Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) under the

crash experienced warrant for traffic control signal needs studies, Chapter 4C. The manual states that when considering an intersection for the highest level of traffic control (traffic signal) the following criteria should be satisfied- *Five or more reported crashes, of types susceptible of correction by a traffic control signal, have occurred within a twelve-month period, each crash involving personal injury or property damage apparently exceeding the applicable requirements for a reportable crash.* Therefore, we feel that providing further analysis for locations with 3 or more accidents of any type annually is a conservative approach.

The following **Table 3-1** provides a rate comparison of the 7 locations to the statewide average. As can be seen, 5 locations experience accident rates that exceed the statewide average (see shading). Based on the proposed project trip assignments, the project is anticipated to add incremental volume to these locations. Therefore, we will explore the anticipated traffic increase at each location and project future accident rates based on these volumes [see Section 3.1.2].

**Table 3-1  
 ACCIDENT RATE COMPARISON**

Location	Average Number of Accidents (per year)	Intersection/Linear Section Accident rate	
		Calculated Accident Rate	NYSDOT Accident Rate
Sunrise Highway North Service Rd. @ Lakeland Ave.	6.7	0.60	0.32
Lakeland Ave. between North Service Rd. and South Service Rd.	3.0	3.94	3.22
Sunrise Highway South Service Rd. @ Lakeland Ave.	6.3	0.66	0.32
Railroad Ave. @ Depot St.	3.0	1.15	0.18
Montauk Highway @ Greene Ave.	3.0	0.35	0.52
Montauk Highway @ Foster Ave.	3.3	0.51	0.52
Lincoln Ave. @ Hiddink St.	3.7	1.67	0.29

~~As can be seen from Table 3-1 above, 5 locations experience accident rates that exceed the statewide average (see shading). Based on the proposed project trip assignments, the project is anticipated to add incremental volume to these locations. Therefore, we will explore the anticipated traffic increase at each location and project future accident rates based on these volumes [see Section 3.1.2].~~

**Intersection Capacity Analyses**

Capacity analyses were conducted for the 2018 Existing Conditions at the study intersections. The following is a summary of the capacity analyses results for the 2018 existing conditions during the weekday AM, PM and Saturday peak periods for the school peak season and the Weekday AM, PM, Friday PM, and Saturday peak hours for the summer season. The existing models were calibrated for the weekday AM and PM School peak hours since they represent the worst conditions, and the model results for each existing condition ~~scenario~~ validated based on comparing these results to

field observations and measurements of travel time, vehicle speeds and delays. After the existing synchro model was developed, the ~~Sim-Traffic simulation was capacity analyses results were reviewed to identify intersections and roadway segments with potential issues. Detailed field observations were then conducted at the study intersections and traffic flows observed and compared to the Sim-Traffic simulation. During the field observations, critical gap acceptance at stop-controlled intersections, roadway travel speeds, vehicle turn speeds, vehicle headways at signalized intersections were recorded and compared to default values in the synchro model. For instance, during several field visits, vehicles were observed exiting most of the stop-controlled leg of intersections along Lakeland Avenue, Railroad Avenue and Montauk Highway during gaps shorter than five (5) seconds. However, the synchro program used for the analyses utilizes critical gaps greater than five (5) seconds for vehicles making a right or left turn out of a stop-controlled intersection. However, to perform a conservative analysis, the higher default values in the synchro program were not adjusted. Capacity analyses were conducted for both signalized and unsignalized intersections during the peak periods studied. The following is a summary of the existing conditions capacity analyses results. The detailed capacity analyses tables and worksheets are contained in Appendix G [in Appendix F-1]. these study intersections to field measure vehicles queues and delays. The following tables summarize the results of the field measured delays and queues compared to the capacity analyses results for the most critical corridor in the study area (Lakeland Avenue/Railroad Avenue) during the weekday AM and PM school peak hours.~~

### ***Signalized Intersections***

The capacity analysis results at the signalized intersections during the analyzed peak periods for both the school peak and summer seasons are discussed below:

- *Smithtown Avenue at NYS Route 27 North Service Road* - During the Existing school peak condition, the signalized intersection of Smithtown Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service Road operates at overall LOS D, D and B during the AM, PM and Saturday midday peak hours respectively. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to E. During the Existing summer peak condition, the signalized intersection of Smithtown Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service Road operates at overall LOS B, C, D and B during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours respectively. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to D.
- *Smithtown Avenue at NYS Route 27 South Service Road* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Smithtown Avenue and NYS Route 27 South Service Road operates at overall LOS B during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to C.
- *Lakeland Avenue at NYS Route 27 North Service Road* - During the Existing school peak condition, the signalized intersection of Lakeland Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service Road operates at overall LOS D, E and C during the AM, PM and Saturday midday peak hours respectively. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to F. During the Existing summer peak condition, the signalized intersection of Lakeland Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service Road operates at overall LOS C, D, E and C during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours respectively. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to F.

- *Lakeland Avenue at NYS Route 27 South Service Road* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Lakeland Avenue and NYS Route 27 South Service Road operates at overall LOS C during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to D.
- *Johnson Avenue at NYS Route 27 North Service Road* - During the Existing school peak condition, the signalized intersection of Johnson Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service Road operates at overall LOS E, D and B during the AM, PM and Saturday midday peak hours respectively. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to F. During the Existing summer peak condition, the signalized intersection of Johnson Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service Road operates at overall LOS C during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from B to E.
- *Johnson Avenue at NYS Route 27 South Service Road* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Johnson Avenue and NYS Route 27 South Service Road operates at overall LOS C or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to D.
- *Lakeland Avenue at Gibbons Court* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Lakeland Avenue at Gibbons Court operates at overall LOS A during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to C.
- *Lakeland Avenue at Tariff Street/Johnson Avenue* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Lakeland Avenue at Tariff Street/Johnson Avenue operates at overall LOS D or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to F.
- *Lakeland Avenue at Manton Street* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Lakeland Avenue at Manton Street operates at overall LOS B or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to C.
- *Montauk Highway at Brook Street* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Montauk Highway at Brook Street operates at overall LOS A during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours.
- *Montauk Highway at Cherry Avenue* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Montauk Highway at Cherry Avenue operates at overall LOS B or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to D.
- *Montauk Highway at Greene Street* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Montauk Highway at Greene Avenue operates at overall LOS B during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to E.



- *Montauk Highway at Gillette Avenue/Railroad Avenue* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Montauk Highway at Gillette Avenue/Railroad Avenue operates at overall LOS B or better during the AM, PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to E.
- *Montauk Highway at Lincoln Avenue/Shopping Center* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Montauk Highway at Lincoln Avenue/Shopping Center operates at overall LOS C or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to E.
- *Montauk Highway at Foster Avenue/Shopping Center* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Montauk Highway at Foster Avenue/Shopping Center operates at overall LOS C or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to E.
- *Montauk Highway at Hiddink Street/Hanson Place* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Montauk Highway Hiddink Street/Hanson Place operates at overall LOS C or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to D.
- *Smithtown Avenue at Terry Road/Island Boulevard* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Smithtown Avenue at Terry Road/Island Boulevard operates at overall LOS B or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to C.
- *Cherry Avenue at Brook Street* - During the Existing school peak and summer conditions, the signalized intersection of Cherry Avenue at Brook Street operates at overall LOS B or better during the AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday peak hours. Individual movements experience LOS ranging from A to B.

### ***Unsignalized Intersections***

The LOS results for the unsignalized intersections show that all the intersections operate at acceptable LOS D or better during the existing conditions for all analyzed peak periods except for eastbound Chester Road at the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and Chester Road which operates at LOS F during all analyzed peak periods. The northbound approach at the intersection of Montauk Highway and Greeley Avenue/Shopping Center Driveway operate at LOS E or F during the PM and Saturday peak hours. The eastbound Depot Street approach at Railroad Avenue also operates at LOS E during the Saturday summer peak hour. ~~Field As previously mentioned, during field observations were conducted to calibrate the existing conditions model. During these field visits, vehicles were observed exiting the minor approaches of stop-controlled leg of intersections along Lakeland Avenue, Railroad Avenue and Montauk Highway during gaps shorter than five (5) seconds. However, Therefore, the synchro program used for the analyses utilizes critical gaps greater than five (5) seconds for vehicles making a right or left turn out of a stop-controlled intersection. Therefore, the operation of the minor approaches to these unsignalized intersections is better than along the~~

Lakeland Avenue/Railroad Avenue corridor were analyzed with and without the calibration of the AM and PM school peak hour synchro models. Tables 13 and 14 [in **Appendix F-1**] present the calculations in results of the existing conditions synchro model. However, to perform conservative capacity analyses, at these intersections with and without the default critical gap acceptance values in the synchro model were not adjusted to reflect field conditions calibration.

From the review of Tables 13 and 14 above, the levels of service at the intersections with and without the calibration are comparable except for the eastbound Chester Road approach at the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and Chester Road that operate significantly better with the calibration. The results of the analyses show that the stop-controlled approaches of the intersections on the Lakeland Avenue/Railroad Avenue corridor except for Chester Road will operate at acceptable LOS D or better during the weekday AM and PM school peak hours with and without the calibration. Without the calibration the Chester Road approach operates at LOS E and F during the weekday School AM and PM peak hours respectively. With the calibration the Chester Road approach will operate at LOS C during the weekday school AM peak hour and at LOS D during the weekday school PM peak hour.

It was also noted during the field observations that there is a loop on the eastbound Chester Road approach tied to the traffic signal at the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and Gibbons Court capable of putting a call to the signal controller when there is a need for vehicles to exit Chester Road. Therefore, the synchro results for the intersection of Lakeland Avenue at Chester Road are very conservative as confirmed by the field delay measurements since the analyses did not take into consideration the effect of the loop ~~and hence~~. Hence, as supported by the field delay measurements, the operation of the eastbound Chester Road approach is better than presented in the traffic analyses.

## Public Transportation

Within the study area, public transit is provided primarily by Suffolk County Transit and the LIRR. The following discussions outline the exiting local bus and train service in the study area.

Suffolk County Transit (SCT) has three (3) bus lines (S40, S57 and S59) that service locations in and around the study area.:

*Route S40* - This route runs between the Babylon Railroad and Patchogue Railroad Stations. Stops along this route include Good Samaritan Hospital, Islip Town Hall and South Brookhaven Health Center. The bus operates on Montauk Highway in downtown Sayville within approximately 1.5 miles of the site. The bus operates approximately every half hour and runs from 5:30 am to 9:30 pm.

*Route S57* - This route runs between Main Street in Sayville and Smith Haven Mall in Lake Grove. Stops along this route include Terry Road and Tariff Street, in the vicinity of the site, Ronkonkoma LI MacArthur Airport and Ronkonkoma Railroad. The bus operates approximately every hour and runs from 7:00 am to 6:25 pm with limited service on Saturdays.

*Route S59* - This route runs between Main Street in Sayville and Smith Haven Mall in Lake Grove. Stops along this route include the intersection of Johnson Avenue at Tariff Street, in the vicinity of

the site, and Ronkonkoma Railroad. The bus operates approximately every hour and runs from 7:00 am to 6:45 pm with limited service on Saturdays.

The LIRR, a division of the Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA), provides passenger rail service to Suffolk County, Nassau County, Queens, Brooklyn and Manhattan. Major hubs provide transfer to several public transit options. Suffolk/Nassau locations provide transfer to Long Island bus services, Queens/Brooklyn locations and provides transfer to the subway/city bus and Penn Station in Manhattan and transfers to New Jersey Transit and Amtrak.

The Sayville Stop of the Montauk Branch of the LIRR is located on Depot Street, approximately 1.5 miles from the site. This station is approximately 50 miles from Penn Station and travel times are about 90 minutes during peak commuting periods. During peak periods, trains generally leave every 25-50 minutes, with off-peak and weekend trains scheduled hourly.

The Ronkonkoma Stop of the Ronkonkoma Branch of the LIRR is located on Railroad Avenue, approximately 4.5 miles from the site. This station is approximately 50 miles from Penn Station and travel times are about 70 minutes during peak commuting periods. During peak periods, trains generally leave every 20-30 minutes, with off-peak and weekend trains scheduled hourly.

### Congestion on Brook Street and Montauk Highway

To address concerns raised by Sayville residents on the potential impacts of the proposed project on the existing congestion on Brook Street and Montauk Highway, due the traffic bypassing the congestion at the Heckscher Spur interchange with NYS Route 27, travel time and delay runs were conducted along the following two corridors for a typical AM (7am-9am) and PM (4pm-7pm) peak periods for both the school peak season and the summer season using GPS and video technology which effectively outdates the traditional floating car technique to compare travel times using both routes.

- Corridor 1 - Travelling to and from the proposed site and the Heckscher Spur Interchange/Southern State Parkway via NYS Route 27 (Sunrise Highway). Corridor 1 is approximately 5 miles long.
- Corridor 2 - Travelling to and from the proposed site and the Heckscher Spur Interchange/Southern State Parkway via Montauk Highway. Corridor 2 is approximately 7.5 miles long.

Prior to conducting the travel time runs, a Dash Cam device is mounted in the test vehicle and set to record. A minimum of three (3) speed runs were conducted for each travel direction during both the AM and PM peak periods for both the school and summer seasons. During each run, the device reports the vehicle's exact latitude, longitude, speed, distance and bearing once every second and saved in kml and excel formats. The average speed and travel time for each study roadway segment was calculated. The run corresponding to the lowest average travel speed was used for the speed analyses. The results of the speed study for each period are summarized in [Tablesthe following tables](#) 7 and 8 [in **Appendix F-1**].

The travel speed data in Tables 7 and 8 [above](#) show that Corridor 2 is longer than Corridor 1 and the travel times are lower on Corridor 1 during the AM peak hours and hence there is no incentive to use Brook Street and/or Montauk Highway to bypass any congestion on either eastbound or westbound NYS Route 27 (sunrise Highway) during the AM peak hour for both the school and summer peaks. During the PM peak hour, the travel times on Corridor 1 are slightly longer than those for Corridor 2 but not significant enough to incentivize the use of Montauk Highway and Brook Street as a bypass to avoid congestion on Sunrise Highway, especially when the proposed development is closer to Sunrise Highway than Montauk Highway. **It was observed during our field observations and speed and delay runs that most of the vehicles using Exit 45 (Montauk Highway) instead of Exit 44 (Sunrise Highway), do so to bypass the vehicle queues leading to Exit 44. However, the delays these vehicles encounter on Montauk Highway after using Exit 45 wipes out the time saved by avoiding Exit 44, making the difference in travel time between Corridor 1 and Corridor 2 insignificant.**

### Traffic Conditions at the Nearby LIRR Grade Crossings

Video recordings were conducted at the Railroad Avenue train crossing to document its' operation and effects on the traffic along Railroad Avenue. The railroad gate was monitored during the weekday AM and PM and Saturday school season peak periods. Whenever the railroad gates go down, the time of occurrence, duration of the closure, the direction of the train, [and the vehicular queue was recorded](#) was documented. [\[see Table 47, in Appendix F-1\].](#)

~~Upon review of the videos, the duration during which the gates were down ranged from 50 seconds to 2 minutes 35 seconds and occurred only three times during each of the peak hours analyzed. All observed queues cleared after the gates were lifted at all times. The simtraffic simulation included the railroad crossing. The videos are available for viewing by the town if required.~~

[Upon review of the videos, the duration during which the gates were down ranged from 45 seconds to 3 minutes 15 seconds. As can be seen in Table 47 above, the longest queues along northbound and southbound Railroad Avenue as a result of the railroad gate closure occur during the PM peak hour. The longest observed queues during the AM and PM peak hours are 16 and 30 vehicles respectively. These queues were sometimes observed to block side streets. However, the queues always cleared upon the opening of the railroad gate. Traffic on Railroad Avenue was observed to flow smoothly with some delays when the railroad gate is open. Under Phase 6 of the proposed project \(Full Build-Out Scenario\), a total of 14 northbound and 35 southbound vehicles will be added to the railroad crossing during the AM peak hour and a total of 35 northbound and 22 southbound vehicles will be added to the railroad crossing during the PM peak hour. The additional traffic will result in an increase of about 1 vehicle every 2 minutes on both the northbound and southbound Railroad Avenue at the crossing. With a maximum observed railroad gate closure of 3 minutes 15 seconds, the proposed project could add two vehicles to the current northbound and southbound queues during the worst-case scenario. \*\*These additional queues will not significantly impact the current traffic flow.\*\*](#)

### The Oakdale Merge

The project scope states that “NYS Route 27, Sunrise Highway, currently experience significant recurring congestion during weekday AM and PM peak hours, largely due to the presence of the interchange with the Southern State Parkway and the Heckscher Spur of the Southern State Parkway, and discontinuous service roads in the area known as the Oakdale Merge. The TIS should include an analysis of conditions on NY27 Sunrise Highway, including the project’s potential impact on future operating conditions on the highway, potential mitigation measures and the project applicant’s role in implementation of mitigation.”

The Oakdale Merge is located approximately 2 miles west of the project site on Sunrise Highway, as the highway traverses a section of the Connetquot River State Park Preserve. The environmentally sensitive nature of the adjacent wetlands imposes width constraints currently resulting in the 2-lane east and westbound service roads merging with the 3 express lanes of the highway. Delays are common on this section of Sunrise Highway during weekday AM and PM commuter peak periods. The Oakdale merge begins around Exit 46 in the eastbound direction and around Exit 47A in the westbound direction. The AADT volumes for this section of roadway were 120,274 vpd (2003 count data: NYSDOT) and forecast to present day with an average of 115,750 vpd.

#### Parking at Sayville LIRR Station and Downtown Sayville

In order to identify the impact of the proposed residential development on the existing LIRR parking lots and municipal parking areas in the Sayville Downtown area, a parking analyses of the existing parking was conducted. The following steps were followed to identify the parking impacts of the proposed project:

- In addition to the LIRR parking lots, the Town of Islip planning was contacted to identify all Town of Islip Parking lots within Downtown Sayville.
- Parking surveys were conducted on June 6th, 2018 when schools were in session from ~~7~~ 7am to 9 pm at the identified parking areas.
- The parking data was summarized to identify existing peak parking demand.
- The potential number of residents in the proposed project that will utilize these facilities was estimated.
- A parking analysis to determine the availability of parking in the downtown parking area and LIRR parking lots to accommodate the new residents was conducted.

A total of ~~9~~ four (4) Municipal and three (3) railroad parking areas were studied. The following **Table 3-2** summarizes the existing supply broken down by the studied parking areas. The Municipal and railroad parking lots contain a total of ~~1308554~~ and 603 parking spaces respectively.

#### Table

**TABLE 3-2**  
**EXISTING PARKING SUPPLY**

Type of Parking	Parking Area	Total Number of Spaces
	Sayville <del>Municipal</del> Parking Lot 3 (Brown River Rd)	129
Municipal Lots	Sayville <del>Municipal</del> Parking Lot 4 (south of Middle Rd between Gillette Ave and Collins Ave)	134
	Sayville <del>Municipal</del> Parking Lot 5 (south of Main St between Candee Ave and Gillette Ave)	29
	Sayville <del>Municipal</del> Parking Lot 6 (south of Main St between Candee Ave and Greene Ave)	187
	Sayville <del>Municipal</del> Parking Lot 8 (River Rd, 130 feet north of Browns River Rd)	22
	Sayville <del>Municipal</del> Parking Lot 15 (Center St)	204
<b>Total</b>		<b>554</b>
Railroad Lots	Sayville <del>LRRR</del> Railroad Station North Parking Lot	331
	Sayville <del>LRRR</del> Railroad Station Southeast Parking Lot	119
	Sayville <del>LRRR</del> Railroad Station South Parking Lot	153
<b>Total Spaces</b>	<b>1,308</b>	603

A parking accumulation survey was conducted at the parking areas between the hours of 7 am – 7 am – 9 pm on an hourly basis on Wednesday June 6, 2018. Table 1750 [in Appendix F-1] shows the existing parking surveys conducted at the parking areas shown in Table 3-2.

A review of Table 1750 reveals that the peak parking demand times for the individual parking areas vary considerably. Parking Lots 4, 5 and LIRR North parking lot are highly utilized during weekdays with overall peak utilization ranging from 90% to 100%. The overall Municipal parking areas have an overall peak parking utilization of 896/334 spaces (6960%). This translates to an overall municipal parking availability of 412/220 parking spaces during the peak weekday parking demand. The Railroad parking areas have an overall peak parking utilization of 497 parking spaces (82%) during the peak weekday parking demand resulting in an availability of 106 parking spaces during the peak weekday parking demand.

### 3.1.2 Anticipated Impacts

#### Trip Generation

To identify the impacts each development phase will have on the Study Area roadways and Study Intersections, it is necessary to estimate the magnitude of traffic volume generated during the peak hours and to estimate the directional distribution of the generated traffic when traveling to and from the Study Area.

The trip generation estimates for the proposed development under each development phase were

prepared utilizing data under Land Use Code 221- Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) from the ITE publication, *Trip Generation, Tenth Edition*. The ITE trip generation publication sets forth trip generation data obtained by traffic counts conducted at sites throughout the country. The ITE Trip Generation Handbook is a valuable reference for traffic studies, as it is by far the most comprehensive source of empirical data on traffic impacts for different land uses. The following Table 3-33A summarizes the trip generation estimates for each lot on the site.

**Table 3-33A**  
**TRIP GENERATION FOR EACH SITE LOT**  
for Each Site Lot/Phase

Time Period	Lot/Phase 1 (138 units)		Lot/Phase 2 (222 units)		Lot/Phase 3 (318 units)		Lot/Phase 4 (289 units)		Lot/Phase 5 (213 units)		Lot/Phase 6 (185 units)		Totals (1,365 units)	
	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit
<b>AM</b>	13	37	21	59	29	85	27	77	20	57	17	50	127	365
<b>Weekday AM</b>	13	37	21	59	29	85	27	77	20	57	17	50	127	365
<b>Weekday PM</b>	37	24	60	38	85	55	77	50	57	37	49	32	365	236
<b>Saturday</b>	30	31	48	50	69	71	62	65	46	48	39	42	294	307
	24	61	38	98	55	140	50	127	37	94	32	81	236	601
	31	61	50	98	71	140	65	127	48	94	42	81	307	601
	61	61	98	98	140	140	127	127	94	94	81	81	601	601

As previously mentioned, traffic analyses were conducted for six (6) project development phases. These analyses will be cumulative from phase to phase. Phase 1 will analyze the traffic impact of the construction of Lot 1, Phase 2 will analyze the traffic impacts of Lot 1 and Lot 2, etc. Table 13-14 in

[Appendix F-13-3B](#) is a summary of the anticipated cumulative trip generation for each of the six phases.

