



**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**FOR CREATION OF THE ISLIP MIXED-USE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (IMUPDD),  
REZONING OF CERTAIN PARCELS INTO SUCH DISTRICT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF  
ISLIP PINES PURSUANT TO THE IMUPDD  
HAMLET OF HOLBROOK, TOWN OF ISLIP, SUFFOLK COUNTY**

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 135.74± acres\* situated on the north side of Sunrise Highway, east of Veterans Memorial Highway, hamlet of Holbrook, Town of Islip, Suffolk County. Total land area affected by the IMUPDD is 143.23 acres when considering all rights-of-way, and Utility properties.

**SUFFOLK COUNTY  
TAX MAP NUMBERS:\*** District 0500 – Section 217 – Block 02 – Lots 3.2 and 9.5, District 0500 – Section 218 – Block 01 – Lots 1.11, 2.5, 2.6, 3.3, 3.4, 4.19, 5 and 6 and District 0500 – Section 239 – Block 01 – Lots 6.1, 7, 17.2, 17.5, 17.6 and 17.7 along with any utility or road rights-of-way adjacent to said parcels.

\*Represents acreage and tax parcels owned or controlled by the Applicant

**APPLICANT:** Serota Islip LLC  
c/o Lighthouse Realty Partners, LLC  
70 East Sunrise Highway, Suite 610  
Valley Stream, New York 11581

Contact: Bram Weber, Esq.  
Weber Law Group  
(631) 549-2000

**LEAD AGENCY:** Town of Islip Town Board  
655 Main Street  
Islip, New York

Contact: David Genaway, AICP  
Commissioner  
Department of Planning  
(631) 224-5450

**PREPARER & CONTACT:** This Final Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by:

VHB Engineering, Surveying and  
Landscape Architecture, P.C.  
2150 Joshua's Path, Suite 300  
Hauppauge, New York 11788

Contact: Theresa Elkowitz, Principal  
Gail A. Pesner, Senior Project Manager  
(631) 234-3444



With technical input from:

**Architect-Site Planner**

John DeFazio AIA, Architect  
4720 Center Boulevard, Suite 216  
Long Island City, New York 11109

**Civil Engineer**

Sidney B. Bowne & Son, LLP  
235 East Jericho Turnpike  
Mineola, New York 11501

**Traffic Engineer**

Stonefield Engineering & Design, LLC  
36 Ames Avenue, Suite 2B  
Rutherford, New Jersey 07070

**Legal Counsel**

Weber Law Group  
290 Broadhollow Road  
Suite 200E  
Melville, NY 11747

**DATE OF PREPARATION:**

March 2013  
Revised May 2013

**AVAILABILITY OF  
DOCUMENT:**

This document, together with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), is the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Copies are available for public review and comment at the offices of the lead agency and the following website:  
<http://www.townofislip-ny.gov>

Copies are also available at the Sachem Public Library.

**DATE OF FILING:**

**Notice of Completion adopted on May 21, 2013**  
**Document on file in the Office of the Town Clerk, 655 Main Street,**  
**Islip, NY**



**Table of Contents**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**2.0 ISLIP PINES REVISED CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN..... 6**

**3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ..... 17**

    3.1.1 Soils and Topography - ST ..... 17

    3.1.2 Water Resources - WR ..... 21

    3.1.3 Ecology - EC ..... 28

    3.1.4 Zoning and Land Use - ZLU ..... 37

    3.1.5 Transportation and Parking - TP ..... 59

    3.1.6 Community Services and Facilities - CSF ..... 86

    3.1.7 Energy - EN ..... 90

    3.1.8 Open Space and Recreation - OSR ..... 94

    3.1.9 Socioeconomics - SO ..... 95

    3.1.10 Aesthetics and Cultural Resources - ACR ..... 126

    3.1.11 Alternatives - AL ..... 132

    3.1.12 Procedure - PR ..... 134

    3.1.13 Miscellaneous- MS ..... 139

**List of Appendices**

- Appendix A - Public Hearing Transcript
- Appendix B - Written Correspondence
- Appendix C - Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Site Layout Plan
- Appendix D - Islip Mixed-Use Planned Development District
- Appendix E - Previously-Proposed DEIS Plan
- Appendix F - Goldisc Recordings, Inc. Environmental Summary
- Appendix G - Suffolk County Sewer Agency Resolution
- Appendix H - Revised Traffic Impact Study

**List of Figures**

Figure 1 - Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan ..... 9

Figure 2 - Green and Open Space Diagram ..... 12

**List of Tables**

Table 1 - Comparison of Previously-Proposed Conceptual Master Plan in DEIS and Revised Conceptual Master Plan Proposed in FEIS..... 7



*Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C.*

This document is a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed  
Islip Pines Mixed Use Development.

This FEIS incorporates, by reference, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this proposed  
action, dated October 2011. The above-referenced  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement was the subject of a  
Town of Islip Public Hearing on March 22, 2012, and written comments were accepted until April 2,  
2012.

The Public Hearing Transcript and the Written Correspondence are provided in  
Appendices A and B of this FEIS, respectively.



# 1.0

## Introduction

This document is a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) prepared in response to comments received by the Town of Islip Town Board (hereinafter “Town Board”) during the public comment period as well as those received after the end of the public comment period<sup>1</sup> on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed action, which involves the adoption of amendments to the zoning chapter of the Code of the Town of Islip (Chapter 68 of the Code of the Town of Islip), including the Zoning Map, to establish the Islip Mixed-Use Planned Development District (IMUPDD); changes in the zoning classification of certain parcels, designated as Suffolk County Tax Map Numbers: District 0500 – Section 217 – Block 02 – Lots 3.2 and 9.5, District 0500 – Section 218 – Block 01 – Lots 1.11, 2.5, 2.6, and 3.2 and District 0500 – Section 239 – Block 01 – Lots 6.1, 7 and 17.1 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “subject property”), along with adjacent utility and road rights-of-way and now classified in the “Industrial 1” and “Industrial Corridor” zoning districts, so as to include such parcels in the newly-established IMUPDD; approval of a Conceptual Master Plan for Islip Pines (hereinafter the “Conceptual Master Plan” or “Islip Pines”); and redevelopment of a portion of the aforesaid parcels, in accordance with the IMUDD and the Conceptual Master Plan therefor.

Pursuant to 6 NYCRR §617.9(b)(8) of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA):

*“A final EIS must consist of: the draft EIS, including any revisions or supplements to it; copies or a summary of the substantive comments received and their source (whether or not the comments were received in the context of a hearing); and the lead agency's responses to all substantive comments. The draft EIS may be directly incorporated into the final EIS or may be incorporated by reference. The lead agency is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of the final EIS, regardless of who prepares it. All revisions and supplements to the draft EIS must be specifically indicated and identified as such in the final EIS.”*

Thus, the FEIS incorporates the DEIS by reference and identifies and responds to substantive comments on the DEIS.

---

<sup>1</sup>Several comment letters were prepared and/or received by the applicant after the end of the public comment period.



The Conceptual Master Plan (presented in the DEIS and cited herein as the previously-proposed DEIS Plan) has been revised to address comments received by the Town. The updated plan is to be cited herein as the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Site Layout Plan (see Appendix C). The Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Figure 1) provides a graphic representation of the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Site Layout Plan contained in Appendix C. These plans are collectively cited herein as the “Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan.” Moreover, the proposed zoning district has been updated to better reflect the overall mixed-use concept of the Revised Conceptual Master Plan. The proposed Islip Mixed-Use Planned Development District (IMUPDD) replaces the formerly proposed zoning district that was known as the Islip Smart Growth Planned Development District (ISGPDD) (see Appendix D).

The Public Hearing Transcript is included in Appendix A of this FEIS. All written correspondence is included in Appendix B of this FEIS. The comments included in this FEIS are those that were made at the Town Board public hearing of March 22, 2012 and in written correspondence to the Town Board during the comment period that ended April 2, 2012. All of the written correspondence received during the comment period was assigned a code that begins with “C.” All comments made at the public hearing held on March 22, 2012 were assigned a code that begins with “H.”

Several comments were issued by the Town subsequent to the close of the comment period on the DEIS, some of which relate to mitigation measures. As the Town Board prepares its Findings Statement and ultimate decision on this matter, as required by the SEQRA regulations, it will weigh and balance relevant environmental factors with economic and social factors. In addition, the Town Board’s Findings Statement will set forth the required mitigation measures, which will be included as conditions to any approval issued. The Town Board will work with the applicant to develop Covenants and Restrictions, which will be filed to ensure that all practicable mitigation measures are implemented to minimize potential significant adverse impacts. As explained in *The SEQR Handbook* (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, <http://www.dec.ny.gov/permits/56832.html>), “[f]indings provide a rationale for agency decisions, including any conditions to be attached to the agency's approval.”

This FEIS includes three sections -- Section 1.0, of which this is a part, is the introduction to the document, which describes the purpose of the FEIS as well as the information included in the document.

Section 2.0 discusses the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan, which has been prepared in response to a number of the comments received by the Town Board.

Finally, Section 3.0 includes the lead agency’s response to all substantive comments made at the public hearing and in the written correspondence received during the comment period, which ended on April 2, 2012. Section 3.0 is arranged by topic, similar to the DEIS for Islip Pines. Many of the responses in Section 3.0 refer to the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, as presented in Section 2.0 of this FEIS.

The following is a list of the topics included in Section 3.0.

- Soils and Topography (ST)
- Water Resources (WR)
- Ecology (EC)



- Zoning and Land Use (ZLU)
- Transportation and Parking (TP)
- Community Services and Facilities (CSF)
- Energy (EN)
- Open Space and Recreation (OSR)
- Socioeconomics (SO)
- Aesthetics and Cultural Resources (ACR)
- Alternatives (AL)
- Procedure (PR)
- Miscellaneous (MS)

The following is the list of commenters from both the public hearing and the written correspondence, with their assigned comment numbers.

#### Public Hearing Speakers

- H1: Councilwoman Bergin Weichbrodt (H1-1 through H1- 12)
- H2: Councilman Senft (H2-1 through H2-7)
- H3: Councilman Cochrane (H3-1 through H3-3)
- H4: Commissioner Genaway (H4-1 through H4-9)
- H5: Councilman Flotteron (H5-1 through H5-2)
- H6: Dean Camenares (H6-1 through H6-4)
- H7: Marie Camenares (H7-1 through H7-4)
- H8: Larry Roppelt (H8-1)
- H9: Bill Etts, President, Sayville Chamber of Commerce (H9-1 through H9-2)
- H10: Lenny Camarda (H10-1 through H10-3)
- H11: Lou Azzara (H11-1 through H11-3)
- H12: Nancy Gamby (H12-1 through H12-2)
- H13: Nick Delvano (H13-1 through H13-3)
- H14: Ed Eckerson (H14-1 through H14-2)
- H15: Rick Ammirati, President, Holbrook Chamber of Commerce (H15-1 through H15-2)
- H16: Pamela Raymond (H16-1)
- H17: Brad Hemingway (H17-1 through H17-3)
- H18: Steve Jensen (H18-1)
- H19: Clara Datre (H19-1)
- H20: Toby Stevens (H20-1 through H-20-4)
- H21: Ed Silsbe (H21-1 through H21-7)
- H22: Bob Draffin (H22-1 through H22-3)
- H23: Anita Jensen (H23-1 through H23-5)
- H24: Pat Mitchell for Diana Romano, President, Bellport Chamber of Commerce (H24-1 through H24-2)
- H25: Mary Schnall (H25-1 through H25-12)
- H26: Mike Kinney (H26-1 through H26-3)
- H27: Peter Zarccone (H27-1 through H27-4)
- H28: MaryAnn Johnston (H28-1 through H28-4)



- H29: Suzanne Hrisho (H29-1 through H29-3)
- H30: Bud Cipoletti (H30-1)
- H31: Charles Meyer (H31-1 through H31-3)
- H32: Matthew Friend (H32-1 through H32-4)
- H33: Brenda Scolaro (H33-1 through H33-4)
- H34: Robin Fox (H34-1 through H34-2)
- H35: Greg Gerkins (H35-1 through H35-4)
- H36: George Fox (H36-1 through H36-3)
- H37: Felix Ruiz (H37-1 through H37-3)
- H38: Donna Bartolomeo (H38-1 through H38-7)
- H39: Dawn Marsh (H39-1 through H39-2)
- H40: Terry Lyons (H40-1 through H40-6)
- H41: Patrick Holton (H41-1)
- H42: Matthew Norton (H42-1 through H42-3)

Comment Letters

- C1: Report on Proposed Change of Zone (C1-1 through C1-5)
- C2: Marie DiBisceglie (C2-1)
- C3: LeShelle Mocniak (C3-1 through C3-2)
- C4: Kevin S. Law (C4-1 through C4-2)
- C5: Stephen Flanagan (C5-1 through C5-6)
- C6: Dorothy Schenblein (C6-1)
- C7: Ronald Schnall (C7-1 through C7-9)
- C8: Lenny Camarda (C8-1 through C8-12)
- C9: Allen Wone (C9-1 through C9-10)
- C10: Marie Camarda (C10-1 through C10-6)
- C11: Andrew Gillespie (C11-1)
- C12: Nancy Gamby (C12-1 through C12-4)
- C13: Fern Spies (C13-1)
- C14: Marie Camenares (C14-1 through C14-10)
- C15: Nicholas Fucci (C15-1 through C15-3)
- C16: John Brass (C16-1 through C16-4)
- C17: Dean Camenares (C17-1 through C17-15)
- C18: Anne and Andrew Targowski (C18-1 through C18-11)
- C19: Jack Ritterman (C19-1)
- C20: Charles Meyer (C20-1 through C20-10)
- C21: Mahmut Salihoglu (C21-1)
- C22: Rich Mikucki (C22-1)
- C23: Gregory Gerkens (C23-1 through C23-6)
- C24: Citizens Campaign for the Environment - Adrienne Esposito (C24-1 through C24-18)
- C25: PowerPoint Presentation of Town of Islip Department of Planning and Development (C25-1 through C25-5)
- C26: Buckhurst, Fish and Jacquemart (C26-1 through C26-9)



*Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C.*

- C27: New York State Department of Transportation (C27-1 through C27-7)
- C28: Suffolk County Department of Planning (C28-1)
- C29: Suffolk County Department of Public Works (C29-1 through C29-2)
- C30: Bud Cipoletti, Capable Youth (C30-1)
- C31: Ruth Nelson (C31-1)
- C32: Rudy & Carol Rognon (C32-1 through C32-4)
- C33: Brenda Scolaro (C33-1 through C33-11)
- C34: Myers Family (C34-1)
- C35: Dianne Romano, Bellport Chamber of Commerce (C35-1)
- C36: Town of Islip Department of Planning and Development (C36-1 through C36-8)
- C37: Town of Islip Department of Planning and Development (C37-1 through C37-9)



# 2.0

## Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan

Based upon the comments made at the public hearing and received during and after the DEIS comment period, as well as discussions with representatives of the Town of Islip, the Islip Pines Conceptual Master Plan has been revised by the applicant (see Figure 1 and Appendix C). Many of the individual responses contained in Section 3.0 of this FEIS are addressed by the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, as discussed below.

The Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan contains the following mix of uses:

- Industrial/Research & Development (R&D)/Office - 818,130 SF
- Flex Office in Mixed Use Buildings - 302,820 SF
- Commercial Services -- 61,300 SF
- Entertainment/Hospitality - 190,800 SF
  - Cinema- 60,000 SF
  - Restaurants - 30,800 SF
  - Hotel - 100,000 SF (200 rooms)
- Retail - 339,700 SF
- Residential - 350 units (250 workforce, 100 market-rate)/402,774 SF
- Civic - 21,154 SF, plus a 30,000 SF open market place, and six athletic fields and a “great lawn”

A quantitative comparison of the uses/parameters and the impacts associated with the previously-proposed Conceptual Master Plan presented in the DEIS and those of the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan presented in this FEIS follows. Table 76 in the DEIS presents a comparison of quantifiable impacts associated with the various alternatives analyzed therein, including no-action, development of the site in accordance with prevailing zoning, Alternate 1 (retail/industrial alternative) and Alternate 2 (retail/commercial/open space alternative).



**Table 1 - Comparison of Previously-Proposed Conceptual Master Plan in DEIS and Revised Conceptual Master Plan Proposed in FEIS**

PARAMETER	PREVIOUSLY-PROPOSED DEIS PLAN	ISLIP PINES REVISED CONCEPTUAL MASTER PLAN
Zoning	ISGPDD	IMUPDD
Total Development (SF) (inc. pkg. garages)	2,254,361*	2,529,112
Total Development (SF) (excl pkg. garages)	2,067,242	2,136,742
Industrial//R&D SF	1,216,304#	818,130
Office	#	302,820
Cinema	60,000##	##
Hotel	100,000##	##
Retail SF	408,673	339,700
Entertainment/ Hospitality (including Hotel, Cinema and Restaurants)	N/A	190,800
Commercial Services	N/A	61,300
Residential SF/units	278,065**/250	402,774/350
Park/civic (building SF/Acres)	4,200/4.1±	21,218***/25±
Floor Area Ratio (inc. pkg. garages)	0.38	0.43
Floor Area Ratio (excl. pkg. garages)	0.35	0.36
Building Area (acres)	30.06 ±	25.97±
Pavement (acres)	73.17±	56.89±
Landscaping/Lawn (acres)	25.84±	38.75±
Natural Area (acres)	11.12±	18.07±
Ponds/Recharge Basins (acres)	3.04±	3.55±
Sewage (gpd)	164,205±	205,101±
Water (gpd) (sewage + irrigation)	178,625±	226,721±
Impervious Surface (acres) (including ponds)	103.23±	86.41±
Pervious Surface (acres)	40.00±	56.82±
Total Population	502±	653±
School-Aged Children	44±	57±
Solid Waste (tons/month)	586.9±	634.7±
AM Peak Hour (Trips)###	1,452	1,625
PM Peak Hour (Trips)	3,109	3,121
Saturday Peak Hour (Trips)	3,032	3,171
Parking Spaces	5,640	6,736
Gross Property Taxes	\$5,909,354±	\$8,581,890±
Permanent Employment	2,612±	3,050±

\*Previously-Proposed DEIS Plan includes 187,119 SF of parking garage associated with the residential development. FEIS plan includes 392,370 SF of parking garages associated with non-residential development

\*\*Includes 273,865-SF of residential space and 4,200-square-foot associated recreational building.

\*\*\*Does not include the 30,000 SF "open market place"

#Formerly included Office Building (130,904 SF)

##Now included in Entertainment /Hospitality Category

###A revised Traffic Impact Study has been prepared based upon the Revised Conceptual Master Plan



As indicated on Table 1 and as shown on the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan in Figure 1 and Appendix C, the total square footage of the proposed Islip Pines development has increased slightly over the previously-proposed DEIS Plan. This is due, almost entirely, to the removal of parking spaces from surface parking lots and their placement in parking structures. This change was made to address comments regarding both the amount of impervious surface provided in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, and the request for more community-accessible open space. As can be seen on Table 1, when the area of the parking garages is excluded, the increase in square footage is due to the increase in the number of proposed residences and the significant increase in square footage for civic uses. The ultimate floor area ratio (FAR) increase of habitable space is 0.01, from 0.35 to 0.36.

Also, while the mix of uses is similar in nature to the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, the arrangement of uses on the site has changed considerably to better reflect informed public comments. This new arrangement of uses results in positive changes in internal circulation, which improve the safety of the internal circulation over the previously-proposed DEIS Plan (see Appendix E). The change in internal circulation was also made to allow for a more cohesive and coherent configuration of the proposed uses throughout the property, which may also have a positive impact on the ability of the overall development to attract shoppers and visitors from a larger primary market area. See additional discussion below with respect to the arrangement of uses and the changes to the access along with a discussion in Section 3.1.9 regarding any impacts to area socioeconomics.



*Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C.*

## Figure 1 – Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan



In order to address the comments on the previously-proposed DEIS Plan pertaining to the placement of the industrial buildings at the northern portion of the property (see, for example, see Comment No. ZLU-1 in Section 3.1.4 of this FEIS), the Revised Conceptual Master Plan relocates the buildings to the eastern portion of the site, adjacent to the proposed commercial uses on neighboring properties, and separates them from Beacon Drive by a vegetated buffer, landscaped parking areas and a tree-lined street. These buildings wrap around the front of the site along the Sunrise Highway North Service Road, where they are separated from the roadway by landscaping and proposed recharge basins/rain gardens. The buildings that are oriented toward Beacon Drive are proposed to be four stories in height, while the two buildings oriented toward Sunrise Highway are proposed to be three stories in height. Based upon comments that industrial space (in and of itself) may not be marketable (which has been the applicant's experience over the last 25 years), these buildings have been redesigned to allow for industrial, as well as office (including professional office) and research and development (R&D) space (as well as a minimal amount of ancillary ground floor retail space and commercial service space, to reflect the goal of mixed-uses spaces). The redesign of these buildings includes reducing their mass, dividing them into a number of smaller buildings (for marketability and feasibility of financing for construction, and/or flexibility in future subdivision requests), increasing their height from two to four stories and placing them in a more campus-like layout, which relates to the commercial development along the east side of Beacon Drive. Parking for these buildings would be below grade, thereby eliminating surface parking and allowing for more open space.

Also, to address various comments relating to the proximity of industrial development to existing residential development to the north of the subject property in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan (see, for example, Comment Nos. ZLU-1 and ZLU-4 in Section 3.1.4 of this FEIS), the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan replaces the industrial buildings on the north side of the site with a buffer of 160 feet (80 feet of the LIPA right-of-way and 80 feet of existing vegetation), followed by playing fields to the south of the buffer. The previously-proposed berm in this area has been eliminated due to the majority of public comments from residents most directly affected, who preferred no disturbance in the area that was to be cleared for the berm, and a six-foot high fence, the final design of which will be determined as part of site plan review, is proposed to be installed just north of the playing fields, a minimum of 160 feet from the residential property line to the north providing a barrier between the development and the adjacent residences. It should be noted that the proposed fence would follow the line of the westernmost baseball field and run to the south of the existing recharge basin. If required, gates would be installed to allow LIPA access to its right-of-way. Therefore, instead of removing the trees at the northern portion of the property in order to create a berm they would remain to form a natural buffer between the proposed development and the residences to the north. The areas to the north of the fence would remain in their existing condition.

The recreational facilities provide a less intense use (as compared to the industrial development shown in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan) adjacent to the residences to the north, which was a concern mentioned in several of the comments. The location and site configuration of the previously proposed industrial buildings would typically result in active loading or truck storage areas along the northern portions of the property. However, in the revised plan, the only buildings in this northern area are a proposed one-story day-care facility (with associated playground) and a small one-story recreation/maintenance building. The day care facility is the building located closest to the northern



property line, with a setback of 300 feet. No other proposed building will be located within 300 feet of the northern property line. The small buildings associated with the civic/recreation space (e.g., restrooms, equipment sheds) would be placed along the southern portion of the playing fields, 400 feet from the northern property line. Further, no substantial lighting is proposed for the ball fields which mitigates any impacts of late-night noise on the residents to the north. Parking for the day-care facility and maintenance facility would be shielded from the residences to the north by vegetated buffers. In order to address comments regarding the proximity of the parking/service areas for the industrial uses that were proposed to be located on the northern portion of the property, the closest proposed internal roadway has been relocated to approximately 425 feet from the northern property line.

To address the comments on the previously-proposed DEIS Plan regarding the need for more open space and natural area on the site (see, for example, Comment Nos. ZLU-3 in Section 3.1.4, EC-7 in Section 3.1.3 and SO-2 in Section 3.1.9), the amount of recreational area and facilities has been expanded. There is an open area green field parking area located to the south of the existing recharge basin. To the south of this are a proposed tennis club house and tennis courts and a one-story senior/youth activity center, which will be built by the applicant and leased to the Town for community uses for \$1.00 per year or other nominal consideration. The Town Planning Department has requested some modifications of this area to increase the amount of area to remain natural. This request will be addressed as the proposed project moves through the approval process. The main civic feature is the large park ("great lawn") that has been created in the central portion of the property. This space is proposed to contain walking paths with an associated arboretum, a playground, fountain and floating plaza within an open water area, which the Town has requested be used as an outdoor skating rink during the winter, an outdoor cinema/stage, a large open green space and support facilities such as restrooms, concession stands and a park office. Overall, the percentage of green space on the site consists of 37.9 percent open space, buffers and parkland (56.82± acres) (see Figure 1), which is an increase of 19.86± acres/12.1± percent over the previously-proposed DEIS Plan (see Figure 2).

In order to address comments regarding the height and location of the proposed hotel on the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, especially as it would be viewed from the residences to the north, the height of the hotel has been reduced by two stories (from five to three stories), and relocated from the center of the site to the perimeter of the site adjacent to the industrial park to the east. It is proposed to be placed amongst the industrial/R&D/office buildings, and face the proposed civic space, discussed above. The hotel would contain parking below the building. A one-story medical arts building has been proposed in the western portion of the property, adjacent to the entry at Veterans Memorial Highway, replacing the four-story office building that was formerly located in that area.



*Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C.*

## Figure 2 – Green and Open Space Diagram



The Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Figure 1 and Appendix C) includes an open air market place that would lead from a proposed three-story parking structure (situated near Veterans Highway/Sunrise Highway) to the central civic space, which will be flanked by mixed use retail/office flex buildings, and will be anchored by the cinema at the western end and the hotel at the eastern end. The retail would be located on the ground floor, with office/flex space located above. The location of these establishments would activate the area around the central civic space and create constant interaction between the civic space and surrounding buildings. The plan includes several stand-alone retail facilities, including several adjacent to the mixed use buildings and two larger retail buildings along the Sunrise Highway Service Road/Veterans Highway frontage. Several pads located along Beacon Drive and another internal pad, located along the main entry drive, are proposed to be commercial service establishments. A second parking structure, with both above and below-grade parking, located north of the proposed cinema, has been placed along the interior of the property, away from both Sunrise Highway and Veterans Memorial Highway. This structure will provide additional parking for both the cinema and the adjacent retail facilities.

The number of residential units has been increased from 250 units to 350 units from the previously-proposed DEIS Plan to the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan, with the same bedroom mix (75 percent one-bedroom and 25 percent two-bedroom). Of these units, 250 would be workforce housing units, subject to further discussions with the Town as the project proceeds through the approval process, each less than 1,200 SF, and 100 units would be market-rate units, each less than 1,200 SF. The residences would be located within four groupings (two-buildings each) of three-story buildings (as compared to the one large multi-winged building in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan), situated south of playing fields and north of the proposed mixed use retail/office flex buildings, separated by a tree-lined street and landscaped parking areas. These residential units would also be connected to the mixed use area with pedestrian or bicycle paths.

In order to address comments on the previously-proposed DEIS Plan relating to the extent of impervious area (including the potential urban heat island effect) and the need for more open space (see, for example, Comment Nos. ZLU-3 in Section 3.1.4, TP-5 in Section 3.1.5, and EN-1 and EN-2 in Section 3.1.7), additional structured parking has been provided. Whereas in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan only the residences had associated structured parking, a total of 3,588 parking spaces associated with non-residential uses would be provided either within structured parking garages or below grade. As noted above, the industrial/R&D/office buildings (with the exception of the medical arts building) would have their own below-grade structured parking facilities. There would be two stand-alone parking structures, one within the southwestern portion of the site and one within the northwestern portion of the site. Overall, structured parking facilities and parking spaces below grade would provide approximately 53 percent of the proposed parking on the site, while 47 percent would be included within parking lots or on the internal streets. Placing former surface parking into structures (both above and below ground), allows for significantly more green space in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, as suggested in many of the comments made on the DEIS (see discussion above and Figure 2) at increased expense to the applicant. Bus pavilions would be provided along the major streets within Islip Pines to encourage the use of public transportation. The applicant would be required to initiate requests to the Suffolk County Department of Public Works (SCDPW) - Traffic Safety Division for altering the existing bus routes



provided by Suffolk Transit. Such requests, if approved, would be reflect well-designed bus-stop locations and shelters in strategic locations within the PDD.

While the applicant is proposing the main access drives generally situated in the same locations as the previously-proposed DEIS plan (along the Sunrise Highway Service Road and at Veterans Highway/Church Street) except that the Sunrise Highway Service Road entrance was shifted West to lessen any conflict with Beacon Drive, and the proposed connections to Beacon Drive have been maintained (with one additional access point), the internal circulation has been reconfigured to address concerns about safety and the arrangement of the proposed uses on the site, as indicated above. Note that all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County and/or New York State roads would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs. The boulevards that previously traversed the site directly from Church Street to Beacon Drive have been modified. The Revised Conceptual Master Plan indicates that the primary internal roadways would operate as two concentric circles that surround a central civic/recreation space and provide access to the various uses and associated parking fields throughout the site. Both main access driveways would intersect the outer primary drive-aisle to form a roundabout. These primary internal roadways would generally provide one lane in each direction, be divided by a grass median, and will also include street parking, which has the additional positive affect of slowing the speed of travel throughout the development.

More specifically, as part of the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the main access from the Sunrise Highway Service Road, near the eastern end of the site, has been transformed into a boulevard that parallels Beacon Drive and leads from the Service Road through the site to the northernmost roadway within the proposed development at Colin Drive, whereas in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, the entry drive ended a short distance into the site and a decision to turn right or left had to be made almost immediately upon entering. Thus, traffic queues, which may have extended into the Sunrise Highway Service Road right-of-way, would be avoided. Another north-south roadway, located between the main entry roadway and Beacon Drive, has been added to service the proposed industrial/R&D/office buildings and the hotel. While this roadway runs the length of the development and connects to the extension of Colin Drive, it does not connect to the Sunrise Highway Service Road. The access at Veterans Highway and Church Street is also proposed as a boulevard type entry that runs to the central civic space and is intersected by several internal roads, subject to review and approval by NYSDOT and further discussions with the Town (see Figure 1 and Appendix C).

As indicated above and as shown in Table 1, green space (natural and landscaped) would comprise a more significant portion of the Revised Conceptual Master Plan (39.7± percent) as compared with the previously-proposed DEIS Plan (25.8 percent). The proposed ponds and recharge basin encompass another 2.5 percent of the site. While pavement constitutes approximately 39.7 percent of the site, building coverage would be 18.1 percent, both significantly decreased from the previously-proposed DEIS Plan. In addition, many of the building roofs are proposed to include green technologies (see Figure 2). Green technologies that are proposed to be incorporated into the development include green roof systems, solar panels, atrium spaces, skylights and white roof systems. A green roof, or rooftop garden, is a vegetative layer grown on a rooftop. Green roofs provide shade and remove heat from the air through “evapotranspiration” (when plants absorb water through their roots and emit it through their



leaves), and thus reduce temperatures of the roof surface and the surrounding air through evaporation. In addition, approximately five percent of the buildings will use “white roofs” or “cool roofs.” A cool roof reflects sunlight and heat away from a building, thus reducing roof temperatures.

In order to address comments concerning the proposed zoning and to better reflect the increased mixed-use nature of the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the proposed zoning ordinance has been revised (see Appendix D). Additional subdistricts have been created in the IMUPDD to more accurately encompass and reflect the uses that are proposed within Islip Pines. Whereas the previously-proposed zoning ordinance defined three subdistricts – industrial, residential and retail, the IMUPDD consists of six subdistricts, including:

- IMU-Industrial (including light industrial, R&D and office uses)
- IMU-Services (including commercial business services)
- IMU-Residential (including workforce and market-rate housing)
- IMU-Entertainment (including entertainment, cultural, dining and food service and hospitality uses)
- IMU-Civic (including recreation, athletic and community/public assembly uses)
- IMU-Retail (including retail or wholesale sale of goods and commercial or residential uses on the upper floors of mixed use buildings)

The overall intent of the IMUPDD is:

*“to enable the development of an environmentally-respectful mixed-use community which incorporates modern planning principals and encourages the productive use of a suitable property to create conditions where the next-generation workforce can leverage industrial, commercial, office, retail, dining and entertainment, recreational, cultural, civic, and workforce residential opportunities in a walkable community which also provides benefits for the larger Islip community.”*

Also, as noted in the Legislative Intent, the development shall be in accordance with the Islip Pines Conceptual Master Plan to be approved by the Town Board.

Pursuant to the IMUPDD, total development at Islip Pines cannot exceed an FAR of 0.5. The maximum height of the subddistricts varies between 50 feet and 60 feet, and setbacks are specified for each subdistrict. Permitted uses, special permit uses and accessory uses are listed for each subdistrict.

The maximum total square footage/units permitted in each subdistrict are defined in the IMUPDD and are set forth below:

- IMU-Industrial – 1,000,00 SF
- IMU-Services – 100,000 SF
- IMU-Residential – 350 residential units
- IMU-Entertainment – 250,000 SF
- IMU-Civic (buildings/markets) – 60,000 SF
- IMU-Retail – 350,000 SF



*Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, P.C.*

Parking requirements are defined for each of the subdistricts and overall loading, landscaping, exterior lighting, and signage regulations are defined within the proposed IMUPDD. See Appendix D of this FEIS for the complete text of the proposed IMUPDD.

The following section contains responses to the comments made during and after the public comment period on the DEIS. Many of the comments have been addressed through the changes made to the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, which are reflected in the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Figure 1 and Appendix C).



# 3.0

## Comments and Responses

The following section includes the comments made either at the public hearing of March 22, 2012 or during or after the public comment period and the responses thereto. The comments are arranged by topic, similar to the arrangement within the DEIS.

---

### 3.1.1 Soils and Topography - ST

#### Comment ST-1:

In regard to the berm, we don't believe that the berm should incorporate the LIPA property. The berm should begin south, the southern part of the LIPA property. It should not be part of the berm, before we do that. (H25-6)

Quite frankly, the four people that I spoke to that do live on Glen Summer Road prefer a berm. They want it to be 20 feet high instead of 16. I did speak to the lawyer for the developer today - yesterday, and they said they would look at it for us. (H26-2)

I am not in favor of a berm. The way I've seen landscapers make them is by piling mounds of soil in an area and end up making a nightmare of runoff when it rains as well as the perfect environment for growing unwanted weeds. Why would anyone prefer this solution for a sound barrier and remove all the trees that would have been in that area? It makes no sense!

Creating a berm would also mean displacing much wildlife. In fact, the way the development is purposed, over 2 million square feet would be either construction or blacktop. Out of the over 100 acres of land that exists there would only be 4 acres left for green space and this also includes those small islands we often see in parking area of shopping complexes. Removing all of this forest as it stands now should be illegal. (C14-2)



The berm which has been mentioned, I, too, agree a 60-foot-wide, quarter mile long berm, almost two and a half acres of forest relocates 22,000 cubic yards of dirt, plants a few trees. I've read the code. Why not save what's there, keep the 80 foot, put up a concrete sound wall, as was mentioned? That cost about \$300,000. That's a better buffer. (H21-2)

**Response ST-1:**

The Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan will preserve approximately 80 feet of natural vegetation north of the proposed athletic fields and south of the 80-foot-wide LIPA right-of-way, in lieu of the construction of a berm. The elimination of the berm, eliminates the need to clear the trees and other vegetation in the northern portion of the site which was preferred by a majority of the comments received. Retention of trees in this area would increase the natural area on the site and would be beneficial to wildlife, as existing habitat will be retained. Therefore, the total setback of proposed new uses (recreation fields) from the residential line is 160 feet, 80 of which would be the LIPA right-of-way and 80 feet of which would remain natural.

A new six-foot-high fence is proposed to be installed along the southern edge of the natural area (on the northern edge of the athletic fields) 160 feet from the northern property line (final design to be determined as part of site plan review process). The fence along with the retention of a 160-foot buffer, as described above, would provide visual screening, noise attenuation and would provide a security barrier between the proposed Islip Pines development and the residential development to the north.

In addition, the redesigned concept plan eliminates and/or relocates any industrial loading areas, which may be a source of noise, away from the northern property line. Thus, the need for the berm for noise attenuation purposes is reduced.

**Comment ST-2:**

And frankly, the DEIS in 1994 said there was a streambed linked to the Browns River. Anyone who knows anything about the status of our bays and creeks knows that development has more than the effluent that goes in the ground that kills those rivers, bays, and streams.

So realistically, it says there are no swales on the property. A big omission. The western part of the property is a swale. However, when they're done with this project, there will be ten feet of fill in that swale. There isn't even a need for this. (H28-2)

The DEIS refers to the headwaters of Browns Creek, and also relates the ability of the ground itself to absorb rainwater, but it does not include information about the underground stream that runs through the property. Does that make their assumptions invalid? (C17-10)



**Response ST-2:**

As noted on page 63 of the DEIS, based upon field observations from December 2010, the construction of roadways (i.e., Sunrise Highway and Veterans Memorial Highway) and adjacent Federal Express facility have altered the topography and hydrology to the west of the development property and blocked any surface connection between the low area and the stream feeding the San Souci Lakes. Therefore, although the low area is apparently still subject to wet conditions, it can no longer be considered an active or even intermittent stream bed connected to the San Souci Lakes watershed.

The Revised Conceptual Plan will preserve approximately 70 feet of natural area along the western side of the property. The existing swale will not be filled in. Where the new access roadway traverses the swale, new drainage culverts will be provided, as necessary, to allow stormwater to continue to flow unimpeded to the south.

Further, Section 4.2.1 of the DEIS indicates that the high groundwater elevation of the area is attributable, in part, to the historical drainage characteristics of the area, including the subject property's location near the headwaters of the Sans Souci Lakes, approximately one-quarter mile to the south. Furthermore, Section 4.2.4 of the DEIS discusses the Brown's River watershed. Thus, while the proposed development would add impervious surfaces within the watershed, Islip Pines has been designed to minimize impacts to the watershed and groundwater resources. One of the principal reasons for this is the design of an extensive and comprehensive stormwater management system, which includes various methods of drainage (i.e., recharge basins, stormwater retention ponds, drywells and bioretention facilities). Moreover, all stormwater would be recharged and handled on-site and in accordance with Town of Islip requirements.

**Comment ST-3:**

The proposed area for construction was placed on the National Superfund List for Hazardous Waste Dump Sites in the late 1970's. Has this area been cleaned up, or was it declared safe as long as the area is not disturbed? In either case, is there documentation to prove it is cleaned up or safe as is? (C7-7)

The existing property on Broadway Avenue and Vets Highway, Broad Vets Center, a long time ago, back in the '70s, it was occupied by Viewlets (phonetic) and Goldisc. They used to dump their plating materials, their hazardous waste materials into that property that Serota is talking about developing. That, at one time, in the late '70s, was part of the National Super Fund list. Has that been cleaned up? And if it's been cleaned up, has it been documented? Or is it in a stable condition, and as long as it stays stable, it's not a threat to anybody? And what kind of documentation do we have on that? That's an important thing that affects all of us, everybody. (H25-10)



**Response ST-3:**

The subject site consists primarily of undeveloped woodlands, and a review of the National Priorities List (NPL or the Superfund list) has confirmed that this site is not included on this list. Review of the NPL revealed that the nearest Superfund site is situated directly to the west of the subject property. This facility is identified as Goldisc Recordings, Inc. (Goldisc) (USEPA ID No. NYD980768717) and is located at the intersection of Broadway Avenue and Veterans Memorial Highway to the west. According to the USEPA NPL, the Goldisc site is situated on approximately 34 acres of land and includes two, one-story buildings on six acres (on the western portion of that site), with three acres of pavement and 25 acres of undeveloped woodland adjacent to the subject property. A summary of the Goldisc NPL site (see Appendix F of this FEIS) indicates that chemical wastes were discovered in storm drains, holding ponds, and dry wells at that site. Impacted groundwater was encountered downgradient (south) of the Goldisc site at the Suffolk County Water Authority (SCWA) Church Street well field. One shallow public water supply well within the Church Street well field was removed from operation in late 1993, as a result of nickel contamination, which was believed to be directly attributable to the Goldisc site. It has since been returned to operation.

Point source remediation was conducted at that site, and approximately 270 cubic yards of contaminated soils and sediments were excavated and disposed off-site. In 1998, the USEPA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) calling for continual monitoring of groundwater, including downgradient locations. In September 2008, the USEPA issued the second five-year review report that indicated remedies implemented at that site adequately control exposures of site contaminants, namely nickel, to ensure the protection of human health and the environment. It was determined that ongoing monitoring would ensure any future exposures would not occur. A review of the USEPA website<sup>2</sup> indicates that both current human exposures at the Goldisc site, as well as contaminated groundwater migration, are under control. The most recent groundwater sampling at the Goldisc site, conducted in 2010, indicated that nickel was detected at levels that do not represent a significant health risk. Additionally, nickel levels at the Church Street well field have shown continual reduction over the years with the elimination of point source contaminants.

A review of the USEPA NPL does not indicate or document any contamination or dumping activities associated with the subject property. Furthermore, the applicant has owned the property for over 25 years and has no knowledge of dumping that may have occurred associated with the Goldisc property.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://cfpub2.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/csitiinfo.cfm?id=0202239>



---

### 3.1.2 Water Resources – WR

#### **Comment WR-1:**

Our community already is devastated with very low water pressure. What's going to happen when this monster community starts drawing water from our only resource? Again, we won't even have water maybe to flush our toilets at this point. I can only speculate. (H10-2)

I'm opposed to this project because I, too, have concerns about water pressure in my community. (H38-4)

We already have very low water pressure in our neighborhood. (C8-1)

Our water pressure is a further concern. This displaced development will create a severe decrease in water pressure, which we cannot afford. (C10-3)

At the present time many homeowners, including myself have to choose whether or not they want to wash clothes or run the sprinklers in the spring, summer and fall months because there is a little water pressure and it's impossible to do both. We have had the water authority over to correct the problem and the answer is that our water pressure is just fine. Ask anyone in the neighborhood, it's not! How is this new development going to address this issue? How can having more demand make things anything but worse than what it already is? (C14-7)

Residents are also concerned that area water mains will be unable to meet increased demands for water, resulting in decreased water pressure in our community. (C20-6)

#### **Response WR-1:**

As noted on page 151 and in Appendix M of the DEIS, correspondence from Timothy J. Kilcommons, PE, Director of Distribution for the Suffolk County Water Authority (SCWA), indicated that "[t]here is an existing water main adjacent to the above-referenced property from Beacon Drive. An additional (new main) tie-in from both Veterans Highway and Church St [sic] to the west across the subject parcel to Beacon will be required. Accordingly, public water service for the parcel will be provided in accordance with the rates and charges applicable at the time of hook-up and should not result in any detrimental water pressure impacts in the surrounding area."

Based on the aforementioned correspondence, the SCWA has confirmed that it can supply the proposed Islip Pines development with water, and there would be no negative impact on water pressure to the surrounding properties due to implementation of the proposed development.



**Comment WR-2:**

[The hole is there] because these people have to pump water out of their basements constantly. There was a mistake that was made about – I’m going to guess about 12 years ago. And these people are paying for it now. If Serota builds and impacts the water table, these people are going to be pumping Lord knows what out of their basements. (H11-3)

Autumn Ridge residents have also expressed concerns that the proposed Islip Pines development will result in a rise in the area water table that will impact drainage sumps and drywells and challenge the capacity of area sewage systems. (C20-5)

The construction will certainly disturb the water table that is very high in our area. We also have a lot of clay that does not absorb water. This project will certainly add to our existing water table and drainage issues. The proposed berm is also a concern, it appears that the water will run off the berm onto the clay and pool, under the current plan. Please prove to us that water will not be a problem for our community. (C23-4)

Some of the other concerns that we definitely have is the water table. I’m not sure what kind of studies you guys have, but the water table is definitely very high in the area, and there is clay. (H35-2)

Where they’re building is a low lying area. As has been said, there’s a swale. It also floods. And I question whether the sewer system can handle any contamination that might travel from flooding. (H29-1)

This area is struggling with drainage and flooding. Taking out trees will increase this, leaving our lands and the land around it saturated. The 200+ homes with running water and a 400-room hotel, not to mention landscaping water use and restaurants. What will be done to fix the drainage in the area as well as the drainage around the home in the area? (C33-3)

**Response WR-2:**

As required by the Final Scope, the applicant reviewed a number of groundwater studies in Sections 3.2.1 and 4.2.1 of the DEIS, including:

- ▶ *Lake Ronkonkoma Clean Lakes Study – 1986*, prepared by the Suffolk County Planning Department, Suffolk County Department of Health Services and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
- ▶ *Drainage Improvements including Groundwater Relief Phase I – Feasibility Study – Volumes 1, 2 and 3* (March 1980), prepared by Holzmacher, McLendon and Murrell, P.C./H2M Corporation



- *Bishop Lane Groundwater Study, Holbrook, New York (November 2007), prepared by R&W Engineers, P.C.*

The groundwater studies examined indicate that the groundwater elevation of the area is attributable, in part, to the historical drainage characteristics of the area, including the subject property's location near the headwaters of the Sans Souci Lakes, approximately one-quarter mile to the south. In addition, based on an analysis of published data, well data and site-specific soil borings, the groundwater elevations are higher both to the north of the property and at the northwestern portion of the Islip Pines property, and they decrease as one moves south and east across the property. Therefore, groundwater flow direction is from northwest to southeast, and would not affect the residences located to the north of the subject property.

The *Bishop Lane Groundwater Study, Holbrook, New York (November 2007)*, (R&W Engineers, P.C.), in particular, discusses the flooding problems associated with the houses located along Bishop Lane. The Bishop Lane Subdivision is located northwest of the subject property and the groundwater flow is from northwest to southeast, as demonstrated by the published data, well data and site-specific test hole data that was examined in Section 3.2 of the DEIS. Since the Islip Pines property is located downgradient of the Bishop Lane subdivision, groundwater flows from Bishop Lane toward the subject property. Therefore, since groundwater flows from Bishop Lane toward Islip Pines, flooding to the north of the site from the development would not likely occur.

While the western portion of the property is topographically lower than the eastern portion of the property, and, although there are high groundwater elevations, the potential for an increase in the water table and on-site flooding is not expected since Islip Pines will provide for the on-site collection and recharge of stormwater runoff through the development of an integrated stormwater management system. Furthermore, the sewer system would not capture the stormwater runoff generated on the site, as there would be separate systems constructed for sewage disposal and stormwater collection.

With respect to the swale, see Response ST-2. In addition, as a berm is no longer proposed, there will be no associated stormwater runoff impact.

In addition, the Town has requested that any proposed clearing or construction within the northwest corner of the subject property to be minimized to the greatest extent possible, which could affect one of the proposed ball fields.

Overall, the proposed Islip Pines development would not have a significant adverse impact on the level of the water table, and would not impact the residences to the north of the property, as groundwater flows from northwest to south. In addition, due to the implementation of an integrated and comprehensive stormwater management plan on the Islip Pines site, flooding is not expected to occur.



**Comment WR-3:**

CCE is concerned that the location of this highly dense development is within the South Shore Estuary Reserve, specifically in the Brown's Creek Watershed. The SSER CMP also identifies areas where municipalities should continue to acquire open space to protect water quality in the Estuary. The plan specifically recommends priority acquisitions of open space "within the town of Islip, along the Champlin Creek, Sans Souci Lakes, Green Creek, and Orowoc Creek tributaries." This parcel should be preserved, due to its direct proximity to the Sans Souci Lakes. (C24-1)

**Response WR-3:**

The subject property is located north of Sunrise Highway, while San Souci Lakes is located to the south of Sunrise Highway. As noted on page 63 of the DEIS, based upon field observations from December 2010, the construction of roadways (i.e., Sunrise Highway and Veterans Memorial Highway) and the Federal Express facility have altered the topography and hydrology to the west of the development property and blocked any surface connection between the low area and the stream feeding the San Souci Lakes. Therefore, it can no longer be considered an active or even intermittent stream bed connected to the San Souci Lakes watershed. Furthermore, as stated above, the Islip Pines property is located to the north of Sunrise Highway, while San Souci Lakes are located to the south of Sunrise Highway, and thus, Islip Pines is not directly proximate to the Sans Souci Lakes.

Amongst all of the comprehensive plans that have been prepared by the Town of Islip and Suffolk County for the area that contains the subject property, and that have been addressed in the DEIS (see Section 3.4.3 of the DEIS) as required by the Final Scope, preservation or acquisition of the Islip Pines parcel has not been recommended.