**TABLE 3-3B**  
**TRIP GENERATION FOR EACH DEVELOPMENT PHASE**

Time Period	Phase 1 Lot1 (138 units)		Phase 2 Lot1+Lot 2 (360 Units)		Phase 3 Lot 1+Lot 2 +Lot3 (678 units)		Phase 4 Lot 1+Lot 2 + Lot 3+Lot 4 (967 units)		Phase 5 Lot 1+Lot 2 +Lot 3+Lot 4 +Lot 5 (1180 units)		Phase 6 Lot 1+Lot 2 +Lot 3+Lot 4 +Lot 5+Lot 6 (1365 units)	
	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit	enter	exit
AM	13	enter	34	enter	63	enter	90	enter	110	enter	127	enter
	37	exit	96	exit	181	exit	258	exit	315	exit	365	exit
	50	total	130	total	244	total	348	total	425	total	492	total
PM	37	enter	97	enter	182	enter	259	enter	316	enter	365	enter
	24	exit	62	exit	117	exit	167	exit	204	exit	236	exit
	61	total	159	total	299	total	426	total	520	total	601	total
Saturday	30	enter	78	enter	147	enter	209	enter	255	enter	294	enter
	31	exit	81	exit	152	exit	217	exit	265	exit	307	exit
	61	total	159	total	299	total	426	total	520	total	601	total

As can be seen from [Table 13](#) the tables above, Phase 1 is anticipated to generate 50, 61 and 61 trips during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively, Phase 2 will generate 130, 159 and 159 trips during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively, Phase 3 will generate 244, 299 and 299 trips during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively, Phase 4 will generate 348, 426 and 426 trips during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively, Phase 5 will generate 425, 520 and 520 trips during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively and Phase 6 will generate 492, 601 and 601 trips during the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours, respectively.

Accidents

The increase in accident occurrence at these locations was estimated by factoring the existing number of accidents by the increase in traffic anticipated by the proposed project. A worst-case scenario between the AM and PM peaks was utilized. Based on the anticipated traffic volumes, [Table 3-4](#) below summarizes the anticipated changes.

**Table** **TABLE 3-4**  
**FORECAST ACCIDENT RATE COMPARISON**

Location	Existing	Forecast
----------	----------	----------



	<u>NumberNo.</u> of Accidents ( <u>per over a</u> <u>3- year</u> <u>period</u> )	Average <u>NumberNo.</u> of Accidents (per year)	<u>NumberNo.</u> of Accidents ( <u>per over a</u> <u>3-year</u> <u>period</u> )	Average <u>NumberNo.</u> of Accidents (per year)
Sunrise Highway North Service <u>Rd.Road</u> @ Lakeland <u>Ave.Avenue</u>	20	6.7	21.5	7.2
Lakeland <u>Ave.Avenue</u> between North Service <u>Rd.Road</u> and South Service <u>Rd.Road</u>	9	3.0	10.8	3.6
Sunrise Highway South Service <u>Rd.Road</u> @ Lakeland <u>Ave.Avenue</u>	19	6.3	21.8	7.3
Railroad <u>Ave.Avenue</u> @ Depot <u>St.Street</u>	9	3.0	9.5	3.2
Montauk Highway @ Greene <u>Ave.Avenue</u>	9	3.0	9.1	3
Montauk Highway @ Foster <u>Ave.Avenue</u>	10	3.3	10	3.3
Lincoln <u>Ave.Avenue</u> @ Hiddink <u>St.Street</u>	11	3.7	11.2	3.7

Upon review of the table above, it can be seen that the additional traffic volume on the study roadway will contribute minimally to the existing accident rates and only one location may see an average increase of 1 accident per year.

A further review of crashes that occurred at the intersections with more than 3 crashes per year and higher than statewide accident rate in the vicinity of the site was conducted. From the Table above, three locations were identified (Sunrise Highway North Service Road at Lakeland Avenue, Lakeland Avenue between North Service Road and South Service Road and Sunrise Highway South Service Road at Lakeland Avenue) with a total of 48 accidents over the 3-year period. Of the 48 crashes, 25 (52%) are rear-end collisions, 7 (15%) involves overtaking and 6 (12%) are unknown type accidents. 30 (63%) of the 48 accidents resulted in property damage. Only 18 (37%) of the 48 accidents resulted in an injury. The accident reports of these 48 accidents were reviewed to identify the possible causes of these accidents and identify potential countermeasures to reduce the accidents at these locations. From the review of the reports, 41 (85%) of the 48 crashes are attributed to driver inattention, 3 (6%) are weather related, 1 (2%) involves a defective car, 1 (2%) is attributed to debris/obstruction and 2 (4%) are related to unknown type crashes. It should be noted that accidents associated with driver inattention are not correctable by geometric or any improvements to traffic flow. The increase use of cell phones and other electronic devises when driving may have increased the number of distracted drivers and hence the potential increase of such accidents associated with distraction and driver error. As previously noted, the amount of traffic added to Lakeland Avenue by the proposed project should not increase this type of crashes. However, as will be seen later in this report, the following physical or geometric improvements have been proposed and will be constructed by the applicant to mitigate the traffic and safety impacts.

- Widen Lakeland Avenue between Chester Road and 11th Street to provide an additional northbound through lane. The widening will begin around Eastover Road and extends to meet the existing 2 lane section of Lakeland Avenue just north of 11th Street. The segment

of Lakeland Avenue between Eastover Road and Chester Road will be striped to provide one shared northbound left turn/through lane into Chester Street and one through lane.

- The southbound approach of this intersection of Lakeland Avenue at NYS Route 27 North Service Road which currently provides an exclusive through lane, a shared through/right turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane will be redesigned to provide two exclusives through lanes and two exclusive right turn lanes. Minor signal timing adjustments will also be conducted for the northbound left turn phase.

According to the 2018 New York State Department of Transportation Post Implementation Evaluation System (PIES) Reduction Factor Report, the addition of lanes may reduce injury accidents by 36%. Therefore, the physical or geometric improvements proposed on Lakeland Avenue as part of this project will improve safety on this corridor.

### Intersection Capacity Analyses

To identify the impacts created by each phase of the proposed project, capacity analyses were conducted at the study intersections for the No Build and Build Conditions during the weekday AM, PM and Saturday midday peak hours for the school peak season and during the weekday AM, PM, Friday PM and Saturday midday during summer season. The results of the capacity analyses for the No Build and Build Conditions were compared to determine the impact that will be created at the study intersections for each phase. Tables summarizing the No Build and Build Conditions levels of service results were prepared and included in the appendices of the TIS Appendix I [in Appendix F-1] of the report. The changes in levels of service from the No Build to the Build conditions were then compared to determine where there was an increase in LOS that is considered a significant impact according to the Town's Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, the criteria for determining impacts. Mitigations were then applied to specific intersections to improve the identified significant impacts. The capacity analyses were conducted at the Study intersections for mitigated conditions and are reported in tables contained in the appendices of the TIS [in Appendix F-1]. Tables contained in Appendix I [in Appendix F-1] of the report. A copy of the determination of significant impact from the Town's Subdivision and Land Development Regulations (SEQR manual) is also contained in Appendix I [in Appendix F-1].

#### **Summary of Analyses Results for Phase 1**

The analyses indicated that 34 of the 36 study intersections will continue to operate at No Build levels of Service (LOS) after the completion of the Phase 1 of the proposed project. Two intersections did experience changes in LOS from the No Build to Build Conditions. However, with the minor signal adjustments that can be accommodated by the current signal controllers, these two intersections will continue to operate at No Build levels of better after the completion of Phase 1 of the project.

Based on the Town's Subdivision and Land Development Regulations' criteria for determining impacts, the increase in delay experienced at the study intersections during all analyzed peak hours for both the school peak and summer seasons do not result in a significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required at these intersections under Phase 1 of the project.

The No Build arterial analyses and measures of effectiveness will be maintained after the construction of Phase 1 of the project.

It is therefore our professional opinion that the construction of Phase 1 of the proposed project will not significantly impact the operation of the intersections within and around the Study Area.

#### **Summary of Analyses Results for Phase 2 With and Without Other Planned Developments**

The results of the analyses for Phase 2 with and without other planned developments are similar to those for Phase 1. Hence, the finding for the two phases are the same.

[The No Build arterial analyses and measures of effectiveness will be maintained after the construction of Phase 2 of the project.](#)

It is therefore our professional opinion that the construction of Phase 2 of the proposed project with and without the consideration of other planned developments will not significantly impact the operation of the intersections within and around the Study Area.

#### **Summary of Analyses Results for Phase 3 With and Without Other Planned Developments**

The results of the analyses for Phase 3 with and without other planned developments are similar to those for Phases 1 and 2. Hence, the finding for Phases 1, 2 and 3 are the same.

[The No Build arterial analyses and measures of effectiveness will be maintained after the construction of Phase 3 of the project.](#)

It is therefore our professional opinion that the construction of Phase 3 of the proposed project with and without the consideration of other planned developments will not significantly impact the operation of the intersections within and around the Study Area.

#### **Summary of Analyses Results for Phase 4**

The analyses indicated that one signalized intersection will require physical improvements and the rest of the signalized intersection will continue to operate at No Build LOS with minor signal timing adjustments where necessary.

[The proposed mitigations will improve both the operation of the arterial and the measures of effectiveness after the construction of Phase 4 of the project.](#)

It is therefore our professional opinion that the construction of Phase 4 with the implantation of the physical improvements at the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service, will not significantly impact the operation of the intersections within and around the Study Area.

#### **Summary of Analyses Results for Phase 5**

The analyses indicated that two signalized intersections will require physical improvements and the rest of the signalized intersections will continue to operate at No Build LOS with minor signal timing adjustments were necessary.

[The proposed mitigations will improve both the operation of the arterial and the measures of effectiveness after the construction of Phase 5 of the project.](#)

It is therefore our professional opinion that the construction of Phase 5 with the implementation of

the physical improvements at the intersections of Lakeland Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service and Lakeland Avenue and Tariff Street/Johnson Avenue will not significantly impact the operation of the intersections within and around the Study Area.

#### **Summary of Analyses Results for Phase 6**

The analyses indicated that two signalized intersections will require physical improvements and the rest of the signalized intersections will continue to operate at No Build LOS with minor signal timing adjustments where necessary. [The widening of Lakeland Avenue between Eastover Road and 11<sup>th</sup> Street to provide an additional northbound lane and the elimination of the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and Chester Road will further improve the operation of the Lakeland Avenue corridor and the intersections within that segment of Lakeland Avenue.](#)

[The proposed mitigations will improve both the operation of the arterial and the measures of effectiveness after the construction of Phase 6 of the project.](#)

It is therefore our professional opinion that the construction of Phase 6 with the implementation of the physical improvements at the intersections of Lakeland Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service and Lakeland Avenue and Tariff Street/Johnson Avenue, [the widening of Lakeland Avenue and the elimination of the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and Chester Road](#) will not significantly impact the operation of the intersections within and around the study area.

#### **Additional Mitigation Measure for Phase 6**

[\(elimination of the Chester Road at Lakeland Avenue intersection\)](#)

[In the February 2020 memo from the Town commenting on the project Traffic Impact study, the town recommended the review of an alternative mitigation measure to eliminate the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and Chester Road. The east-west portion of Chester Road to be eliminated and access to Chester Road provided via a new intersection of Chester Road and the signalized Site Access. The intent of the mitigation measure is to eliminate the need for the unconventional signal operation and provide a more efficient operations for the vehicles at Chester Road. Figure 31 is a conceptual plan showing this optional improvement.](#)

[As stated previously, the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant for Phase 6 of the project are adequate to mitigate the impacts associated with Phase 6 of the project. However, the optional additional mitigation measure recommended by the Town to further improve the operation of the Lakeland Avenue corridor after the construction of Phase 6 of the project have been analyzed. The following tables summarizes the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue lengths on intersection movements along the Lakeland Avenue corridor in the vicinity of the site that will see increase in traffic volumes due to the proposed project. These tables present a comparison of the No Build, Build and Build with mitigations conditions during the weekday AM and PM school peak periods. It can be seen from the tables below that the reduction in the northbound queue lengths is not significantly different from the reduced queue lengths achieved by the mitigation proposed by the applicant under phase 6. Hence the additional migration recommended by the Town by itself will not further improve queues. However, this mitigation will eliminate the delays associated with the eastbound Chester Road traffic at Lakeland Avenue.](#)

The TIS concludes as follows:

Based on the results of the TIS, as detailed in the body of this report, it is the professional opinion of Nelson & Pope that the construction of ~~the~~ Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed project will not significantly impact the operation of the roadways and intersections adjacent to the site. The impacts created by Phases 4, 5 and 6 can be mitigated by the implementation of the proposed improvements measures [see **Section 3.1.3**]. With these improvement measures, the Lakeland Avenue corridor and the intersections in the study area will continue to operate at ~~current~~No Build or better levels of service after the full build out of the project.

### Congestion on Brook Street and Montauk Highway

Traffic from the proposed project that will be using Montauk Highway has already been accounted for in the trip distribution and generation and hence included in the traffic analyses. However, to further identify any potential impact of any increase in use of Brook Street and Montauk Highway by the traffic from the proposed project to avoid congestion at the interchange, we assumed a conservative 10% of the project traffic anticipated to use NYS Route 27 (Sunrise Highway) during the PM peak hours will use Montauk Highway as a bypass. Based on our trip generation and distribution for the full build out of the project, a total of 73 vehicles will be leaving the site to head west on NYS Route 27 (Sunrise Highway) and a total 113 vehicles will be heading to the site travelling east on NYS Route 27 (Sunrise Highway). These numbers will result in 8 vehicles using Montauk Highway as a bypass travelling west and 12 vehicles using Montauk Highway as a bypass travelling east. These numbers amount to, at most, 1 vehicle every 5 minutes. This increase will not exacerbate the existing traffic congestion on these roadways; hence the proposed project will not create any significant impacts on the operation of these roadways.

### Traffic Conditions at the Nearby LIRR Grade Crossings

In order to model the at grade crossing on Railroad Avenue, the intersection of the railroad crossing and Railroad Avenue was analyzed as a two-phase pre-timed traffic signal with a cycle length equivalent to average time between trains during the peak hours. The train phase is the eastbound/westbound phase with a cycle length equal the average time the gates are in a down position during the peak hours. The northbound/southbound phase has a green phase equal to the average time the gates were in an upward position during the peak hours. The northbound/southbound traffic volumes equal the Railroad Avenue traffic going through the tracks during the peak hours. The eastbound/westbound railroad traffic equal the number of eastbound and westbound trains during the peak hours. The simtraffic simulation included the railroad crossing. The videos are available for viewing by the town if required.

The Sim Traffic analyses of the railroad crossing simulation was compared with the observed queues at the railroad crossing during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Table 48 [in **Appendix F-1**] summarizes the maximum northbound and southbound queues at the railroad crossing obtained from the Sim Traffic simulation.

As can be seen from the review of tables 47 and 48, the queues observed on Railroad Avenue in the vicinity of the railroad crossing during AM and PM peak hours are similar to those in the Sim Traffic Simulation, hence the modelling results reasonably reflect prevailing conditions. Considering the current traffic flow conditions on Railroad Avenue in the vicinity of the railroad track, the additional

traffic from the proposed residential development will not exacerbate the current traffic flow conditions.

### The Oakdale Merge

The proposed project is projected to generate 39 eastbound and 112 westbound trips during the AM peak that will traverse the Oakdale Merge section of Sunrise Highway. During the AM peak hour approximately 4,500 vehicles travel in the eastbound direction and 6,600 vehicles in the westbound direction. Therefore, during this period the proposed project will generate slightly less than 2 additional vehicles per minute to the westbound traffic and less than one vehicle per minute in the eastbound direction. During the PM peak hour, the proposed project is expected to generate 113 eastbound and 73 westbound trips that will traverse the Oakdale Merge. Therefore, during this period the proposed project will generate slightly less than 2 additional vehicles per minute to the eastbound traffic and slightly more than one vehicle per minute in the westbound direction. This additional traffic volume is extremely minimal, especially when considering existing traffic volumes on the roadway and will have an imperceptible effect on existing conditions.

Municipal agencies are aware of the congestion present at the Oakdale Merge and in the past have put forth proposals to improve the roadway section but have failed to garner approval due to the environmental sensitivity of the surrounding parklands. However, recently, the NYSDOT has scheduled a Public Information Meeting in order to discuss a Planning Feasibility Study for the Oakdale Merge section of Sunrise Highway. This study has been initiated to identify “existing deficiencies and determine alternatives for operational, safety and mobility improvements”. The DOT is seeking participation, comments, ideas and feedback from local community groups. The anticipated completion of the feasibility study is slated for January 2019.

Currently NYSDOT PIN 0059.27 is under construction on the Oakdale Merge section of Sunrise Highway with a contract completion date of 11/14/2019. This project scope includes the following:

- Milling/pavement restoration.
- Drainage improvements.
- The opening of the median barrier on Sunrise Highway (NY27) between Pond Road and Oakdale-Bohemia Road for emergency vehicle access.
- The closure of the first eastbound South Service Road entrance ramp to mainline Sunrise Highway, just east of the Connetquot Avenue overpass.
- Modification to roadway delineators.
- Upgrades to deficient guide rail sections.

Install ramp metering at several westbound entrance ramps prior to the Oakdale Merge.

### Parking at Sayville LIRR Station and Downtown Sayville

During the scoping process, the issue of the level of use of the Sayville downtown parking areas including the LIRR parking lots by the potential future residents of the proposed residential development was raised and included in the final scope of the proposed PDD. To determine the level of use of these parking areas by potential residents, an estimate of the number of potential

users was determined.

The proposed residential development contains a total of ~~1,365~~1365 residential units. Based on the fiscal and economic analyses conducted for this project, a total of ~~2,313~~2313 adults (non-school age) residents will reside in this residential development.

To determine the number of adult residents of the development who will likely be employed and potentially use public transit, data from the U.S. Census Bureau specifically for Sayville was utilized.

Based on the US Census Data for Sayville, 60% of Adult residents will likely be employed. Applying these number to the potential number of Island Hills residents, a total of 1,388 Island Hills residents will likely be employed. A percentage of these working residents will likely use the LIRR to commute to their place work. The same census data indicated that approximately 8% of workers uses the railroad. Given that Sayville residents have the option to use either the Sayville Station or the Ronkonkoma Station, we assume that 4% of commuters will use the Sayville Station and the other 4% of commuters will use the Ronkonkoma Station. Applying these percentages, the potential number of employed residents in the proposed development will result in an estimate of 56 potential LIRR users from the Island Hills development for both the Sayville and Ronkonkoma Stations.

Based on the current availability of parking within the Sayville Downtown Area and the LIRR parking lots, there will be an adequate number of parking spaces to support the additional demand from the potential residents of the Island Hills development. To further reduce or eliminate the need for parking at the trains station by potential residents, the applicants is proposing to provide private shuttle services (private transit) to transport residents to and from the train station during the AM and PM commuter peak hours. The applicant will be working on the details of this service as the project progresses.

Parking observations were also made at the Ronkonkoma Station during the peak (9am -10am), when all commuters would have parked their vehicles for two typical weekdays. On both days more than 260 parking spaces were available. Therefore, there is adequate parking (paid and unpaid) available at the Ronkonkoma Station to accommodate the estimated 56 residents that could potentially use the Ronkonkoma Station.

The availability of parking in the Sayville downtown area during weekends will be significantly higher than what was observed during weekdays since the LIRR parking lots will be highly under-utilized on weekends. Hence, there will be adequate parking to support any weekend shoppers from the Island Hills development.

~~It should be noted that, the applicant is proposing to provide private transit services for residents of the development that will include stops at both train stations, which would decrease or eliminate the need for parking at both train stations.~~

### School-Related Transportation Issues

In response to comments from the Town on the proposed development's impact on school related

traffic field observations were conducted at the following schools on May 30<sup>th</sup> and June 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019 during the AM drop-off periods and the PM pick-up periods.

- Edward J. Bosti Elementary School
- Oakdale-Bohemia Middle School
- Connetquot High School

#### **Edward J. Bosti Elementary School**

The Edward J. Bosti Elementary School is located at 50 Bourne Boulevard, less than 0.5 miles from the proposed site. The morning arrival times and afternoon dismissal times at this school are scheduled at 9:05 am and 3:35 pm respectively. Field observations were conducted at this school between 8:30 am and 9:30 am and from 3pm to 4pm to observe firsthand, the pickup and drop off at the school to get a clear understanding of the existing operation and how the proposed project may or may not affect the existing school arrival and dismissal patterns. From an overall perspective the busy drop-off time period lasted for approximately 20 minutes between 8:50 AM to 9:10 AM and the busy pick up period lasted for approximately 30 minutes between 2:30 PM to 3 PM. During these short time periods minor congestion was observed on Bourne Boulevard and the loop access to the school. No Traffic flow and circulation issues were observed during these time periods. Drop-offs and pick-ups were done in an orderly manner. Outside of these time periods, no traffic congestion issues were observed on the roadways in the vicinity of the school.

#### **Oakdale-Bohemia Middle School**

The Oakdale-Bohemia Middle School is located at 60 Oakdale-Bohemia Road, approximately 2.5 miles from the proposed site. The morning arrival times and afternoon dismissal times at this school are scheduled at 7:40 am and 2:44 pm respectively. Field observations were conducted at this school between 7:20 am to 8:00 am and from 2:00 pm to 3pm to observe firsthand, the pickup and drop off at the school to get a clear understanding of the existing operation and how the proposed project may or may not affect the existing school arrival and dismissal patterns. From an overall perspective the busy drop-off time period lasted for approximately 25 minutes between 7:25 AM to 7:50 AM and the busy pick up period lasted for approximately 15 minutes between 2:30 PM to 2:45 PM. During these short time periods significant amount of congestion was observed on northbound Oakdale-Bohemia Road and the access to the school especially during the afternoon pick-up period. Outside of these time periods, no traffic congestion issues were observed on the roadways in the vicinity of the school. The following is a more detailed description of the field observations.

- During drop-off in the morning all buses were observed lined up along the bus drop-off area along the eastside of the school. The students were discharged from the buses at the same time (around 7:45 am). All the students entered the school building in an orderly manner using the two main doors on the eastside of the building. No conflicts between students and vehicles were observed.
- Parents entered the school from the north driveway and dropped-off students on the south side of the school building. After dropping off the students, parents looped around the perimeter of the parking lot and exit via the north access if their destinations were north on Oakdale-Bohemia Road or via the south access if their destination were south on Oakdale-Bohemia Road. Cones were deployed along the parking lot perimeter to prohibit the use of the middle parking lanes.
- Long queues were observed on Oakdale-Bohemia Road during the drop-off periods.