Moreover, pursuant to the Town of Islip Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, a minimum of 20 percent of any development site must be comprised of landscaping. In cases where native vegetation exists, the Town requires the preservation of same in lieu of clearing and planting of new vegetation to the greatest extent possible.

**Comment WR-4:**

CCE urges Islip to require organic landscape practices be implemented to reduce nitrate and pesticide contamination to the drinking and surface waters particularly since it is located in the Brown's River Watershed, a tributary to the South Shore Estuary Reserve.

CCE commends the developers for stating that the plan will comply with 208 guidelines and will "restrict the use of inorganic, fast-acting fertilizers. Promote the use of low-maintenance lawns" - however the developer needs to go one step further and ensure that no toxic pesticides or harmful fertilizers are used throughout the property. (C24-2)



**Response WR-4:**

As noted in the comment, the applicant will comply with the guidelines of the *Long Island Comprehensive Waste Treatment Management Plan* (the 208 Study). In addition, the applicant will comply with the prevailing regulations of the Town with respect to the use of pesticides and fertilizers.

**Comment WR-5:**

The project should contain a plan for the installation of Green Infrastructure to manage wet weather flows and enhance water quality recharge as well as for protection of the Brown's River, San Souci Lakes and the South Shore Estuary Reserve (SSER). The proposal woefully fails to capitalize on the benefit of creative stormwater management. (C24-15)

The Town of Islip is a member of the Council, which aims to advance and implement the principles of ecosystem based management in the Great South Bay portion of the Reserve. All Reserve partners, including the Town of Islip, should be engaging in co-ordination of activities to address stormwater management within the watershed of the Great South. The objective is to implement new and effective technologies and methodologies to reduce and filter stormwater before it reaches the Great South Bay. The Islip Pines stormwater plan does not conform to this critically important new state, regional and town initiative.

On March 13, 2012 Suffolk County Legislature unanimously passed Intro. Res. No. 1119-2012, which requires the Suffolk County Department of Public Works to consider the techniques and guidelines established in the Suffolk County Planning Commission report "Managing Stormwater – Natural Vegetation and Green Methodologies" and the NYS EFC's Green Innovation Grant Program when preparing to design and/or pave any new parking lot or redesign and/or repave any existing parking lot owned by Suffolk County. Citizens Campaign for the Environment strongly supports this resolution and urges that these two resources be referred to help strengthen the stormwater management aspects of this project. They can be accessed at :

1. [http://suffolkcountyny.gov/Portals/0/planning/Publications/Stormwater\\_greenmetnods021011.pdf](http://suffolkcountyny.gov/Portals/0/planning/Publications/Stormwater_greenmetnods021011.pdf).
2. <http://www.nysefc.org/GreenGrants.aspx> (C24-16)

**Response WR-5:**

The applicant has indicated that every effort would be made to incorporate green infrastructure and construction techniques into the stormwater management design, to minimize the environmental impacts of the proposed Islip Pines development.



Strategies such as using grass filter strips, vegetated swales, bioretention basins, rain gardens and depressed landscaped islands to encourage recharge and treatment of water where it falls are proposed to be employed as part of the stormwater management system. These measures have the added benefit of creating habitat and shade, reducing heat island effect and improving parking lot aesthetics.

Green roofs, where applicable, will be used to help mitigate the impact of development by detaining rain from small storms and reducing heat island effect (see Figure 2).

**Comment WR-6:**

The main concern I had when I came here tonight was how this is going to impact the sewage treatment. I cannot believe that our existing sewer plants can support the amount of excess that they're going to put on. (H11-2)

A point of high concern and alarm is the impact on the sewage treatment plant right off of Joanne Drive within our community. I'm aware that the treatment plant, the sewage treatment plant, is under the supervision of the County. (H23-2)

I'm also aware that Mr. Serota, in anticipation of the development of this property, had forethought years ago to purchase usage of this treatment facility at some 200-plus thousand gallons a day. But what was originally built to handle sewage for a community of 650 homes, is now overburdened in handling sewage for all over the county. As you can imagine, this already overwhelmed facility will be heavily impacted by this increase in volume. (H23-3)

The heavy truck traffic carrying sewage waste through our neighborhood streets while children wait on their bus stops is scary and frightening to say the least. The horrendous odor that permeates our homes on a weekly basis now is sure to get worse with this increase in volume. (H23-4)

The sewage problem that Anita talked about is very great. This kind of project with hotels, restaurants, movie theatres, could you imagine the sewage that's going to be developed? Light industry may not have been so bad. So I want you to take that into consideration. (H25-1)

I'm opposed to this project because I have concerns about the sewer situation in my development. I am very concerned that Serota intends to tap into our sewers. There are areas in our community that - where people cannot go into their backyard because the odors from the sewer treatment center is so very bad that they cannot inhabit their backyards. It's becoming more offensive. I'm concerned that that will happen in the future to a greater degree as a result of Serota attempting to use our sewers. (H38-5)

I heard earlier that in 1989 there was a sewage approval to the contract and to the plan. That was 23 years ago. I don't know about anybody else, but I don't buy up on programs that are 23 years old. It just doesn't make sense. (H40-2)



The sewer problems the Parkland community already struggles with will become a greater problem with this enormous development. (C10-2)

Even if the sewage plant off JoAnn Drive is adequate to handle more sewage, what about the quality of life for the residents that are already dealing with 15 trucks plowing down their narrow streets? How many children will have to be run over while playing or riding their bikes before we realize what a nightmare this potentially can create? Why not be insightful and protect the quality of life as we have known here? Why not be insightful and realize the potential of critically injuring children just for being children and playing where they live? How will they be able to even go outside and play when the odors will be so overwhelming? (C14-8)

CCE urges that the final EIS use an updated number for the capacity available at the Parkland Sewage Treatment Plant. (C24-17)

Currently, the proposal is for sewage from the recreational building to be handled separately from the rest of the property, citing that the recreational building is not within the sewage district. Therefore, sewage from the recreational building is to be handled by "conventional subsurface sewage disposal system." CCE strongly disagrees with this proposal. If the sewer district cannot be expanded to include effluent from this building, advanced sewage treatment is necessary. The DEIS states: "since the portion of the development not situated within the sewer can accomplish sewage disposal via use of a conventional subsurface sewage disposal system within its permitted limits, no significant adverse impact associated with increased sewage generation would result." CCE does not believe this to be true as emerging research across Long Island is showing that wastewater is leaching through groundwater and negatively impacting rivers, bays. The property is located above a shallow groundwater resource, is within the Brown's River watershed, the San Souci Lakes watershed, and will negatively impact the South Shore Estuary Reserve. (C24-18)

And while the existing capacity of the Parkland Sewage facility can accommodate the 200K additional gallons per day that is proposed in the DEIS, this will increase the activity of the facility and impose greater hardship for those that must endure the truck traffic and unpleasant smells that emanate from the treatment plant – esp. those that live on JoAnn Dr. At the recent town hall public hearing, a resident claimed she counted 15 trucks in one day pass through her otherwise quiet residential street. This would only get worse if the development ifs fully realized. (C17-11)

The applicant needs to describe the impacts on the sewerage treatment plant to the north, including its capacity and any planned improvements. (C26-9)

How will our sewer system handle increase demand and will the city be financially responsible for the damage that a sewage back up may cause in our community? (C33-4)



**Response WR-6:**

Sections 3.2.2 and 4.2.2 of the DEIS provide detailed descriptions of the sewage treatment and the subject site's allocation of capacity at the plant. Specifically, as stated on page 54 of the DEIS, the Islip Pines property has capacity of 210,000 gallons per day (gpd) available at the Parkland Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) within Suffolk County Sewer District #14 - Parkland, based upon a resolution of the Suffolk County Sewer Agency (SCSA), dated November 30, 1989 (see Appendix G).

As stated in Section 4.2.2 and Appendix M of the DEIS, Craig A. Platt, Secretary of the SCSA, in a letter dated December 2, 2010 reiterated that the applicant has a 210,000 gpd allocation since it was a participant in the expansion of the sewage treatment plant. Connection would be handled through the Bergen Point Permit office. Mr. Platt, in a follow-up letter dated July 7, 2011 also indicated that the 210,000 gpd capacity that is available to the project "does not depend on or require any additional expansion or modifications to the STP of the district." Based upon this, the existing plant can handle the anticipated amount of sewage generation from Islip Pines, which has been estimated at 205,101 gpd, based upon the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Appendix C). This is within the site's 210,000 gpd allocation.

Sewage effluent from the Islip Pines development will travel via piping from the subject property to the Parkland STP. Additional sewage generated by Islip Pines will generate additional sludge, which would have to be transported from the sewage treatment plant. Such transport is the responsibility of Suffolk County. With respect to odor and other issues such as "back-ups," Suffolk County is responsible for the maintenance of the STP. The STP contains odor control devices, which are currently undergoing upgrades.

As indicated in Section 3.2.2 of the DEIS, the land to the west of the westernmost LIPA-owned right-of-way is not situated within Suffolk County Sewer District No. 14 - Parkland. The applicant will request from the Suffolk County Sewer Agency that sewage from the buildings proposed to be located west of the westernmost LIPA right-of-way on the subject property be disposed of via connection to the Parkland STP, and incorporated into the site's flow allocation (210,000 gpd).

---

**3.1.3 Ecology – EC**

**Comment EC-1:**

And my concern really has to do with the environment, and groundwater, and wildlife, that when you propose two-point-some-odd million square feet being taken away from our wildlife. (H7-1)



I've taken several walks through the woodland that's there now, natural woodlands. A great place for animals, trees, water. It acts like a sponge. It filters all the water going to the aquifer. But anyway, the animals I've seen back there over the past just five years alone' a buck with a full rack, box turtles, quail, fox, bobwhites. I saw an eagle I'm sure about two years ago. It sure would be a shame to lose all that. (H14-2)

No concern by Serota for misplaced wildlife! Where will they be running to - or will Serota just bulldoze over them also!! (C18-7)

About 136 acres of wooded land that is home to numerous animals will be destroyed. The animals in this land will die searching for a new home. This is heartbreaking. Deer, rabbits, turtles, quail, eagle, etc. What will be done to preserve 136 acres of precious trees and animals? Exactly what is the price that is put on the well being of our environment? What is the dollar figure you put on our children's future world and environment? (C33-2)

**Response EC-1:**

Sections 4.2.1 and 4.3 of the DEIS provide analysis of impacts to groundwater and wildlife, respectively, and Section 5.0 describes the mitigation measures that will be implemented by the applicant to minimize impacts to both groundwater resources and wildlife.

As explained in Section 4.2 of the DEIS, development of the site has the potential to impact groundwater resources, due to the high water table found in the area, but not to a level considered significant. Islip Pines will generate sewage effluent, demand potable water and produce stormwater runoff. The installation of landscaping associated with the project has the potential to introduce fertilizers and generate the need for irrigation water. With respect to mitigation of groundwater impacts, no significant adverse impacts to groundwater resources were identified as the proposed development would be connected to the existing Parkland STP to ensure that there is no disposal of sewage effluent directly into the ground beneath the site. Also, Islip Pines will be connected to the municipal water purveyor (SCWA), who indicated that it has capacity to serve the site and there would be no concern with respect to water quantity, water quality or water pressure.

The installation and/or preservation of native species as part of the landscaping program will minimize impacts to groundwater resources by lessening the need for the use of fertilizers and irrigation. With regard to stormwater runoff as it affects groundwater, Islip Pines will prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in accordance with relevant and applicable requirements. Furthermore, the incorporation of an integrated stormwater management system, including the use of recharge basins, leaching pools, bioswales, rain gardens, etc. will minimize the potential impacts to groundwater resources and will lessen the potential for both on-site and off-site flooding due to the high groundwater table, especially in the northwestern portion of the site.



As indicated in Section 4.3.2 of the DEIS, following implementation of the proposed action, the site would still provide wildlife habitat and would favor wildlife species that are most adapted to developed habitats and close human presence, including common songbirds (e.g., American robin, northern cardinal, etc.) and small mammal species (e.g., gray squirrel, eastern cottontail, eastern mole, etc.). As woodland habitat at the property would be reduced, it is expected that individuals of most woodland-adapted wildlife species currently found at the development property would persist in the preserved woodland areas of the site, though at reduced population densities. Further, large undisturbed tracts of wooded wildlife habitat are common locally, to the northwest and south of the site. Additionally, the proposed action includes the preservation of the existing recharge basin and the creation of five additional ponds/stormwater retention areas at the development property. These ponds would provide additional habitat for local wildlife species.

The property would continue to provide environmental benefits to underlying aquifers and wildlife habitat for resident species through proposed mitigation measures, including the preservation of 18.07± acres of existing woodlands and the planting of many native tree, shrub and herbaceous plant species as part of the site landscape plan. As a result of the proposed action, it is anticipated that individuals of most woodland species currently found at the development property would be displaced to contiguous and non-contiguous areas of wooded habitat located in the general surrounding area of the development property, including the adjoining property to the west of the site. However, some individuals would remain and would inhabit the existing woodland vegetation that would be retained.

**Comment EC-2:**

There are some items of concern such as the Eastern box turtle. It's not an endangered, but it is an item of concern. So that turtle will probably have nowhere to go but the blacktop. (H7-2)

The list of animals has already been spoken about. They're out there. They don't acknowledge the deer - which aren't listed - to box turtles, cooper's hawks. (H21-3)

The Eastern Box turtle is not an endangered species, but it is on the list as an animal of concern. What kind of concern would it be to remove its habitat and eventually kill it off? I didn't see mention of their scope of plant the terrestrial orchids that have inhabited these wooded areas for many years. What's to become of them? (C14-3)

**Response EC-2:**

The Eastern box turtle (*Terrapene Carolina*) is a NYS Special Concern species. According to 6NYCRR Part 182 Section 182.2(i), Species of Special Concern "*warrant attention and consideration, but current information, collected by the department does not justify listing these species as either endangered or threatened.*"



Eastern box turtle was not observed at the property during the 2010 field inspections, although habitat for this species is supported at the site and several commenters have reported sightings of eastern box turtle at the development property. If present at the development property, eastern box turtle would most likely be found within Pitch Pine-Oak Forest habitat. As 18.07± acres of Pitch Pine-Oak Forest would be preserved by the proposed action, potential habitat for this species would continue to exist at the development property. Further, additional contiguous Pitch Pine-Oak Forest habitat exists to the west of the site.

Whitetail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) are common in Suffolk County and were included in the list of observed or expected mammals in Section 3.3.2 of the DEIS.

Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) was not observed at the development property during the 2010 field inspection, although red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*) were observed over the site. Currently, the development property supports ample potential habitat for this woodland raptor. Following implementation of the proposed action on-site habitat for Cooper's Hawk would consist of the 18.07± acres of woodland habitat to be preserved. Nevertheless, extensive woodland habitat for Cooper's Hawk exists in the general surrounding area, including adjacent wooded habitat at the adjoining property to the west and in excess of 100 acres of woodlands surrounding the Sans Souci Lakes, to the south of Sunrise Highway.

**Comment EC-3:**

The proposed berm that was issued by the civic association of – Parklands Civic Association, I feel is not really addressing the issue as a sound barrier, or as the special needs that the trees give to the environment. (H7-3)

I'd like to talk about the buffer that the developer has proposed. And this is from the environmental impact study. From the LIPA lines, which are right behind Glen Summer Road's homes, an 80-foot buffer. And within that buffer is a 60-foot-wide by ten-foot-high berm facing the north. And my question is, how you construct a 60-foot-wide berm, which is practically the size of this room, without cutting down trees? I feel this is ridiculous. We should be saving trees, the natural woodlands, not mowing them down to build a berm, a mound facing the north. How do plants survive when you have something facing the north? They're going to die in a year or two. If this parcel was in Brookhaven, the Town would require 35 percent natural woodland be preserved. Why can't the Town of Islip propose a similar measure? (H20-1)

The trees become a carbon sink. They produce oxygen. They muffle urban noise almost as effectively as any stone wall. They clean the air. The trees shade and cool. They act as windbreakers. Trees flight soil erosion. They slow stormwater runoff. And trees also increase property value, as well as clean the soil. So removing as much as they want to move, and dealing with the stormwater issues, and the



groundwater, and – it just doesn't make sense to me. It really doesn't. So I just want to be heard for that. (H7-4)

Second, the impact of a development of this size can have great consequences to the environment in the area around the proposed development. The loss of almost all the trees that currently exist on the property will change the character of the area and diminish the benefit that trees can provide (see attachment C). It will also promote the development of an Urban Heat island Effect-something which has not been addressed in the DEIS (see attachment D). (C17-8)

**Response EC-3:**

The aforementioned berm is no longer included as part of the proposed action due to the majority of comments which recommend the preservation of existing vegetation in the area which would have been cleared for the berm. Instead, the existing woodlands along the northern boundary of the property will be left undisturbed. The 80-foot-wide natural area and the 80-foot-wide LIPA right-of-way will form a 160-foot-wide buffer between the residences to the north and the athletic fields. The trees in this area will function as a natural sound barrier and will continue to provide important environmental benefits. Additionally, chain-link, screen fencing with black vinyl slats will be installed along the northern border of the athletic fields. Installation of chain link fencing is expected to have only a minimal impact on the natural vegetation by limiting the removal of trees.

With respect to the reference to the environmental benefit of trees included in the comment, it is acknowledged that trees perform many important environmental functions. Accordingly, the proposed action includes the preservation of many trees within the 18.07± acres of existing woodland habitat to be preserved (note that a tree survey will be required at the time of site plan review). These trees will continue to provide environmental benefits at the development property and to the general surrounding area. Moreover, additional trees would be planted within the proposed 38.75± acres of landscaped open space. Any preservation of native forested areas and/or requirements for additional supplemental plantings shall be determined during the site plan review process prior to the issuance of any clearing or building permits.

**Comment EC-4:**

And then, also, we are very concerned - there are lots of animals in the area that is going to be taken down. There's also lots of debris and garbage in the woods and the sump that is currently there, closest to our property. (H35-3)

Wildlife currently living within the 140 acres will have nowhere to run or end up moving into our community. (Deer, raccoons, rabbits, Red Tail Hawks). (C8-2)



Additional residents' concerns are that the proposed massive development will destroy the existing natural area and wildlife and cause an invasion of rodents, feral cats and destructive insects into our community (C20-8)

The current pitch pine forest that exists on the site is filled with many animals including deer, fox, rabbits, raccoons... There is a lot of debris that has been dumped in various areas of the site and evidence of large colonies of mice and rats are a concern. There are also several colonies of cats. When construction occurs what will be done to ensure that this negative impact will be minimized for our community? We will certainly require exterminators to ensure that our homes and properties do not become infested. We have hundreds of rabbits living in our common areas, we cannot even begin to speculate what would occur once the proposed site is cleaned up and cleared. The health and safety impact to our community needs to be considered as this proposal moves forward. (C24-5)

And another possible problem resulting from construction would be pest and rodent control from the development. (H31-3)

And we are worried about pests and rodents that will scurry over to our neck of the woods when the only remaining large piece of woods will be the telephone company and LIPA property directly behind the Autumn Ridge backing Parkland. (H35-4)

**Response EC-4:**

Dumped debris that is located on the subject property would be removed during the clearing and construction phases of the proposed action. Removal of such debris will eliminate some of the existing purported pest population associated with such debris.

The displacement of resident wildlife was evaluated in Section 4.3.2 of the DEIS and is summarized as follows. Following implementation of the proposed action, the site would favor wildlife species that are adapted to developed habitats and close human presence, including common songbirds (e.g., American robin, northern cardinal, etc.) and small mammal species (e.g., gray squirrel, eastern cottontail, eastern mole, etc.). Additionally, the development property would continue to provide habitat for existing woodland-adapted species through the preservation of 18.07± acres of natural vegetation. It is also expected that individuals of most woodland species currently found at the development property could be accommodated in contiguous and non-contiguous areas of wooded habitat located in the general surrounding area of the development property, including the adjoining property to the west of the site. In the short-term, it is anticipated that the aforementioned wooded habitats on and in the surrounding area of the site would experience a temporary increase in wildlife populations during the clearing and construction phases of the proposed action, due to emigration of individuals from the disturbed portions of the development property. Subsequently, it is anticipated that inter- and intra-specific competition for available resources within these surrounding habitats would result in a small net decrease in local



population size for most species, until equilibrium between wildlife populations and available resources is achieved.

With respect to “pest” rodents in particular, rodent species that are typically viewed as “pests,” such as Norway rat (*Rattus norvegicus*), house mouse (*Mus musculus*) and raccoon (*Procyon lotor*) typically live within developed areas inhabited or frequented by humans, as human habitations and associated activities (e.g., agriculture, food storage, food preparation, sanitation and waste disposal facilities, etc.) serve as food sources for these animals. Since the subject property is currently undeveloped and consists primarily of undeveloped woodlands, it is not anticipated that the site supports large populations of pest rodent species, including as those discussed above. Rather, it is anticipated that the majority of rodents currently inhabiting the site are typical woodland rodent species (e.g., eastern chipmunk [*Tamias striatus*], eastern gray squirrel [*Sciurus carolinensis*], white-footed mouse [*Peromyscus leucopus*], eastern mole [*Scalopus aquaticus*], short-tailed shrew [*Blarina brevicauda*] etc.) As such, it is not anticipated that the proposed action would result in emigration of significant numbers of pest rodents to neighboring communities. Nevertheless, standard Town requirements for rodent and pest control shall be a condition of any site clearing or work permits.

No significant adverse impacts to surrounding communities due to destructive insects are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

The proposed action includes the preservation of the existing recharge basin and the creation of additional ponds/stormwater retention areas at the development property. These ponds would provide additional habitat for local wildlife species.

The four wildlife species mentioned in the comments (whitetail deer [*Odocoileus virginianus*], raccoon [*Procyon lotor*], eastern cottontail [*Sylvilagus floridanus*] and red-tailed hawk [*Buteo jamaicensis*]) are all considered to be generally mobile and are expected to be accommodated by the preserved woodland habitat at the site and by other wooded habitats in the general surrounding area, including the adjoining property to the west. The four aforementioned wildlife species are all known to inhabit or frequent suburban communities and individuals of each are likely already present within the residential developments surrounding the development property. It is anticipated that this will continue following implementation of the proposed action.

As described in Section 4.3.2 of the DEIS and addressed in the responses to Comments EC-1 through EC-3, it is anticipated that habitats at and surrounding the site would experience a temporary increase in wildlife populations during the clearing and construction phases of the proposed action, due to emigration of individuals from the disturbed portions of the development property. It is anticipated that most wildlife, including rodents and feral cats would be displaced to undeveloped/wooded habitats in the general surrounding area of the site, rather than to developed communities. Subsequently, it is anticipated that inter- and intra-specific competition for available resources within these surrounding habitats would result in a small net decrease in local population size for most species, until equilibrium



between wildlife populations and available resources is achieved. Furthermore, through the preservation of 18.07± acres of existing natural vegetation, it is anticipated that individuals of most woodland species currently found at the development property would still inhabit the site following implementation of the proposed action.

**Comment EC-5:**

They're claiming 11 acres of natural stuff preserved. Twenty-six acres are going to be reworked and replanted. The difference is, the plot plan shows [topos] that makes it impossible. There are areas which have natural vegetation, which are set with ten foot of fill on them. It's impossible. I don't know how that works. (H21-1)

**Response EC-5:**

As detailed on the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the proposed action includes the preservation of 18.07± acres of existing woodland habitat, within which no grading or filling is proposed. Additionally the proposed action includes the creation of 38.75± acres of landscaped open space.