- Security personnel were present to direct traffic and help minimize traffic conflicts.
- All buses left the school after drop-off in an orderly manner.
- The queues on the school drop-off area and on Oakdale-Bohemia Road cleared around 7:50am.
- The morning drop-off observations were similar to the afternoon pick-up observations.
- During the afternoon pick-up period, all the buses lined-up in the bus pick up area around 2:30 pm. Parents were also lined up along the parent drop-off/pick-up area on the south side of the school. Around 2:40 students boarded the buses and all the buses left the school via both the north and south driveways in an orderly manner around 2:45 pm.
- Similar to the drop-off, parent picked-up students and looped around the perimeter of the parking lot to exit the school via the north and south driveways. Vehicles exiting the north driveway experienced longer queues since most of the exiting vehicles were making left turns onto Oakdale Bohemia Road. Left turning vehicles experienced an average of 20 seconds of delay per vehicle.

Overall, Oakdale-Bohemia Road and the school access points and drop-off/pick-up areas experienced delays and traffic congestion during the drop-off and pick-up periods that lasted at most 30 minutes. Outside these time periods no traffic congestion and traffic flow issues were observed. These types of conditions are common at many schools in Long Island.

#### **Connetquot High School**

The Connetquot High School is located at 190 7<sup>th</sup> Street, in Bohemia New York, approximately 3.8 miles from the proposed site. The morning arrival times and afternoon dismissal times at this school are scheduled at 7:00 am and 1:30 pm, 2:11 pm respectively. Field observations were conducted at this school between 6:30 am to 7:30 am and from 1:00 pm to 2:30 pm to observe firsthand, the pickup and drop off at the school to get a clear understanding of the existing operation and how the proposed project may or may not affect the existing school arrival and dismissal patterns. From an overall perspective the busy drop-off time period lasted for approximately 30 minutes between 6:45 AM to 7:15 AM and the busy pick up period lasted for approximately 50 minutes between 1:30 PM to 2:20 PM. During these short time periods congestion was observed on 7<sup>th</sup> Street and the access to the school. Outside of these time periods, no traffic congestion issues were observed on the roadways in the vicinity of the school. The following is a more detailed description of the field observations.

- At the High School the bus drop-off area is totally separated from the parent drop of area. The bus drop of are is in front of the school building on the east side and the parent drop-off area is in front of the school building on the west side.
- During drop-off in the morning all buses were observed dropping students along the bus drop-off area and left the school via the bus loop area and 7<sup>th</sup> Street in an orderly manner.
- Parents dropped off the students along the parent drop off area and looped around to exit the school via 7<sup>th</sup> Street in an orderly manner.
- Long queues were observed on 7<sup>th</sup> Street during the drop-off periods.
- Security personnel were present at the entrance to direct traffic and pedestrian crossing to help minimize traffic and pedestrian conflicts.
- All buses left the school after drop-off in an orderly manner.

- During the afternoon pick-up period, all the buses lined-up in the bus pick up area Parents were also lined up along the parent drop-off/pick-up area. Around 2:10 students boarded the buses and all the buses left the school via 7<sup>th</sup> Street in an orderly manner.
- Parents picked up the students along the parent drop off/pick-up area and looped around to exit the school via 7<sup>th</sup> Street in an orderly manner.

Overall, 7<sup>th</sup> Street and the school access point and drop-off/pick-up areas experienced delays and traffic congestion during the drop-off and pick-up periods that lasted at most 30 minutes in the morning and 50 minutes in the afternoon. Outside these time periods no traffic congestion and traffic flow issues were observed. These types of conditions are common at many schools in Long Island.

To determine the level of impact the proposed development will have, if any, on school-related transportation of these parking areas by potential residents, an estimate of the number of potential number of school children that will reside at the development was determined. The proposed residential development contains a total of ~~1,365~~1365 residential units. Based on the fiscal and economic analyses conducted for this project, a total of 210 school-aged children will reside in this residential development. ~~These~~The as-of- right development of 98 single family homes will generate a total of 144 school aged children, 66 less than the proposed development. The 210 students will be distributed between the elementary, middle and high school. A-Based on the number of grades from K through 12, of the 210 school aged children, we estimated 97 elementary school children, 48 middle school children and 65 high school students. Based on this estimate, the elementary school children will generate between 2 and 3~~total of 210 children will generate approximately 5 school buses that, the middle school children will be distributed~~generate between the three schools. The addition of 5 school 1 and 2 buses will not significantly impact traffic flow and congestion on the surrounding roadwaysand the high school students will generate between 1 and 2 buses.

Based on our field observations as noted above, the addition of few more school buses will not significantly impact traffic flow and congestion on the surrounding roadways and should not require any changes to the current bus routes. Data obtained from the Pre-K Through 12<sup>th</sup> Grade Nassau/Suffolk County School Enrollment for 2014 through 2019 show that the student enrollment at the Connetquot Central School District consistently declined over the five (5) school year periods. The Connetquot Central School District lost a total of 502 students over the 5-year period. Based on this trend and the current bus utilization, the additional students could be accommodated in the current bus fleet and hence may not require any changes to the current fleet. Additionally, any increases in the number of vehicles dropping off and picking up students, driving to and parking at the school facilities was included in the trip generation and distribution of traffic for the proposed project and hence will be reflected in the capacity analyses results of the study intersections. Any traffic flows and congestion issues at the school facilities are existing and only occur for a short period of time during the morning drop-off periods and the afternoon pick-up periods. The project traffic traveling to and from these school facilities should not significantly impact the current operation of the school facilities.

However, to improve the current traffic condition during the short period of time they occur, the following can be considered:

- [Have more than one arrival and departure time per school \(stagger the arrival and departure times by 30 minutes\). This can be done by grades. For example, have Grade 3 thru 5 students arrive half an hour before Pre-K thru 2. This will help distribute traffic and relieve traffic congestion.](#)
- [Install signs along the drop off /pick up areas to encourage parents not to double park during drop off and pickups. This will improve traffic circulation and hence reduce traffic congestion](#)

### 3.1.3 Proposed Mitigation

- From the review of the capacity analyses results for each of the phases contained in the analyses section of this report, the analyses indicated that 34 of the 36 study intersections will continue to operate at No Build levels of [serviceService](#) (LOS) after the completion of Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the proposed project. Two intersections did experience changes in LOS from the No Build to Build Conditions. However, with minor signal adjustments that can be accommodated by the current signal controllers, these two intersections will continue to operate at No Build [levels-ofLOS or](#) better after the completion of Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the project. Based on the Town's Subdivision and Land Development Regulations' criteria for determining impacts, the increase in delay, experienced at the study intersections during all analyzed peak hours for both the school peak and summer seasons [does](#) not result in a significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required at these intersections under Phases 1, 2 and 3 of the projects.

It is therefore our professional opinion that the construction of up to Phase 3 (678 units) of the proposed project will not significantly impact the operation of the intersections within and around the Study Area.

- The results of the capacity analyses for Phase 4 indicated that the southbound approach at the intersection of Lakeland Avenue at NYS Route 27 North Service Road experiences an increase in delay of more than 29 seconds for both the PM and Friday PM peak periods and the overall intersection delay also increased by more than 9 seconds during the PM and the Friday PM peak periods. These increases, in delay, are considered significant impacts and hence will require mitigation.

In order to mitigate these impacts, the southbound approach of this intersection which currently provides an exclusive through lane, a shared through/right turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane will be redesigned to provide two exclusives through lanes and two exclusive right turn lanes. Minor signal timing adjustments will also be conducted for the northbound left turn phase. [-\[Note that road widenings will not require any takings of privately-owned land, but will take place within the road ROWs.\]](#)

With this mitigation, the Town's Subdivision and Land Development Regulations' criteria for no significant impacts will be met during all the studied peak periods with and without other planned developments.

- The results of the capacity analyses for Phases 5 and 6 indicated that, the intersections of Lakeland

Avenue and NYS Route 27 North Service Road and Lakeland Avenue at Tariff Street/Johnson Avenue experiences increases in delay that are considered significant impacts and hence will require mitigations. ~~In order to mitigate these impacts, the southbound approach of the intersection of Lakeland Avenue at NYS Route 27 North Service Road which currently provides an exclusive through lane, a shared through/right turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane will be redesigned to provide two exclusives through lanes and two exclusive right turn lanes.~~

~~In addition to the mitigation recommended for Phase 4, with the development of Phases 5 and 6 additional mitigations are recommended. Minor signal timing adjustments will also be conducted for the northbound left turn phase.~~ In order to mitigate these impacts at the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and Tariff Street/Johnson Avenue, the northbound approach will be widened to provide an exclusive left turn lane enabling the redistribution of green time to improve the failing westbound approach. [Note that road widenings will not require any takings of privately-owned land, but will take place within the road ROWs.]

With these mitigations, the Town's Subdivision and Land Development Regulations' criteria for no significant impacts will be met during all the studied peak periods with and without other planned developments.

- In order to respond to the Town's comment on the current operation of the Lakeland Avenue corridor in the vicinity of the proposed project site and potential impact of the proposed project on this corridor a further review of traffic analyses results was conducted. As stated above, the mitigation measures recommended for Phase 5 of the project are adequate to mitigate the impacts associated with Phase 6 of the project. However, the following additional mitigation measure has been proposed to further improve the operation of the Lakeland Avenue corridor after the construction of Phase 6 of the project.
  - Widen Lakeland Avenue between Chester Road and 11<sup>th</sup> Street to provide an additional northbound through lane. The widening will begin around Eastover Road and extends to meet the existing 2 lane section of Lakeland Avenue just north of 11<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - The segment of Lakeland Avenue between Eastover Road and Gibbons Court/Site Access will be striped to provide two through lanes and one northbound left turn into the Site Access.

With these improvements the traffic flow along the Lakeland Avenue corridor will improve significantly.

The proposed mitigations will improve both the operation of the Lakeland Avenue corridor and the measures of effectiveness after the construction of the proposed project.

## **3.2 Land Use, Zoning and Plans**

### **3.2.1 Existing Conditions**

#### Land Use

The aerial photograph in **Figure 1-3** shows that the subject site is presently classified as a Vacant former golf course/country club property.

**Figure 3-2a** shows the pattern of land uses in the nearby area, and **Figure 3-2b** depicts the land uses of the area immediately surrounding the subject property (i.e., within approximately 1,000 feet). The following summarizes the land uses of the properties within approximately 1,000 feet in the area surrounding the site:

- North - Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential, Commercial & Utility (recharge basin); *Nearby:* Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential, Open Space, Institutional, Industrial, Transportation & Commercial
- East - Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential, Institutional (cemetery & church), Commercial; *Nearby:* Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential, Institutional, Open Space & Utility
- South - Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential; *Nearby:* Residential, Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential, Institutional, Open Space, Industrial, Commercial & Community Services
- ~~West - Residential, Industrial, Undeveloped & Commercial; *Nearby:* Residential, Community Services, Commercial & Industrial~~

The land use map of the surrounding area shows that West - Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential & Commercial; *Nearby:* Medium-Density Residential, High-Density (Multifamily) Residential, & Commercial

Figures 3-2a and 3-2b show that immediately surrounding the subject site is predominantly single-family dwellings developed at low and medium densities. In addition, high-density, multifamily properties are found in the area. In the general area surrounding the subject site, there is a wide range of land use types in the vicinity, having a wide range of land use intensities. NYS Route 27 (Sunrise Highway) is a dominant land use factor in the area, comprising a major transportation corridor. The corridor along Sunrise Highway includes commercial and high density residential uses with generally lower density residential use at greater distances from the highway. The area surrounding the sites exhibits a wide range of uses including: intermittent commercial uses, a cemetery, a church, industrial use, high-density residential use and open space. Key uses in the area include the Sayville Plaza to the northeast across Sunrise Highway, the Sayville Commons apartments (for 55 years and older) across Lakeland Avenue to the east, the St. Lawrence Parrish Cemetery and the New Life Community Church east of the site, south of which are the Fairfield Apartments and the Coral Lane multifamily developments, the Bayman Soccer Fields and the West Sayville National Wildlife Refuge to the south, and the Edward J. Bosti Elementary School and the Eastern Suffolk BOCES Milliken Technical Center generally southwest of the subject site beyond the 1,000'000-foot radius. These uses are intermixed with small commercial uses and single family residential use.

~~The aerial photograph in **Figure 1-3** shows that the subject site is presently classified as a vacant former golf course/country club property.~~

Zoning

**Figure 3-3a** shows the pattern of land uses in the larger nearby area, and **Figure 3-3b** depicts zoning in the area immediately surrounding the subject property (i.e., within approximately 1,000 feet). The following summarizes the zoning of the properties within approximately 1,000'000 feet in the area surrounding the site:

- North - AAA, CAA, Business 1, Business 3, GSD & GST; *Nearby:* A, AA, CA, B, Business 3 & GSC
- East - AA, B, CA, CAA, Business 1, Business 3, & GSD; *Nearby:* A, AA, B, C, CA, & Business 2
- South - AAA & B; *Nearby:* AAA, B, CA, BD & Industrial 1
- West - AA, AAA, B, Business 1 & Industrial 1; *Nearby:* AA, CA, Business 1, Business 2, & Industrial 1

The figures illustrate that, similar to the pattern of land uses discussed above, the pattern of zoning in the area reflects the wide range of land use types in the area.

The subject site is presently zoned in the Residence AAA district. Permitted uses in Residence AAA district include detached single-family homes, places of worship, public parks or libraries, municipal buildings, railway stations, and agricultural or nursery uses. As shown in the **Yield Map** ([in a pouch at the back of this document](#)), and based on the minimum lot size of 40,000 SF in the Residence AAA District, 98 lots could be delineated on the site.

**Table 3-5** lists the various bulk and setback requirements of the Residence AAA zoning district, which currently apply to the project site.

**TABLE 3-5**  
**ZONING REQUIREMENTS**  
Residence AAA District

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Requirement</u>
<u>Height, Principal Building</u>	<u>35 feet, 2-1/2 stories</u>
<u>Lot Occupancy (FAR), maximum</u>	<u>0.25</u>
<u>Area Density, minimum</u>	<u>40,000 SF</u>
<u>Lot Width, minimum</u>	<u>150 feet</u>
<u>Front Yard, minimum</u>	<u>50 feet</u>
<u>Side Yards, minimum, each</u>	<u>30 feet</u>
<u>Side Yard, minimum, combined</u>	<u>60 feet</u>
<u>Rear yard, minimum</u>	<u>40 feet</u>

Land Use Plans

*Sayville Hamlet Study (1976)* - In the mid-1970's, the Town of Islip began to prepare a Comprehensive Plan. As part of and in support of that effort, the Town first prepared a number

of hamlet “Community Identity” studies, the results and recommendations of which would be considered in the Comprehensive Plan, when prepared (the Town Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the Town in 1979, and is presently being updated). The hamlets of Oakdale, West Sayville, Sayville, and Bayport were evaluated in one such study. The following is taken from that [1976](#) document.

**Table 3-5**  
**ZONING REQUIREMENTS**  
 Residence AAA District

<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Requirement</b>
<del>Height, Principal Building</del>	<del>35 feet, 2-1/2 stories</del>
<del>Lot Occupancy (FAR), maximum</del>	<del>0.25</del>
<del>Area Density, minimum</del>	<del>40,000 SF</del>
<del>Lot Width, minimum</del>	<del>150 feet</del>
<del>Front Yard, minimum</del>	<del>50 feet</del>
<del>Side Yards, minimum, each</del>	<del>30 feet</del>
<del>Side Yard, minimum, combined</del>	<del>60 feet</del>
<del>Rear yard, minimum</del>	<del>40 feet</del>

**Town Objectives**

The Town of Islip is in the process of developing planning studies (with the help of Federal funding) for all communities within the Town. When these studies are completed, they will provide an invaluable planning tool for the growth and development of the Town of Islip. This volume deals with the communities of Oakdale, West Sayville, Sayville and Bayport. Combining these communities into one Study Area will provide the Town with an analysis of the interrelated problems, as well as those problems specifically related to each community.

The following objectives have been established as guidelines by the Town for each of the community plans.

- Preserve residential areas
- Satisfy housing needs
- Provide opportunities for recreation
- Protect environmental features
- Project commercial and industrial needs and their proper locations
- Evaluate traffic and road networks
- Provide adequate public service
- Promote community awareness

This [1976](#) volume reflects the combined efforts of the Town of Islip Department of Planning and Development, other Town Departments and the Consultants. Although the final report is as timely as possible, fluctuating circumstances require that this study be periodically reviewed and updated to be a viable planning tool.

The project site was designated within the hamlet of West Sayville, and the following is the Study's recommendation for the property.

#### Residential

Residential policies for this area should be consistent with and as proposed for Oakdale, especially south of Montauk Highway. North of Montauk Highway, residential areas should again be preserved by maintaining present zoning for vacant residential properties and no down-zoning.

Another large parcel of open space is the Island Hills Golf Course. This large piece of open space should be protected as a scenic easement through a tax abatement or, ultimately, encouraged as a cluster-type development with, perhaps, an executive-size golf course incorporated into the site development plan.

*Suffolk County Sunrise Highway Corridor Study (August 2009)* - The following material, taken from the [adopted](#) 2009 Suffolk County Planning Department report, describes the goal and intent of that Study.

#### **Introduction**

This study was initiated by the County Executive in response to increasing concerns over the impact of development along Sunrise Highway for that portion extending along a 12.7-mile segment straddling the towns of Islip and Brookhaven. These concerns included traffic congestion and safety issues on Sunrise Highway including the service roads, traffic impacts and land use conflicts to the neighborhoods that adjoin the highway as well as potential adverse impacts to existing centers, including downtowns.

The study was completed with a unique interagency approach. From the beginning, all of the involved agencies came together to define the project and contribute valuable information and professional assistance. The agencies included the New York State Department of Transportation, the Suffolk County Department of Public Works, the Town of Brookhaven Department of Planning, Environmental and Land Management, the Town of Islip Department of Planning and the Town of Islip Department of Public Works (Division of Traffic Safety). The Suffolk County Department of Planning served as the coordinator of the project.

This approach is a recognition that agency coordination of planning within the corridor is essential to a comprehensive understanding of current and emerging problems as well as the identification of alternative policy options. From this process, sound information can be utilized by involved stakeholders and decision makers to create and implement the desired vision for the future.

Sunrise Highway, State Route 27, is an east-west roadway that begins in southern Queens and terminates in Montauk. Its total length is 70.6 miles and its limited-access length is 49.7 miles.

This report analyzes the area surrounding a 12.7-mile segment of Sunrise Highway within the towns of Islip and Brookhaven. The length of Sunrise Highway in the study area is 7.4 miles in the Town of Islip, and 5.3 miles in the Town of Brookhaven.



The study area covers 3,105 acres (4.85 square miles) and contains parcels of land with a close connection to Sunrise Highway. The area is 0.5% of the total area of Suffolk County. The studied segment includes the parcels adjacent to Sunrise Highway from Islip Terrace east to North Bellport.

The western boundary of the study area is Heckscher State Parkway and the eastern boundary lies just east of Bellport Station Road.

Much of the land in the study area is developed, but there are some significant areas of vacant land. There are also several properties that could reasonably be redeveloped. The study area contains a significant number of units of multiunit housing in housing complexes as well as numerous single-family residences near Sunrise Highway. In addition, the study area contains many shopping centers, other commercial development and significant industrial development.

The goal of this study is to identify policies and practices that will help to manage growth within the Sunrise Highway corridor in a manner that will improve the quality of development, provide for a balance of land uses and a reduction of commercial sprawl, minimize the impact on traffic and minimize the impact of land use conflicts with surrounding communities. The study includes broad guidelines as well as recommendations for land uses and traffic impact mitigation

The following recommendation was provided for the subject site:

**Island Hills Country Club 0500-280.00-01.00-015.001 Recommendation:** Retain existing Residence AAA zoning. Consideration should also be given to the designation of a recreational zoning district in order to protect this valuable recreational use and preserve this existing oasis of open space. Retain golf course or if an application is received, allow as-of-right development or similar FARS and density and require cluster subdivision which preserves golf course or any other open space on site. TDRs should be considered if on-site yield is incompatible with golf course. Actual yield would be about 107 units if developed under the existing Residence AAA District.

### 3.2.2 Anticipated Impacts

#### Land Use

The Island Hills golf course closed in 2015 and the site has been vacant and unused since that time. The proposed project will change the land use type of the site, from Vacant to Residential. ~~Residential~~Generally, residential use is the dominant land use in the area at present (though there are a variety of land uses represented in the area), ~~therefore, the basic land use proposed is compatible with uses in the area and the specific type of residential use represented by the project, High-Density Residential use, is represented in numerous locations in the vicinity, though there is no individual site of a size comparable to the subject site.~~ The proposed project features a 25± acre park surrounding the development, thereby clustering the proposed multiple family residential use within the property. This feature provides a perimeter setback that will be accessible to the public and therefore will add to the park-like setting and available park space in the area.

The project will increase the amount and intensity of development on the site as compared to existing use and use if the site were ~~development under current zoning developed under current zoning and as per the recommendations of the aforementioned plans; it would further decrease the amount of open space but would provide an additional 25 acres of public recreational space.~~ This density requires a change of zone from the Town Board. Through the zone change, the applicant seeks to establish a use on the site that will enhance the character of the community through superior site design, architecture and landscape setting, and provide needed apartment style living options to serve a need in the community and the region. Given the diversity of land use types in the area which includes high-density (multifamily) residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, religious, and active/passive open space uses, the proposed project will complement land uses in the area.

A number of supplemental studies have been prepared for the Applicant to understand land use in the area and to consider the benefits and potential impacts of the proposed project. These studies were summarized and referenced in **Section 1.0**; however, are relevant to the assessment of the appropriateness of the proposed land use and its potential impacts. **Appendix C-1** includes a market analysis that demonstrates the need for the proposed project and supports the proposed use as contributing housing stock that will assist in retaining millennials and those seeking apartment opportunities. **Appendix C-2** provides a density analysis that examines the land uses in the area in terms of units per acre, and the other measures to assess the change in land use density represented by the proposed project. This study finds that the proposed density is not inconsistent with the surrounding area and support the location of the proposed project as designed and intended for this site. **Appendix C-3** provides a fiscal and economic assessment that quantifies the anticipated tax revenue and school district surplus revenue after consideration of the cost of education of school age children expected to occupy the development. This study also quantifies construction jobs and operational jobs as well as the beneficial ripple effect on the local and regional economy. Tax revenue and job creation are important land use considerations, particularly given the

beneficial aspects of expanded tax base and employment opportunities. **Appendix C-4** includes a real estate impact analysis intended to determine if the proposed land use will impact real estate values of properties proximate to the subject site. This study examines comparable situations and provides a professional assessment leading to the finding that the proposed project will not adversely impact real estate values in the area.