**Comment EC-6:**

Wetland restoration in northeast corner of site. A wetlands restoration project would benefit the area and would alleviate some of the existing flooding problems known to exist near this portion of the property. Additionally, it would provide a natural habitat for wildlife. Although the addition of playing fields is a community benefit, the need for all of the additional fields proposed should be verified. Overall concerns regarding flooding and loss of natural habitat could be improved by eliminating some of the field space in the northwest corner of the property, where a history of drainage problems is evident. (C36-3)

**Response EC-6:**

The "water feature" located in the northeastern corner of the site is not a wetland, but is a recharge basin that captures runoff from the Bishop Lane subdivision, located to the north of the subject property. As indicated in Section 4.2.4 of the DEIS, while the recharge basin accepts stormwater from Town-owned Bishop Lane, based on information obtained from the Town of Islip, the present ownership and maintenance of the recharge basin is the responsibility of the owners of Islip Pines. This recharge basin will be cleaned out so that it functions properly. Further, it is proposed that the basin and the associated existing overland flow be maintained as they presently exist. If water overflows from this recharge basin, it will be conveyed to the south and be captured within the proposed development's stormwater management system. This will assist in reducing flooding that is occurring off-site in the Bishop Lane subdivision, as well as on the subject property.



While flooding problems currently exist in the western portion of the site, future on-site flooding is not expected since Islip Pines will provide for the on-site collection and recharge of stormwater runoff through the development of an integrated stormwater management system. See Response WR-2 for additional information regarding groundwater levels and flooding concerns.

With respect to wildlife habitat, the proposed Islip Pines development is proposed to retain 18.07± acres of natural vegetation and provide an additional 2.93 acres of ponds (which will serve both a stormwater function and provide habitat for wildlife). The drainage issues on the site are expected to be addressed through the cleaning out of the existing recharge basin and the installation of the extensive integrated stormwater management system that will be part of the Islip Pines community.

With respect to the athletic fields, the applicant has had numerous conversations with representatives of both youth and adult sports leagues, including soccer and lacrosse, and there is uniform opinion among these active community leaders of the need for additional sports fields in the community. Therefore, Islip Pines would balance the provision of athletic fields for the community, with the retention of natural vegetation that will benefit wildlife. As previously indicated, the Town has requested that the applicant minimize clearing in the northwest portion of the site, which could affect one of the proposed ball fields.

**Comment EC-7:**

The proposed site is one of the few densely wooded areas in the area left undisturbed. Intense development of the property would be detrimental to the natural open space in this parcel. The area would change from forested lands and open fields with undisturbed plant and animal life, to a high density, intensely developed area. CCE is concerned that the proposed “open spaces”, where the DEIS claims wildlife will inhabit, would be segmented by the surrounding housing and retail structures. In addition, the proposal seems to include playing fields as open space. This type of “open space” is unsuitable for wildlife. Roads and vehicles would also act as anthropogenic borders prohibiting free migration of wildlife.

The DEIS states approximately 30% of the land would remain as open space and screening areas would provide vegetation. Due to the size of the development portion of this proposal, 30% will be inadequate to provide necessary habitat for displaced wildlife.

Although open spaces such as parks and ball fields are important in communities, they do not provide meaningful habitats for wildlife. (C24-4)

**Response EC-7:**

Town representatives and local civic organizations have requested that the applicant include parks and playing fields within the proposed development. These recreation/open spaces have not been considered as wildlife habitat.



The proposed development provides 18.07± acres (12.6 percent of the site) of natural area, most of which would be located along the perimeter of the site. This natural area would provide habitat for wildlife. In addition, the proposed ponds (2.1 percent of the site) would provide additional habitat as would the 38.75± acres (27.1 percent of the site) of new landscaping.

---

### **3.1.4 Zoning and Land Use – ZLU**

#### **Comment ZLU-1:**

Did you ever consider in the design of this to not have the industrial where you put it? But rather have – can you pull that picture back up again – rather put the industrial on the eastern portion of the property so that it sort of abuts Costco as opposed to abutting residential communities? (H1-5)

Without too much thought as to why this wasn't zoned residential at least abutting what's already residential. And you know, allowing for the industrial to at least be pushed towards the highway. (H32-3)

It looks right now like all that industrial is going to be in front of my house. And it's going to be right on the other side of that berm. And I'm certainly concerned about that. (H40-4)

If industry must be built then it should be placed along Beacon Drive which for the most part already has industry there. (C8-5)

The "saved" industrial part of the plan faces the adjacent Parkland community. Industrial should never be allowed to back up to residential. (C9-9)

If it's industrial – if there is – that's the area, back there (indicating [the northern area]), that strip that we're talking about – if there was industrial that needed to load and unload, that's where it would go; correct? (H1-1)

And garbage trucks, that is the way they would go [along the northern side of the site]; correct? (H1-2)

#### **Response ZLU-1:**

Based upon the comments received on the DEIS regarding the location of the industrial buildings, as well as discussions with representatives of the Town of Islip, the Islip Pines Conceptual Master Plan has been revised by the applicant (see Figure 1 and Appendix C). The industrial buildings that were located along the northern portion of the Islip Pines property in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan have been relocated to the eastern and southeastern portion of the site and re-oriented toward Beacon Drive and Sunrise Highway (see Figure 1).



Furthermore, the applicant has indicated that it has unsuccessfully attempted to develop the site for industrial purposes for over two decades (see Section 2.3 of the DEIS), thus, these buildings have been reconfigured to allow for industrial, as well as office and R&D space, by reducing their mass, dividing them into a number of smaller buildings, increasing their height from two to four stories, placing them in a more campus-like layout (see Figure 1), and providing for more flexible mixed-use building types.

Parking for these buildings is located underground and in lots adjacent to Beacon Drive, and a vegetated buffer has been designed between these parking areas and Beacon Drive. In addition, the industrial buildings are now contemplated as a mix of industrial, office and research and development space. It is expected that loading and unloading for the industrial/R&D buildings would take place under the building, within the parking garage, or in the parking areas alongside the proposed buildings. The outside loading areas associated with these buildings would not be located near any on-site or off-site residences.

As noted above, the industrial buildings have been relocated to an area along the eastern and southeastern portion of the site and re-oriented toward Beacon Drive and Sunrise Highway. Therefore, garbage trucks associated with collection at the industrial buildings would no longer be required to traverse the northern portion of the site, adjacent to the northern property line. Solid waste collection and pick-up areas associated with these buildings would not be located near any on-site or off-site residences.

In place of the industrial buildings shown on the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan includes recreational facilities between the residences to the north and the proposed residential facilities on the Islip Pines site. The building located closest to the northern property line in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan is a day care facility, which, at its closest point, is located approximately 300± feet from this boundary. The roadway that traversed the northern portion of the site, adjacent to the industrial buildings, has been relocated to be approximately 425 feet from the northern property line, and is proposed to be separated from the residences to the north by the 80-foot-wide LIPA right-of-way, an 80-foot-wide vegetated buffer, a fence and playing fields. In the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the proposed on-site residences are located to the south of the northernmost internal roadway.

**Comment ZLU-2:**

Additionally, can you talk to me about – the application here notes the term smart growth. Can you explain to me what about this design is smart growth? (H1-3)

This is absolutely smart growth. And I'll tell you a few reasons why. The traffic calming -- so look up traffic calming with smart growth and it will be two lanes, one in each direction with a bike path. It's going to be very hard for those tractor trailers to get through. And mixed-used housing – mixed use, just because they might not put a residential above businesses, doesn't mean it's not mixed use. The only thing that doesn't make it smart growth is it's not next to a train station. That's the only thing. (H12-1)



There are eight points within the County law from 2000, Smart Growth Policy. There's none of it here. (H21-6)

How do we just put this smart growth tag line on this development, and then it just covers wherever they want to kind of put things? (H32-1)

The DEIS is generally organized well and is a complete document. Smart Growth Concept – Consider whether the use of this term is appropriate in the title of the Planned Development District. Improvements could be made.

- Mix Land Uses - YES
  - Take Advantage of Compact Building Design - NO
  - Create a Range of Housing Opportunities and Choices - YES
  - Create Walkable Neighborhoods - NO
  - Foster Distinctive, Attractive Communities with a Strong Sense of Place - ANALYZE
  - Preserve Open Space, Farmland, Natural Beauty and Critical Environmental Areas - ANALYZE
  - Strengthen and Direct Development Towards Existing Communities - NO
  - Provide a Variety of Transportation Choices - NO
  - Make Development Decisions Predictable, Fair and Cost Effective - YES
  - Encourage Community and Stakeholder Collaboration in Development Decisions - ANALYZE
- (C25-1)

Revisions could help achieve closer compliance to Smart Growth Concepts.

- Greater walkability
- Better mix of land uses
- Greater separation of Industrial uses from residential uses.
- Creative use of drainage areas for decorative civic focal points (see ACR-4)
- Integration of the recreational area with residential uses
- Relocation of Beacon Drive (C25-2)

**Response ZLU-2:**

The applicant has focused on the mixed-use, walkable nature of the revised Conceptual Master Plan and has incorporated some smart growth principles into the development's design. Smart growth has many different meanings and can be accomplished by various methods. According to the Smart Growth Network:

*"Growth is smart when it gives us great communities, with more choices and personal freedom, good return on public investment, greater opportunity across the community, a thriving natural environment, and a legacy we can be proud to leave our children and grandchildren."*

The smart growth principles outlined by the Smart Growth network are as follows:



- Mix land uses
- Take advantage of compact building design
- Create a range of housing opportunities and choices
- Create walkable neighborhoods
- Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place
- Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas
- Strengthen and direct development towards existing communities
- Provide a variety of transportation choices
- Make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective
- Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions

As outlined in the Section 3.4.3 of the DEIS and analyzed in Section 4.4.3 of the DEIS, in its publication entitled *Smart Communities through Smart Growth* (2000), Suffolk County has generally adopted these policies, as follows:

- Direct development to strengthen existing communities
- Encourage mixed land uses and mixed use buildings
- Encourage consultation between communities
- Take advantage of compact building sizes and create a range of housing opportunities
- Provide a variety of transportation choices
- Create pleasant environments and attractive communities
- Preserve open space and natural resources
- Make development decisions predictable, fair and cost effective

The Conceptual Master Plan has been revised to address many of the comments that were made by the public and the Town of Islip with respect to smart growth, the configuration of the development and the proposed mix of uses.

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan contains a greater variety of land uses than were included in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan and the development's design has been improved to provide for better mixed-uses, walkability, and provision of open space. This proposed development includes a wide range of uses -- residential, retail, civic, office, industrial/R&D, entertainment/hospitality and open space/recreation. A number of the buildings have been reconfigured to be mixed use in nature, some containing retail on the ground floor with flex office space above, some containing a mix of retail, commercial services and industrial/R&D. As shown on the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Figure 1 and Appendix C), the industrial uses have been located away from the residences along the northern portion of the property to the eastern side of the property, proximate to the off-site commercial uses, east of Beacon Drive. Furthermore, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan locates the recreational uses just to the north and west of the proposed residences, so that there is a better relationship between these two uses.



With respect to compact building design, as opposed to traditional zoning, which separates uses, the proposed IMUPDD allows a mix of uses on one site. Compact design encourages the maximization of open space. Therefore, while not exceeding the maximum building height permitted in the prevailing industrial zoning, Islip Pines incorporates a variety of building heights (from one to four stories) within the proposed development. Furthermore, the Islip Pines development incorporates the use of structured parking, both within separate parking structures and under some of the proposed non-residential buildings in order to have less surface parking and to increase the amount of open space on the site. Compact building design will allow more recharge, reduce flooding and lower the amount of potential contaminants running off into the ground.

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan proposed by the applicant increases the number of housing units from 250 to 350 by adding 100 market-rate units to the 250 workforce housing units (subject to further input by the Town with respect to workforce housing units). Therefore, not only will there be a range of housing on-site, there will be more variety of housing in an area predominantly developed with single-family homes.

As discussed below, Islip Pines' road system is a group of parallel loops with interconnecting short streets. This "net system" of roadways lends itself to create a walkable community in all directions. Carefully scaled sidewalks and street fronts are designed to make walking a safe and pleasurable experience. These walkable streets extend out into the park spaces with connecting paths that allow pedestrians to "short-cut" through the parks north and south through the site. The residences are within walking distance of the recreational facilities, the retail and the central civic space. Furthermore, the hotel is located across from the central civic space and the industrial/R&D/office buildings are now located in more of a campus-like, walkable, setting, rather than in two large structures situated within parking areas, as was proposed on the previously-proposed DEIS Plan.

Islip Pines would be developed as a distinctive and attractive community through its cohesive design and the proposed layout of the buildings.

With respect to the preservation of open space, farmland, natural beauty and critical environmental areas, the site is not farmland and is not zoned or used for agricultural purposes. The property is not located within a critical environmental area. It is surrounded by two major highways to the west and south and commercial development to the east. While the property is undeveloped, it is privately owned and zoned for industrial development and has been for decades.

As indicated in Section 4.4.3 of the DEIS, while the property is generally undeveloped (with LIPA-owned rights-of-way), it is completely surrounded by a mix of commercial development along Veterans Memorial Highway, Broadway Avenue, Sunrise Highway, Beacon Drive and the residences to the north. The proposed development would complement the existing uses and strengthen the identity of Holbrook.



The internal circulation system within Islip Pines provides several bus pavilions and a loop shuttle system, which will allow for residents, employees and visitors to make internal connections as well as connections from Islip Pines to the nearest train station and to surrounding destinations (e.g., Long Island MacArthur Airport). Thus, the need for short-trip car use will be greatly reduced. The incorporation of bus lines and routes to provide additional transportation choices is a viable smart growth transportation option, along with provision of access for motorized vehicles and pedestrians. Dedicated bike lanes will further promote a safe, active and enjoyable alternative to short-trip auto usage and can be connected to a Long Island regional bike trail system in the future.

In addition, as noted in Responses PR-1 and PR-2, the applicant has met with a number of the local civic groups, community organizations, chambers of commerce and representatives of the Town of Islip. The applicant has also met with County and State officials with respect to the transportation aspects of the proposed project. The Conceptual Master Plan and the Revised Conceptual Master Plan included in this FEIS, has been discussed with the nearest residential neighbors. Therefore, community members, other stakeholders and municipal officials have been involved in the development process since the application was filed. Furthermore, additional opportunities for public involvement exist as part of the site plan review process of the Town's Planning Board.

With respect to the creative use of drainage areas for decorative civic focal points, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan incorporates landscaping and ponds/stormwater retention areas at both major entrances to the development and a large pond within the central civic area that will also be used as part of an overall water resource recovery system. In addition, rain gardens will be used throughout the development as part of the stormwater management system.

Furthermore, the 2000 *Suffolk County Planning Commission, Smart Communities through Smart Growth* report was examined in the Islip Pines October 2011 DEIS that was accepted as complete by the Town Board of Islip as lead agency for the SEQRA process. The 2000 *Suffolk County Planning Commission, Smart Communities through Smart Growth* report is a policy document that is not legally binding on the Town. As noted on page 94 of the DEIS, the 2000 *Suffolk County Planning Commission, Smart Communities through Smart Growth* report outlines eight principles of "Smart Growth" development that can be used as guidelines for further development in communities throughout Long Island. Pages 211 through 215 of the October 2011 Islip Pines DEIS provides an analysis of Islip Pines' consistency with the eight principles.

**Comment ZLU-3:**

In addition to that, what impact [the widening of Veterans Memorial Highway] will that have on the size of this project? You talked about one-third of this property is going to be green. Are we now going to reduce the level of green in our development package? (H2-5)

It says it will be a third green. They forgot to mention most of that will be painted. (H28-3)



The proposed buffer zone should begin at that southern border of the existing LIPA right-of-way and property. The buffer zone should not include the LIPA property. The buffer zone should be at least 300 feet from the southern portion of the LIPA property before the proposed berm or suggested sound barrier is erected. This will allow for more original and natural vegetation to remain and will further reduce the increase noise and lighting from the new construction. It will also allow for more green space as was questioned during the public hearing. (C7-1)

Based on the conceptual site plan, does the development proposal take full advantage of compact development options to reduce the need for removing vegetation and to help maintain existing vegetated buffers between the proposed development along both NY454 and NY27? (C27-6)

**Response ZLU-3:**

Excluding the civic buildings<sup>3</sup> and the parking garages, the proposed FAR (0.36) is only marginally greater than the FAR permitted in the existing Industrial 1 and Industrial Corridor zoning districts (0.35). Moreover, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan now includes a large central civic space (“great lawn”), numerous athletic facilities, increased open space and increased natural buffer areas. Accordingly, the revisions to the proposed plan (see Figures 1 and 2) increase the natural area to be retained as well as the proposed landscaping. More specifically, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan contains 56.82 acres of green space, which comprises 39.7 percent of the site.

Also, many of the parking spaces that were shown as surface parking in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan are now contained within parking garages that have a smaller footprint (less impervious surface) and contain green roofs. The amount of pervious surface on the site has been increased from 40.00 acres to 56.82 ± acres. In addition, more civic space (including the athletic fields and central civic space) have been added to the Revised Conceptual Master Plan as compared to the previously-proposed DEIS Plan (25± acres v. 4.2 acres). As noted, the width and overall size of the buffers along the perimeter of the property have been increased. The vegetated buffer at the convergence of Veterans Memorial Highway and Sunrise Highway North Service Road has a minimum width of 53 feet.

Within the northern portion of the site is a buffer of 160 feet in width (80 feet of the LIPA right-of-way and 80 feet of existing vegetation), followed by playing fields to the south, which are at minimum 100 feet in width. The playing fields will not be lighted. The previously-proposed berm in this area has been eliminated, and a six-foot high chain-link screen fence with vinyl slats is proposed to be installed just north of the playing fields, a minimum of 160 feet from the residential property line to the north. It should be noted that proposed the fence would follow the line of the westernmost baseball field and run to the south of the existing recharge basin. Therefore, instead of removing the trees at the northern portion of the property in order to create a berm, these trees would remain to form a natural buffer between the proposed development and the residences to the north. The areas to the north of the fence

---

<sup>3</sup> Includes tennis pavilion, youth and senior center, restrooms, parks office and the large central civic space [including the outdoor cinema/stage, pond, walking trails and arboretum], which would be open to and benefit the public.



would remain in their existing condition and the fence would provide the barrier requested by the majority of residents to the north.

The impact of widening of Veterans Memorial Highway would slightly reduce the amount of development acreage of the site. However, it will not reduce the amount of vegetated buffer maintained between the roadway and the proposed development.

**Comment ZLU-4:**

Would you consider clearing the slate and starting all over again? (H1-6)

When you talk about a mixed-use community, why is there no residential on top of the retail? (H1-7)

The current site plan layout is not pedestrian friendly as residents would be required to walk across a 70 foot wide interior roadway and several rows of parking to reach this retail area. In addition, the proposed location of the industrial buildings to the north of the subject property is not ideal as they are located adjacent to an existing residential neighborhood. (C26-3)

At this point, the Planning staff is making the recommendation that we do believe that there should be greater walkability; a better mix of land uses; perhaps greater separation of the industrial uses from the residential uses. (H4-1)

The Planning staff is making the recommendation that there should be integration of recreational areas with residential uses. (H4-3)

I'm also a real estate broker for 25 years in the area, and I feel as the plan is now, with the warehouses behind there, and the noise, I really feel that the real estate values be in jeopardy. If the plan considered having the condominiums behind there, I do not feel they would be in jeopardy. So hopefully that can be considered as well. (H20-4)

I live in Holbrook. I shop in Holbrook. I shop in Bayport, in Sayville, in Oakdale, Patchogue. There are all the places where – that are my communities. You are taking, with this amount of land, and you are not just putting retail there, which we do not need, but you are putting another town in my town.

Industrial, yeah, it's an ugly thing to have near you. But it certainly beats the big box store and the 7:00 a.m. rush hour traffic on Sunday in your backyard, which this is my backyard. (H32-2)

So I just think that perhaps maybe they need to revisit at, a bare minimum, at least a band of zoning that would allow for residential to border what's already residential with us, and then allow for other development in the front. (H32-4)



We are incorporated. This is not incorporated. This does not belong in our town. If you want to develop this land, please find another use that will not impact our town in such a cruel way. (H29-3)

In conclusion, I feel the development of Island [sic] Pines as proposed, cannot move forward. Ideally, I'd like to see no change to the area. Yet, if the owner of the property still wants to develop this land, I think the town council should consider much a smaller scale development, perhaps one that is strictly industrial, as now zoned. If a mixed use zoning is granted it must be on a greatly reduced footprint, and one that embraces the community and the Comprehensive Plan of Islip. And sensible configurations need to be proposed. Don't put industrial next to existing residential, especially when there is existing industrial to the east. Don't put in theatres and hotels that aren't warranted by need. (C17-15)

A more detailed breakdown of the proposed square footage is needed. The total gross ground floor area of 408,200 sf. does not appear to include all of the retail space shown on the plan. A more detailed breakdown of uses is needed. In addition, the four pad sites on the eastern portion of the site are included in the retail portion, but appear more suitable for office or other uses as discussed previously with the Planning Staff. Also, the proposed hotel and conference center does not belong in the industrial/research category. A clarification of what is included in the flex space is needed. The possibility of residential loft space on the third floor of the structures proposed surrounding the central park area should be included. (C36-8)

**Response ZLU-4:**

As explained in Section 2.0 and Response ZLU-1, as a response to the comments received during the DEIS comment period, and based on subsequent discussions with the Town, the applicant has revised the Conceptual Master Plan to address many of the concerns that were raised at the public hearing and thereafter. (e.g., moving the industrial development to the east [further away from existing residential development], removing the berm so that less disturbance would occur along the northern property line, providing mixed-use buildings [including retail/office buildings], lowering the height of the proposed hotel and relocating it to the eastern portion of the site). The Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan is shown in Figure 1 and in Appendix C of this FEIS.

Although Islip Pines is proposed as a mixed use community, residential uses on top of retail use are not required for a development to be mixed-use. This proposed development meets the definition of mixed use, as it combines residential uses, retail uses, office uses, hospitality uses, recreational uses, etc. in one walkable development. The applicant considered the placement of residences over the retail development, but determined that it was not feasible, as many of the national retailers that the applicant expects to lease at this site do not favor residential uses above their stores. Accordingly, while the applicant would be willing to locate residences above retail uses, it would not be financially feasible for this development, as the potential tenants that the applicant is currently negotiating with would not accept residential uses above their retail space.



Although not including residences within the mixed use buildings, the applicant has modified the development plan to now include offices and flex space, which could include offices/artist lofts, etc., above the retail development. The principal retail development has been reconfigured from a “main street” design located near Sunrise Highway to an area of shops that encircles the central civic space.

Furthermore, the development designations have been refined to group similar uses into new categories (see Section 2.0). Hotels have been grouped with restaurants and the cinema to form an entertainment and hospital category of uses. Several of the “pads” have been designated for commercial service uses (such as banks), and the day care facility is classified as a commercial service.

The specific breakdown of all of the proposed uses is as follows:

- Industrial/R&D/Office – 818,130 SF
- Flex Office in Mixed Use Buildings – 302,820 SF
- Commercial Services – 61,300 SF
- Entertainment/Restaurants/Hospitality – 190,800 SF
  - Cinema- 60,000 SF
  - Restaurants - 30,800 SF
  - Hotel - 100,000 SF (200 rooms)
- Retail – 339,700 SF
- Residential – 350 units (250 workforce, 100 market-rate)/402,774 SF
- Civic – 21,154 SF, plus a 30,000 SF open market place, and six athletic fields and a “great lawn”

As shown on Figure 1 and Appendix C, the applicant has relocated the proposed industrial development to the eastern and southeastern portions of the site, away from the residential development situated to the north of the site. The proposed industrial buildings have been oriented toward both Beacon Drive and Sunrise Highway. These buildings are also now designated as industrial/R&D/office, providing more flexibility for the types of uses on the site. Furthermore, the mass of these buildings has been decreased by breaking up the square footage into several smaller, but slightly taller buildings. As shown on Figure 1, these buildings are now located in more of a campus-like, walkable, setting, rather than in two large structures situated within a parking area.

The large boulevard traversing Islip Pines in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan has been eliminated, and the residential development is proposed to be located closer to both the retail development and the civic and recreational spaces. A large open area (“great lawn”) with a proposed pond has been situated in the center of the development, providing a public focal point. Opportunities for walking have been enhanced by the redesigned internal circulation system. Specifically, Islip Pines’ road system is a group of parallel loops with interconnecting short streets. This “net system” of roadways lends itself to create a walkable community in all directions. Carefully scaled sidewalks and street fronts are designed to make walking a safe and pleasurable experience. These walkable streets extend out into the park spaces with



connecting paths that allow pedestrians to “short-cut” through the parks north and south through the site.