In summary, the project would be appropriate at this location with respect to the land use pattern, given its proximity to similar and complementary land uses in all four directions and the absence of a distinct, overarching pattern of land uses in the larger vicinity.

### Zoning

*Zoning Pattern in Area* - The proposed project will change the zoning classification of the site, from Residence AAA to PDD. A PDD zoning provides the flexibility in zoning site design that is necessary to achieve land use goals and provide benefits to the community in conjunction with a proposed land use. It is acknowledged that the PDD district is not presently found in the area, so that the project's use of this district represents an impact to the local zoning pattern. However, as discussed below, that impact would not be adverse in its nature, as the PDD enables development of a project that is needed in the community, includes significant benefits to the community, and conforms to Town plans and engineering/design requirements and standards.

A PDD is enabled under NYS Town Law Section 263 which addresses incentive zoning.- Further assessment of the use of a PDD for the subject site and proposed project is provided below.

*NYS Town Law Section 263* - The following is a discussion of the project's conformance to the purposes for a PDD, as listed in NYS Town Law Section 263.

*§263. Purposes in view. Such regulations shall be made in accordance with a comprehensive plan and designed to:*

- *Lessen congestion in the streets;*

A Traffic Impact Study has been completed and finds that the road system can accommodate the PDD with planned mitigation and transportation improvements. Additionally, the project site is located along a Suffolk Transit Bus Route (#57), which will help reduce vehicle trips. **The proposed project is designed with on-site amenities and availability of goods that will which may help to reduce the need to travel off site for recreation and conveniences.** The site is less than ½ mile walking distance to Sayville Plaza to the northeast, along sidewalks on the west side of Lakeland Avenue and the north side of the Sunrise Highway North Service Road. Sayville Plaza has a variety of restaurants and retail stores. There are walking opportunities with sidewalks on Bohemia Parkway and the South Service Road to access businesses along Sunrise Highway to the north and west. **The combination of on-site amenities and convenience goods, internal walkability and sense-of-place,** along with public transportation and walkability to off-site goods and services will help to reduce dependence on the automobile. Certainly residents will own and use cars and so an in-depth traffic study of the areas immediately surrounding the site and

beyond was completed. The TIS demonstrates that traffic can be accommodated on area roads with the use of mitigation measures outlined in the TIS and the appropriate sections of the DEIS.

- *Secure safety from fire, flood, panic and other dangers;*  
The proposed project will establish a residential use on the site that iswill be designed to current site plan, building and fire code standards, upon Town Fire Marshall review and approval of turning radii, fire hydrant locations, private accesses, and turnarounds. The site is not located in a flood plain, and the building will meet all current code requirements. The site plan is designed to facilitate emergency response (fire, police, ambulance), if necessary. There are no known dangers associated with the site, and the type of development is multiple family residential that is common in the area.
- *Promote health and general welfare;*  
The project includes features that will promote walking and the general welfare of its residents, by its provision of on-site indoor and outdoor recreational amenities, the internal walking trails, and the 25-acre perimeter park. It is well-established that pedestrian activity in general is a passive form of exercise that is beneficial and healthful to the public.
- *Provide adequate light and air;*  
The project has been designed to provide substantial landscaped open spaces between the buildings, which would benefit the residents and produce an attractive project that fits within the local development pattern. The perimeter park provides public space between the new development and existing neighborhoods and promotes open feel as well as light penetration and air circulation. The project will include a landscape plan that will place grasses, shrubs and trees throughout the interior of the site and along the site's perimeter, so that the spaces between the residential buildings and between the developed portions of the site and bordering roadways will convey a sense of openness.
- *Prevent the overcrowding of land;*  
The site design is one that has been demonstrated to be successful and attractive to residents seeking a multiple family apartment lifestyle. The land is not overcrowded as the interior space is walkable and provides a sense-of-place, and is consistent with sound planning principles. The community features a 25-acre public space around the perimeter of the site. The overall design will feature a landscaped active/passive park setting to complement the interior development areas and encourage public use. The project will provide substantial landscaped space between the buildings, which will result in an open, visually-attractive project that precludes a sense of overcrowding of development or population. The 2,391 parking spaces proposed (as 2,089 installed and 302 spaces landbanked) will conform to Town Parking Code requirements of 1.75 spaces /unit.
- *Avoid undue concentrations of population;*  
The proposed project will provide a development that will encourage residential occupancy of the site for those seeking the lifestyle offered. The project will not concentrate any population type onto the project site, as it is a rental apartment development that is open to tenancy to all demographic groups. It is acknowledged that the project will increase the overall population of Sayville by an estimated 16%, on a site that represents 3.3% of Sayville's land area. The project

will provide 217 affordable units (15.9% of the total) at 80% of the US HUD Nassau/Suffolk Median Family Income as approved by the Town Board in the PDD-GS.

- *Make provision for, so far as conditions may permit, the accommodation of solar energy systems and equipment and access to sunlight necessary therefor;*  
The proposed project will not foreclose the possibility for use of solar energy systems, and is designed to permit access to sunlight. No determination by the Applicant has been made at the present stage of the application process regarding use of specific solar energy equipment or systems (e.g., rooftop solar panels). It is expected that specific sustainable energy-related features, systems and equipment will be determined in concert with the appropriate Town agencies during the site plan application review process.
- *Facilitate the practice of forestry; and*  
The subject site is a fallow golf course and does not provide opportunities to facilitate the practice of forestry. There is no forest on the subject site that could be retained and/or managed as part of the proposed project; the only wooded portions of the site are in the form of narrow bands between fairways and as narrow buffers along the site's bordering roadways.
- *Facilitate the adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks, and other public requirements.*  
Adequate transportation is provided by safe roads, on-site parking (conforming to Town standard of 1.75 spaces/unit) and internal circulation, with off-site mitigation planned through the recommendations of a detailed Traffic Impact Study. The proposed project includes an on-site STP for treatment and recharge of treated effluent for the project as well as connection to downtown Sayville for additional treatment capacity. The proposed project will utilize a number of public services and utility providers, including the Connetquot CSD, the West Sayville Fire Department, the SCPD (5th Precinct), the SCWA (water), PSEG (electricity), and National Grid (natural gas). The Applicant has contacted service providers through this DEIS process, and will submit applications as appropriate to service providers to notify and/or obtain approvals for connections and services.

The above analysis demonstrates that the proposed project satisfies the standards given in NYS Town Law Section 263 for a PDD; it will mitigate the anticipated impacts of the vehicle trips generated on-site, not endanger public safety and/or security, promote public health, provide a healthy environment for its residents and visitors, **prevent overcrowding of the site or an undue concentration of population, promote alternative energy production, and provide for all necessary public services.**

*Proposed PDD Regulations* - The proposed project will create a new zoning district in the Town Zoning Code that would apply only to the subject site (see **Appendix A-1**). The project will be developed in conformance with the specific use, setback and bulk standards of this new district, which are based on the standards of the Residence CA district (see **Table 3-6**).

**Table**

**TABLE 3-6**  
**ZONING CONFORMANCE**  
 Proposed Greybarn-Sayville PDD/Residence CA District

Parameter	Conformance	
	Requirement	Provided
Building Height, max.:	---	---
2-Story Residential	35 feet, 2 stories	35 feet, 2 stories
3-Story Residential	45 feet, 3 stories	45 feet, 3 stories
4-Story Residential	55 feet, 4 stories	55 feet, 24stories
Building FAR*, max.	30% **	35.4%
Lot Area, min.	80,000 SF	4,980,650 SF
Lot Width, min.	200 feet	443 feet
Front Yard Depth, min.:	---	---
2-Story Residential	75 feet	267.7 feet
3-Story Residential	75 feet	116.3 feet
4-Story Residential	100 feet	211.1 feet
Rear Yard Depth, min.	50 feet	134.5 feet
Side Yard Width, min.	50 feet	105.1 feet
Parking, min. ***	2,391 spaces	2,391 spaces

Notes (for Table 3-6):

- \* Floor-Area Ratio.
- \*\* If density bonus has been granted, 37%.
- \*\*\* 1.75 spaces/unit.

It is noteworthy that the Residence CA district (and development having the physical characteristics of that district) is already found in the area, [\(see Figures 3-3a and 3-3b\)](#), so that while there would be a change in the pattern of zoning districts in the area, the physical manifestation of this new zoning district would be of land uses that are already well-represented in the area. That is, the new PDD would provide for the same types of land uses that are already found on adjacent and nearby properties. In this way, the potential impact of this change in the pattern of zoning is ensured to be compatible and appropriate for the site and area.

*Town Zoning Code Section 68-166* – The guidelines for development and use of the site are modeled after an existing zoning district in the Town Zoning Code in order to provide a baseline for orderly development through the site specific PDD. The project will be developed based on the yield, bulk and setback requirements of the Town’s Residence CA district. **Table 3-6** presents the pertinent standards of the CA district, with the corresponding value of the proposed project.

The following presents the project’s conformance to the Town’s policy for multi-family residential use, as expressed by the General Site Criteria for the Residence CA zoning district.

- A. *The site shall be located within a convenient distance to a downtown center or in the alternative existing retail services.*

The proposed project is within a convenient distance of downtown Sayville. It is less than a 2 mile drive and accessible by car or bus. The site is within a convenient distance of the Sayville Plaza with a drive time of a few minutes and the potential to access the Plaza on foot in less than ½ mile using existing sidewalks in the area. The site is within a short driving distance to additional retail goods and local services in both downtown Sayville and the various commercial spaces along the Sunrise Highway commercial corridor. **Additionally, the project includes 24,000 SF of on-site amenity space and convenience goods exclusive to the site's residents.**

- B. *The site shall maintain convenient access to public transportation services.*

The project site lies along a portion Suffolk Transit Bus Route #57 along Hauppauge (Terry) Road on the project's southwestern frontage, which will give site residents convenient access to destinations between Smithaven Mall and Railroad Avenue at Montauk Highway, in Sayville. It should be noted that Suffolk County Bus Routes traditionally offer limited areas of service and are not comprehensive nor convenient to access Greater Long Island.

- C. *The site shall be of sufficient size and shape so as to provide for the required buffer, landscaping and setback requirements.*

The project site is over 114 acres in size, and is designed to satisfy all of the buffer, landscaping and setback standards of the Residence CA district.

- D. *The site shall be of sufficient size so as to provide for adequate parking in accordance with Town standards while still maintaining a residential appearance to the site.*

Based on the Town parking requirement of 1.75 spaces residence, a total of at least 2,391 on-site parking spaces are required. The proposed project will provide this number of spaces, of which 302 spaces will be landbanked.

- E. *The site shall be of sufficient size so as to provide for ample open space and/or recreation areas consistent with the needs of the residents and the goals of the Town of Islip.*

Nearly 22% of the site (an estimated 25 acres) will be a public park around the entire perimeter of the project site. Within the site, and reserved for the site's residents, will be substantial indoor and outdoor recreational spaces, including walking trails, pool/patios, gazebos, a community garden and gathering areas.

The above analysis indicates that the proposed project satisfies some of the Town policy requirements for multi-family residential development in the Residence CA district.

#### Land Use Plans

*Sayville Hamlet Study (1976)* - This study recommended that the subject site be retained in its then-present golf course use by applying a scenic easement on the property (encouraged by a tax abatement) or, failing that, be re-developed with a clustered residential project. Such a re-development scenario could include an executive size golf course as an amenity for the site's residents. The recommended easement was not pursued, so that the prior country club operation (and associated taxation) continued unchanged, eventually forcing the owner to close the operation and sell the property.

It should be noted that this recommendation was established ~~42 years ago~~, 44 years ago ~~(and reaffirmed 11 years ago in the Sunrise Highway Corridor Study)~~, and reflects Town and public goals for the site, as well as economic conditions of the then-site owner, in the mid-1970s. However, this recommendation was not realized and, since that time, the need for quality rental, and particularly affordable quality rental housing has increased. The proposed project is intended to address both of these needs, by providing significant numbers of these two types of housing by use of the PDD concept and as provided for in the Town Zoning Code.

The proposed project seeks to maximize the number of units allowed under the proposed PDD zoning to simultaneously address the above-described housing needs and to generate sufficient revenue to provide the necessary on-site and off-site mitigation measures, Community Benefits and utilities. ~~It is not expected that redevelopment with a 98-unit clustered residential project as recommended by the Sayville Hamlet Study would adequately address the Town's current rental and workforce housing needs.~~

The alternative recommendation in the Sayville Hamlet Study was also considered. The recommendation was to retain the golf club or encourage cluster-type development with a potential executive-sized golf course. The development is in effect a cluster-style development which offers a 25-acre perimeter park area accessible to the public. The proposed project can be compared with Alternative 7 in this DEIS which assumes a PDD similar to the proposed project, with an executive-style golf course as a recreational amenity for the site's residents.

*Suffolk County Sunrise Highway Corridor Study (August 2009)* - This document recommends that the site be retained in its existing Residence AAA zoning to support continued golf course use. It suggests that it may be advisable to designate the site as a recreational zoning district to support the golf course. If redevelopment becomes inevitable, the study recommends a clustered residential subdivision under the existing zoning (approximately 107 units) that retains the golf course or open space. Such a scenario is the subject of Alternative 2 as analyzed in Section 5.2 of this document, which concludes as follows:

It is acknowledged that Alternative 2 conforms to the existing zoning and poses significantly less impact on surrounding public roadways than the proposed project, but Alternative 2 would not achieve the Applicant's goals or objectives, which are to realize a reasonable return on the investment in land by constructing a high quality multiple family/apartment residential development that addresses a need for rental and affordable housing in the area and provides benefits to the community.

As discussed above, the prior country club operation was forced to close because it was no longer commercially viable, and the owner sold the property, suggesting that the site can no longer support the type of golf course that once operated on the site. With respect to rezoning the site from the Residence AAA district to a recreational district (to assist in supporting renewed golf course use), Alternative 6 of this document (see **Section 5.6**) investigates such an action, and determined that such a rezoning is not feasible for any commercial recreational use:



...the Applicant determined that none of the commercial recreational uses permitted in the Recreational Service G District would be viable for the subject site, in consideration of the consumer needs, goals and expectations in the 21<sup>st</sup> century market place. Specifically, based on the Applicant's experience in this regard, the following briefly indicates why each permitted use would not be appropriate on the subject site:

- The prior Island Hills Country Club (a facility based on its golf course) at the site was not commercially viable and is now closed;
- Swimming pools, and bath houses, are municipal uses, and performing arts centers are may be municipal uses as well;
- Drive-in movie theaters were a popular movie venue in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century but by the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the rise of the internet has replaced and superseded their attractiveness, and with the result that drive-ins have long since disappeared from the landscape;
- Additionally, due to recent events and lack of large public entertainment alternatives, temporary "pop-up" facilities have recently garnered renewed interest;
- Commercial riding stables/academies have not been a viable use in the Islip area for many years, and only a few existing stables remain in the region, and no new commercial ones have been proposed;
- The balance of the permitted uses may be appropriate and viable on small sites located in downtown areas or in industrial and commercial centers, but are not viable on a 114-acre standalone site in proximity to residential development.

In summary, none of the uses permitted with or without a special permit in the Recreational Service G District are realistic or viable alternatives for the development of the subject site.

It is also noteworthy that the Applicant is a developer of high-quality residential, industrial and office projects, and has no experience or business interest in the types of commercial recreational projects that are the basis for this alternative. As such, this alternative is not reasonable or feasible to the Applicant, and so is not pursued further.

~~It is noted that this Study was not adopted by the Town of Islip Town Board.~~ The proposed project does seek a change of zone to permit the Greybarn development community, open space opportunities and benefits that are offered. The change of zone is subject to Town Board review, and this DEIS presents the proposed project, potential impacts and mitigation and alternatives, to assist the Town Board in reaching an informed-decision.

### 3.2.3 Proposed Mitigation

- As the project would be appropriate with respect to the land use pattern in the vicinity given its proximity to similar and complementary land uses in all four directions and the absence of a distinct, overarching pattern of land uses in the larger vicinity, no further mitigation measures are necessary or proposed.

- Analysis demonstrates that the proposed project satisfies the standards given in NYS Town Law Section 263 for a PDD, in that it will mitigate the anticipated impacts of the vehicle trips generated on-site, not endanger public safety and/or security, promote public health, provide a healthy environment for its residents and visitors, prevent overcrowding of the site **or an undue concentration of population**, promote alternative energy production, and provide for all necessary public services. Therefore, no further mitigation measures are necessary or proposed.
- Analysis indicates that the proposed project satisfies the Town policy requirements for multi-family residential development in the Residence CA district, under which requirements and standards the project will be developed. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary or proposed.
- The proposed project will provide for the housing diversity that the Town recognizes is necessary (i.e., rental housing and affordable rental housing) based on economic conditions, demographic trends and existing housing stock. As such, no further mitigation measures are necessary or proposed.
- The proposed project conforms to the spirit and intent of the type of use recommended for the site in the 1976 Sayville Hamlet Study. Though the golf course cannot be retained, residential development is clustered on the site to provide a quality **multiple-family/multifamily**/apartment use with internal sense-of-place and community enhancement through a 25-acre passive/active perimeter park. This study dates to 1976, and the proposed use is updated to address the Town's current rental and workforce housing needs. The proposed project seeks to address the housing needs and to provide the necessary on-site and off-site mitigation measures, Community Benefits and utilities and therefore, no further mitigation is necessary or proposed. Consideration may be given to Alternative 7 in this DEIS which provides a PDD with an executive golf course for use by site residents.
- **Use of the site in conformance with the recommendations of the 2009 Sunrise Highway Corridor Study is not viable. It is noted that this Study was not adopted by the Town of Islip Town Board. The Town Board has legislative authority over a change of zone, and this DEIS provides information for the Town Board to consider in order to reach an informed-decision on the proposed project.**

### 3.3 Community Facilities and Services

The project site is located in the following service districts and/or service areas of the following community service providers:

- Connetquot CSD (99.2% of the site)
- Sayville UFSD (0.8% of the site)
- West Sayville Fire Department
- Community Ambulance Company, Inc.
- SCPD, Fifth Precinct, Sector 503
- SCWA, Distribution Area 1
- PSEG, Long Island (electricity)
- National Grid (natural gas)

Each of the above-listed service providers was contacted by letter to inform them of the project and solicit input with respect to the service capabilities and limitations (if any) on each. **Appendix H** contains the relevant correspondence, with responses (if provided).

### 3.3.1 Existing Conditions

#### Property Taxes

The following brief discussion of the site’s existing tax generation and distribution is taken from the Fiscal and Economic Impact Summary, **Appendix C-3**.

...the majority of the Town’s revenues are levied through property tax generation, which is based upon a rate per \$1,000 of assessed valuation for a given parcel. As indicated in **Table 3-7**, property owners within this part of the Town of Islip are currently<sup>1</sup> taxed at a rate of \$24.947 - \$27,320 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation, depending on location within school districts and other jurisdictional boundaries. These tax rates account for property taxes paid to either Connetquot CSD/Library District or Sayville UFSD/Library District, in addition to Suffolk County, various Town districts, Metropolitan Transportation Authority, West Sayville-Oakdale Fire District, Sayville Community Ambulance, and other local taxing jurisdictions.

**Table 3-7**  
**EXISTING TAX REVENUES**

<b>Taxing Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Current Tax Rate (per \$1,000 Assessed Valuation)</b>	<b>Current Taxes</b>	<b>Percent of Total Taxes</b>
<b>Total: School Tax</b>	<b>18.496 – 20.029</b>	<b>\$196,629</b>	<b>71.7%</b>
Sayville School District	18.777	\$13,003	4.7%
Sayville Library District	1.252	\$867	0.3%
Connetquot School District	17.645	\$174,350	63.6%
Connetquot Library District	0.851	\$8,409	3.1%
<b>Total: County Tax</b>	<b>3.139</b>	<b>\$33,190</b>	<b>12.1%</b>
County General Fund	0.186	\$1,967	0.7%
County Police	2.953	\$31,224	11.4%
<b>Total: Town Tax</b>	<b>1.326 – 2.126</b>	<b>\$21,848</b>	<b>8.0%</b>
General Town (I)	0.713	\$562	0.2%
Town Excluding Villages (I)	0.035	\$28	<0.1%
Combined Highway (I)	0.578	\$456	0.2%
General Town (II)	1.107	\$10,832	3.9%
Town Excluding Villages (II)	0.058	\$568	0.2%
Combined Highway (II)	0.961	\$9,403	3.4%
<b>Total: Other Tax</b>	<b>1.986 – 2.026</b>	<b>\$22,579</b>	<b>8.2%</b>
New York State Real Property Tax Law	0.424	\$4,483	1.6%
Out of County Tuition	0.066	\$698	0.3%
West Sayville-Oakdale Fire District	1.120	\$11,842	4.3%

<sup>1</sup> The Town of Islip’s fiscal year is between December 1, 2017 and November 30, 2018.

<b>Taxing Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Current Tax Rate (per \$1,000 Assessed Valuation)</b>	<b>Current Taxes</b>	<b>Percent of Total Taxes</b>
Street Lighting District (I)	0.073	\$58	<0.1%
Street Lighting District (III)	0.113	\$1,106	0.4%
Sayville Comm. Ambulance	0.268	\$2,834	1.0%
Town Water	0.035	\$370	0.1%
Garbage District	=	\$978	0.4%
Fed EPA Clean Air Mand.	=	\$83	<0.1%
New York State MTA Tax	=	\$127	<0.1%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>24.947 - 27.320</b>	<b>\$274,246</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Town of Islip Receiver of Taxes; analysis by NP&V, LLC.

The site currently generates a total of \$274,246 in property tax revenues. Of this, approximately 71.7% of the total taxes generated by the site are distributed to the two (2) school districts, with Connetquot CSD receiving \$174,350 and Sayville UFSD receiving \$13,003 in tax revenue. An additional \$8,409 is levied by the Connetquot Library District and \$867 by the Sayville Library District. Suffolk County receives \$33,190, or 12.1% of the total tax revenues, and the Town of Islip an additional \$21,848 or 8.0% of total revenues received by the site. The West Sayville-Oakdale Fire District levies approximately \$11,842 or 4.3% of the total tax revenue generated by the subject property, and the Sayville Community Ambulance generates \$2,834 or 1.0% of all revenues. The balance of the current property tax revenues are apportioned to various other local taxing jurisdictions, as seen in **Table 3-7**.