In response to recommendations received during and after the public comment period, and as shown on Figure 1 and Appendix C, the majority of the recreational uses (playing fields, courts) have been relocated to the north and west of the proposed residences. Additional recreational space for both active and passive activities has been added to a central civic space.

The applicant is requesting a change of zone to allow a mixed use development, which includes housing, retail shops, offices, industrial/research and development space, and civic spaces (including athletic fields), while the current zoning does not permit all of the proposed uses. An as-of-right industrial development has been examined in Section 7.2 of the DEIS. Also, as discussed in Section 2.3 of the DEIS, the applicant has stated that it has unsuccessfully attempted to develop the property pursuant to its industrial zoning for over two decades. The Town has agreed to consider the applicant’s proposed rezoning for mixed use and will make an informed determination based, in part, on the environmental review process that the application is currently undergoing.

With respect to the location of specific uses along the northern property line, see Section 2.0, Response ZLU-1 and Figure 1, which indicate that uses proposed to be located closest to the northern residential property line are athletic fields and a day care center. In addition, the vegetated buffer on the northern portion of the site is proposed to be 160± feet in width at its narrowest point. The next “band” of uses, south of the athletic fields, is the proposed residential units, followed by retail development located around a central civic space.

It should be noted that Holbrook is located partially within the Town of Islip and partially within the Town of Brookhaven and is not incorporated. Bayport, Sayville and Oakdale are all unincorporated hamlets within the Town of Islip, and Patchogue is an incorporated Village within the Town of Brookhaven.

**Comment ZLU-5:**

Why not do something a little innovative? Transfer development rights. It’s been done before. Take them off of here. Redevelop a real downtown. Why not? (H21-7)

**Response ZLU-5:**

The applicant is not proposing the transfer of development rights from the Islip Pines property to a downtown. Moreover, such recommendation is not identified in any of the Town’s planning documents (see Section 3.4.3, pages 83 through 100 of the DEIS).



While the Town supports the concept of transferring development rights, TDR has been primarily linked to the preservation or protection of groundwater from excess sanitary wastewater. This was a concept identified in the aforementioned “208 Study” and which is implemented by Suffolk County’s Article 6 regulations. In this project, the applicant is proposing to tie in to an existing sewage treatment plant that would be augmented and/or maintained with fees paid for connection and daily flow. Thus, the impacts to groundwater are expected to be minimized.

**Comment ZLU-6:**

As was stated, the last public hearing in this matter in November, 2009, the Bayport Civic Association opposed this land use and required zone change for this site. This opposition is grounded in both the Islip Town’s 1986 Sunrise Highway Study, and the 2009 Comprehensive Sunrise Highway Corridor Study. (H22-1)

As the Islip Town Comprehensive Plan Progress Report, specifies, some of the goals of the Plan are to “protect the natural resources and environment of Islip; to promote only those commercial and industrial developments that are compatible with local employment needs; and to promote attractive environments that enhance the value of life” (C17-2)

To this end, the proposed development comes up short. As the Sunrise Highway Corridor Study recommends “limit and avoid new retail...” retain existing industrial zoning.” “encourage mixed use within the (existing) nodes” In this regard, simply put, there is little economic viability to the proposed Serota plan. (C17-3)

Please be advised that our agency, the Suffolk County Planning Commission, has no specific comment on the content of the DEIS action at this time other than to note that it is interested in the discussion on how the proposal relates to the context of the Town’s Comprehensive Plan and the Draft Sunrise Highway Corridor Study wherein preserving and enhancing existing downtown centers (particularly Patchogue & Sayville) is a significant objective. (C28-1)

**Response ZLU-6:**

As indicated in Section 3.9 of the DEIS, the proposed development, while not situated within a retail node (as identified in the *1986 Sunrise Highway Study* and the *2009 Comprehensive Sunrise Highway Corridor Study*), would be situated within two established retail developments, and if developed in the mixed-use manner, as proposed, could supplement the viability of those retail properties. The *1986 Sunrise Highway Study* recommended the development of clustered residential development on parcels along Sunrise Highway, when possible. In keeping with this recommendation, the proposed action includes a residential component, in addition to a mix of other uses. Despite the fact that the subject property is not situated within an identified node, the creation of a mixed-use development is also in keeping with the recommendations of the *2009 Comprehensive Sunrise Highway Corridor Study*. Other recommendations



from this study that the proposed development would comply with include those of connecting to an existing sewer district, and the developing of industrial and office uses within the corridor. Furthermore, as explained in Section 3.4.3, page 100 of the DEIS, Appendix 1 of the 2009 *Sunrise Highway Corridor Study – Islip Town and Brookhaven Town – Suffolk County, New York*, entitled “Site Specific Recommendations Suggested by the Town Planning Departments” specifically states: “An application to rezone this site [Serota site] to permit retail and residential use, in addition to industrial zoning, has been made to the Town of Islip. The final scope for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for this proposal was adopted by the Islip Town Board on March 16, 2010. The DEIS will identify all significant issues including traffic volume and safety, especially the existing location of Beacon Drive; the impact of development on established retail centers; socioeconomic impacts; consistency with previous studies of Sunrise Highway Corridor; maximizing buffer and open space; and impacts on stormwater run-off and groundwater.” No specific recommendation for this parcel exists in the Appendices of said study.

The subject property could be considered as part of a retail node, as the area adjacent to the property contains retail uses and part of a node. The Broadway Avenue node, which is located less than 1,000 feet west of the subject property, includes approximately 598,000 SF of retail development. Directly to the east of the site, east of Beacon Drive, are two large retail establishments, including a 147,000-SF Costco and a Savers thrift store. Retail uses are also located along Veterans Memorial Highway in the vicinity of the site. Therefore, the proposed retail portion of the mixed use development would be not be sprawl, as retail uses already exist in the immediate area east and west of the site, and thus, the development on the subject site would essentially connect two existing retail areas. The applicant has analyzed the marketability of the proposed development at subject property and believes that due to the location of the project, and current and predicted future socioeconomic factors in the community, it is economically viable as described in Appendix P of the DEIS.

As described in Section 2.3 of the DEIS, this property is and has been zoned industrial for at least 25 years (since the time the applicant acquired the property), similar to the industrial zoning south of Sunrise Highway, east of Beacon Drive and north along Veterans Memorial Highway in the immediate area of the site. Where not zoned industrial, the areas along Sunrise Highway between Nicolls Road and Raft Avenue are generally zoned for commercial/retail development. These zoning districts allow for intensive development that does not maintain the natural environment. The quote in the comment indicates that the Town should only promote commercial and industrial development that is compatible with local employment needs. The proposed Islip Pines mixed-use development provides a vast array of employment opportunities, including industrial jobs, that meet the needs of the community, as explained in Response SO-3.

The subject property is not located within an existing downtown center, it is located along Sunrise Highway, which is generally considered a commercial corridor. Based upon the retail market analysis, the vacancy analysis and the overall socioeconomic analysis presented in the DEIS (Sections 3.9, 4.9 and Appendix P) and this FEIS (Section 3.1.9), the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the existing downtown centers.



Finally, the applicant, who owns the property that is the subject of this application, has the right to request a change of zone for the property to permit development of the proposed mixed-use community. As the Town of Islip has agreed to consider the change of zone application, it is required to conduct an environmental review process, weighing the social and economic considerations and the environmental considerations, in order to make an informed decision with respect to the proposed zoning and subsequent development of the property. Such review, within the context of said SEQRA process creates an opportunity for the Town to re-analyze its Comprehensive planning goals and to create a unique Planned Development District that implements those goals.

**Comment ZLU-7:**

I respect that Mr. Serota owns this property. I respect that – it is my understanding that he, right now, has the ability to build to suit for industrial use. I respect also his right to apply for this zone change in order to build the proposed development. Quite frankly, I’m not really sure which is more of a detriment or which is better for our community. But we can only hope that as the Board again considers this zone change, you will have done your best to ensure that the quality of life at the parkland, Islip Town residents, is respected as well, or respected at least as well as the rights of Mr. Serota. (H23-5)

And without the zone change, Serota Properties could start to build the property tomorrow because as you’ve heard, it is as-of-right. They don’t want to build around anybody’s neighborhood two million square feet of industrial. (H27-4)

The bottom line here is Mr. Serota has a right to develop his property. But he could have developed it years ago as an industrial thing. But no, he wants to have his own mall. We don’t need another mall. We really don’t. (H36-1)

It is our opinion that changing the current zoning for the property would be a mistake. The amount of industrial property available in Islip Town is diminishing and the property might someday be necessary for industrial development (offices, small manufacturing, etc.). The original zoning was done for this reason. (C5-1)

Construction jobs and other temporary jobs can still be realized if the property is developed in a manner that is not injurious to the surrounding neighborhoods (i.e., rezoning to single-family, residential). (C5-5)

As of right now, the parking, the floor area ratio – this is a two-part question. As of right now, the zoning that they’re changing to, what would be the as-of-right with that? And past that is, what will be requested? (H5-1)

The property was zoned many years ago. It has been – you know, things have changed, the economy has changed, the world has changed. There was a new look at it in 2009 with the county and the other town.



What has changed from that? Because basically, my understanding of what you said is, the zoning is the proper zoning at this time? I just want to clarify that. (H5-2)

**Response ZLU-7:**

As indicated in Response ZLU-6, *2009 Sunrise Highway Corridor Study – Islip Town and Brookhaven Town – Suffolk County, New York*, entitled “Site Specific Recommendations Suggested by the Town Planning Departments” specifically states: “An application to rezone this site [Serota site] to permit retail and residential use, in addition to industrial zoning, has been made to the Town of Islip.” No specific recommendation for this parcel exists in this section of the study. Further, although the industrial zoning classification would not be retained on the property, as a mixed-use zoning district is proposed, the largest component of the proposed development would still be industrial development.

Although the aforesaid Corridor Study did not include specific recommendations for this parcel, comprehensive planning is a recursive process and needs constant updates in order to address current trends and public needs.

The commenters are correct in indicating that the applicant has the ability to develop industrial uses on the subject property based upon the prevailing zoning. As indicated in Section 2.3 of the DEIS, the applicant has attempted, over the last two-plus decades, to develop the site with industrial uses in accordance with prevailing zoning. In spite of such efforts, the viability of maximizing the full development yield of the property with industrial uses is questionable. Therefore, as is also correctly noted in the comments, the applicant has the ability to apply for a change of zone to permit the proposed mixed-use development on the property. As the Town of Islip has agreed to consider the change of zone application, it is conducting an environmental review process and weighing the social and economic considerations and the environmental considerations in order to make an informed decision on the change of zone application.

As part of the DEIS, the applicant has compared the impacts of the Islip Pines mixed-use development with as-of-right industrial development (see Section 7.0 and Table 76 of the DEIS), in order to permit the Town Board to compare the as-of-right zoning to the proposed change of zone request. It should be noted that the FAR permitted under prevailing zoning is 0.35, while the proposed FAR (without the parking garages) is 0.36. Therefore, the proposed density of the habitable space within Islip Pines is only marginally higher as what is permitted by right.

The Town recognizes that the applicant is pursuing the proposed change of zone, which would allow the development of mixed uses on-site. The proposed mixed-use development would include 818,130 SF of industrial/research & development space, as well as 302,820 SF of flex office space in mixed use buildings. Furthermore, as noted in Section 2.3 of the DEIS, zoning and planning principles have changed and modernized in the decades since the applicant purchased the property, and the applicant respectfully asserts that the development of this property should be viewed as a way to create Islip’s next



great community. Therefore, the objectives of the applicant are to develop the property as a mixed-use community that can function cohesively, while providing a pedestrian-friendly and economically beneficial environment for the Town of Islip.

Construction and other temporary jobs would be realized with any type of development of the property. Based upon the size and proposed mix of uses, the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual master Plan is expected to generate approximately 1,609 full-time construction jobs (or approximately 707 more construction jobs than under the previously-proposed DEIS Plan). This is indicated in Comment No. SO-3, Section 3.1.9 of this FEIS.

**Comment ZLU-8:**

Islip Pines appears to be overambitious given the scope of what they propose. What I am against is something that is trying to create a make-believe town so to speak, where it doesn't really fit. (H37-1)

It is our opinion that creation of a high-density, mixed use project will be harmful to the current bedroom communities in the immediate area. The proposal as written creates an "urban" look to the development. High-rise, high-density, mixed-use buildings are something that many Long Islanders fled when they moved from the "city" to the "suburbs". We believe any consideration to change zoning for housing should reflect the single-family, bedroom communities of the immediate surrounding area. (C5-2)

In addition, the developer several times mentions the term "urban streetscape". The residents of this area have chosen to live in the suburban setting not in an "urban streetscape". If we wanted to live with developments such as this, there are areas designed this way, parts of Nassau County and New York City would fit this definition. (C9-10)

I saw the proposal for the 140 acre development project in Holbrook located at Sunrise Highway and Vets Highway. This is the last thing the people of Islip need. My family moved to Islip in the mid 1980's because we thought Queens was becoming too crowded and too developed. I have noticed over the years that Islip is starting to become too urbanized. Islip and Suffolk are becoming "Queens East". I am totally against this development. (C11-1)

As Islip town residents we are writing this letter in regards to the Islip Pines/Serota Development. We are completely against this project as it will ruin our neighborhood and what we have called home for 33 years. Holbrook has always been a quiet town with no retail, fast food, or movies and that is why we live here. (C15-1)

Please reconsider this plan. The development of this area will distract from the aviance [sic] of suburban America. Keep the area zoned commercially and develop it as such. (C32-4)



**Response ZLU-8:**

The application requests a change of zone from industrial zoning to a planned development district in order to permit the development of a mixed use community within the Town of Islip. As analyzed in Section 7.2 of the DEIS, prevailing zoning would permit the development of just over two million square feet of industrial development on the subject property, and this development proposes 2,136,742 square feet (not including parking garages).

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan incorporates a much greater amount of open space, increased setbacks, and lowered the height of the proposed hotel than the plan evaluated in the DEIS. Thus, the proposal calls for a design that is more in keeping with a suburban landscape. The applicant is proposing a density that is marginally higher than what is permitted on the site by the prevailing industrial zoning (the FAR is only marginally higher -- 0.36 for the Revised Conceptual Master Plan wherein 0.35 is permitted by the prevailing industrial zoning, and the proposed maximum height is 60 feet, which is the same as the prevailing zoning).

The proposed layout of the site has been modified so as to better relate the proposed on-site uses to the existing off-site uses. As noted in Section 2.0, the industrial/R&D/office buildings have been relocated from the northern portion of the site, adjacent to existing residences, to the eastern portion of the site adjacent to Beacon Drive and the non-residential uses on its eastern side. These buildings wrap around to the Sunrise Highway North Service Road. Also, the larger retail establishments have been relocated to the frontage along the North Service Road, as it turns north to Veteran Memorial Highway. Athletic fields are now situated at the northern portion of the property, adjacent to the existing off-site residences, the on-site residences are located between the athletic fields and the smaller retail stores. Finally, the hotel has been lowered in height and relocated amongst the industrial/R&D/office buildings and oriented toward the central civic space ("great lawn"), which is a new element of the design.

The Holbrook community is located within the Towns of Islip and Brookhaven. While Holbrook (Islip portion) contained approximately 8,200 residential units, according to the 2010 Census, it contains far more than just residences. According to the Suffolk County Planning Department, as of November 2011, Holbrook (Islip portion) contained approximately 733,000 SF of retail (including fast-food establishments) within 12 shopping centers, as well as additional retail space in free-standing stores. Many of these centers were first opened in the 1970s. This retail space includes the adjacent Costco and the Sun-Vet Mall, which opened in 1974. Most of the retail space is located along major roadways within Holbrook, including Sunrise Highway and Veterans Memorial Highway (at which the property is located), Broadway, Furrows Road and East and West Main Street. Furthermore, Holbrook contained over 80,000 SF of office space as of November 2011. There is no movie theater located within the hamlet of Holbrook.

Therefore, while the subject property is, and has been, undeveloped for many years, Holbrook contains a vast array of both commercial and residential uses, similar to the mix of uses that are proposed to be developed within Islip Pines.



**Comment ZLU-9:**

Project phasing. The Planning Department believes that the mixed-use character of the proposed plan is of vital importance. In order to ensure that this character is maintained throughout the build-out of the site, appropriate phasing of this project is necessary. The ultimate site development proposed includes a ratio of residential to retail square feet at approximately 1:1, and industrial to retail square feet should be at 2:1. Possible phasing to maintain this ratio would be that construction of 200,000 sf. of residential (or approximately 175 units) and 400,000 sf. of industrial space be required before building permits are granted for more than 200,000 sf. of retail space. The proposed public amenities such as the park areas and youth and senior centers should be constructed during the initial phases. (C36-1)

As discussed recently, we would like to allow the developer as much flexibility as possible. Clearly, a project of this magnitude must rely on market forces and economic feasibility. However, part of the Planning rationale for allowing the proposed level of retail square footage in the project was the fact that increased demand from *on-site* sources such as residential units or office workers would allow the overall site to be more sustainable (in furtherance of Smart Growth principles). Thus, the FEIS should contain further clarification of the amount and/or timing of parallel, non-retail development. Lastly, the central mall area or recreation areas should be done during the initial construction periods. Please provide additional details on the timing of that. (C37-9)

**Response ZLU-9:**

The applicant has considered the request for phasing, and while the development will be phased, the phasing must be dictated by market demand in order to ensure the feasibility of the development.

**Comment ZLU-10:**

As part of a past project, Sunrise Highway Extension Project, Brentwood Rd to Phyllis Dr, in accordance with the current Federal noise regulation (23CFR 772) and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) policy, a noise study was completed. At that time, the noise study showed elevated noise levels near the area noted for the proposed Islip Pines new mixed-use development. We recommend a noise study be performed to determine the existing and future noise levels in the exterior areas of frequent human activity within the proposed development nearest to major roadways. The procedures specified in the NYSDOT manual Field Measurement of Existing Noise Levels can be used as a guide to how this can be accomplished and to determine the future noise levels, the Federal Highway Administration TNM 2.5 can be used inclusive of the additional traffic that will be generated by the proposed development. The results' format should be in both noise contours and numerical in tabular form. The receptor points should be showing on the plan. If the noise level approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria based on the type of exterior use activity, this information should be used to make adjustments to the site plan. If any mitigation measures are incorporated into the development site design such as acoustical design, vegetated buffers, etc. these measures should be discussed as part of the



DEIS to ensure that noise-compatible land-use and potential mitigation measures have been considered (C27-2).

The Zoning and Land Use sections of the document should discuss how the proposed zoning change from industrial to mixed-use fits within the framework of noise-compatible land-use planning as the proposed development relates to road noise. As previously noted, the noise study that was done a number of years ago by the NYSDOT indicated elevated noise levels that were considered acceptable based on the less noise sensitive commercial land use designation at that time (C27-3).

**Response ZLU-10:**

As indicated by the commenter, “elevated noise levels near the area noted for the proposed Islip Pines” development were detected as part of a past study by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) conducted in 1977. As there was no development on the subject property at the time the NYSDOT’s noise study was conducted, the subject site was not contributing to this noise condition. 6 NYCRR Part 617 requires that impacts of a proposed project (in this case, Islip Pines) be mitigated to the maximum extent practicable. However, 6 NYCRR Part 617 does not require that an applicant mitigate a pre-existing condition caused by factors that are beyond its control (i.e., roadway noise that exists before the subject property is developed).

With respect to noise impacts associated with the proposed Islip Pines development, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan has been designed to specifically minimize impacts (including noise) on proximate sensitive receptors. Specifically, the industrial buildings shown in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan as being located along the northern portion of the site (adjacent to existing residences) have been relocated to the eastern and southeastern portion of the site, along Beacon Drive and the Sunrise Highway North Service Road, respectively (see Figure 1 and Appendix C). This will reduce potential noise impacts to the residents to the north. As noted in Section 2.0, replacing the industrial buildings on the north side of the site is a large buffer of 160 feet (80 feet of the LIPA right-of-way and 80 feet of existing vegetation), followed by playing fields to the south at least 100 feet in depth. A six-foot high chain-link screen fence with vinyl slats is proposed to be installed just north of the playing fields, a minimum of 160 feet from the residential property line to the north. The existing trees, which will remain intact north of the proposed vinyl fence, will form a natural buffer between the proposed development and the residences to the north. The areas to the north of the fence would remain in their existing condition. The closest proposed internal roadway to the north has been relocated to approximately 425 feet from the northern border of the site, thereby minimizing potential noise impacts from internal roads to sensitive receptors.

Moreover, the design of this development will serve to help attenuate existing roadway noise to the residences to the north as well as to the proposed residences in Islip Pines. The existing residences to the north are located 2,400 feet from the Sunrise Highway North Service Road. The intervening proposed buildings, the fence and the increased vegetated buffer to the north will all assist in minimizing the noise



from Sunrise Highway and the Service Road. The NYSDOT has indicated that “vegetation can reduce highway traffic noise,” and the proposed retention of the vegetated buffer along the northern portion of the site will serve this function.

According to FHWA *Highway Traffic Noise: Analysis and Abatement Guidance*, “a 200-foot width of dense vegetation can reduce noise by 10 decibels.” Furthermore, according to the *NYSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual, Chapter 3.1* (Environmental Analysis Bureau, August 1998), the NYSDOT recognizes that rows of buildings, as well as extensive vegetation reduce traffic noise levels at receivers. This is referred to as shielding. Therefore, the combination of vegetation and rows of buildings proposed at Islip Pines will have the effect of reducing traffic noise from the existing roadway. Additionally, with respect to the proposed on-site residences, the intervening non-residential buildings, as well as the distance between the proposed residences and Sunrise Highway North Service Road (1,600± feet) will help to attenuate noise from that roadway.

Based on the foregoing, the development of Islip Pines would not result in significant adverse noise impacts, and the design of the site has been configured to mitigate potential noise impacts.

**Comment ZLU-11:**

The draft PDD ordinance should be revised to reflect new site plan. Additional revisions to this ordinance should also be reviewed to more accurately reflect the intended uses on the subject parcel than the draft ordinance currently proposed. Many of the permitted uses and special permitted uses in the proposed ordinance are not appropriate for the subject parcel including activities such as vehicle repair, spray booths, outside storage, etc. (C36-2)

**Response ZLU-11:**

The Islip Mixed-Use Planned Development District (IMUPDD) has been modified to reflect the proposed Revised Conceptual Master Plan, which is more mixed-use (overall and in individual buildings) in nature than the previously-proposed DEIS Plan (see Section 2.0 of this FEIS for a more detailed discussion of the revisions).

The current proposal does not contemplate the development of vehicle repair, spray booths, outside storage, etc. However, these uses are permitted on this site under the prevailing Industrial 1 and Industrial Corridor zoning, and are considered industrial uses by the Town. To accommodate the Town’s request that some industrial space be developed on this site, and given that no industrial uses have been able to be secured for over two decades, it is important to maintain maximum flexibility for industrial development.



**Comment ZLU-12:**

I also hear about, in a very strange soft kind of way about a transfer station possibly on the facility. (H40-6)

**Response ZLU-12:**

A transfer station is not now proposed, nor was it previously proposed to be developed on the subject property.