Public Schools

Based on the site’s current use and condition, and confirmed by the Applicant, there are currently no school-age children residing on the site. As of 2017, there were a total of 5,892 students enrolled in the Connetquot CSD.

**Figure 3-5a** shows the locations of educational resources in the vicinity of the site. The following brief discussion of the site’s school-related issues is taken from the Fiscal and Economic Impact Summary, **Appendix C-3**:

**TABLE 3-7**  
**EXISTING TAX REVENUES**

<b>Taxing Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Current Tax Rate (per \$1,000 Assessed Valuation)</b>	<b>Current Taxes</b>	<b>Percent of Total Taxes</b>
<b>Total: School Tax</b>	<b>18.496 - 20.029</b>	<b>\$196,629</b>	<b>71.7%</b>
Sayville School District	18.777	\$13,003	4.7%
Sayville Library District	1.252	\$867	0.3%
Connetquot School District	17.645	\$174,350	63.6%
Connetquot Library District	0.851	\$8,409	3.1%
<b>Total: County Tax</b>	<b>3.139</b>	<b>\$33,190</b>	<b>12.1%</b>

<u>Taxing Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Current Tax Rate (per \$1,000 Assessed Valuation)</u>	<u>Current Taxes</u>	<u>Percent of Total Taxes</u>
<u>County General Fund</u>	<u>0.186</u>	<u>\$1,967</u>	<u>0.7%</u>
<u>County Police</u>	<u>2.953</u>	<u>\$31,224</u>	<u>11.4%</u>
<b><u>Total: Town Tax</u></b>	<b><u>1.326 - 2.126</u></b>	<b><u>\$21,848</u></b>	<b><u>8.0%</u></b>
<u>General Town (I)</u>	<u>0.713</u>	<u>\$562</u>	<u>0.2%</u>
<u>Town Excluding Villages (I)</u>	<u>0.035</u>	<u>\$28</u>	<u>&lt; 0.1%</u>
<u>Combined Highway (I)</u>	<u>0.578</u>	<u>\$456</u>	<u>0.2%</u>
<u>General Town (II)</u>	<u>1.107</u>	<u>\$10,832</u>	<u>3.9%</u>
<u>Town Excluding Villages (II)</u>	<u>0.058</u>	<u>\$568</u>	<u>0.2%</u>
<u>Combined Highway (II)</u>	<u>0.961</u>	<u>\$9,403</u>	<u>3.4%</u>
<b><u>Total: Other Tax</u></b>	<b><u>1.986 - 2.026</u></b>	<b><u>\$22,579</u></b>	<b><u>8.2%</u></b>
<u>New York State Real Property Tax Law</u>	<u>0.424</u>	<u>\$4,483</u>	<u>1.6%</u>
<u>Out of County Tuition</u>	<u>0.066</u>	<u>\$698</u>	<u>0.3%</u>
<u>West Sayville-Oakdale Fire District</u>	<u>1.120</u>	<u>\$11,842</u>	<u>4.3%</u>
<u>Street Lighting District (I)</u>	<u>0.073</u>	<u>\$58</u>	<u>&lt; 0.1%</u>
<u>Street Lighting District (II)</u>	<u>0.113</u>	<u>\$1,106</u>	<u>0.4%</u>
<u>Sayville Comm. Ambulance</u>	<u>0.268</u>	<u>\$2,834</u>	<u>1.0%</u>
<u>Town Water District</u>	<u>0.035</u>	<u>\$370</u>	<u>0.1%</u>
<u>Garbage District</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>\$978</u>	<u>0.4%</u>
<u>Fed EPA Clean Air Mand.</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>\$83</u>	<u>&lt; 0.1%</u>
<u>New York State MTA Tax</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>\$127</u>	<u>&lt; 0.1%</u>
<b><u>TOTALS</u></b>	<b><u>24.947 - 27.320</u></b>	<b><u>\$274,246</u></b>	<b><u>100.0%</u></b>

Source: Town of Islip Receiver of Taxes; analysis by [NPV, LLC](#).

The majority of the site (99.2%) is located within the Connetquot CSD, and a small portion (0.8%) is located within the boundaries of the Sayville Union Free School District (UFSD). The Connetquot CSD is comprised of seven (7) elementary schools, two (2) middle schools and one (1) high school, while the Sayville UFSD is comprised of three (3) elementary schools, one (1) middle school and one (1) high school.

...both school districts' enrollment has declined significantly over the past ten (10) years between 2007-08 and 2016-17. The enrollment within the Connetquot CSD witnessed a 15.1% decline (a loss of 1,069 students), and the enrollment within the Sayville UFSD decreased by 15.4%, or 517 students, in that time period.

According to the New York State School Report Card, Fiscal Accountability Supplement for the Connetquot CSD, expenditures averaged \$14,604 per general education student and \$35,459 per special education student during the 2015-16 academic year. During this year, 1,001 students, or 14.3% of the students within Connetquot CSD, were enrolled in the special education program. Likewise, in Sayville UFSD, expenditures averaged \$14,644 per general education student and \$47,396 per special education student during the 2015-16 academic year. During this year, 420 students or 12.4% of the students within Sayville UFSD, were enrolled in the district's special education program.

...the Connetquot CSD passed a budget of \$192,870,820 for the 2018-19 academic year, and Sayville UFSD passed a budget of \$93,555,280 for the 2018-19 academic year. Similar to municipal budgets, school district budgets are projected to be balanced. A closer examination of the audited and reported 2017 Connetquot CSD financial data reveals that the district generated over \$190.0 million. Of this, over \$107.4 million was levied through property taxes and assessments, over \$55.0 million from state aid and an additional \$2.7 million through federal aid. In 2017, expenditures nearly equaled revenues, at approximately \$191.9 million. This included over \$108.2 million for education expenses and over \$42.1 million for employee benefits. The school district experienced a \$1.8 million deficit in 2017, and total indebtedness of approximately \$67.2 million.

Likewise, a closer examination of the audited and reported 2017 Sayville UFSD financial data reveals that the district generated approximately \$123.2 million. Of this, over \$51.0 million was levied through property taxes and assessments, over \$26.8 million from state aid and over \$1.3 million from federal aid. This also includes \$29.8 million generated from proceeds of debt. In 2017, expenditures were far below revenues, at approximately \$95.1 million. This included over \$53.5 million for education expenses and over \$19.5 million for employee benefits. The school district experienced a \$28.1 million surplus in 2017, but bonded indebtedness is \$35.8 million.

### Police Services

**Figure 3-5b** indicates the locations of police stations in the vicinity of the site. The site and surrounding area are located within the jurisdiction of the Fifth Precinct, Sector 503 of the SCPD. Based on the nature and extent of the site's current land uses and activities, it is expected that the SCPD patrol responsibilities are primarily oriented toward general safety and security functions associated with trespassing and/or oversight for brush fires on the former golf course property, and responses to traffic accidents on bordering roadways (with potential need for emergency medical response).

The following information on existing SCPD services is taken from the response letter:

The subject site is located within the confines of the SCPD Fifth Precinct, Sector 503. The Fifth Precinct is located at 125 Waverly Avenue, Patchogue...~~The Precinct Commanding Officer is William G. Silva.~~ The Fifth Precinct covers 75.006 square miles of southern half of the Town of Brookhaven and southeastern part of the Town of Islip. There are approximately 240,000 residents serviced, plus working, business patrons and vacationing transient population in the thousands. The Fifth Precinct has 195 sworn members and 17 non-sworn.

The Department has categorized the intersection of Lakeland [Avenue] and Sunrise Highway (Route 27) as a high crash area. Current maps show limited access to the planned site.

The subject site currently generates annual property tax revenues in the amount of \$31,224 to the SCPD, which assists in offsetting the costs to the SCPD in providing patrol services.

### Fire Department and Ambulance Services

**Figure 3-5b** shows the locations of the fire stations in the area; the project site is within the limits of the West Sayville Fire District, which is served by the West Sayville Fire Department.

Considering the site's existing condition and uses, it is expected that the department's current service-related responsibilities are primarily oriented toward general fire prevention and response functions, response to brush fires, and need of emergency medical response. The subject site is also served by the Community Ambulance Company, Inc., which maintains a facility at 420 Lakeland Avenue, abutting the project site to the east.

The subject site currently generates property tax revenues in the amount of \$11,842 per year to the West Sayville Fire District, and \$2,834 annually to the Community Ambulance Company.

#### Public Water Supply

As noted in **Section 2.2.1**, public water supply to the area surrounding the site is provided by the SCWA; the subject site is located within Distribution Area 1. Based on the current site use and condition (a closed former country club with no occupancy), it is expected that the site currently consumes only a minimal amount of water from the public water supply system of the SCWA. As the site is no longer irrigated, under current conditions, no water is pumped from the existing on-site irrigation well.

**Figure 3-5c** shows the locations of wellfields in the area of the subject site; as can be seen, there are four wellfields nearby, of which two are upgradient and two are cross-gradient. There are no wellfields down-gradient of the subject site, so that recharge generated on-site is not expected to presently impact any public water supply wellfields. The SCWA "blends" the water pumped from each wellfield within its distribution system prior to delivery to its customers, so that no site is served by only one wellfield. Water mains which presently serve the area include a 12-inch main beneath Lakeland Avenue, an 8-inch line beneath 11<sup>th</sup> Street, 10-inch lines beneath East Golf Street and Bohemia Parkway, and a 6-inch line beneath Sterling Place.

#### Sanitary Wastewater Treatment

The structures on the project site are presently served by individual septic tank/leaching pool (conventional) systems. As the site is presently closed and vacant, no potable water is assumed to be consumed, so there is no sanitary wastewater generation on the site.

There is no public sanitary wastewater treatment plants in the area. Smaller private sewage treatment plants are present in conjunction with multiple family housing in the area; however, these STPs serve individual developments. It is assumed that all wastewater generated in the area is treated in individual STPs or conventional septic systems on each developed property.

#### Solid Waste Removal and Disposal

Based on the vacant condition of the subject site, it is not expected that any solid waste is generated at present.

The Town Department of Environmental Control (DEC) manages the Town's solid waste stream, and oversees recycling and garbage collection. The Town's Multi-Purpose Recycling Center in

Holbrook handles approximately 300 tons of recyclable materials weekly, including metals, glass, plastics, paper and cardboard as well as white goods (large appliances such as refrigerators, washing machines, etc.). The Town recycles approximately thirty percent of the residential waste stream. The Department has developed markets for recyclables, depending upon quantities and commodity. The following additional information on current Town solid waste removal and disposal practices has been taken from the Town DEC response letter:

Town Solid Waste disposal facilities include the following:

- Blydenburgh Road Clean Fill, Hauppauge - Construction and demolition debris - no commingled solid waste;
- MacArthur Waste-to-Energy Facility - Municipal solid waste - need permit for disposal;
- Yard Waste Compost Facility, Ronkonkoma - leaves, grass trimmings, cut-up trees - produce compost for sale;
- WRAP Facility, Sayville - Materials Recovery Facility for residential curbside recyclables, dual stream (separate newsprint, corrugated and commingled containers) transfer station for construction/demolition debris and bulk items, household hazardous waste facility, propane tank disposal and e-waste recovery facility.

#### Energy Supply

PSEG provides electrical service to the site and the area, and National Grid serves as the natural gas supplier for the area. Based on the vacant nature of the site usage, little if any of either of these energy forms is presently consumed on the project site.

#### 3.3.2 Anticipated Impacts

As noted in **Section 3.3.1**, each of the above-listed service providers was contacted by letter to inform them of the project and solicit input with respect to the service capabilities and limitations (if any) on each. **Appendix H** contains the relevant correspondence, with responses (if provided). A discussion of tax revenues that will be allocated to service providers is provided below, followed by a discussion of the potential impact of the proposed project on each of the noted community service providers.

#### Property Taxes

Many of the Town and County's community services and facilities are supported in large part by the revenues generated through property taxes. The Town of Islip and Suffolk County, as well as other local taxing jurisdictions will greatly benefit from an increase in such property tax revenues, resulting from the proposed project. The following brief discussion of the site's anticipated tax generation and distribution is taken from the Fiscal and Economic Impact Summary, **Appendix C-3**.

Upon full build-out and a stabilized year of operations, the proposed project (which includes the cumulative operations of Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3, Phase 4, Phase 5, and Phase 6) is estimated to



contribute over \$10.1 million in annual tax revenue. Of this, over \$7.3 million will be generated by the two school districts, with Connetquot CSD anticipated to generate over \$6.4 million and Sayville UFSD \$483,302 in tax revenue. An additional \$312,539 is projected to be levied by the Connetquot Library District and \$32,225 by the Sayville Library District. Over \$1.2233 million, or 12.2% of the total tax revenues, are projected to be distributed to Suffolk County, and approximately 8.0% of the total tax revenue is projected to be levied to the Town of Islip. The West Sayville-Oakdale Fire District is projected to levy over \$440,000, or 4.3% of the total tax revenue generated by the proposed project, and the Sayville Community Ambulance is projected to generate \$105,324 or 1.0% of all revenues. The balance of the current property tax revenues is projected to be apportioned to various other local taxing jurisdictions, as seen in **Table 3-8**.

### Public Schools

~~The proposed development is projected to generate 2,705 residents, of which an estimated 210 will be school-age children, and of these 199 would be expected to attend public schools of the Connetquot CSD. Based on the 2017 enrollment in the Connetquot CSD, the proposed project would represent a 3.38% increase in enrollment, necessitating an increase in district expenditures of approximately \$3.49 million annually (see **Table 3-9**). Through taxation, the proposed project is projected to generate an increased level of school district taxes allocated to the Connetquot CSD, of \$6,480,320 annually, which would more than fully offset the added costs to the district to provide educational services to the 199 students generated by the proposed project. Based on **Table 3-9**, it is expected that the revenue will exceed the cost of education to provide a surplus of \$2,990,184 per year.~~

**Table**TABLE 3-8  
**ANTICIPATED TAX REVENUE, Overall Project**

Taxing Jurisdiction	Current Taxes	Projected Taxes	Increase in Taxes	Percent of Total Taxes
<b>Total: School Tax</b>	<b>\$196,629</b>	<b>\$7,308,386</b>	<b>\$7,111,757</b>	<b>72.0%</b>
Sayville School District	\$13,003	\$483,302	\$470,299	4.8%
Sayville Library District	\$867	\$32,225	\$31,358	0.3%
Connetquot School District	\$174,350	\$6,480,320	\$6,305,969	63.9%
Connetquot Library District	\$8,409	\$312,539	\$304,130	3.1%
<b>Total: County Tax</b>	<b>\$33,190</b>	<b>\$1,233,627</b>	<b>\$1,200,437</b>	<b>12.2%</b>
County General Fund	\$1,967	\$73,098	\$71,131	0.7%
County Police	\$31,224	\$1,160,529	\$1,129,305	11.4%
<b>Total: Town Tax</b>	<b>\$21,848</b>	<b>\$812,072</b>	<b>\$790,224</b>	<b>8.0%</b>
General Town (I)	\$562	\$20,896	\$20,334	0.2%
Town Excluding Villages (I)	\$28	\$1,026	\$998	0.0%
Combined Highway (I)	\$456	\$16,940	\$16,484	0.2%
General Town (II)	\$10,832	\$402,608	\$391,776	4.0%
Town Excluding Villages (II)	\$568	\$21,094	\$20,527	0.2%
Combined Highway (II)	\$9,403	\$349,509	\$340,105	3.4%
<b>Total: Other Tax</b>	<b>\$22,579</b>	<b>\$795,046</b>	<b>\$772,467</b>	<b>7.8%</b>
NYS Real Property Tax Law	\$4,483	\$166,632	\$162,149	1.6%
Out of County Tuition	\$698	\$25,938	\$25,240	0.3%
West Sayville-Oakdale Fire District	\$11,842	\$440,160	\$428,318	4.3%
Street Lighting District (I)	\$58	\$2,139	\$2,082	0.0%
Street Lighting District (II)	\$1,106	\$41,097	\$39,992	0.4%
Sayville Comm. Ambulance	\$2,834	\$105,324	\$102,490	1.0%
Town Water	\$370	\$13,755	\$13,385	0.1%
Garbage District	\$978	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fed EPA Clean Air Mand.	\$83	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York State MTA Tax	\$127	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$274,246</b>	<b>\$10,149,131</b>	<b>\$9,874,885</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Town of Islip Receiver of Taxes; Town of Islip Assessor; Analysis by Nelson, Pope & Voorhis, LLC.

Public Schools

The proposed development is projected to generate 2,705 residents, of which an estimated 210 will be school-age children, and of these 199 would be expected to attend public schools of the Connetquot CSD. Based on the 2017 enrollment in the Connetquot CSD, the proposed project would represent a 3.38% increase in enrollment, necessitating an increase in district expenditures of approximately \$3.49 million annually (see Table 3-9). Such an enrollment increase would tend to halt or stem the trend in decreasing enrollment and district fiscal conditions experienced in the Connetquot CSD over the past 10 years. Through taxation, the proposed project is projected to generate an increased level of school district taxes allocated to the Connetquot CSD, of \$6,480,320 annually, which would more than fully offset the added

costs to the district to provide educational services to the 199 students generated by the proposed project. Based on Table 3-9, it is expected that the revenue will exceed the cost of education to provide a surplus of \$2,990,184 per year.

**Table**

**TABLE 3-9  
 FISCAL IMPACT ON SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Parameter	General Education	Special Education	Totals
Existing Enrollment	6,016	1,001	7,017
Percentage of Existing Enrollment	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Estimated Enrollment Increase, Connetquot CSD: Proposed Project	171	28	199
Expenditure per Student	\$14,604	\$35,459	--
Anticipated Expenditure Increase: Proposed Project	\$2,497,284	\$992,852	\$3,490,136
Anticipated Taxes to Connetquot CSD: Proposed Project	--	--	\$6,480,320
<b>Net Additional Revenue</b>	--	--	<b>\$2,990,184</b>

Source: Connetquot CSD; New York State Education Department; Analysis by NPV, LLC.

Police Services

The project site will continue to be patrolled by the SCPD’s Fifth Precinct, Sector 503. The proposed project will significantly change the nature of the use of the site from vacant fenced land to an occupied residential community. The community will be occupied by individuals, couples and families and will potentially need police response. The site design will include appropriate safety and security systems, such as fire, smoke and security alarm systems and outdoor lighting, and employment of a qualified safety/security patrol.

Additionally, the increase development will increase vehicle use of local roadways, increasing the potential for traffic accidents, which would also increase SCPD response. The following concern was noted in the SCPD response:

New traffic patterns and the increased flow regarding the influx of occupants will increase accidents and calls for police services. This project development would have an impact on the workload of Sector 503 and the Fifth Precinct. Emergency response time and public safety is a variable which requires careful consideration.

This DEIS includes a detailed Traffic Impact Study that evaluates traffic and proposes mitigation to ensure that an appropriate Level of Service is maintained on area roads. Additional traffic congestion and/or change in response times is not expected as a result of the project, given the proposed mitigation. The project will increase annual tax allocations to the SCPD to \$1,160,529 which is expected to assist in offsetting the expected increase in offset the costs to provide police services.

### Fire Department and Ambulance Services

The proposed project will continue to be serviced by the West Sayville Fire Department and the Community Ambulance Service. The site is currently vacant, and this use would change the site to be occupied by a residential community. It is expected that the proposed project will have the effect of changing the nature of potential calls for emergency services to the site, as well as increasing the potential for need of emergency services of both the West Sayville Fire Department and the Community Ambulance Service, due to the new residents in the vicinity. For the West Sayville Fire Department, such changes would include a reduced need for response to brush fires (due to reduced acreage of open spaces, presence of maintained landscaping, presence of on-site safety/security staff, on-site fire hydrant network) , and need for additional types of emergency responses associated with the site residents (such as medical emergencies, in-home accidents, auto accidents, etc.).

The proposed project will be constructed in conformance with all applicable building and fire codes. The site will be designed to accommodate emergency service response vehicles. The West Sayville Fire Department and the Community Ambulance Service were informed of the project through correspondence contained in **Appendix H**.

The project will generate \$440,160 per year in tax revenue to the West Sayville Fire District, and \$105,324 will be allocated to the Community Ambulance Service annually. These tax revenues are expected to contribute to the budgets of these services and assist in offsetting increased demand for services as a result of the project.

### Public Water Supply

The project will utilize public water for all of its domestic needs, to be supplied by the SCWA (see confirming Letter of Water Availability in **Appendix H**). It is expected that the location and number of connections from the SCWA distribution system to the project will be determined during the site plan review process, to be conducted under the jurisdiction of the Town Engineering Department in coordination with the SCWA.

The following has been provided by the SCWA, in response to a request for written confirmation that the SCWA can and will provide sufficient potable water to serve the project.

Per your request, we have determined that there is an existing water main adjacent to the above captioned property from Lakeland Avenue and East Gulf [Golf/] Street and based upon the water requirements provided in your application dated June 7, 2018, the Suffolk County Water Authority (SCWA) has sufficient capacity to this property provided your client pays us for the improvements to our distribution system. This letter is also being issued based on our requirement that your client is installing a well for irrigation use; should that change in the future, you must contact us.

Connection fees, which include any applicable water main surcharges, or directional bore fees, will be required for service line installations, as well as service line and RPZ [reduced pressure zone] applications and inspections. An RPZ device is required on commercial properties.

SCWA recommends the use of smart irrigation control systems and drought tolerant plantings to promote conservation and minimize the impact of peak pumpage so as to ensure compliance with the SCWA Water Conservation Plan.

The expected domestic consumption of the project, 307,125 gpd is not anticipated to impact the ability of the SCWA to serve the subject site and existing customers. The SCWA is chartered to provide water to its service district customers, based on approved tariffs.

An additional estimated 34,813 gpd of water are anticipated to be used for landscape irrigation, all of which would be provided by the on-site irrigation well. As this volume would be applied only during the estimated 5-month irrigation season (assumed to be from mid-May to mid-October), total water use on the site will be 341,938 gpd during the irrigation season and 307,125 gpd outside of it.

#### Sanitary Wastewater Treatment

As discussed in **Section 1.4.5**, use of existing sanitary sewer lines or off-site wastewater treatment capacity is not available to the project site, and the project's design sanitary wastewater flow is greater than the allowable flow under SCSC Article 6 for use of septic systems, so the Applicant proposes to construct an on-site STP.

In addition to treating all of the wastewater generated on-site, the proposed STP will also be designed to handle a portion of the wastewater generated in downtown Sayville hamlet, specifically from commercial sites. In order to accomplish this, a sanitary sewer line from the project's STP will be installed southward along Lakeland Avenue to the downtown Sayville hamlet center. Such a benefit will have the effect of treating wastewater in the downtown area at no public cost for the installation program; however, the individual connections to the new system would be borne by each landowner.

The project's STP will be constructed to treat 377,000 gpd of sewage. The design flow for sewage generated ~~on~~from the project is estimated at 307,125 gpd, leaving capacity for 69,875 gpd of flow (from existing downtown development that connects to this extension and from future growth in the estimated flow downtown area served) from downtown Sayville hamlet-~~is about 69,875 gpd.~~

Impacts on Lakeland Avenue from installation of the 4-inch sewer line are ~~to be~~ expected, and would include disruption of ~~normal~~ traffic flow, congestion associated with construction vehicle movements, noise, odors and dust from construction activities (e.g., trench excavation, pipe installation, trench filling and repaving). However, these impacts will be temporary in duration and, as only portion of Lakeland Avenue will undergo construction activity at any one time, limited in extent.

Solid Waste Removal and Disposal

It is anticipated that the residential and clubhouse facilities of the proposed project would generate a total of 10,220 lbs/day of solid waste, as follows:

Generator	Solid Waste Generation Rate	Quantity	Waste Generated (lbs/day)
Residents	3.5 lbs/day/resident*	2,706 residents	9,471
Amenity Spaces	3.12 lbs/day/100 SF**	24,000 SF	749
<b>Total</b>	---	---	<b>10,220</b>

\* Per **Nemerow (2009)**.

\*\* Per <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteGenRates/Service.htm>.

The following comments pertinent to the project’s waste handling and disposal practices have been taken from the Town’s response letter:

The Town Refuse Collection and Disposal will not serve the proposed project with the collection and disposal of solid waste.

The contracted private carter will presumably collect and dispose of all solid waste generated within the facility. The Town requests an active waste recycling program be implemented as soon as possible.

Solid wastes generated in the residences and in the non-residential spaces will be deposited in roll-off carts inside each building, from where each cart will be rolled outdoors for regularly-scheduled removal by a certified carter operating under a contract with the owner of the project and disposed of at an approved facility. It is expected that project management will develop and implement a recycling program developed in coordination with the private carter.

Energy Supply

The proposed project will use PSEG and National Grid to supply electricity and natural gas resources to the proposed project, respectively. Connections will be made to each utility through the creation of an internal distribution network within the proposed development. Connection of these networks to PSEG and National Grid will likely be through the transmission line as well as gas mains if present in the vicinity. It is anticipated that both of these energy supply companies maintain adequate resources to supply the proposed project.

As noted in **Section 1.2.4:**

The Applicant seeks to provide energy-efficient housing in conformance with Town Code Section 68-30, and embraces the concept of ensuring a more energy-efficient project than mandated by merely meeting the NYS Energy Code. Energy efficiency benefits the overall environment, reduces dependency on non-renewable resources thus providing an energy policy and use benefit, and benefits the residents through decreased operational costs of living space and site amenities. In general, energy-conserving materials, fixtures and mechanical systems will be utilized where practicable to reduce the total energy demand of the project. No determination by the Applicant regarding use of solar energy equipment or systems has been made at the present stage of the application process. The Applicant is committed to incorporating appropriate energy-saving designs, materials, equipment and systems, and is willing to consider active solar energy systems (e.g.,

rooftop solar panels) and LEED® features and concepts, but such decisions will be made later, during the site plan application process.

### 3.3.3 Proposed Mitigation

- Development of the proposed project will generate approximately \$10,149,131 in total tax revenue, which exceeds the \$274,246 generated by the site in its under existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project may ultimately create an additional \$9.87 million in annual tax revenues to be distributed to all applicable community services providers, particularly to the Connetquot CSD. No further mitigation is necessary or proposed.
- The proposed project represents an increase in enrollment for the Connetquot CSD, for which an estimated increase in expenditures of about \$3.49 million/year will result. However, the proposed project is anticipated to generate taxes of \$6,480,320 per year, resulting in a net surplus revenue to the school district of about \$2,990,184 million per year. This net revenue could ease the district's need to tap into additional fund balances and could also help alleviate an increased burden on other taxpayers throughout the district. No further mitigation is necessary or proposed.
- The proposed project will include current building materials and safety installations per the NYS Building and Fire Codes, such as fire and smoke alarms and sprinkler systems. The project will be planned with suitable access for emergency vehicles and will include installation of fire hydrants as directed through the site plan review process. The project will also include a full-time professional safety and security service.
- By its issuance of a Water Availability Letter, the SCWA confirms that it can and will provide applicable water services to the site and project. No further mitigation is necessary or proposed.
- The proposed project will provide and maintain private on-site recreational facilities for the exclusive use of its residents, as well as a 25-acre public park along the site's perimeter.
- In conformance with Town requirements, the proposed project will utilize a private carter to remove and dispose of all site-generated solid wastes, and will develop and implement a recycling program.
- Water and energy resources will be conserved through use of energy- and water-conserving design principles, building materials, mechanical and plumbing systems, plumbing fixtures and appliances and rain sensors on irrigation systems, which will further minimize the volume of water required from the public water supply.
- The project's internal roadways, sidewalks, lighting systems, and recreational areas, as well as its drainage system, STP and sanitary sewer connection will be owned, operated and maintained by the project's POA, obviating potential increased public costs for these responsibilities.

## 3.4 Community Character

### 3.4.1 Existing Conditions

#### Visual Character

**Appendix D-32** contains a series of photographs of the site and of those portions of its perimeter that lie along the bordering roadways, taken by the Applicant's architect. These photographs depict the existing visual character of the property, and are then used as the base upon which computer-simulated views of the proposed project have been superimposed (see



**Section 3.4.2**); the following description of these photographs was prepared by the Applicant's architect:

At nine (9) locations around the perimeter of the site, photographs of the existing view were taken and photo-simulations of what the same view might look like after the proposed project is constructed have been created. These views include:

1. Looking toward the southeast from the intersection of Eleventh Street and Bohemia Parkway
2. Looking toward the southeast from in front of 724/728 Bohemia Parkway
3. Looking toward the northeast from in front of the recharge basin on Bohemia Parkway
4. Looking toward the north from Terry Road just south of the intersection with Bohemia Parkway
5. Looking toward the northeast from the intersection of Terry Road and Sterling Place
6. Looking toward the north from the intersection of Carrie Avenue and Marion Street
7. Looking toward the north from the end of Durham Road
8. Looking toward the north from the intersection of North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and Chester Road
9. Looking toward the south from the intersection of Lakeland Avenue and 11<sup>th</sup> Street

These views were chosen to provide:

- Views at major approaches to the site
- Views into the site from most of the surrounding neighborhoods
- Views from locations closest to the proposed buildings to truly represent the project

The photographs demonstrate that the project site is presently occupied by a closed country club operation, and is characterized by open vistas across an unused former golf course whereon vegetation (both the fringe of former woods kept as a visual buffer, and the former fairways, tees and greens of the golf course holes) are generally untended and are undergoing natural succession.

### Noise

The environmental impact of noise can have various effects on human beings ranging from annoyance to hearing loss. A noise problem is said to exist when noise interferes with human activities (**Rau and Wooten, 1980**). Various noise scales have been developed to describe the response of an average human ear to sound. The most common unit utilized to characterize noise levels is the A-weighted decibel (dBA), which weighs the various components of noise according to the response of the human ear. Because the human ear perceives the middle range of frequencies better than the high or low frequencies, the dBA scale assigns the middle range a much larger "loudness" value than higher and lower frequencies. For the purpose of this report, sound levels are reported in  $L_{eq}$  and range (minimum/maximum).  $L_{eq}$  refers to the energy-average sound level for a specific time period and relates sound intensity level to time as the "equivalent sound level" scale expressed in dBA.  $L_{eq}$  is commonly utilized as a statistical average sound level in noise impact prediction.

Physical measurements of noise may be measured in dBA using a sound level meter. The meter collects frequency values, which are automatically interpreted as a function of human hearing frequency response (according to the weighted decibel scale). The weighted scale thus provides a measure of noise that is meaningful for assessing ambient noise environments and potential noise impacts as heard by human beings. On average, a change of 3 dBA is required for the average person to detect a difference in the level of noise, whereas a change between 2 and 3 dBA is the level associated with the threshold of detection and a change in the range of 5 dBA is noticeable and is considered to be an impact (see **Table 3-10**).

**Table 3-10**  
**AVERAGE ABILITY TO PERCEIVE CHANGES IN NOISE LEVELS**

Change (dBA)	Human Perception of Change in Sound Levels
2-3	Barely perceptible, threshold of detection
5	Readily noticeable
10	Doubling or halving of the loudness of sound
20	Dramatic change
40	Difference between a faintly audible sound and very loud sound

Source: Fundamentals and Abatement of Highway Traffic, Report No. PB-222-703, FHWA, June 1973.

As a point of reference and comparison, an increase of 3 dBA equates to a doubling of the sound energy. This phenomenon is related to the logarithmic nature of the decibel scale, which will be explained below. In the same respect, a decrease of 3 dBA appears to the listener as a halving of noise. **Table 3-11** relates changes in dBA to a receiver as compared to a base reference of 60 dBA.

Physical measurements of noise may be measured in dBA using a sound meter. The meter collects frequency values, which are automatically interpreted as a function of human hearing frequency response (according to the A-weighted decibel scale). The weighted scale thus provides a measure of noise which is meaningful for assessing ambient noise environments and potential noise impacts as heard by human beings. Sound levels decrease with distance from the source as a result of dispersion which is predicted using the “inverse square law,” which applies a reduction of 4.5 dBA for each doubling of distance from a line source (such as a roadway) and 6 dBA reduction for a point source (a stationary source). This reduction effect is due to natural dispersion only and is not a function of the presence of barriers or other objects (**USDOT, 1980**), which may result in additional attenuation of noise. Also, because the decibel scale is logarithmic, the laws for addition of logarithms must be utilized for addition of decibels. The addition of two similar noise levels will result in an increase of 3 dBA. For example, a noise level of 50 dBA added to an existing noise level of 50 dBA would result in an end noise level of 53 dBA, an increase that is considered to be the threshold for human detection. In addition to attenuation by distance from the source, vegetation and noise barriers also result in attenuation of noise levels. Densely wooded areas are expected to have an attenuation rate of

5 dBA for every 100-foot depth of woods (up to a maximum attenuation of 10 dBA). For low-density vegetation, a nominal amount of attenuation of 2 to 3 dBA per 100 feet of woods may be expected to occur. The attenuation of noise due to barriers (walls and buildings) is a function of the height and composition of the barrier. A barrier capable of reducing sound energy transmission through the structure which interrupts the line of sight between a source and a receptor, will generally provide a minimum sound reduction of 5 dBA.

**Table**TABLE 3-11  
**COMMON SOUND LEVELS AND REACTIONS**

Sound Source	Sound Level (dBA)	Apparent Loudness	Typical Human Reaction
Military jet Air raid siren	130	128X as loud	Limit of amplified speech
Amplified rock music	110	32X as loud	Maximum vocal effort
Jet takeoff at 500 meters Train horn at 30 meters	100	16X as loud	
Freight train at 15 meters	95		
Heavy truck at 15 meters Busy city street Loud shout	90	8X as loud	Very annoying Hearing damage (8+ hours)
Busy traffic intersection	80	4X as loud	Annoying
Highway traffic at 15 meters Train horn at 500 meters Gas lawn mower at 10 feet Noisy restaurant	70	2X as loud	Telephone use difficult
Predominantly industrial areas Light car traffic at 15 meters City or commercial areas Residential areas close to industry Noisy office	60	Base reference	Intrusive
Quiet office Suburban areas with medium- density transportation	50	½ as loud	Speech interference
Public library	40	¼ as loud	Quiet
Soft whisper at 5 meters	30	1/8 as loud	Very quiet
	10	1/32 as loud	Just audible
Threshold of hearing	0	1/64 as loud	

Note: The minimum difference in sound level noticeable to the human listener is 3 dBA. A 10 dBA increase in level appears to double the loudness, while a 10 dBA decrease halves the apparent loudness.

Sources: NYSDOT, 1980 and White, 1975

By utilizing this information, it is possible to combine the background noise, source noise and attenuating factors to predict sound levels resulting from a particular source. The adjusted level is the noise level associated with the source after it is attenuated by distance and other attenuating factors such as structures interrupting the line of sight between the source and receptor, noise barriers, and thick vegetation. The adjusted level is combined with the ambient level using the concepts of decibel addition.

Chapter 35 of Islip Town Code Noise was adopted in 1986 with the intent of preventing unreasonably loud and disturbing noises deemed to be detrimental to the life, health, welfare and good order of the people of the Town of Islip. The chapter provides definitions, a listing of prohibited noises, maximum permissible A-weighted sound pressure levels and exceptions. As defined by Chapter 35, a noise violation is a disturbance caused by any of the prohibited noise sources which:

1. Annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal auditory sensitivities; or
2. Is clearly audible outside the residential, real property boundary from which it originates; or
3. Is loud, disturbing, unusual, unreasonable and unnecessary as well as audible outside the structure or the real property boundary from which it originates.

Examples of prohibited noise levels include the following: electronics (tv/radio, etc.); horns; animals; shouting; engines; defects in vehicles; heavy equipment used in construction (except between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays); loading/unloading; construction of buildings (except between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays); commercial music, explosives; and, ice cream trucks (while idling at a stop for more than one minute).

The maximum permissible A-weighted sound pressure levels for sound source property and receiving property categories are provided in §35-4, stating that *“no person shall cause, suffer, allow or permit the operation of any source of sound on a particular category of property or any public lands or right-of-way in such a manner so as to create a sound level that exceeds the particular sound level limits set forth in Chapter 35 Attachment 1 Noise Control Table 1 (image included below) when measured at or within the real property boundary line of the receiving property”*. As illustrated in the image below, there is a higher threshold for commercial or industrial land use when considered a source property as compared to residential sources. For example, the maximum sound level generated by commercial or industrial property measured

**Noise Control Table 1**  
**Maximum Permissible A-Weighted Sound Pressure Levels in dBA**

Sound Source Property Category	Receiving Property Category					
	Another Apartment within multidwelling building		Residential		Commercial (all times)	Industrial (all times)
	7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.	7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.		
Apartment within multidwelling building	45	40	55	50	65	75
Residential	—	—	55	50	65	75
Commercial or public lands or right-of-way	—	—	65	50	65	75
Industrial	—	—	65	50	65	75

at a residential property line is 65 dBA for the hours 7 a.m. to 10 p.m., whereas the level is decreased to 55 dBA if generated by a residential source.

**Noise Control Table 1**  
**Maximum Permissible A-Weighted Sound Pressure Levels in dBA**

Sound Source Property Category	Receiving Property Category					
	Another Apartment within multidwelling building		Residential		Commercial (all times)	Industrial (all times)
	7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.	7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.	10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.		
Apartment within multidwelling building	45	40	55	50	65	75
Residential	—	—	55	50	65	75
Commercial or public lands or right-of-way	—	—	65	50	65	75
Industrial	—	—	65	50	65	75

As stated in §35-4(B), there are a number of acts that are exempted from the maximum permissible sound levels, including noise generated by construction activity. Specifically, the following acts are exempt from the A-weighted sound pressure level limits set in Table 1 (above):

1. Noise from the operation of heavy equipment, including the operation of any pile driver, pneumatic hammer, derrick, electric hoist, bulldozer, grinder or other appliance, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays.
2. Noise from the construction, excavation, demolition, alteration or repair of any building between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays.

Also exempted from the maximum permissible sound levels is noise generated by the operation of domestic equipment, including any power saw, drill, sander, router, lawn or garden device, leaf or snowblower, insect control device, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays, or between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Sundays.

In order to assess potential noise impacts of the project, several factors must be considered including the location of potential sensitive noise receptors, existing background environment and sources of noise, potential noise generated by the project, and noise attenuation factors. As the subject property is not presently used other than maintenance of the grounds, only natural sources of noise and period mowing of the grass are generated on the site, and no significant adverse impacts to the area are attributable to the project site.

The proposed development site is located between Sunrise Highway South Service Road to the north and generally bounded by Bohemia Parkway (and Hauppauge Road) at the west, Lakeland Avenue (as well as Chester Road, Durham Road, and Carrie Avenue) at the east and Sterling

Place at the south. Vehicular traffic and residential activity from the surrounding homes are the major sources contributing to the ambient noise environment in the area. The primary receptors for consideration of potential noise impacts are the residential homes that surround the property to the west, east, and south and the Edward J. Bosti Elementary School located on the south side of Bourne Boulevard over 1,200 feet west of the westernmost property line of the site.

NP&V conducted a field visit at the property and in the surrounding area to prepare a characterization of existing sources of noise and to monitor sound levels during typical weekday morning hours. A total of twelve (12) sound level monitoring stations were selected including eleven (11) stations along the subject site property line and one (1) on Bourne Boulevard at Edward J. Bosti Elementary School. Station locations are shown on **Figure 3-6**. These locations were selected as being areas closest to proposed development areas on the site and representing the worst case for analysis of potential noise related impacts at nearby residential properties and the nearby school.

The sound level measurements were collected on June 29, 2018 beginning at 8:15 a.m. using a SPER Scientific Model 8400029 Digital Type II Sound Level Meter that was calibrated before the period of readings. The time of monitoring was chosen to begin at a time period with typical ambient noise and accounting for commuting traffic on Sunrise Highway. One hundred noise readings were taken at 10-second intervals at the stations and from these data the average continuous sound level was computed.

Sound levels fluctuate, and it is common to provide an average of sound levels over a period of time to describe the “equivalent continuous noise level” or  $L_{eq}$ . Stations #1-11 follow the perimeter of the clockwise beginning at Station 1 which is located approximately 150’ south of the east-west portion of Chester Road and continuing around to Station 11 opposite Fulton Avenue along the northern property line at the proposed main entrance to the development. Station 12 is located on Bourne Boulevard in front of the elementary school. Sound level data sheets providing each measurement for each of the locations, field notes, and a graphic representation of sound levels are provided in **Appendix I-1** and a summary of the  $L_{eq}$  results are provided below in **Table 3-12**.

**Table****TABLE 3-12**  
**SUMMARY OF NOISE MONITORING DATA**

Station	$L_{eq}$
1	53.9
2	51.6
3	45.8
4	43.8
5	56.4

6	56.3
7	71.8
8	52.2
9	63.0
10	57.7
11	62.9
12	63.9

Comparison of these results with the examples of typical sound levels listed in **Table 3-11** (Common Sound Levels and indicates that the average continuous sound levels ( $L_{eq}$ ) are levels characteristic of areas ranging from suburban areas with medium-density transportation, to residential areas close to industry with light car traffic, to highway traffic at 15 meters. The levels for Station 7 were the highest of all stations due to the proximity to the travel lanes of Terry Road and Bohemia Parkway as well as due to landscaping activity at a number of homes in the vicinity during monitoring.

The levels at Stations 3 and 4 which are located east of the project site and on side street had the lowest continuous sound levels which was due to low level of passing cars and trucks and no other sources of noise being generated during the monitoring period. Sources of background noise noted during the monitoring consisted mainly of passing vehicle traffic, landscaping, and natural sources.

Lighting

The only outdoor lighting on the site at present are small, wall-mounted safety/security fixtures located among the existing golf course buildings and the two residences in the northeastern corner of the site, and at the two maintenance structures in the central and southwestern portions of the site (see **Figure 1-3**). The only lighting that is provided currently is at the southwestern maintenance building; it operates on a timer. As a result, the site is generally dark at night, with some illumination cast on the perimeter of the site from the few street lights on the bordering roadways.

Demography

**Table 3-13** presents some current demographic information on the hamlet of Sayville, wherein the subject site is located. As can be seen, of the total population in the hamlet, an estimated 4.72% are pre school-age children, school-age children constitute 18.59% of the hamlet's inhabitants, and 76.69% of the residents are adults.

This population resides in 5,976 households, of which 78.75% are owner-occupied and 21.25% are rental units.

**Table**TABLE 3-13

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, 2018**  
 Sayville

Total Population	Age			Housing		
	Pre School-Age (<1 - 5 yrs.)	School-Age (5 - 19 yrs.)	Adults (>19 yrs.)	Total Households	Owner-Occupied	Rented
16,975	802	3,155	13,018	5,976	4,706	1,270

Source: US Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File 1. esri Forecast for 2023, referenced November 20, 2018.

3.4.2 Anticipated Impacts

Visual Character

The following discussion of the project’s potential for impact on the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood [from differences in visual appearances](#) was prepared by the project’s architect.

The Greybarn team has sited the buildings based upon an extensive study and analysis of the site. The site plan is based upon understanding the site’s topography, locations existing healthy, mature trees landscaping and using these features to preserve and enhance views from the surrounding neighborhoods into site.

~~The buildings have been placed far much further back from the property lines than would be allowed for other types of housing. Creating not only walking/biking paths around the entire perimeter of the site that are open to all Sayville residents, this also opens up wider views to the sky and sunlight than if the streets were lined with new, single family homes.~~

[As can be seen in the Viewshed Analysis \[Appendix D-2\], at the size of this site and over the distances from the property lines to the proposed buildings, the additional height of going from 2-1/2 stories to 3-stories will only be minimally perceivable.](#)

The photosimulations presented in **Appendix D-32** demonstrate that the views of the project site as well as views along the length of the bordering roadways will be substantially improved upon construction of the proposed project. The anticipated removal of brush and debris in the site’s perimeter buffer will widen and deepen vistas into the site (of and between the proposed residential buildings), and simultaneously open up vistas along the bordering roadways. These vistas will be enhanced by landscaping and park space available to the public.

The Viewshed Analysis concludes:

[As the diagram clearly shows, these heights as the proposed distances from the property line actually create a more open view of the sky and access to sunlight than would be possible under either the Residence AAA or Residence B districts.](#)



The following discussion of the project’s potential for impact on the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood from proximity of the new buildings to observers was prepared by the project’s architect.

The buildings have been placed far much further back from the property lines than would be allowed for other types of housing. Creating not only walking/biking paths around the entire perimeter of the site that are open to all Sayville residents, this also opens up wider views to the sky and sunlight than if the streets were lined with new, single-family homes.

In order to make height easier to understand, we have developed a Zoning Height Diagram [see Appendix D-3]. We have used the Bohemia Parkway side of the site for purposes of this analysis, but the principals apply to all of the roadways around the proposed PDD-GS.