**Comment ZLU-13:**

I'm a little concerned because on page 212 it states, "Holbrook is a community without much specific identity." While that being said, if I had my druthers in relation to the scope of this project, I'd continue to prefer it be that way. (H15-2)

I've been in Holbrook for 30-something years. It used to be the hamlet of Holbrook. I like the way it got disrespected in the report. That was kind of cool. We don't have any identity. That's ridiculous. (H36-2)

The proposed development conflicts with the Town of Islip planning policies and Suffolk County "Smart Growth" principals. Such studies call for reinforcing and redeveloping under-utilized properties of six existing commercial nodes along Sunrise Highway (Locust Avenue, Johnson Avenue, Broadway Avenue, Waverly Avenue, Route 112 and Station Road) and four downtown areas (Holbrook, Sayville, Bayport and Patchogue) in the Town of Islip, retaining existing industrial zoning, creating walkable communities, encouraging mixed land uses and mixed use buildings, creating a range of housing opportunities, preserving open space, and discouraging sprawl development along the town's arterial roadways. (C26-1)

**Response ZLU-13:**

As stated on page 83 of the DEIS, the Town of Islip has adopted numerous comprehensive plan volumes to guide development within the Town. Three comprehensive plan volumes in particular contain guidelines that relate to the proposed action. These documents are: *Town of Islip, Comprehensive Plan Volume 1: The Goals*; *Town of Islip, Comprehensive Plan Volume 7H: Community Identity, Holbrook and Bohemia*; and *Town of Islip, Comprehensive Plan Volume 7E: Community Identity, Oakdale, West Sayville, Sayville, Bayport*. In September 1989, the Town of Islip adopted the *Town of Islip, Comprehensive Plan Progress Report Volume 1: Achievements and Challenges*. Three additional Town plans/studies and four additional County plans/studies have been prepared by the Town and County, which pertain to the development property. Some of these plans date as far back as the 1970s. The proposed project's consistency with each of the 11 identified plans/studies is discussed in Section 4.4.2 of the DEIS.



The Revised Conceptual Master Plan offers considerable benefits to the Town of Islip, as recommended within many of the aforementioned comprehensive plans. Islip Pines offers an opportunity to improve the area, generate significant increased property and sales tax revenue, create jobs, provide affordable housing, offer an attractive mixed use destination with a strong sense of place and provide athletic and civic facilities that are publicly accessible.

Specifically, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan:

- retains the existing industrial zoning on the site, and modernizes its applicability into 818,130 square feet of mixed-use industrial/research & development/office space
- creates a walkable community where residences will be proximate (within easy walking distance) to retail, entertainment and sources of employment
- provides a mix of land uses and mixed use buildings,
- creates a significant housing opportunity by making available 250 units of workforce housing
- creates publicly accessible active and passive open spaces
- discourages sprawl along the town's arterial roadways by creating a compact, mixed-use community

The statement regarding "Holbrook is a community without much specific identity" is not a conclusion presented by the applicant, nor is it something that was developed in the DEIS. As stated on page 212 of the DEIS, this was a conclusion in *Volume 7H* of the Town's Comprehensive Plan. In addition, Section 3.1 of that volume of the Comprehensive Plan, entitled Community Form and Identity Crisis, states on page 23 that "*Partly as a result of the road network and partly a result of past development decisions, certain neighborhoods or developments are so physically isolated from the rest of the community that their identity with the community is greatly weakened.*" That section then identifies that the problem is most notable in the Triangle, Waverly Avenue, and Old and New Holbrook. While the project site is generally undeveloped (with LIPA-owned rights-of-way), it is completely surrounded by a mix of commercial development along Veterans Memorial Highway, Broadway Avenue, Sunrise Highway, Beacon Drive and the residences to the north. The proposed development would blend with and help strengthen the identity of the Holbrook area. This "sense of place" would give the area a stronger presence and would help define the character of the area.



---

### 3.1.5 Transportation and Parking – TP

#### **Comment TP-1:**

Have you done a traffic study as part of this? It's a bad merge getting into Costco if I'm not mistaken. So have we done a really thorough job of traffic? (H3-1)

#### **Response TP-1:**

A revised Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design to reflect the changes that are incorporated into the Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Appendix H for the revised Traffic Impact Study). This revised Traffic Impact Study has been used as the basis for the responses to the comments contained in this section of the FEIS. Additionally, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan has been redesigned to provide modified access from the North Service Road to the development project. As such, it is anticipated that all trips accessing the site from the North Service Road would utilize the proposed driveway rather than Beacon Drive given the modified internal layout and the accessibility provided by the proposed driveway and associated circulation aisle. Further, it is expected that a portion of the existing turning movements at the North Service Road/Beacon Drive intersection would be rerouted through the subject property as a motorist would have additional maneuvering distance on the North Service Road and would be able to conveniently access Beacon Drive once on the subject property.

As previously indicated, all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County and/or New York State roads would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.

#### **Comment TP-2:**

I guess you guys took this picture during a holiday because Costco is just packed there. And again, as I said, I go there all the time for my business and family. What is your projection for your transportation? How many people are going to be going with their cars into the Pines daily? What's your model? (H3-2)

#### **Response TP-2:**

The Traffic Impact Study focuses on the weekday morning, weekday evening, and Saturday midday peak hours in accordance with accepted industry standards. These times periods were chosen as they are the periods when traffic volumes along the adjacent roadway network are at a maximum and could be potentially impacted by the development of the site. Specifically, manual turning movement counts were done on Saturday April 10, 2010 and Tuesday April 13, 2010 and automatic traffic recorders were



installed to supplement this, and recorded data from Saturday April 10, 2010 to Monday April 19, 2010. Based on the trip generation projections, it is anticipated that the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would add approximately 1,600 new trips to the adjacent roadway networking during the weekday morning peak hour, approximately 2,500 new trips during the weekday evening peak hour, and approximately 2,400 new trips during the Saturday midday peak hour.

**Comment TP-3:**

So these boulevards are going to be two lane highways? (H3-3)

**Response TP-3:**

The internal roadway network has been revised from the previously-proposed DEIS Plan to the Revised Conceptual Master Plan presented in this FEIS. The boulevards that previously traversed the site directly from Church Street to Beacon Drive have been modified. The Revised Conceptual Master Plan indicates that the primary internal roadways would operate as two concentric circles that surround a central civic/recreation space and provide access to the various uses and associated parking fields throughout the site. Both main access driveways would intersect the outer primary drive-aisle to form a roundabout. These primary internal roadways would generally provide one lane in each direction and be divided by a grass median. At this time, the final geometry of the internal intersections has not been determined and is shown on the plan to conceptually illustrate the internal circulation of the site. During the preparation of final design plans, the anticipated traffic volumes at the major internal intersections would be analyzed to determine the appropriate lane geometry and whether any internal traffic signals would be required.

**Comment TP-4:**

You just discussed some of the potential mitigation recommendations that you might have. And one you mentioned would be the widening of Vets Highway along the southern portion. Have you considered what impact [the project] will have - well, first I should ask, is the applicant willing to widen Vets Highway? And if so, when; what portion or a phase of the build-out? (H2-4)

**Response TP-4:**

The recommended mitigation plan includes widening Veterans Memorial Highway to provide three lanes in each direction between the proposed signalized access and Broadway Avenue. The applicant will coordinate with NYSDOT as to the appropriate timing to construct these improvements, as ultimately reviewed and approved by the NYSDOT.



**Comment TP-5:**

If we're going to go two lanes in some of these boulevards, that again, might have an impact on the size of this project. So we may need to consider a scaling back in size and quantity of space, as well as are we now going to decrease the amount of green. So am I getting more blacktop in other words? (H2-6)

**Response TP-5:**

The internal roadway network depicted on the Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Figure 1 and Appendix H) will be designed with adequate geometry to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes in accordance with industry standards while maintaining a balance between impervious coverage and green space. It should be noted that the overall amount of green space (natural vegetation and landscaping) on the Revised Conceptual Master Plan has increased from the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, with a commensurate decrease in impervious surface. The amount of green space has been increased from 25.8 percent to 39.7 percent of the property in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan.

**Comment TP-6:**

I would assume that the nature of this particular project will require the wider road because this is not a typical residential district. This is not a typical, you know, boulevard or street. It's not only going to have residential vehicles, but trucks, and tractor trailers, and delivery vehicles. So we're going to have to maintain an atypically wide roadway. (H2-7)

**Response TP-6:**

The anticipated types of vehicles on the internal site roadways would be similar to other mixed-use areas (that contain residences, among other non-residential uses) and would be mostly comprised of single occupancy vehicles and lower percentages of delivery and service vehicles. The roadways would not be atypically wide. As such, the internal roadway geometry would be designed accordingly.

**Comment TP-7:**

Has there been any sort of a mitigation fund talked about? If so, how much would be in it, just in case – if this application was to go through, and the road situation was a mess, that there would be money set aside to mitigate the problems. (H1-4)

**Response TP-7:**

The applicant will continue to coordinate with the NYSDOT, the SCDPW, and the Town of Islip on the appropriate off-site mitigation or proportionate contributions to future improvements.



**Comment TP-8:**

The Planning staff is making the recommendation of the potential relocation of Beacon Drive. (H4-4)

Traffic - Appendix G - Validate that the relocation and/or removal of a portion of Beacon Drive is recommended for further study. Weave analysis to be scrutinized. (C25-3)

Under the existing conditions, namely the close-proximity of Beacon Drive to the end of the CR 97 southbound to westbound ramp, a difficult merge condition exists. The DEIS shows an increase in through and turning vehicles at this intersection with no significant mitigation. Our Department recommends that this project eliminate the Beacon Drive intersection and better incorporate access to and from the Beacon Drive complex via the proposed new entrance/exit approximately 500 ft. west of Beacon Drive. (C29-2)

We recently met with both State and County officials in an attempt to ascertain what each would require as part of a future site plan process. Closure of Beacon Drive at Sunrise Highway. (C37-3)

**Response TP-8:**

The Conceptual Master Plan has been redesigned to provide modified access from the North Service Road to the development project. As such, it is anticipated that all trips accessing the site from the North Service Road would utilize the proposed driveway rather than Beacon Drive given the modified internal layout and the accessibility provided by the proposed driveway and associated circulation aisles. Further, it is expected that a portion of the existing turning movements at the North Service Road/Beacon Drive intersection would be rerouted through the subject property as a motorist would have additional maneuvering distance on the North Service Road and would be able to conveniently access Beacon Drive once on the subject property. The intersection of Beacon Drive with the North Service Road is a public intersection that serves numerous retail and commercial buildings. As previously indicated, all roadway improvements/modifications proposed by the applicant are subject to the review and approval of the appropriate regulatory authorities (NYSDOT, SCDPW and/or Town of Islip).

**Comment TP-9:**

We [the Planning staff] would like to work together with the applicant to see if there any other appropriate mitigations for any of the key intersections that would be impacted by the application. (H4-5)

**Response TP-9:**

The applicant is willing to review alternative mitigation strategies to evaluate their effectiveness and appropriateness for this development.



**Comment TP-10:**

They expect about 2,600 jobs, permanent jobs on the site once it's developed. And there's about I think 500 residents, so about 3,000 people. But they say that only 1,400 cars are going to be coming into the development in the mornings. You know, don't those people go to work, or leave? Or aren't customers coming into the spot if it's retail? (H6-4)

**Response TP-10:**

Based on the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Figure 1 and Appendix C), approximately 1,200 vehicles would be expected to enter the site during the morning peak hour. Please note that this is the anticipated entering trips for the 7:30 am to 8:30 am peak hour. Additional vehicles would enter the site before and after this period during a weekday morning; however, the greatest impact to capacity would be during the peak hour studied.

**Comment TP-11:**

All the traffic is going to be coming out onto Church Street because they put that little I'm going to call it a bump in the road by Vets Highway and Church Street. Before they put that in when Sunrise Highway backed up, they used Church Street. So Church Street became like Sunrise Highway. After they put so-called berm in there, it's alleviated it. But having traffic come back out with that traffic come back out with that traffic light, and if they're going to come down Church Street, no one is going to be able to get out of their driveways. (H8-1)

**Response TP-11:**

The Conceptual Master Plan has been redesigned to provide modified access from the North Service Road to the development project. As such, it is anticipated that all trips exiting the site to travel westbound along Sunrise Highway would utilize the proposed North Service Road driveway rather than Church Street given the modified internal layout and the accessibility provided. As such, the only site traffic anticipated to utilize Church Street would be associated with local residents. As documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study, sufficient capacity is available to accommodate the site-generated traffic with implementation of the recommended improvements (see Appendix H). As previously indicated, all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County and/or New York State roads would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.



**Comment TP-12:**

Like everyone else, I'm concerned for the traffic impact on the road I travel daily. I don't need a week, or a month, or a year study to know that there's complete chaos there already, and it's only to get worse no matter what's built there. (H23-1)

**Response TP-12:**

As documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design (see Appendix H), the adjacent roadway network would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated site-generated traffic with the implementation of the recommended improvements.

**Comment TP-13:**

The light at Church Street. Now, if any of you have traveled that area between 3:00 and 7:00, do you know what kind of backup of traffic that light is going to cause? They're going to be backed up into Bohemia. (H25-3)

**Response TP-13:**

As documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design (see Appendix H), it is recommended to widen Veterans Memorial Highway in both directions to provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the site-generated traffic and the proposed signalized access. This widening will also facilitate the visibility of the new traffic signals by Sunrise Highway traffic merging onto to Veterans Memorial Highway. The resulting queues would not adversely impact the adjacent roadway network in accordance with NYSDOT requirements.

**Comment TP-14:**

I thought about it with the apartments. There may be school buses involved. I know there are only one or two bedrooms. Is a school bus going to be able to get out of there safely? So that's another concern. (H25-4)

**Response TP-14:**

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan includes 350 residences, which are expected to generate approximately 57 school-aged children. The geometry of the site driveways and internal roadway network will be designed to accommodate the anticipated vehicles, including school buses.



**Comment TP-15:**

In their proposal there is nothing stated that there will be no access from Parkland development into Islip Pines, either by motor vehicle or by foot traffic. They're telling us yes, there will be no more access to it, but we see nothing in writing. It's just word of mouth. I have a problem with that. (H25-7)

**Response TP-15:**

As depicted on the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, no access between Islip Pines and the residential development to the north is proposed. In addition, the revised Traffic Impact Study indicates that access to the subject property would only be provided via Veterans Memorial Highway, the North Service Road, and Beacon Drive/Colin Drive. Any existing approved subdivision map which shows paper-streets connecting to Parkland would be abandoned and replaced with a new filed map which would implement the proposed road network in the revised Conceptual Master Plan.

**Comment TP-16:**

The traffic light, reopening Church Street. Back in the mid-'90's the Town – the Town of Islip fought with the state to get that intersection closed. Yes, it was an uncontrolled intersection at that time. They fought to close it due to the many motor vehicle and deaths that happened in the '90s at that intersection. Are you considering reopening that? Again, even with the traffic light, it's still a dangerous situation. (H25-11)

During the 1990's, the Town of Islip asked for the help of other organizations and associations to help convince the State in closing the Church St. and Veterans Memorial Highway intersection due to the many fatal motor vehicle accidents that occurred there. This proposal is asking to reopen that intersection, it appears that would just be repeating history and creating hazard that was rectified. (C7-8)

**Response TP-16:**

The previous intersection of Veterans Memorial Highway with Church Street was unsignalized. The Revised Conceptual Master Plan proposes a signalized access along Veterans Memorial Highway (Route 454) across from Church Street. The intersection and traffic signal would be designed in accordance with NYSDOT design standards to provide safe and effective operations. An intersection under unsignalized control operates in a significantly different manner than a signalized intersection. As previously indicated, all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County and/or New York State roads would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.



**Comment TP-17:**

Everybody's talked about going from west to east, but if you're going east to west, there's no easy way to cross over to get to this property. You either have to go through Broadway and back on Church Street. (H29-2)

**Response TP-17:**

Vehicles accessing the site traveling from east to west (westbound) along Sunrise Highway would access the site via the North Service Road driveway.

**Comment TP-18:**

One of the biggest problems we have is that of traffic at County Road 97 and Nicoll's Road, which is also at Colin Drive. Our community entrance and exit is located at that location. And it's impossible to cross most of the time to cross it. The traffic is impossible for pedestrians to navigate there. And the development draft describes that area as a possible entrance into Islip Pines. (H31-1)

And right now it [Colin Drive] is already overpacked. You cannot get out and it's dangerous. You're going to increase the amount of cars and thus sacrificing the safety of the residents that abut that road. (H33-1)

The traffic at that main entrance onto Colin Drive is definitely a safety concern. And with increasing the volume, which is inevitable with anything that is built there, that is something that we hope that you guys do take, you know, care in addressing because it is almost impossible at peak times to make a safe turn; to make, you know, either a left or right onto Nicolls Road. (H35-1)

For pedestrian safety, sidewalks and guard rails on Colin Drive and Beacon Drive must be constructed. (C20-2)

The only entrance and exit from Autumn Ridge is on Colin Drive. Colin Drive is already a hazard with the traffic impact that we have experienced from COSTCO. The congestion from the intersection of Nichols Road and Colin Drive is typically backed up past our entrance making exiting the development a challenge especially at peak times. Something needs to be done to address this, especially with the increase in traffic anticipated with the proposed project. (C23-1)

We have a playground and pool area that is separated from Colin Drive only by a 6 foot stockade fence. With the proposed increase in traffic we would request that you consider sidewalks and guard rails on Colin Drive. There are already a significant number of accidents at Nichols Road and Colin Drive. Please protect our children who play on that playground and our residents that walk, run and ride bikes on



Colin Drive. We do not want to be held captive within the development because of the traffic. We do not want to be afraid to let our children play at our existing facilities. (C23-3)

Sidewalks at Colin and Beacon Drives, there are no pedestrian sidewalks, and there are no guardrails. We would require that. We need a noise abatement wall, especially for the increased noise and traffic around Autumn Ridge's perimeter, including on Nicoll's Road, which I realize is a County road, and also on Colin Drive. (H31-2)

**Response TP-18:**

It is anticipated that between approximately 12 percent and 14 percent of the site-generated trips would access the site via Colin Drive. These trips would account for less than seven percent of the total Nicolls Road/Colin Drive intersection volume. Furthermore, the applicant will continue to coordinate with the SCDPW on determining the appropriate mitigation measures at the Nicolls Road/Colin Drive signalized intersection to ensure that it would operate safely and efficiently with the construction of the proposed development project.

Under existing conditions, sidewalks are located along the easterly side of Beacon Drive and in the southerly portion of Colin Drive. The proposed Islip Pines development incorporates extensive pedestrian sidewalks and crosswalks in accordance with the Complete Streets principles, which involves designing roadways to accommodate all anticipated users, inclusive of bicyclists, pedestrians of all ages and abilities, and public transportation vehicles and riders. As such, the proposed development is well-suited to receive pedestrian traffic from the adjacent streets should additional pedestrian improvements be constructed on the adjacent streets in the future.

Moreover, the proposed internal roadway network would provide additional access options to the adjacent roadway network for residents and commercial properties along Colin Drive and Beacon Drive.

**Comment TP-19:**

Today I was coming from Beacon Drive and I wanted to go into Costco. The way you have to do that is, you have to travel west – sorry, east on Sunrise Highway, get off on the service road, and then take the cloverleaf around. You have to go all the way around, and then exit Nicoll's Road on the Sunrise Highway service road going west. Now, I wanted to go into Costco. Now, unless you've actually experienced it – I don't know how many of you have actually done it – there is maybe two seconds where you have to go from the service road on the right-hand side to get into the road that enters into Costco. I'm a good driver. But I want to tell you, I felt I was taking my life in my hands. And now you're talking about adding all kinds of trucks that are going to go into this new development. How much more difficult is that going to be for your average person to try and get into Costco? (H34-1)



**Response TP-19:**

The Conceptual Master Plan has been redesigned to provide modified access from the North Service Road to the development project. As such, it is anticipated that all trips accessing the site from the North Service Road would utilize the proposed driveway rather than Beacon Drive given the modified internal layout and the accessibility provided by the proposed driveway and associated circulation aisle. Further, it is expected that a portion of the existing turning movements at the North Service Road/Beacon Drive intersection would be rerouted through the subject property as a motorist would have additional maneuvering distance on the North Service Road and would be able to conveniently access Beacon Drive once on the subject property. The improvements proposed by the applicant are subject to the review and approval of the SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.

**Comment TP-20:**

Now, while this picture looks very nice, in real travel time when you're on the service road going onto Vets Highway, that's all of maybe one minute before you get to the Broadway traffic light. And now you're going to put another traffic light in there. (H34-2)

**Response TP-20:**

The proposed traffic signal along Veterans Memorial Highway would likely be coordinated with the existing signal at Broadway Avenue to provide effective progression through the two signals. The westbound approach would operate at Level of Service E or better and the majority of green time would be given to the east-west approaches.

**Comment TP-21:**

I'm opposed to this project because it will increase traffic congestion, possibly increasing traffic fatalities. (H38-2)

I am against this project because it will add too much traffic to the area. It is already difficult getting out of the Autumn Ridge Development on the weekend due to Costco traffic. (C6-1)

The traffic in that area is already exceptionally congested. To further impact that section of road would leave a greater margin for motor vehicle accidents. (C10-1)

**Response TP-21:**

As documented within the comprehensive revised Traffic Impact Study (see Appendix H), the adjacent roadway network would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated site-generated traffic



with the implementation of the recommended improvements. In addition, the proposed site access points would be designed in accordance with NYSDOT and SCDPW design standards to provide safe and efficient access to the adjacent roadway network. Further, the applicant will coordinate with the SCDPW on the construction of mitigation improvements or proportionate contributions to improvements at the Nicolls Road/Colin Drive signalized intersection to mitigate the impacts to Colin Drive. As explained throughout the traffic responses, all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County and/or New York State roads would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.

Lastly, the proposed internal roadway network would provide additional access options to Veterans Memorial Highway and Sunrise Highway for residents of the Autumn Ridge development.

**Comment TP-22:**

I am opposed to this project because there will be trucks riding through my neighborhood [Greenbelt Parkway West] that will make it unsafe for my grandchildren and for my 92-year-old grandmother to cross the street. (H38-3)

But most of all, it's the safety of all these trucks coming through a residential neighborhood and how this will impact that. It's very scary. (H39-2)

**Response TP-22:**

No access between Greenbelt Parkway West and the subject property is proposed.

In addition, no access between Islip Pines and the residential development to the north is proposed. All trucks would be expected to access the site via Sunrise Highway or Veterans Memorial Highway.

**Comment TP-23:**

We talked about the ease of getting in and the ease of getting out. And one of the things I heard was that we have about 3,000 cars going through the complex on a daily basis, and I heard that we were going to have about 3,030 on Saturday. That's to cover all of those extra stores, and the movies, and that other stuff. So we gain an extra 30 cars on the weekend. I think there was a lot more. (H40-5)

**Response TP-23:**

As documented within the Traffic Impact Study (see Appendix H), trip generation projections for the proposed development were prepared based on industry standard trip generation rates. Based on the analysis, the proposed development is expected to generate approximately 1,625 total trips during the weekday morning peak hour, 3,121 total trips during the weekday evening peak hour, and 3,171 total



trips during the Saturday midday peak hour. Please note that although the retail portion of the development is expected to generate approximately 720 more trips during the Saturday midday peak hour than during the weekday evening peak hour, the industrial and office portions of the project are expected to generate approximately 670 less trips during the Saturday midday peak hour than during a typical weekday evening peak hour. As such, the weekday evening peak hour and Saturday midday peak hour exhibit similar total trip generation projections.

**Comment TP-24:**

I am against this project because this will cause an abundance of traffic which will make it impossible for residents to leave and enter their homes and also the area. This will be very stressful and cause many accidents. (C2-1)

**Response TP-24:**

As documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study (see Appendix H), the adjacent roadway network would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated site-generated traffic with the implementation of the recommended improvements. The proposed site access points would be designed in accordance with NYSDOT and SCDPW design standards to provide safe and efficient access to the adjacent roadway network, and proposed improvements would be subject to their review and approval (including potential modification).

**Comment TP-25:**

Although the architect claims there will be no access into Islip Pines from the Parkland development, nothing has been placed in writing. We are opposed to any form of entry from the Parkland development into Islip Pines, whether it is by foot or by motor vehicle. (C7-2)

**Response TP-25:**

No vehicular or pedestrian access is proposed from Islip Pines to the Parkland development.

**Comment TP-26:**

Traffic on the north service road to Sunrise Hwy and Veterans' Hwy is already out of control, how much more with the additional traffic. (C8-6)

**Response TP-26:**

The proposed access along the North Service Road has been designed to provide safe and efficient access to the adjacent roadway network and is subject to NYSDOT review and approval. The development is



expected to add approximately 283 vehicles to the North Service Road during the weekday morning peak hour, approximately 393 vehicles during the weekday evening peak hour, and approximately 230 vehicles during the Saturday midday peak hour. Based on the analysis prepared, this amount of traffic would not significantly impact the traffic operations along the North Service Road.