The homes immediately across Bohemia Parkway from the site are within the Residence B zoning district and we have assumed that if single -family homes were to be constructed on the proposed site they would be covered by the provisions of the Residence AAA zoning district. The specific requirements of the districts for heights and setbacks are:

- Residence B: building height – 2 stories /28 feet; 25-foot front yard setback
- Residence AAA: building height – 2-1/2 stories/35 feet; 50-foot front yard setback

The diagram shows the orientation of the “Site Line” for the Residence B and Residence AAA zones. The Site Line marks the angle at which a building, if of a conforming height and located at the setback line, would intrude into an observer’s viewscape and therefore, represents an approximation of qualitative visual impact. Thus, visual impacts are associated with the interplay of two factors; building height and building setback; a taller building would have more of an impact than a shorter building, if both are at the same setback. Conversely, two buildings of the same height would have differing visual impacts if one were located at a lesser setback (i.e., it is closer to the observer) than the other. The Site Line is intended to illustrate this relationship. (Note: the diagram shows that, if a 3-story building of the proposed PDD-GS were sited at its 75-foot setback, it would intrude into the viewscape to about the same degree as a conforming building in the Residence AAA district.)

In comparison to the setbacks, the **Conceptual Layout Plan** shows the following building setbacks for the proposed PDD-GS:

- 2-story buildings: 35-foot height; 75-foot front yard setback (minimum 267.7 feet provided, to Carrie Avenue)
- 3-story buildings: 45-foot height; 75-foot front yard setback (minimum 105.1 feet provided, to Eleventh Street)
- 4-story buildings: 55-foot height; 100-foot front yard setback (minimum 211.1 feet provided, to Eleventh Street)

For the proposed zoning regulations of the PDD-GS, it is expected that 2-story and 3-story buildings will have a minimum setback of 75 feet, and 4-story buildings will have minimum

setback of 100 feet. However, the proposed project's buildings will exceed their respective setbacks, in order to reduce potential visual impacts to visual resources and thereby, on community character. Specifically, relative to Bohemia Parkway, the shortest setback for a 3-story building will be about 135 feet, and the least setback for a 4-story building, will be about 350 feet. The potential for adverse visual impacts due to the difference in building height (i.e., of the project's four-story buildings versus those of the single-family, 2-½ story buildings that characterize the surrounding area) was evaluated. As discussed in **Section 1.4.2** and illustrated in **Appendix D-23**, despite the higher buildings allowed by the proposed PDD as compared to that allowed by the Residence AAA district, the substantially greater front yard setbacks of the proposed PDD would result in less intrusion into the viewscape than would result from development conforming to the Residence AAA district. The ability to secure greater building setbacks is due to the large size of the site and the use of multi-unit structures, which enable substantial perimeter setbacks, which could not be provided if the site were subdivided into individual lots, which would require some of those lots to be located abutting the site's perimeter.

#### Noise

In comparison to its current generally vacant state as a former golf course, unavoidable short-term noise impacts will result from construction on the site; these potential impacts are discussed in **Section 4.1.1**.

Generally, the development of the property will result in a change in the ambient noise levels with noise generated by property maintenance and vehicle movements in the interior roadways and parking areas, and from typical human related activities. The proposed use as a multi-family housing development with a limited commercial area is a use that is compatible with the nearby residential uses and noise related to these uses will be consistent with residential development, with the exception that the common areas of the site will be controlled by the POA, whereas, in comparison to a single family residential development, noise generation varies between the individual homeowners and use of their properties.

It is expected that noise from vehicles on local arterials and background noise from Sunrise Highway will continue to be the dominant source of noise in the area following construction. As with any developed site, there is the potential for generation of periodic noise related to site activities following development of the site as a multifamily development. The most common sources of intermittent noise generating activities will be related to vehicular access to the new development, vehicles driving on the interior driveways and parking areas, and maintenance of landscaping on the site. These were analyzed and are discussed in the paragraphs below. A noise attenuation worksheet, which provides the values and calculations utilized for each source and station, is provided in **Appendix I-2**.

- Maintenance of common lawn/garden areas. The nearest common areas to be landscaped to residential property lines are located at various distances from surrounding property lines ranging from 25 feet for properties sharing a property boundary with the site (along the eastern

property line) to 55 feet where a roadway and buffer separate the site and nearest property line. Attenuation of sound levels is provided with distance, predicted by application of the inverse square law and accounting for the intervening area of woods to remain between the new development and property lines where it is planned (for a reduction of up to 2 dBA). Use of a gas-powered lawn mower was assumed which results in a level of approximately 70 dBA at a distance of 10 feet. When adjusted source levels are combined with the ambient level for morning levels based upon monitoring results, the levels range between 56.9 dBA at Station 4 to 72.1 dBA at Station 7. It is noted that the ambient level at Station 7 was already high due to activity related to lawn maintenance and the resulting 72.1 dBA was a net increase of 0.3 dBA over the ambient level. At other stations, the increase in sound level would be audible at nearby property lines; however, such activities are typical of a residential area, are not sustained for long periods and occur periodically. In addition, while these levels are greater than the maximum permissible levels per Table 1 in Chapter 35, noise from the operation of domestic equipment is exempted from the maximum permissible levels if the maintenance occurs between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m. on weekdays or between the hours of 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Sundays. While the code does not exempt such activity on Saturdays, as Sunday hours are permitted, it is assumed that the same hours would apply on Saturdays.

- Motor vehicles. The analysis includes an assessment of combined noise for a common source of noise – the use of motor vehicles within the site. For each station, a realistic number of vehicles was inputted in consideration of the site location (entrance as compared to internal roadway or parking area). The sound levels associated with normal motor vehicle activity is not expected to result in a noticeable change in the noise environment, as it is consistent with existing sources in the vicinity. However, the analysis performed illustrates that at the property lines, the sound levels range between 46.8 for Station 3 and 72.1 at Station 7 (which as noted above is an increase of 0.3 dBA over the ambient based upon monitoring and would vary as with the current conditions and sources of noise). This analysis was not prepared for Station 5 due to the high level of vehicular traffic on Station Road which would make movement within the site indiscernible from background levels.

In summary, following construction, the only regularly occurring sources of noise which may be audible to nearby residents related to the long-term use of the property is expected to be associated with vehicular ingress and egress from the development and movement within the site. This traffic will proceed at low speeds and will not cause a perceptible increase above ambient noise, particularly due to the vehicle traffic consisting mainly of passenger cars. Other than maintenance of lawn and garden areas on the site and the envisioned accessory commercial uses to occur indoors are typically quiet in their operations, any occurrence of loud sounds would be random and intermittent as is the case with any development.

Based on the above analysis and lack of necessity to implement noise mitigation proposed, no noise-related impacts are expected.

#### Lighting

As described in **Section 1.4.6**, the proposed project includes a lighting system designed to establish a safe and secure environment for its residents and visitors, and that will provide pole-

mounted illumination only in those areas where it is necessary and appropriate. These areas include the internal roadways and parking areas, as well as the STP and the three site access points. Lighting will not be provided at the pool/patio areas, along the internal sidewalk network, or along the walking trail in the 24.6-acre public park.

The project's lighting will conform to the requirements of Town Code Chapter 68, Article LII, with all lighting fixtures proposed to be dark-sky compliant. This design consideration will help to minimize the potential for enhancing or contributing to diffuse sky-glow. With the exception of the three site access drives, no pole-mounted lights will be placed within 50 feet of the site boundaries. In this way, the potential for fugitive lighting to pass through the perimeter vegetation buffer and bordering roadways to impact the neighboring residences will be minimized.

### Demography

**Table 3-14** below builds on the baseline demographic data discussed above (which represents current, 2018 conditions), with a projection of those data types to the year 2023. The projections enable some analysis of the anticipated trends in the demographic characteristics if the proposed project is not implemented. **Table 3-14** provides some insight as to the trends that may be expected in these characteristics in 2023. Specifically, a slight increase in total population in Sayville is expected, with a small decrease in the pre school-age cohort, and a more substantial decrease in school-age population. These latter two trends would be pertinent to the Connetquot CSD, for planning purposes. The adult cohort in Sayville would experience an increase, reflective of the general aging of the Sayville population. With respect to housing, a small increase in total households is expected, with an increase in owner-occupied units and a substantial decrease in rental units. This trend would attract younger and/or less affluent potential occupants, as this type of residence is generally more affordable to these cohorts.

### Table

**TABLE 3-14**  
**IMPACT ON DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, 2018 - 2023**  
 Sayville

	Total Population	Age			Housing		
		Pre School-Age (<1 - 5 yrs.)	School-Age (5 - 19 yrs.)	Adults (>19 yrs.)	Total Households	Owner-Occupied	Rented
2018	16,975	802	3,155	13,018	5,976	4,706	1,270
2023	17,098	799	2,902	13,397	5,989	4,817	1,172
% Change vs. 2018 <sup>(1)</sup>	+0.72	-0.37	-8.03	+2.91	+0.22	+2.36	-7.72
With Project	19,803	981	3,112	15,710	7,354	4,817	2,537
% Change vs. 2018 <sup>(2)</sup>	+15.82	+22.65	+7.24	+17.27	+22.79	0	+116.47

(1) These values represent anticipated Sayville demographic conditions in 2023 if the proposed project is not built.

(2) These values represent anticipated Sayville demographic conditions in 2023 if the proposed project is built.

The table includes the effects of the proposed project on the demographic characteristics of Sayville anticipated in 2023. As can be seen, with the proposed project, the total population in the hamlet would be increased substantially (whereas if the project is not built, the total population would increase only slightly). The project would cause a substantial increase in pre school-age children and a lesser increase in school-age children. In the same way as noted above, these two trends would be of interest to the local school district, for planning purposes. That is, if the project is not built, the Connetquot CSD should expect a decrease in enrollments, whereas if the project is built, the district can expect an increase in enrollments. Finally, the project would cause an increase in the adult cohort.

With respect to housing, the proposed project would substantially increase the total number of households in Sayville, with a substantial increase in rental units (which is the goal of the Town, the community, and the intent of Applicant). As the units in the proposed project would all be rental units, the project would not increase the number of owner-occupied units in Sayville.

### 3.4.3 Proposed Mitigation

- Analysis indicates that the proposed buildings will not result in adverse visual impacts for observers on adjacent residential sites or the bordering roadways. However, the Applicant could consider additional plantings in the perimeter vegetation buffer, to further screen the project.
- As the noise analysis prepared for the proposed project indicates that no significant adverse impacts are anticipated with respect to receptors on the site or in the vicinity, the Applicant does not propose to implement noise mitigation measures beyond the noise-reducing measures in the applicable Building Code requirements.

- It is expected that the project's conformance to the applicable standards of Chapter 68, Section LII (Outdoor lighting) will be sufficient to adequately mitigate potential impacts from fugitive lighting. However, the Applicant could consider additional screen plantings in the perimeter vegetation buffer, to increase the level of lighting obscuration.

### 3.5 Cultural Resources

As shown in **Figure 3-7**, the project is not within an area designated by the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) as "Sensitive" for the presence of significant re-historic (i.e., before colonization of Long Island in the late 1600's) or historic (i.e., after colonization began) artifacts.

The project site was the subject of a previous re-development Application in 2006, for which a Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation (consisting of a Phase 1a Site Assessment and Phase 1b Excavation Program) was performed. That study (see **Appendix J-1**) was performed on approximately 67 acres in the central portions of site, and involved 1,016 shovel test holes excavated within that area.

The current proposed project would develop a larger portion of the subject site, so that a significant number of additional shovel test excavations are necessary, in the form of a Phase 1b Addendum (see **Appendix J-2**).

#### 3.5.1 Existing Conditions

##### 2006

The following is taken from the Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation:

##### **INTRODUCTION**

Between April 12 and May 5, 2006, TRACKER-Archaeology Services, Inc. conducted a Phase I A documentary study of a Phase IB archaeological survey for the proposed Island Hills subdivision in Sayville, Town of Islip, Suffolk County, New York. The purpose of the Phase IA documentary study was to determine the prehistoric and historic potential of the property for the recovery of archaeological remains. This was accomplished by a review of the original and current environmental data, archaeological site files, other archival literature, maps, and documents.

A prehistoric site file search was conducted utilizing the resources of the New York State Historic Preservation Office- Field Services Bureau in Waterford, New York. Various historical and archaeological web sites were reviewed for any pertinent information.

The purpose of the Phase IB survey was to recover physical evidence for the presence or absence of archaeological sites on the property. This was accomplished through subsurface testing and ground surface reconnaissance.

The entire property consists of an existing golf course known as the Island Hills Golf and Country Club. It is approximately 120 acres. However, the project area of potential effect (APE) consists of about 67 acres inclusive with a developed area around the clubhouse and some heavily graded areas of the golf course. The property as a whole is bounded on north by 11<sup>th</sup> Street, to the west by Bohemia Parkway, to the east by Chester Road and Carrie Avenue, and to the south by Sterling and Hauppauge (Terry's) Roads.

### **PREHISTORIC POTENTIAL**

A prehistoric site file search was conducted at the New York State Historic Preservation Office (NYSHPO). Archaeological sites recorded within 1 mile of the study area included:

- No sites recorded.

Indian foot trails passed through the vicinity. One such trail traversed along current day Montauk Highway. Although recorded historically, it undoubtedly existed prehistorically.

Assessing the known environmental and prehistoric archaeological data, we can summarize the following points:

- An intermittent drainage flows through the golf course on the County Soil Survey draining south to Green Creek approximately 1800 feet away. However, the USGS does not depict this stream.
- The project area contains level to some steep sloped topography with well drained and some graded soils.
- An Indian foot trail was reported in the vicinity of the project area.
- No prehistoric sites are recorded near the project area.

In our opinion, the study area has a moderate potential for the recovery of prehistoric archaeological remains on level terrain which has not been graded.

### **HISTORIC POTENTIAL**

Contact Period (Seventeenth Century)

At the time of European contact and settlement, the study area was probably occupied by the main branch of the large Patchogue tribe which inhabited the southern portion of the Brookhaven Township.

#### Eighteenth Century

In 1732 the Colonial Assembly passed an act to build the South Country Road through Islip (present day Montauk Highway). Before this, travel was largely restricted to the interior due to the numerous streams, intersecting southern Islip, making travel unsafe and inconvenient.

A wigwam was recorded along the aforementioned Indian foot trail (see Prehistoric Potential) in this area by Reverend Horton in the 1740's who likely visited there.

#### Nineteenth Century

The 1836 Colton map depicts the Sayville area with what might be Green Creek east of Connetquot River. Montauk Highway is shown but none of the adjacent roads to the project area are in (Figure 3

[of **Appendix J-1**]). During this century, the main occupations seemed to be farming, fishing, and lumbering. Sayville was a major source of wood, particularly pine, for New York City by 1830.

The 1858 Chace map shows Montauk Avenue, Greens Point, and what appears to be Green Creek. Neither Sunrise Highway nor any other nearby roads to the project area are in yet (Figure 4 [of **Appendix J-1**]).

By the middle of the century, most of the Town’s forest had been decimated. In 1844, the railroad construction went through the best part of the remaining forest. Remaining forests cleared for shipbuilding, houses, and other buildings. Pine trees were turned into charcoal and burned in pits in the woods for use in the blacksmith forges before coal became popular. Population now was approximately 2602.

The railroad arrived in 1868 and shortly after Sayville became a bustling resort town.

The 1873 Beers map shows the adjacent Lakeland Avenue with no structures on or adjacent to the project area. The area is shown as becoming subdivided (Figure 5 [of **Appendix J-1**]).

Twentieth Century

The 1904 USGS shows the project area with bordering roads. Structures are seen possibly on or adjacent to the project area (Figure 6 [of **Appendix J-1**]).

An historic site file search was conducted at the New York State Historic Preservation Office (NYSHPO). Archaeological sites recorded within 1 mile of the study area included:

<b>NYSM Site</b>	<b>NYSHPO Site</b>	<b>Distance from APE ft (m)</b>	<b>Site Type</b>
	10305.000603	164 (538)	Franklin Avenue Site: 1920’s foundation
	10305.000804 (B)	1380 (4528)	Union Cemetery and Jan Hus Statue: 1893 cemetery
	10305.000604	809 (2654)	Johnson Avenue Site: Mid 20 <sup>th</sup> C foundation

Assessing the known environmental and historic archaeological data, we can summarize the following points:

- An intermittent drainage flows through the golf course on the County Soil Survey draining south to Green Creek approximately 1800 feet away
- The project area contains levels to some steeply sloped topography with well drained and some graded soils.
- An Indian foot trail was reported in the vicinity of the project area.
- Early twentieth century historic map documented structures were recorded possibly on or adjacent to the project area.
- One early twentieth century site was reported across the road from the project area.

In our opinion the study area has a higher than average potential for the recovery of early twentieth century historic archaeological remains.



## **FIELD METHODS**

### Walkover-Reconnaissance

Exposed ground surfaces (70 to 100 percent visibility) were subjected to a close quarters walkover, at 3 to 5 meter intervals, to observe for artifacts. Covered ground terrain was reconnoitered at about 15 meters (50 feet) intervals to observe for any above ground features, such as berms, depression, or rock configurations, which could be evidence for a prehistoric or historic site. Photographs were taken of the project area.

### Shovel Testing

Shovel tests (ST's) were excavated at about 15 meter (50 foot) intervals across most of the project area. Tees, putting greens, sand traps, and water traps were not tested due to their heavily graded/manufactured landscape. The developed area around the clubhouse which included other buildings, roads, and parking lots was also not shovel tested. The fairways and roughs were subjected to shovel testing.

Each ST measured about 30 to 40 cm. in diameter and was dug into the underlying subsoil (B horizon) 10 to 20 cm. when possible. All soils were screened through ¼ inch wire mesh and observed for artifacts. Shovel tests and surface finds were flagged in the field. All ST's and SF's were mapped on the project area map at this time. Soil stratigraphy was recorded according to texture and color. Soil color was matched against the Munsell color chart for soils. Notes were transcribed in a notebook and on pre-printed field forms.

## **FIELD RESULTS**

Field testing of the project are included the excavation of 1,016 ST's across the project area. No prehistoric artifacts or features were encountered. No historic artifacts or features were encountered. Nine mid-twentieth century buildings were on the project area consisting of the clubhouse, housing for some employees, utility buildings, bathrooms, etc.

## 2018

The following is taken from the Phase 1b Addendum:

### **INTRODUCTION**

Between June 20 and July 7, 2018, TRACKER Archaeology, Inc. conducted a Phase 1b Addendum archaeological survey for the proposed Island Hills subdivision in Sayville, Town of Islip, Suffolk County, New York. The purpose of the survey was to provide physical evidence for the presence or absence of archaeological sites on the project area. In 2006, a Phase 1a and 1b Archaeological Investigation was conducted on the bulk of this former golf course but buffers were excluded around the periphery adjacent to the neighboring streets. At that time, 1,016 shovel tests were conducted with negative results. The current investigation is a continuation of field testing and includes the remaining portions of the property planned for development.

The remaining project area is about 47 acres in size including buildings, parking areas, sand traps, golf tees, bulldozed areas, paved walking paths, etc. The current project area is limited to the areas along the roads and adjacent residential properties, about 150 to 300 feet wide corridors adjacent to Eleventh Street, Bohemia Parkway, Chester Road, Hauppauge Road, Carrie Avenue, and Sterling Place.

Field testing of the project area included the excavation of 583 ST's. Shovel testing began with ST number 1,017, since the 2006 shovel testing ended at ST 1,016. Vegetation consisted mostly a mowed lawn, with some tall grass (un-mowed) and weeds, and a light scatter of wooded areas. Two prehistoric isolated quartz debitage were recovered at ST 1,268. Eight radial ST's were excavated at 1 and 3 meters to the north, south, east, and west with no additional finds. No historic sites were encountered.

### 3.5.2 Anticipated Impacts

#### 2006

The following is taken from the Phase 1 Archaeological Investigation:

##### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based upon topographic characteristics, distance to other known prehistoric sites and an Indian trail, the property was assessed as having a moderate potential for encountering prehistoric sites.

Based upon topographic characteristics, distance to historic map documented structures, historic sites, and an Indian trail, the property was assessed as having a higher than average potential for encountering historic sties

The field testing included the excavation of 1,016 ST's on the project area. No historic artifacts or features were encountered. No prehistoric artifacts or features were encountered. No further work is recommended.

#### 2018

The following is taken from the Phase 1b Addendum:

##### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

During the course of the Phase 1b survey, 583 ST's were excavated. Prehistoric isolated finds were encountered. No historic artifacts or features were encountered. No further work is recommended for the project property.

### 3.5.3 Proposed Mitigation

- Neither of the two Phase 1 Archaeological Investigations revealed the presence of, or the suspected presence of, cultural resources, or historic or architecturally significant structures on the subject; no further investigation was warranted. As such, no mitigation measures with respect to cultural resources is necessary or proposed.

### 3.6 Emergency Preparedness

#### 3.6.1 Existing Conditions

##### General Discussion of Emergency Preparedness

As the subject site is currently a vacant, closed former country club/golf course operation, no private emergency response or disaster recovery procedures (undertaken in response to natural disasters such as drought, flooding, infestation, lightning, hail, tornado, blizzards, hurricanes, nor'easters, earthquakes, coastal erosion, etc., or human-related disasters such as power failure, groundwater contamination, or wildfire) ) are presently applied to or practiced on the property.

##### 2014 Update to the Suffolk County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (2008)

The following description of the 2014 Update to the Suffolk County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan of 2008 (hereafter, the "All Hazard Mitigation Plan") has been from the Executive Summary of that document.

The 2014 Update to the 2008 Suffolk County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan was prepared in accordance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000). DMA 2000 requires states and local governments to prepare all hazard mitigation plans in order to remain eligible to receive pre-disaster mitigation grant funds that are made available in the wake of federally-declared disasters. **To restate, by not participating in this process and adopting the resulting plan, municipalities will not be eligible to receive future pre-disaster mitigation grant funding (404 grant funds).** It is also important to remember that pre-disaster mitigation grant funds are separate and distinct from those federal and state funds available for direct post-disaster relief (i.e. Public Assistance (PA) and Individual Assistance (IA)). The availability of those funds remains unchanged; if there is a federally declared disaster in Suffolk County, the affected municipalities will still receive immediate recovery assistance regardless of their participation in this plan.

However, DMA 2000 effectively improves the disaster planning process by increasing hazard mitigation planning requirements for hazard events and requiring participating municipalities to document their hazard mitigation planning process and identify hazards, potential losses, and mitigation needs, goals, and strategies.

Several major natural hazard events occurred since the adoption of the original 2008 Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) that signaled a call to action throughout Suffolk County to review the risks disasters pose and create solutions. In 2011 Hurricane Irene occurred and then 14 months later the worst natural disaster since 1938 struck Suffolk County- [Hurricane\[Superstorm\] Sandy](#). To date, properties still remain damaged and communities are still trying to recover from both Hurricane Irene and Sandy. This plan provided an opportunity for communities to learn from the past and strengthen policies and actions taken to reduce impact from natural disasters.

Suffolk County has seen much success in the implementation of the 2008 HMP. Proactive measures such as protecting critical infrastructure through the purchase of backup generators has proven to be a wise investment and strong pre-disaster preparation reduced damages seen in the aftermath of

major disasters. Communities have also considered regulatory standards regarding land-use and zoning that exceed minimum requirements and provide the communities with greater capability to manage development without increasing hazard risk and vulnerability.

The process to update the Suffolk County HMP incorporated the four major tasks taken to develop hazard mitigation plans and their subsequent updates (FEMA 3, specifically:

**Organize Resources:** From the start, communities should focus on the resources needed for a successful mitigation planning process. Essential steps include identifying and organizing interested members of the community as well as the technical expertise required during the planning process.

**Assess Risk:** Next, communities need to identify characteristics and potential consequences of hazards. It is important to understand how much of the community can be affected by specific hazards and what the impacts would be on important community assets.

**Develop a Mitigation Plan:** Armed with the understanding of the risks posed by hazards, communities need to determine what their priorities should be and then look at possible ways to avoid or minimize the undesired effects. The result is a hazard mitigation plan and strategy for implementation

**Implement the Plan and Monitor Progress:** Communities can bring the plan to life in a variety of ways ranging from implementing specific mitigation projects to changes in the day-to-day operations of the local government. To ensure the success of an on-going program, it is critical that the plan remains relevant. Thus, it is important to conduct period evaluations and make revisions as needed.

The following Executive Summary is organized according to these general steps.

#### **Suffolk County Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Process**

DMA 2000 requires states to submit comprehensive Hazard Mitigation Plans (HMPs) to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to be eligible for future pre-disaster mitigation funding. Local governments, including counties, municipalities, tribal governments and special purpose districts must also develop plans. Suffolk County developed and adopted the original county HMP in 2008. The DMA 2000 regulations require that local plans be formally updated and adopted every five years, reassessing their risk and updating their local strategies to manage and mitigate those risks. To comply, Suffolk County and inclusive jurisdictions actively participated in the update of the 2008 Suffolk County Multi- Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. Once the mitigation plan is completed and approved, the participating jurisdictions will continue to address and implement the findings, recommendations and mitigation strategies identified in this plan update.

Extensive outreach efforts by the Suffolk County Department of Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services (FRES) resulted in full participation of all municipalities, as well as the Shinnecock and Unkechaug Tribal Nations. Further, the Suffolk County Water Authority (SCWA) fully participated to achieve the ability to independently apply for grant funding.

It is noted that FEMA and the New York State Office of Emergency Management (NYSOEM) has long been interested in unifying all municipalities under countywide HMPs. The 2008 countywide HMP

included eight of the ten Suffolk County towns and their inclusive municipalities. During this update, all municipalities in the County have fully participated in this planning process, resulting in a true countywide HMP. The Town of Islip and several of the villages were previously covered under single jurisdiction local HMPs, which have now been incorporated into this plan update. Further, the Town of Southampton and their inclusive villages conducted a concurrent hazard mitigation planning process, which has also been fully integrated into this countywide plan update.

Within this plan update process, Suffolk County and the participating jurisdictions accomplished the following:

- Developed a Steering Committee and Planning Committee;
- Sought and incorporated the input of the public and stakeholders;
- Reviewed and updated the hazards of concern;
- Profiled and prioritized these hazards;
- Estimated inventory at risk and potential losses associated with these hazards;
- Reviewed and updated hazard mitigation goals and objectives;
- Reviewed and updated the County and local mitigation strategies to address the identified risks and vulnerabilities;
- Updated and developed mitigation plan maintenance procedures to be executed upon plan approval.

The planning process involved a large number of Federal, State, Regional, County and local stakeholders.

As required by DMA 2000, the participating jurisdictions and Suffolk County have informed the public about these efforts and provided opportunities for public comment and input on the planning process. In addition, numerous agencies and stakeholders have participated as core or support members to provide input and expertise to the planning process. This HMP documents the process and outcomes of the jurisdictions' mitigation planning efforts. Announcements regarding the planning process were publicized in local newspapers and on the Suffolk County web site (<http://www.suffolkcountyny.gov/RESPOND/>). The RESPOND website also offered the general public and stakeholder groups an opportunity to provide their input through community surveys.

Note that the All-Hazard Mitigation Plan is the local agency response to a federal requirement under the DMA 2000 for local agencies to prepare disaster mitigation plans, in order to remain eligible to continue to receive pre-disaster mitigation funds. As such, the disaster-related mitigation and recovery recommendations and procedures of the All-Hazard Mitigation Plan are directed toward local governmental agencies and not to specific properties or applicants.

### 3.6.2 Anticipated Impacts

#### General Discussion of Emergency Preparedness

The proposed project will re-develop and re-occupy the site, so that there will be a potential for impact to the site's residents from natural and human-related disasters. However, it is

expected that the project's conformance to Town and NYS requirements for engineering review, stormwater/drainage control, fire safety, evacuation, building construction and overall site development will protect the site and its residents from impacts from most if not all reasonably foreseeable natural and human-related disasters that could occur. It is also expected that local, Town, County and NYS emergency police, fire safety, health, and social services would be available to help protect the site and its residents during a disaster, by measures such as evacuation, direct intervention (e.g., dispatching firefighters to attack wildfires, or pumping of floodwaters, snow plowing, powerline repair, etc.). The site is not located within a flood plain area and therefore not subject to flooding. The site is located within convenient proximity to both the eastbound and westbound lanes of Sunrise Highway and therefore should evacuation ~~be needed~~[become necessary](#), transportation systems are in place to permit vehicular access to major roads.

#### 2014 Update to the Suffolk County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (2008)

The All-Hazard Mitigation Plan does not include recommendations specific to the project site or to the type of development represented by the proposed project. Generally, the types of disaster addressed in the All-Hazard Mitigation Plan focus that would apply to the subject site are related to stormwater/flooding and wildfires. As discussed above, it is expected that conformance to the applicable Town and NYS requirements for stormwater system design, and for conformance to applicable Town, County and NYS requirements for fire safety measures, will protect the site and its residents from potential impacts from most if not all reasonably foreseeable natural and human-related disasters that could occur.

### 3.6.3 Proposed Mitigation

- The Applicant will ensure that the project incorporates appropriate building materials, mechanical systems, and design elements to support a safe built environment on the site that will protect the residents in case of a natural and/or human-related disaster.
- The Applicant acknowledges that the project design, construction, operation and maintenance will be subject to engineering, building/construction requirements and fire safety review by the Town.

## 3.7 Open Space and Recreation

### 3.7.1 Existing Conditions

The site is presently a closed, vacant former country club/golf course operation; it is not open to the public as an open space or recreational space, though evidence of unauthorized trespass is evident in places. As discussed in **Section 2.3.1**, the site is presently vegetated with the unmaintained remnants of the former golf course operation, including grasses on the fairways and rough, as well as the trees between each fairway. A number of public open spaces/recreational sites are located within one mile of the subject site, and include school

fields, Town, Suffolk County and NYS parks, a Suffolk County Nature Preserve, and a National Wildlife Refuge (see **Figure 3-8**).

### 3.7.2 Anticipated Impacts

As the subject site is presently closed and unavailable to the public as an open space or recreational resource, the proposed project will not cause any reduction in the availability of such land to the public. To the contrary, the project will have the beneficial impact of increasing the acreage of public open space/recreational resources, by removing the existing perimeter fencing and ~~and~~ developing a 25-acre active/passive park along the site's perimeter. This facility will be privately owned and maintained by the project's POA, but will be open to the public.

The proposed project will not encroach upon any of the existing park or recreational facilities in the vicinity. Given the on-site recreational amenities and public park space, it is expected that many residents will use these resources for their park interests. New residents may use existing public open space and recreational resources in the area; however, would not be expected to overburden these facilities as these public parks are large enough to accommodate all likely, day-to-day visitors and only intermittent, incremental use by some of the site residents would be expected. Finally, the number of local public recreational sites available to the project's residents would tend to spread the project's visitation geographically, to reduce the potential impact of visitation at any one site.

### 3.7.3 Proposed Mitigation

- The Applicant will fund and construct a 25-acre perimeter park, which will be owned, operated and maintained by the project's POA.

## 3.8 Local Economy

### 3.8.1 Existing Conditions

The local economy pertinent to the proposed project is characterized by the demographics, employment and residential real estate market in the greater Sayville area and Central Long Island. A number of supplemental studies have been prepared to understand the local economy and to consider the benefits and potential impacts of the proposed project with respect to the local economy. **Appendix C-1** includes a market analysis that demonstrates the need for the proposed project and supports the proposed use as contributing housing stock that will assist in retaining millennials and those seeking apartment opportunities. **Appendix C-2** provides a density analysis that examines the land uses in the area in terms of units per acre,

and the other measures to assess the change in land use density represented by the proposed project. This study finds that the proposed density is not inconsistent with the surrounding area and support the location of the proposed project as designed and intended for this site.

**Appendix C-3** provides a fiscal and economic assessment that quantifies the anticipated tax revenue and school district surplus revenue after consideration of the cost of education of school age children expected to occupy the development. This study also quantifies construction jobs and operational jobs as well as the beneficial ripple effect on the local and regional economy. Tax revenue and job creation are important land use considerations, particularly given the beneficial aspects of expanded tax base and employment opportunities.

**Appendix C-4** includes a real estate impact analysis intended to determine if the proposed land use will impact real estate values of properties proximate to the subject site. This study examines comparable situations and provides a professional assessment leading to the finding that the proposed project will not adversely impact real estate values in the area.

Existing conditions in the local economy are summarized from the bae urban economics report, Market Analysis for the Proposed Greybarn Project, Sayville prepared by bae urban economics and included in **Appendix C-1**.

#### Demographics

- In recent years, Central Long Island and the immediate project area have experienced stagnant population growth and household growth. Between 2010 and 2018, the number of households in Central Long Island increased by only 0.2%, while the number of households within 1.5 miles of the project site decreased by 0.2%.
- Over three quarters of households in Central Long Island and nearly 70% of households in the immediate project area are family households. The lower proportion of family households in the immediate project area is driven by the high proportion of one-person senior households in the area.
- Overall, household incomes in Central Long Island and the immediate project area are significantly higher than in the New York Metro Area. The median income is \$102,060 in Central Long Island and \$96,254 in the immediate project area, as compared to \$74,510 in the New York Metro Area. The slightly lower median household income in the immediate project area is due to the higher proportion of single-person households.
- The population in Central Long Island and the immediate project area is older than that of the New York Metro Area. The median age in Central Long Island is 41.3, while it is 45.3 years in the immediate project area. In the New York Metro Area, it is 38.7. Over thirty percent of residents in Central Long Island are over the age of 55, while the same is true for 35.6% of residents within 1.5 miles of the project site. The fastest-growing age groups in Central Long Island and the immediate project area are 25 to 34 and 55+.
- The majority of employed residents in Central Long Island (76%) and the immediate project area (77.9%) work in Long Island. Approximately 44% of Central Long Island residents and project area residents travel less than 10 miles to work.

#### Local Employment



- The largest employment sectors in Central Long Island are healthcare and social assistance (14.6% of all jobs), educational services (11.9% of all jobs), retail trade (11.9% of all jobs), and manufacturing (8.9% of all jobs).
- From 2010 to 2015, the fastest-growing sectors were construction (27.5% growth), accommodation and food services (17.1% growth), other services excluding public administration (15.5% growth), administration and support, waste management and remediation (14.6% growth), and transportation and warehousing (11% growth).
- The number of manufacturing jobs in Central Long Island remains steady, despite losses in the New York Metro Area. From 2010 to 2015, the New York Metro Area lost 8.2% of its manufacturing jobs, while Central Long Island saw a decline of only 0.1%.
- The largest publicly traded companies in Central Long Island are Henry Schein (21,000 employees), MSC Industrial Direct Co. Inc. (6,462 employees), and Verint Systems (5,100 employees). Other large employers include healthcare providers and institutions of higher education such as Stony Brook University and Suffolk County Community College.
- The places with the highest job densities include Melville, Hauppauge, Plainview, Farmingdale, Stony Brook, and Bohemia.
- Approximately 82.5% of Central Long Island workers travel from within Suffolk or Nassau County. Over half of workers commute less than 10 miles, while 81.2% commute less than 25 miles.

#### Residential Real Estate Market

- In Central Long Island and the immediate project area, the majority of housing units were constructed between 1950 and 1979. Central Long Island and the New York Metro Area experienced relatively significant housing inventory growth through 2009; however, since 2010, there has been very little housing inventory growth in either geography.
- Homes in Central Long Island are predominantly owner-occupied. Only 20.2% of housing units in Central Long Island are renter occupied, as compared to half of units in the New York Metro Area. In the immediate study area, one quarter of housing units are renter-occupied.
- As of the second quarter of 2018, the average rent for a market-rate two-bedroom apartment in the immediate study area was \$2,308. This is slightly higher than the average two-bedroom rent in Central Long Island (\$2,119). In the New York Metro Area, the average two-bedroom rent was \$2,670 in Q2 2018. Market-rate rents in all three geographies have consistently increased since 2009. Beginning in 2015, rental rates in Central Long Island and the immediate project area began increasing even more sharply than in the New York Metro Area.
- Multifamily vacancy rates are relatively low in the New York Metro Area, Central Long Island, and the immediate project area. As of the second quarter of 2018, the average multifamily vacancy rate within a 1.5-mile radius of the project site was 1.9%.
- The majority of multifamily units in the immediate study area (96.6%) and in Central Long Island (91.1%) have one or two bedrooms. The New York Metro Area has a significantly larger proportion of studios (15.4%) and units with three or more bedrooms (8.1%).
- Over half of multifamily units in the immediate project area are in buildings with between 301 and 400 units, while 35.3% are in buildings with between 51 and 100 units. In Central Long Island, 70% of multifamily units are in buildings with 101 or more units, while 38% of units are in buildings with 301 or more units.

- In the immediate project area, there are no Class A multifamily units. Approximately 43.4% of units are Class B, while 56.6% are Class C. In Central Long Island, 7.5% of units are Class A, 49.2% are Class B, and 43.3% are Class C.
- In the immediate project area, no multifamily units were constructed between 2009 and the second quarter of 2018. In Central Long Island, multifamily inventory increased by 7.5%, which is slightly higher than the growth rate in the New York Metro Area during this time period (6.2%). In Central Long Island, three bedroom units experienced the highest growth rate (19.9%).
- According to CoStar, as of July 2018, there were 458 multifamily units under construction in Central Long Island. Additionally, there are 7,736 units proposed. The majority of the proposed units (7,102) are part of the Heartland Town Square project in Brentwood.
- Most owner-occupied homes in Central Long Island and the immediate project area are single-family homes. Nearly 91% of homes that sold in the immediate project area from July 2017 to June 2018 were single-family homes, while only 9.2% were condos or townhomes. In Central Long Island, an even smaller proportion of homes that sold during this period were condos or townhomes (5.4%).
- Of the three geographies analyzed, the immediate project area has the highest median sale price (\$415,000), followed by the New York Metro area (\$385,000) and then Central Long Island (\$360,000). With the exception of a few individual years in which the New York Metro Area's median home sale price matched that of the immediate project area, the project area has historically had the highest median sale price of the three geographies. The immediate project area is the only geography where the current median home sale price is higher than it was in 2008.
- An analysis of twelve comparable multifamily rental projects in Central Long Island revealed that the average rent per square foot of these projects ranges from \$2.06 to \$3.17. Apart from newer projects that have not yet fully leased up, vacancy rates in these developments are relatively low. The locations with the highest concentrations of competitive multifamily projects are Bay Shore, Farmingdale, and Port Jefferson.
- There are fewer comparable condominium projects in Central Long Island. Many of the condominium projects that offer similar monthly pricing are age-restricted retirement communities.

### 3.8.2 Anticipated Impacts

Potential impacts to the local economy are generally positive and beneficial. The proposed project will add new rental apartments in an area that is in need of this housing stock. The low vacancy rate of existing multiple family housing supports the need and demand for the project. **Appendix C-1** addresses the housing affordability and project demand as follows:

#### Housing Affordability Analysis

- The housing affordability analysis emphasized the limited supply of rental housing in Central Long Island. This especially impacts smaller households (two- and one-person households). An individual who earns median income (\$81,700) can afford less than one quarter of the for-sale homes on the market. If that individual is not able to (or does not wish to) purchase a home, he can afford only 180 available rental units in the entire Central Long Island geography.

- The Greybarn Sayville project would provide 1,148 market-rate units affordable to households earning between 100 and 125% of AMI, as well as 217 workforce units affordable to households earning up to 80% of [AMI:the US HUD Nassau/Suffolk Median Family Income.](#)

#### Assessment of Project Demand

- According to the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council, Long Island is expected to grow at a faster rate from 2010 through 2050 than in previous decades. Driving this expected increase are employment growth, natural and migration-based population growth, and land use and housing capacity constraints in New York City, which will push development outwards.
- From 2018 to 2040, Central Long Island is expected to gain 69,885 households, representing a 13.7% increase. Growth rates are expected to be even higher in the Town of Islip, where Greybarn Sayville will be located. From 2018 to 2040, the Town of Islip is expected to gain 20,858 households, representing a 20.1% increase.
- To achieve full lease-up by 2030, Greybarn Sayville would need to capture 4.03% of Central Long Island’s projected 2018 – 2030 housing unit demand that remains after accounting for entitled and proposed units. This capture rate seems reasonable, given local market conditions and national trends that continue to bolster demand for multifamily rental housing. Several variables contribute to this growing demand, including economic factors that make homeownership unaffordable for a significant proportion of millennials, changing preferences and lifestyle choices among young adults, and rapidly growing senior populations looking to “downsize.”
- Changing housing needs throughout an individual’s life creates a cycle known as the “housing spectrum.” Multifamily rental housing may be more practical, convenient, and affordable for younger and older households, while owner-occupied single-family homes meet the needs of families with children. Ensuring that there are adequate supplies of both rental and homeownership opportunities ensures that all types of households can meet their needs as their lives change.

Consequently, based on local rental communities and low vacancy rates, the proposed project fits within a rent and size increment that supports the local housing market and will help to meet existing demand for this type of housing.

There are positive and beneficial economic benefits to downtown Sayville expected to result from the project in the form of consumer demand to support local business. **Appendix C-3** provides a fiscal and economic assessment prepared by [NP&V/NPV](#) which indicates an anticipated population of 2,705 residents, including 182 infants and toddlers aged 0-4 years old, 210 school-aged children (between the ages of five [5] and 17 years), and 2,313 adults aged 18 years and older from the 1,365 households. The median household income in the Greater Sayville Area \$103,468. Local businesses will capture a portion of the spending associated with this income for food, apparel, entertainment, personal care products and services and other expenditures. The spending power of this population and income is significant, such that if just 10% of the household income were spent locally, this would represent over \$14 million. As a result, Sayville and surrounding communities can expect economic benefits from spending by occupants of the Greybarn community as a result of the proposed project.

**Appendix C-3** provides the [NP&V/NPV](#) fiscal and economic report that includes the anticipated

employees at the project including: types of jobs and potential for secondary impacts from labor pool that will serve the project. The 60.1 FTE direct employment positions created during Phase 6 (and upon full build-out and annual operations of the proposed project) of the development are projected to result in an indirect impact of 104.4 FTE jobs, and an induced impact of 42.8 FTE jobs throughout the region, bringing the total economic impact of operational employment to 207.2 FTE jobs during annual operations of Phase 6, and upon full build-out and annual operations of the proposed project. Projected salaries from operations will collectively total nearly \$4.0 million per year, after full buildout of the proposed project. The \$4.0 million in direct labor income is projected to result in an indirect impact of nearly \$5.3 million and an induced impact of nearly \$2.3 million, bringing the total economic impact of labor income to over \$11.6 million during the annual operations of Phase 6, and upon full build-out and annual operations of the proposed project. Direct jobs include: Office Management, Administrative Jobs; Leasing Agent Jobs and Maintenance Jobs. Indirect and induced jobs include the following types: Employment services; Services to buildings; Maintenance and repair construction of nonresidential structures; Investigation and security services; Landscape and horticultural services; Full-service restaurants; Limited-service restaurants; Maintenance and repair construction of residential structures; Architectural, engineering, and related services. Therefore, the proposed project is expected to provide economic benefits in the form of job creation and beneficial ripple effect on the economy to Sayville and the region.

There is a clubhouse proposed for use and enjoyment of site residents, much like any multiple family community. **The clubhouse amenities may include fitness centers, yoga and spin studios, screening rooms, club rooms, community kitchens, community workspace/library, and meeting rooms; the commercial amenities may include a café/coffee shop. The clubhouse is more for social activity within the community and is provided for the convenience of residents.** The clubhouse amenities will not fulfill the needs of residents who will continue to require goods and services from outside the community. As a result, it is not expected that the clubhouse amenities will result in an impact to existing establishments within the community. The occupancy of the Greybarn community will add significant spending power at the site, which will filter to the surrounding area in the form of consumer demand and sales by locate establishments thus providing additional economic benefit.

In terms of potential impact on home values within the surrounding area, and as previously referenced, **Appendix C-4** includes a study prepared by Breslin Appraisal Company, Inc. that addresses this issue. Excerpts from the study are provided in **Section 1.2.5**, and the overall finding of the study is reiterated below:

Based upon this data as well as our general experience, it is our opinion that the development as proposed will have no adverse impacts on surrounding residential real property values, specifically those near Island Hills, and it will not adversely affect the community in any way. It will provide a needed element of housing stock for the community. We would, therefore, urge the town to look favorably on this application.

The real estate value report supports a finding that the proposed project will not adversely impact real estate values of homes in the surrounding area.

The project is expected to result in substantial tax revenue such that a total of \$10,149,131 in annual taxes are expected to be levied, based on today's dollars, during a stabilized year of operations of the full project. The portion of tax revenue allocated to the Connetquot CSD is \$6,480,320 which, when after considering the cost of education, is expected to result in a \$2,990,184 surplus to the school district. The other tax revenue will benefit other taxing jurisdictions.

### 3.8.3 Proposed Mitigation

- The proposed project contributes to the local economy in a positive and beneficial way and therefore no mitigation is proposed or necessary.