**Comment TP-27:**

A well planned condominium complex and sports field may be the answer with industry on the Beacon Drive side of the property. Steering traffic onto Church Street or Broadway Avenue is not the answer. (C8-11)

**Response TP-27:**

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan incorporates residential buildings and athletic facilities in the northerly portion of the subject property. The industrial/R&D/Office buildings have been relocated to the easterly portion of the property across from Beacon Drive. The access management plan has been designed to accommodate the majority of the site-generated traffic via the proposed Veterans Memorial Highway (Route 454) and North Service Road access points and minimize the impact to the adjacent roadway network. The NYSDOT has ultimate jurisdiction over any modifications to the Church Street intersection.

**Comment TP-28:**

Serota has not brought to the table any new plans or proposals to mitigate the traffic issues with a development of this size. The existing exits off this property at Vets Hwy (one way, west only) and Beacon Drive on to Sunrise Hwy are not even close to good enough. The Beacon Drive intersection is a nightmare now with just Costco and Savers. Since Vets Hwy and Sunrise Hwy are state roads, I have not seen anything regarding their involvement in any potential traffic studies and/or mitigation issues. (C9-2)

**Response TP-28:**

A comprehensive Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design for the development project, and revised to reflect the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Appendix H). As documented within the study, the adjacent roadway network would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated site-generated traffic with the implementation of the recommended improvements. The recommended improvements include widening Veterans Memorial Highway to provide three (3) lanes in each direction between the proposed site driveway and Broadway Avenue and retiming the proximate traffic signals to provide more efficient traffic progression through the roadway network. Additionally, it is expected that a portion of the existing turning movements at the North Service Road/Beacon Drive intersection would be rerouted through the subject property as a motorist



would have additional maneuvering distance on the North Service Road and would be able to conveniently access Beacon Drive once on the subject property. This vehicle rerouting would help mitigate the existing capacity constraints at the North Service Road/Beacon Drive intersection. Lastly, the applicant will be required to comply with NYSDOT and SCDPW conditions of approval relating to capacity improvements along the adjacent roadway network (including any required modifications).

**Comment TP-29:**

More traffic on the Sunrise service road and Vets Hwy is not something we need. The road intersections are poorly designed to begin with and the entrance to this development is going to be near the already horrible Nicholls Rd ramp by Beacon Drive and the entrance to Costco. The south service road is filled with higher speed traffic and mitigation measures to solve similar problems at Gateway Plaza in Patchogue have not been helpful. The proposed development has exits on to Beacon Drive as well. The current traffic exiting from Costco and what use to be Circuit City is dangerous enough now with traffic coming off of Nicolls Rd and people trying to get in to the turn lane from Sunrise Hwy onto Beacon Drive. Worse is people could use existing office park behind Costco as a shortcut to Colin Drive and Nichols Rd. This is the intersection at one entrance to my community. One of the planning documents for LITP 2000 has Suffolk County closing off this intersection partially to prevent crossing over Nichols Rd. If this is done, where does this traffic go? (C9-3)

**Response TP-29:**

Should the through movements across Nicolls Road be restricted, vehicles traveling from Colin Drive to Greenbelt Parkway would be re-routed through the subject property to access the proposed signalized intersection along Veterans Memorial Highway. Vehicles would then travel south to access the interchange of the South Service Road with Nicolls Road. Similarly, vehicles traveling from Greenbelt Parkway to Colin Drive would have the option to utilize the proposed access along the North Service Road instead of Beacon Drive. Lastly, the new roadway network links proposed as part of the Islip Pines development would likely reduce the existing turning movements at the intersection of the North Service Road with Beacon Drive.

**Comment TP-30:**

Figure 3 shows the current Vets Hwy intersections with Church Street and the Sun Vet Mall. The Church Street intersection was closed by NY State within the last few years because of numerous accidents. Adding a traffic light here may not help this situation if this indeed the main egress for the proposed development. There is currently no way to go to westbound Sunrise Hwy from Vet Hwy even unless the Church St intersection is reopened according to conceptual drawings from the developer. The sketches also show a new ramp to the westbound Sunrise Hwy from Vets Hwy. Is this ramp even on the state's drawing board for construction? Without this access, traffic intending to head west on Sunrise will have to head either West on Vets Hwy, then South on Broadway Avenue through 3 traffic lights managed by



NY State and one by the Town of Islip. These lights are currently unsynchronized and cause traffic under existing conditions. The second option is go straight on Church Street if the intersection is reopened and then encounter most of the same traffic lights as mentioned above. In addition, if people either get lost or are trying to bypass traffic, they will go straight on Church St after Broadway Avenue and head through a residential neighborhood not equipped for this traffic. (C9-4)

**Response TP-30:**

Two primary points of egress for the subject property are proposed, one via the proposed traffic signal along Veterans Memorial Highway and a second via a proposed intersection of the North Service Road with the primary north/south internal roadway. It is anticipated that all vehicles exiting the site destined to travel west along Sunrise Highway would exit via the proposed North Service Road access and would not be expected to utilize Church Street. A submission has been made to NYSDOT and the access is currently under review. The applicant will be subject to modification required by NYSDOT.

**Comment TP-31:**

There is also a fire station on Church Street near Broadway Avenue. If traffic is backed up at this intersection, response time to the southern part of Holbrook could be severely impacted thereby endangering the safety of both life and property of the residents of Holbrook and/or neighboring communities if a mutual aid response is ordered. (C9-5)

**Response TP-31:**

As documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study (see Appendix H), the intersection of Church Street with Broadway Avenue is calculated to operate at Level of Service<sup>4</sup> with the recommended mitigation measures. As such, it is not expected that the construction of the proposed development project would significantly impact the response times of emergency vehicles.

**Comment TP-32:**

The amount of traffic that they say will come through and around the Islip Pines will be a hazard to those who live in both the new development and the surrounding neighborhoods. 3000 cars in and out of that development a day will really impede on the safe pedestrian and vehicle traffic especially if the development roads are one lane in each direction and narrower in width. (C12-3)

---

<sup>4</sup>According to the Highway Capacity Manual, Level of Service (LOS) "D" indicates that an intersection has tolerable delay and is approaching unstable flow, in which vehicles occasionally wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding.



**Response TP-32:**

As documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study (see AppendixH), the adjacent roadway network and proposed access points to the subject property would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated site-generated traffic. Additionally, the Islip Pines' road system is a group of parallel loops with interconnecting short streets and on-street parking. This "net system" of roadways not only facilitates efficient traffic flow, but also lends itself to create a walkable community in all directions. Carefully scaled sidewalks and street fronts are designed to make walking a safe and pleasurable experience. These walkable streets extend out into the park spaces with connecting paths that allow pedestrians to "short-cut" through the parks north and south through the site. Dedicated bike lanes will further promote a safe, active and enjoyable alternative to short-trip auto usage and can be connected to a Long Island regional bike trail system in the future.

**Comment TP-33:**

It was stated at the meeting last night that for one week and one weekend traffic was observed in the area of Veteran Highway and Sunrise Highway. When was this conducted: when we had the freak snowstorm on Halloween? Anyone who lives in the area knows what a nightmare it already is to shop on a busy holiday week or weekend. The traffic backs up to the 7-11 on Broadway Ave. coming from North to South and you have to allow an additional 15 minutes just to make your way down the street, or out of the parking lot of Costco. Why do we need to act like two proposed streets are going to magically make everything wonderful? (C14-9)

**Response TP-33:**

The traffic counts were conducted in April 2010 during favorable weather conditions. Additionally, automatic traffic recorders (ATRs) were placed along the adjacent roadway network to collect traffic data for a full seven-day period in April 2010 to identify daily fluctuations in traffic patterns.

The proposed internal roadway network would provide additional access options for the retail and commercial uses along Beacon Drive as well as the residents of Autumn Ridge. This would likely reduce the existing capacity constraints along Beacon Drive. As previously indicated, all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.

**Comment TP-34:**

One major impact is that of traffic safety. County Road 97 (Nicolls Road) at Colin Drive is our only community entrance and exit. Colin Drive leads into Beacon Drive, which the development draft describes as an entrance into Islip Pines.



Nicolls Road at Colin Drive is now a hazardous intersection, as is the roadway of Colin Drive leading to Beacon Drive. Anticipated major increases in traffic would result in even greater hazards to vehicles and pedestrians entering and existing our community. A significant increase in traffic, particularly truck traffic, will result in a significant, undesired increase in both traffic safety, traffic noise and air pollution. (C20-1)

**Response TP-34:**

The applicant will continue to coordinate with the SCDPW on determining the appropriate mitigation measures or proportionate contributions to the Nicolls Road/Colin Drive traffic signal. As documented in the revised Traffic Impact Study, the Nicolls Road/Colin Drive traffic signal would operate at overall improved Levels of Service with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, resulting in a reduction in overall average vehicle delay of approximately 15 to 20 seconds during the weekday morning and evening peak hours and approximately four seconds during the Saturday midday peak hour.

**Comment TP-35:**

A hazardous traffic condition exists at the ramp exiting westbound off Nicolls Road onto Sunrise Highway (NYS Route 27) service road at Beacon Drive. The merge of the Nicolls Road off ramp with westbound Sunrise Highway Service Road, with a sudden right turn onto Beacon Drive is extremely difficult to safely navigate, particularly at peak traffic times.

A similar condition occurs at the traffic merge of the westbound service road of Sunrise Highway at NUS Route 454/Veterans Memorial Highway, at the southwestern perimeter of the proposed Islip Pines development. (C20-4)

**Response TP-35:**

The Conceptual Master Plan has been redesigned to provide modified access from the North Service Road to the development project. As such, it is anticipated that the majority of trips accessing the site from the North Service Road would utilize the proposed driveway rather than Beacon Drive given the modified internal layout and the accessibility provided by the proposed driveway and associated circulation aisle. Further, it is expected that a portion of the existing turning movements at the North Service Road/Beacon Drive intersection would be rerouted through the subject property as a motorist would have additional maneuvering distance on the North Service Road and would be able to conveniently access Beacon Drive once on the subject property. The proposed site access points have been designed to provide safe and efficient access to the adjacent roadway network. As previously indicated, all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County and/or New York State roads would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.



**Comment TP-36:**

The only way to immediately go North on Nichols Road from COSTCO and from the proposed project is to travel via Colin Drive past our entrance. Colin Drive is already a hazard for cars and for pedestrians any increase in traffic will certainly add to the safety issues that already exist. (C23-2)

**Response TP-36:**

The applicant will continue to coordinate with the SCDPW on determining the appropriate mitigation measures at the Nicolls Road/Colin Drive traffic signal to ensure that it would operate safely and efficiently with the construction of the proposed development project.

Additionally, the proposed traffic signal along Veterans Memorial Highway would provide an alternative route for vehicles from the proposed development project to travel north on Nicolls Road. Vehicles from the subject property and adjacent commercial uses would have the option of turning left out of the signalized access to travel to the Nicolls Road/Sunrise Highway interchange.

**Comment TP-37:**

Provide adequate mitigations to ensure no reduction (or improvements) in Level of Service of each intersection studied. (C25-4)

**Response TP-37:**

As documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study (see Appendix H), the adjacent roadway network and proposed access points to the subject property would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated site-generated traffic with the recommended mitigation measures documented therein. The applicant will continue to coordinate with the NYSDOT and the SCDPW on the appropriate mitigation measures along the adjacent roadway network.

**Comment TP-38:**

Finally, the potentially dangerous impact this would have on an already unsafe traffic situation that exists between Sunrise Hwy and Veterans Memorial Hwy cannot be ignored. (C16-4)

**Response TP-38:**

The proposed access along the North Service Road has been designed in accordance with NYSDOT design criteria to provide safe and efficient access to and from the adjacent roadway network, and is subject to review and approval by NYSDOT. The proposed signalized intersection along Veterans Memorial Highway will be designed in accordance with NYSDOT design criteria and industry standards.



Additionally, a clear line of sight would be provided to allow sufficient stopping sight distance for an approaching vehicle from the Sunrise Highway North Service Road to perceive and stop for a red signal indication and a vehicle positioned in the back of queue along Veterans Memorial Highway.

**Comment TP-39:**

Third, a major area of concern is the ability of the existing roads to handle the predicted increase in traffic that would be caused by development of Islip Pines. The DEIS cites traffic studies showing increases of 1,400 to 3,000 vehicles per day in and out of the site. I think these numbers are well understated, especially in light of the facts that there will be over 5,000 parking spaces, and an estimated 2,600 employees and 550 residents in the fully developed site. (C17-12)

**Response TP-39:**

The referred “vehicles per day” figures within this comment are the anticipated peak hour trip generation projections of the subject property. The trip generation projections have been developed in accordance with industry standards to determine the traffic impact of the proposed development project during the weekday morning, weekday evening, and Saturday midday peak street hours. An extensive Traffic Impact Study has been prepared and the findings indicate that the adjacent roadway network would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the site generated traffic with the improvements recommended (see Appendix H).

**Comment TP-40:**

Further, these studies were based on observations of traffic flow for only one day on a week day, and a weekend. This seems like a very weak methodology to me. I travel these roads daily, and witness the great swings in traffic volume on a daily and hourly basis. I also witness what happens to traffic when there is a holiday, and especially during the Christmas shopping season. The roads are often overburdened now, with long waits at intersections. Additional traffic volume due to the Serota development would increase what is, at times, dangerous driving conditions due to congestion. An example would be the proposal to put a traffic light on Vets Hwy and Church St. When travelling westbound on Vets, coming off Sunrise Hwy. there is a sharp almost 75 degree blind turn just before the proposed traffic light. Since cars usually travel at 50 mph in that turn now, a back up at a red light is just asking for trouble. (C17-13)

**Response TP-40:**

In addition to the manual turning movement counts, automatic traffic recorders (ATRs) were placed along the adjacent roadway network for one week to identify any hourly or daily fluctuations in traffic flow. Additionally, a seasonal adjustment factor was applied to the existing traffic volumes in accordance with NYSDOT published data to account for seasonal fluctuations in traffic volumes. As documented



within the revised Traffic Impact Study prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design, the adjacent roadway network would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated site-generated traffic with the recommended improvements noted within. The proposed signalized intersection along Veterans Memorial Highway will be designed in accordance with NYSDOT design criteria and industry standards. Additionally, a clear line of sight would be provided to allow sufficient stopping sight distance for an approaching vehicle to perceive and stop for a red signal indication and a vehicle positioned in the back of queue.

**Comment TP-41:**

The traffic mitigation plans as outlined in the DEIS need major overhaul to be of any benefit. It also does not address a viable plan to deal with traffic coming off Nicolls Road, which then must travel through the Autumn Ridge, Costco areas. (C17-14)

**Response TP-41:**

The revised Traffic Impact Study identified recommended improvements along the adjacent roadway network that would sufficiently accommodate the site-generated traffic. Additionally, the proposed internal roadway network provides a benefit to existing traffic volumes along Colin Drive and Beacon Drive by providing additional points of access to Veterans Memorial Highway and Sunrise Highway as well as an alternative route to access Nicolls Road. Further, the applicant and its consultants will coordinate with the SCDPW on an acceptable mitigation plan for the intersection of Nicolls Road with Colin Drive.

**Comment TP-42:**

Will new transit facility, bicycle, and pedestrian connections for residents and employees of this development be included in the proposal to provide alternative transportation access to existing municipal centers or popular destinations to help reduce reliance on automobile travel within the community? (C27-4)

**Response TP-42:**

The current site design of Islip Pines incorporates several forward looking transportation planning features:

- Islip Pines' road system is a group of parallel loops with interconnecting short streets. This "net system" of roadways lends itself to create a walkable community in all directions. Carefully scaled sidewalks and street fronts are designed to make walking a safe and pleasurable experience. These walkable streets extend out into the park spaces with connecting paths that allow pedestrians to "short-cut" through the parks north and south through the site. Dedicated



bike lanes will further promote a safe, active and enjoyable alternative to short-trip auto usage and can be connected to a Long Island regional bike trail system in the future. It is the applicant's hope that bicycle shops and rental facilities will take advantage these amenities and bring their services to the site.

- At each intersecting street, along the loop road system, there will be bus-stops for a potential local jitney service. This system will allow visitors, shoppers and employees to drop off their cars at the many convenient locations throughout the site and take this internal jitney system to any location within the development. In addition, this jitney service will be extended out to the currently planned Ronkonkoma Hub (with its access to the Long Island Rail Road and regional bus service) and to McArthur Airport, and could be expanded further to travel to local points of interest, such as area downtowns. Potential formal Suffolk Transit system stops could also be explored.

**Comment TP -43:**

Given that the development will likely have new school aged children living within the development, what types of pedestrian safety features will be provided at high volume intersections and along state routes nearest to the development? (C27-5)

**Response TP-43:**

While the development of Islip Pines may add some new school aged children to the community, it is designed intentionally not to have any sizable impact upon the existing school system. Its residential units will be designed as one and two bedroom types (with the majority one bedroom rather than two bedroom), and designed to accommodate mostly young singles and couples, as well as seniors. This said, Islip Pines does incorporate many traffic calming and pedestrian safety features into its plan. The Town has adopted an official policy statement that requires all new road construction within the Town to be "Complete Streets" compliant. The applicant is required to comply with applicable Town regulations.

Traffic circles are used at both major entries to slow traffic movement as soon as one enters the development. Intersecting streets create a series of natural stopping points along the boulevards, further calming driving speeds. Trees and plantings along streets and boulevards shorten the visual distance that drivers see down the road, causing them to naturally drive slower and more carefully. Crosswalks are proposed be located at all intersections and will have raised textured paving to further slow traffic and to provide slip-resistant surfaces for pedestrians. Crossing lights will be incorporated at all major intersections. Directional and information signage will be placed throughout the site to assist pedestrians to find their route to their destination. Street lighting and path lighting along park walks will be pedestrian scaled and will extend their use in to the evening and make their use more pleasant and safer. All street corners will have curb-cuts and slip-resistance surfaced sidewalks reflecting the latest standards for accessible design and design for seniors. Street furniture and benches will provide places for seniors



to pause and rest along their route. Parallel and diagonal street parking throughout the development will also have a traffic calming effect as well as providing a layer of protective space for pedestrians walking along sidewalks. All surface parking areas in Islip Pines will also have defined walkways and sidewalks. Promenades and pathways, along the park edges and within the parks themselves, will provide routes where pedestrians can cross the site without the need of crossing multiple streets. All these features will combine to help create a safe, accessible and pleasing pedestrian environment within Islip Pines and its surroundings, and for everyone, of all ages.

**Comment TP-44:**

We note that the plan (dated September 20, 2010) that was submitted with the Draft DEIS (revised Oct. 2001), still shows a proposed signal at Church St and Route 454.

However, in the meeting we had expressed that we would like to see the site access laid out such that it also accommodates the Fed Ex access. This would require that the proposed access be located between Church St. and the existing driveway for Fed Ex. Fed Ex will get a new access from the proposed access road internally and their current access point on Route 454 will be closed. Currently eastbound Fed Ex vehicles cannot make a left turn into their site and have to go past their entrance all the way to Route 27 – County Road 97 interchange to make a U-turn. The Fed Ex site access currently operates as a right turn in and right turn out only, restricting left turns into and out of the site. See attached concept access plan. (C27-1)

**Response TP-44:**

The applicant has been unable, to date, to obtain the cooperation of the owner of the FedEx property to attempt to design the Veterans Memorial Highway (Route 454) signalized access in accordance with NYSDOT's desired access plan, although efforts to do so will continue. Please note, as documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study (see Appendix H), the proposed signalized driveway along Route 454 as designed would operate at acceptable levels of service during the critical weekday morning, weekday evening, and Saturday midday peak hours.

**Comment TP-45:**

The proposed project is categorized as a Major Commercial Highway Work Permit with 100,000 square feet of gross building area or greater. NYSDOT plan review for Major Commercials requires submission of a \$2,000.00 application fee, along with completed PERM 33m APPLICATION FOR HIGHWAY WORK PERMIT and PERM 51 PAYMENT AGREEMENT FOR HIGHWAY WORK PERMITS DESIGN REVIEW (see attached forms). A Project Identification Number (PIN) will be assigned to this case once fee remittance and the signed applications are received.

The costs incurred by the department for plan review will be billed to the applicant on a monthly basis.



In addition, six (6) sets of a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and eight (8) sets of detailed Site Plans are required of all Major Commercial along with an electronic file of both in a PDF format. All the plans should be the same size and no larger than 24" x 36".

The TIS must be prepared by a Professional Engineer licensed in New York State. The TIS shall identify all road improvements necessary for mitigating traffic generated by the proposed development. All proposed road improvements detailed in the Site Plans must be designed in accordance with the latest versions of AASHTO, National Manual of Uniform Traffic Control (MUTCD) with the NYS Supplement, NYSDOT Highway Design Manual, and the POLICY AND STANDARDS FOR THE DESIGN OF ENTRANCES TO STATE HIGHWAYS. Road improvement plans must provide all appropriate NYSDOT Standard Details and NYSDOT Standard Item Numbers.

It will also be necessary to obtain "AS-BUILTS" for this section of Route 27 & 454 on file with this department when preparing the required materials. Copies of all "AS-BUILTS" may be obtained in writing from our Freedom of Information Officer. (C27-7)

**Response TP-45:**

The requisite Plan Set, Traffic Impact Study, and required PERMs and application fees will be submitted to NYSDOT for review of the Major Commercial Highway Work Permit Application. Please note that the Draft DEIS submitted for NYSDOT review contained the Traffic Impact Study prepared for the proposed development program.

**Comment TP-46:**

The proposed development would substantially increase traffic at the CR 97, Nicolls Road, and Colin Drive/Greenbelt Parkway intersection. Using the Saturday peak hour as an example, eastbound left turn traffic would increase by 63%, going from 262 in the no-build condition to 427 in the build condition, while the eastbound right turns increase 40% from 225 to 313. The plan does not propose any mitigation other than basic traffic signal timing changes. To increase capacity, our Department recommends an improvement to CR 97 that adds a northbound and southbound lane through this section of the corridor and additional lanes on the eastbound and westbound approaches from Colin/Greenbelt. (C29-1)

We recently met with both State and County officials in an attempt to ascertain what each would require as part of a future site plan process. Upgrades to Nicholls Road/Colin Drive intersection along with a mitigation fee. Please see the attached letter. (C37-2)



**Response TP-46:**

As the subject intersection operates under existing capacity constraints, geometric improvements are warranted to mitigate existing operations. Thus, in cooperation with the SCDPW, the applicant will consider a proportionate contribution to future capacity improvements at the intersection. These improvements could potentially consist of one additional through lane in the northbound direction along Nicolls Road as well as improvements to provide greater efficiency in the traffic signal phasing. The applicant and its consultants will coordinate with the SCDPW on an acceptable mitigation plan.

**Comment TP-47:**

What impact will the increased traffic have on our environment and the safety of our children (a park is planned)? (C32-3)

**Response TP-47:**

Sidewalks and crosswalks are proposed within Islip Pines to provide safe and effective pedestrian connectivity throughout the development project in accordance with industry standard design criteria.

**Comment TP-48:**

I would like to see the dates of the traffic analysis. The numbers presented appear to be skewed and not consistent with the current traffic flow. (C33-5)

**Response TP-48:**

Manual turning movement counts along the roadway network were conducted in April 2010. In addition, data from ATRs were collected in mid-April 2010. As the No-Build and Build analyses were prepared utilizing a 2021 design year, an annual background growth rate of one percent per year was applied to the existing traffic volumes based on data provided by the NYSDOT. Additionally, trip generation estimates were prepared for the vacant retail space in the area at the time of the manual turning movement counts and assigned to the roadway network accordingly. All of the methods of data collection and analysis are in accordance with industry standards.

**Comment TP-49:**

How are you going to keep Sunrise Highway from backing up between Nicholls Rd and Veterans Highway in both directions? What alternate routes will people have to go north on Nicholls Rd? Collin Rd and Beacon Rd are not equipped for the level of traffic this would cause. Residents in Autumn Ridge on Collin Dr would not be able to enter or exit the development due to the amount of traffic. (C33-6)



**Response TP-49:**

The proposed access along the North Service Road has been designed in accordance with NYSDOT design criteria to provide efficient access to and from the adjacent roadway network.

As an alternative to Colin Drive, vehicles would be permitted to exit via the signalized access along Veterans Memorial Highway (Route 454) and travel southbound to the South Service Road. Vehicles would then be able to access Nicholls Road via the proximate interchange.

**Comment TP-50:**

What will be done to address emergencies when police and fire vehicles cannot enter the area during high volume such as Christmas etc? Will the town be responsible for added response times for emergency vehicles? (C33-7)

**Response TP-50:**

As multiple access points to the development project are proposed, emergency vehicles will have a number of alternative routes to access the subject property during peak times. The applicant is working closely with the Town and area fire and ambulance companies to ensure emergency vehicle access is designed appropriately.

**Comment TP-51:**

Colin Drive runs parallel to Autumn Ridge and would be the entrance and exit for traffic coming from Nicholls Rd into the proposed Islip Pines. There is a playground, swimming pool and tennis court on the other side of the fence from Collin Drive. The increase in traffic would mean and increase in the likelihood and severity of car accidents. What will be done to protect the residents of this community from the danger the increase of traffic would cause? Will there be a guard rail along the roadway and where will pedestrians walk? (C33-9)

**Response TP-51:**

No guide rail along Colin Drive is proposed. The general levels of traffic along Colin Drive would not be expected to significantly change as a result of the project.

**Comment TP-52:**

What happens in your town affects our town. When you look at the traffic on Sunrise Highway, that is a killing zone. To create something like this is appalling to me, absolutely appalling.



We worked with people from the South Shore Civic Association to see to it that we could get Suffolk County to do a study there. And their study says this site, as in '94 and as in '86, recommends that it remain industrial, not retail. And frankly, smart growth, bull. This is sprawl by any other name. (H28-1)

But I would ask respectfully that you recognize that the 45,000 cars that are coming through, going west, a lot of them are coming from Brookhaven Town. And I would be remiss if I did not step up and say this is not a good plan, and respectfully ask that you not grant them the change of zone. (H28-4)

**Response TP-52:**

The Conceptual Master Plan has been redesigned to provide an integrated mixed-use development utilizing certain smart growth principles. The site access points have been designed in accordance with industry standards to provide effective access to and from the development project. As part of future approvals for the project, NYSDOT, SCDPW, and the Town will undertake a detailed review of the proposed geometry and capacity at each access along Route 454 and the North Service Road. Furthermore, traffic mitigation measures are recommended within the revised Traffic Impact Study (see Appendix H), and the findings indicate that the site-generated traffic can be accommodated along the adjacent roadway network with the implementation of the recommended improvements.

**Comment TP-53:**

We recently met with both State and County officials in an attempt to ascertain what each would require as part of a future site plan process. Addition of new northbound lane coming into the site from the primary Sunrise Highway entrance. (C37-4)

**Response TP-53:**

The Conceptual Master Plan has been redesigned to provide modified access from the North Service Road to Islip Pines (see Figure 1 and Appendix C). As such, the new driveway from the North Service Road would provide access to the entire development project. As previously indicated, all proposed improvements that involve Suffolk County and/or New York State roads would be subject to review and approval of SCDPW and/or NYSDOT, respectively, which could include modifications to the proposed roadway improvement designs.

**Comment TP-54:**

We recently met with both State and County officials in an attempt to ascertain what each would require as part of a future site plan process. Relocate primary Sunrise Highway ingress (along with traffic circle) further west. (C37-5)



**Response TP-54:**

Based on the applicant's coordination with NYSDOT to this point, the access drive as shown on the Site Plan is in the proper location and is adequately spaced from Beacon Drive.

**Comment TP-55:**

We recently met with both State and County officials in an attempt to ascertain what each would require as part of a future site plan process. Integrate a Suffolk Transit bus line, along with bus stops at appropriate locations throughout the site. Financial feasibility analysis would be conducted by Suffolk Transit. Our recommendation would be a new and/or revised bus route that connects key destinations such as: area downtowns, Macarthur airport, Ronkonkoma LIRR station, Serota site itself. (C37-6)

**Response TP-55:**

The applicant is agreeable to working with the public transportation agencies to forward the public transportation alternatives for residents, employees, and patrons of Islip Pines.

**Comment TP-56:**

We have not yet received a formal response from DOT on the newest version of the plan. However, eventually, they may require: Relocation of Vets Highway curb cut further west. Continue discussions with adjacent property owner regarding shared access. (C37-7)

**Response TP-56:**

The applicant has discussed a shared access driveway with the owner of the FedEx property to attempt to design the Route 454 signalized access in accordance with NYSDOT's desired access plan. The FedEx property owner has indicated he would not be agreeable to working with the applicant towards the provision of a shared access point, at this time, although discussions are on-going. Please note, as documented within the revised Traffic Impact Study prepared by Stonefield Engineering & Design, the proposed signalized driveway along Route 454 as designed would operate at acceptable levels of service during the critical weekday morning, weekday evening, and Saturday midday peak hours.

**Comment TP-57:**

We have not yet received a formal response from DOT on the newest version of the plan. However, eventually, they may require: Potential dedication of a small amount of Sunrise Highway road frontage to accommodate road widening. (C37-8)



**Response TP-57:**

As part of the NYSDOT Highway Work Permit Application, the applicant will coordinate with NYSDOT on the design of the frontage improvements and any right-of-way dedication that may be required.

---

**3.1.6 Community Services and Facilities – CSF**

**Comment CSF-1:**

I'm concerned about the school system and the influx of children into our school system. I am also concerned about the overburden on the police department and the fire department. (H38-6)

So let me restate them. I'm opposed to this project because it will bring increased crime into our neighborhood. (H38-1)

I have a big concern about whether or not the volunteer fire department will be able to respond to single dwellings, or whether they will prioritize and respond to the Serota property, hotels, big box stores if there's an emergency on their property. (H38-7)

I also wonder how the zoning will impact the schools that are already pretty crowded. How can the school really sustain going further with that? I think it should be looked at. I'm not sure that it has been. (H39-1)

Plus the amount of children that will be put into one school district will greatly impact on the rest of the residents in the school district as far as their school taxes being raised and the amount of students that they have to support. (C12-4)

Further concerns have been expressed that proposed home/apartments at Islip Pines would result in an increased population that will adversely impact our local schools as well as response calls for police, fire and emergency services. (C20-7)

**Response CSF-1:**

Based upon the 350 residential units proposed in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the proposed project would generate 57± school-aged children. As explained in Section 4.6.1 of the DEIS, with the exception of Sachem North High School (which students from Islip Pines would not attend), none of the schools in the Sachem CSD are near their rated capacity based upon their current enrollment. Therefore, development of Islip Pines is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on the capacity of the Sachem CSD.



In terms of property tax revenues for the school district, at full build-out, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would be expected to generate \$5,735,698±, annually for the Sachem CSD. Based upon a per pupil expenditure of approximately \$18,600,<sup>5</sup> the total expenditure for 57± school-aged children would be close to \$1.1 million, annually. Thus, development of the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would result in significant excess revenues over expenditures for the Sachem CSD.

While new uses would be added to the property, there is no basis for the assertion of the commenters that the development of Islip Pines would bring additional crime to the neighborhood. As discussed in Sections 3.6.3 and 4.6.3 of the DEIS, the property is located within the jurisdiction of the Fifth Precinct of the Suffolk County Police Department, and Principal Management Analyst William J. English indicated that while the exact impacts of the proposed action on the Fifth precinct are difficult to determine, the Fifth Precinct will adapt, as necessary, as the community grows (see Appendix H of the DEIS). The Police Department would receive a significant amount in annual property taxes (\$1,141,334) upon full build-out of Islip Pines, (\$355,430 greater than the previously-proposed DEIS Plan and \$1,086,538 greater than existing annual taxes), which would help offset any increased in demand on the police department. In addition, the applicant anticipates having private security on the overall site. Furthermore, individual components of the development, such as the hotel, cinema, and the industrial/R&D/office buildings, for example, may have their own private security systems and/or personnel.

Also, according to a March 6, 2013 Wall Street Journal blog entitled *Zoning Changes Take Bite Out of Crime, Study Says*, having residential uses in retail and other commercial areas tends to reduce crime. According to the article “residential parcels seem to reduce crime in commercial areas.”

Sections 3.6.2 and 4.6.2 of the DEIS also discuss fire protection and emergency medical services. As indicated in the DEIS, the subject property is located within the service area of the Holbrook Fire Department. As noted in Section 4.6.2 of the DEIS, construction of all new buildings would conform to prevailing building and fire codes. In addition, internal circulation has been designed to provide sufficient turning radii for emergency vehicles. Also, the proposed buildings would be no higher than those currently existing within the service area of the Holbrook Fire Department. These measures would assist in minimizing the impacts to the Holbrook Fire Department. Moreover, the applicant will work with the Holbrook Fire Department to assist in meeting emergency service needs.

In addition, at full build-out, in accordance with the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan would generate approximately \$380,598±, annually for the Holbrook Fire Department, which is \$118,524 greater than with the previously-proposed DEIS Plan and \$362,325 greater than the existing annual tax revenue. Based upon the analysis in Section 4.9 of the DEIS, the proposed development would require approximately four additional fire personnel and would not require additional EMS personnel. There would be essentially no increase in the need for an additional EMS vehicle. The projected property tax

---

<sup>5</sup> As indicated in Section 3.6.1 of the DEIS, per pupil expenditure was provided by the School Business Administrator of the Sachem School District. Approximately 47 percent of this total is from local property taxes. However, the DEIS (Section 4.9.3) used the higher figure to provide a more conservative analysis.



revenue would assist in off-setting the expected increase in costs associated with training and providing new equipment and would generally augment the Holbrook Fire District's capabilities, as necessary.

In addition, construction of all new buildings would conform to prevailing building and fire codes. Furthermore, internal circulation has been designed to provide sufficient turning radii for emergency vehicles. The applicant would work with the Holbrook Fire Department to assist in meeting emergency service needs.

**Comment CSF-2:**

Other concerns are that the proposed development would result in increased crime and decreased homeowners' property value, further closing of local businesses, and increased Town, County and School District taxes. (C20-9)

**Response CSF-2:**

See Response CSF-1 with respect to crime, security and police protection.

With respect to property values, *The SEQR Handbook*<sup>6</sup> states that:

*"purely economic arguments have been disallowed by the courts as a basis for agency conclusions when concluding a SEQR review by developing Findings. Therefore, potential effects that a proposed project may have in drawing customers and profits away from established enterprises, **possible reduction of property values in a community**, or potential economic disadvantage caused by competition or speculative economic loss, are **not environmental factors**" (Page 118). (emphasis added)*

With respect to the closing of local businesses, see Response SO-4. Furthermore, based upon the proposed mix of uses in the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the total property taxes generated at full build-out are anticipated to be \$8,581,890. As indicated in Section 4.9.3 of the DEIS, while certain additional services over current levels, such as fire, police, and schools, will be required, the anticipated property tax revenue would exceed the cost of required services. Although the amount of habitable development only increased 69,500 SF from the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, the total potential property tax generated increased \$2,672,536 due to the revised mix and proportion of uses in the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Table 1). Therefore, the aforementioned conclusion from the DEIS with respect to property taxes remains valid.

**Comment CSF-3:**

The Town of Islip has one of the most commendable and profitable recycling programs on Long Island. Unfortunately, private developments do not always take advantage of this great recycling program. CCE

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits\\_ej\\_operations\\_pdf/seqrhandbook.pdf](http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/seqrhandbook.pdf)



strongly urges the development to include a waste management plan that includes recycling opportunities for residential, retail, and commercial occupants. Currently, the DEIS only says that recycling will be available, but does not mention the development of a comprehensive recycling plan. (C24-5)

A source separation recycling program needs to be established for residents. The residential aspect of Islip Pines is mainly one and two-bedroom condo units. On Long Island many complexes, similar in this make-up, do not have a source separation recycling program. Residents throw everything in the garbage and a carter is responsible for taking away garbage, sometimes claiming to pull out recyclables.

The Islip Pines development should ensure that residents are separating out their newspapers, plastics, glass, metal containers and bottles. The recyclables should be picked up separately and property recycled. In addition, community composting centers would greatly decrease garbage entering the waste stream. (C24-6)

Islip Pines should develop a "main street" program for retail businesses to recycle. A "main street" program allows for businesses located on "main streets" in downtown areas to be able to place recyclable curbside where they are picked up by the carting company for recycling. It is an easy program that encourages businesses to recycle. The developer should make arrangements with the carting company to ensure these programs are in place. (C24-7)

Throughout the development area there should be recycling bins in common areas, downtown areas, and in the various community parks. (C24-8)

The Islip Pines development should establish a model food-scrap recycling/composting program (C24-10)

**Response CSF-3:**

The proposed development will follow relevant and applicable laws and regulations regarding recycling, source separation, and storage and collection of materials. The developer will work with the Town of Islip and will consider all reasonable measures to reduce solid waste generation from the various project components.

**Comment CSF-4:**

CCE recommends an organic landscaping program coupled with a comprehensive composting program. This partnership would both save on waste and would provide free and organic fertilizer for use throughout the development. It would also provide a new cutting edge program that could be used as a model for other development proposals. (C24-3)



The Islip Pines development should ensure that all lawn-landscaped areas be required to leave the grass clipping on the lawn. (C24-9)

**Response CSF-4:**

The proposed development will follow relevant and applicable laws and regulations regarding recycling and composting. The developer will work with the Town of Islip and will consider all reasonable measures with respect to recycling of various materials.

---

**3.1.7 Energy - EN**

**Comment EN-1:**

In addition the proposed Islip Pines development could contribute to the Urban Heat Island Effect. The main cause of urban heat island is modification of the land surface by urban development such as Islip Pines. Urban development uses materials which are highly effective at retaining heat. Waste heat generated by energy usage is a secondary contributor, and could be a significant one with the combined housing and industrial usage planned for Islip Pines. (C14-4)

Research has found that just an additional 10% of green spaces can mitigate the urban heat island effect by 7 degrees. Removal of 136 acres has the potential to drive temperatures up in the surrounding areas like Parklands and Woodgate (together approximately 200 acres). If 10% green space means a 7 degrees cooler difference, local temperatures could increase on the order of 10 degrees or more during the summer. (C14-6)

**Response EN-1:**

The design strategy towards the mitigation of an “urban heat island effect” in the proposed plan for Islip Pines is four-fold. As follows:

- A large portion of the site is dedicated to open/green spaces, parks and playing fields that include trees, grass fields and extensive vegetation. Trees and vegetation are the most useful mitigation strategy when planted in strategic locations around buildings and to shade pavement in parking lots and on streets as in the current plan. Approximately 39.7 percent of the ground area is proposed to be composed of green space.
- Green roofs and rooftop gardens are proposed to be used throughout all of the buildings which will create additional site green area. A green roof, or rooftop garden, is a vegetative layer grown on a rooftop. Green roofs provide shade and remove heat from the air through “evapotranspiration” (when plants absorb water through their roots and emit it through their



leaves), and thus reduce temperatures of the roof surface and the surrounding air through evaporation.

- The balance of the roof surfaces will utilize “cool roof” technologies in combination with photovoltaic and solar energy harvesting panels. A cool roof reflects sunlight and heat away from a building, reducing roof temperatures.
- “Cool pavement” technologies will be used where appropriate throughout the development. Cool pavements come in two systems -- reflective materials that lower surface temperatures and reduce heat absorption and permeable pavement systems that keep the materials cool through integrated vegetation and water evaporation.

With this four-fold approach, approximately 44.9 percent of site area will be comprised of green space and green roofs. The balance of the site area will address the issue of heat island effect through the other potential advanced green technologies and materials. This approach is based on the best practice recommendations of the USEPA.

Approximately 39.7 percent of the Islip Pines site is dedicated to open green space, parks, athletic fields. This, combined with green roofs, cool roof and cool paving technologies will minimize the heat island effect, to the maximum extent practicable.

It should also be noted that as-of-right industrial development for this site would be expected to have a much greater building and pavement coverage (78 percent) with extensive single story buildings with large parking areas for tractor trailers. This would have a much greater environmental impact, in general, and in the creation of urban heat island effect, in particular.

**Comment EN-2:**

The primary reason for night time warming is the heat retention during the day and re-radiation of that heat at night of building block surface heat.

Two other reasons for changes in the heat exchange properties of surface materials and severely reduced evapotranspiration, for example through lack of vegetation due to removal of 136 acres of trees for construction of Islip Pines.

Materials commonly used in building projects like Islip Pines include concrete and asphalt for pavement and roofs. These have significantly different thermal bulk properties like heat capacity or thermal conductivity and surface radiative properties than surrounding more rural properties with greater green space, often leading to higher temperatures than surrounding more rural areas.

Buildings taller than typical single family dwellings such as apartment complexes, cinemas or retail business buildings with their attendant parking areas provide multiple surfaces for the reflection and



absorption of sunlight, increasing the efficiency with which newly developed areas are heated resulting in the “urban canyon effect”.

These taller buildings also block wind which inhibits convection cooling.

Waste heat from automobiles, air conditioning, industry, and construction also increase the urban heat island effect. (C14-5)

**Response EN-2:**

In addition to the fourfold strategy outlined in Response EN-1, it is the applicant’s intent to reduce night-time microclimate warming that is caused by day heat-retention through super insulating building wall and roof systems. This will reduce uncontrolled heat gain during the day and undesired heat loss in the evenings.

In the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Appendix C), building heights are held to a 60-foot maximum. Multi-story buildings are, by their nature more compact (in regards to the ratio of interior floor square footage in comparison to their surface area) and hence more energy efficient and lend themselves to energy recapture systems.

Open green spaces and parks will allow for natural wind currents for convection cooling of the site as well as reducing heat retention.

Structured and below grade parking, as proposed, reduces surface parking lots, and in turn, reduces paved areas exposed to solar radiation and its related heat absorption. Urban heat island effect will be further mitigated by the cool paving technologies and materials discussed in Response EN-1. Street trees, parking lot trees and landscape trees will shade pavement and exterior building walls, reducing their day/night heat retention.

It is the applicant’s intention to reduce the amount of waste-heat from autos by creating a walkable and “bikeable” development. In addition, with Islip Pines’ incorporation of a loop shuttle system within the site and to surrounding centers (i.e. Ronkonkoma train station and Long Island MacArthur Airport), the need for short-trip car use will be greatly reduced.

**Comment EN3:**

CCE recommends that the Islip Pines development lay out a comprehensive energy efficiency plan and construct all buildings to LEED standards to ensure the energy impact of the site is a minimal as possible (C24-11)



Islip Pines should strive to be the most energy efficient, sustainable, green living community, all critical factors of a “smart growth” development. Ensuring that all buildings meet LEED standard will ensure buildings are energy efficient, water efficient, and build with recycled and sustainable products. LEED certified buildings have enormous environmental and health benefits for the surrounding area, as well as improved health for the building workers. LEED certified buildings promote and encourage the use of renewable energy and energy efficiency, thus decreasing our dependence on fossil fuel resources such as coal, oil and natural gas. (C24-12)

**Response EN-3:**

It is the applicant’s intent to construct all buildings and infrastructure in Islip Pines to, at a minimum, meet LEED certified standards, and incorporate energy efficiency technologies, techniques of water resource conservation and reuse and recycled and sustainable building products, materials and technologies in every aspect of the project to ensure as minimal an energy impact upon the site and its surroundings as possible.

In addition to technologies and materials indicated in Responses EN-1 and EN-2, office and retail buildings are proposed to include skylights, atrium spaces, operable windows and loft height ceilings for natural light and ventilation. All roof systems (including green roofs and cool roof systems) on all buildings will also include water recapturing systems for grey water uses. See Sections 4.7, 5.7 and 10.0 of the DEIS for additional information on energy conservation and sustainability.

**Comment EN-4:**

The DEIS states that the proposal will incorporate “Purchase of renewable energy from the energy utility, if available.” This lack of commitment is deeply troubling and we are concerned with the lack of a comprehensive plan to ensure that these technologies are being used at the site. CCE urges the site to construct on-site renewable energy sources in its design instead of building, then waiting to see if renewable energy credits are available for purchase post-construction. It is critical that energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies be implemented. (C24-13)

Currently, the DEIS does not predict the amount of energy needed for the development. It is necessary to determine how many MW is expected to be used. Once determined, the developer should ensure a certain percentage of the development’s energy is from on-site renewable energy technologies, such as solar and wind energy. Renewable energy is clean, emission-free, home-grown energy that will create jobs and reduce our dependency on foreign fossil fuels and provide for a sustainable future for the Islip Pines project. (C24-14)



**Response EN-4:**

Sections 4.6, 4.7 and 10.0 discuss energy requirements of the proposed Islip Pines development. Based upon the approximate size of the buildings and specific assumptions, the project engineer estimated the electrical load for the proposed facilities at 10,087 kVA (or 8,070 kW). Furthermore, the total estimated gas load was estimated at 155,000 CFH. The applicant has requested letters of availability from both LIPA and National Grid, and has received a positive response from LIPA, which is contained in Appendix O of the DEIS. A response from National Grid, dated February 15, 2011, indicated the presence of the existing gas main within the North Service Road, but requires a site plan be filed prior to determining the feasibility of supplying the project with natural gas. All utility-related correspondence is included in Appendix O of the DEIS.

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan addresses virtually all LEED criteria for Smart Location and Linkage, and Neighborhood Pattern and Design. In addition, it reflects the criteria for LEED for New Construction, LEED for Retail, and LEED for Core and Shell, as far as it can be shown at this scale and at this point of the design.

As the project moves forward, each individual building will be developed with a program and budget in collaboration with users, tenants and the developer. Schematic building designs and performance specifications will then be worked up as well as a comprehensive energy efficiency plan and target LEED performance standards. It is the applicant's intent to design in order to utilize renewable energy resources available, as market rates allow. At that time, energy requirements can be quantified, on-site renewable energy sources can be incorporated and renewable energy credit needs and availability can be properly analyzed, post-construction purchases can be then committed to. Once a final site plan and build-out program is approved, design, specification and analysis can proceed.

---

**3.1.8 Open Space and Recreation – OSR**

**Comment OSR-1:**

Another key point is that in terms of the amount of natural area that would be preserved under an as-of-right condition, I would like to increase that a little bit, or just to do – just tightly study that amount of acreage of natural area preserved. The reason this is, is because if this came to the Planning Board as part of an industrial park, it is an almost certainty under our current policies that the Planning Board would mandate a clustered subdivision. And in so doing, you might be able to preserve more natural space than a conforming yield plan. (H4-8)



**Response OSR-1:**

The applicant is not proposing the “as-of-right” plan. Also, as demonstrated in Table 1 of this FEIS, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan has increased both the proposed landscaping and natural area from the plan proposed in the DEIS (i.e., 38.73 acres landscaping/18.07 acres natural area currently proposed vs. 25.84 acres landscaping/11.12 acres natural area previously proposed). The Town has requested that additional natural area be preserved, and has suggested that any proposed clearing or construction within the northwest corner of the subject property to be minimized to the greatest extent possible, which could affect one of the proposed ball fields. The applicant will continue to work with the Town during the site plan review process to refine the proposed site design.

**Comment OSR-2:**

The Greenleaf Trail was mentioned. We’re currently promoting that. The trail is – it should be on an easement. They’re claiming that they’re going to go for new easements with LIPA. Why not expand the Town’s current LIPA bike path lease? Expand it – (inaudible) – the trail should have a – (inaudible) – spine throughout the site. (H21-4)

**Response OSR-2:**

The applicant is not proposing new easements with LIPA. The applicant is proposing to bury the transmission lines that are located in both north-south easements, so that these areas can be incorporated into the proposed development. The Greenleaf Trail is not included within the Revised Conceptual Master Plan. The Town will continue to review this as the approval process progresses.

---

**3.1.9 Socioeconomics – SO**

**Comment SO-1:**

Has there been any sort of an economic impact study done to see how all of the retail that you’re proposing here would affect our Chambers of Commerce? (H1-8)

I took a drive around the neighborhood about three miles around the site. I found 67 vacant and for rent spaces; 22 of them are retail and the rest were industrial. So, by seeing that, I’m saying well, why do they need to have more space there when all this space is vacant and the people are not using it. So that speaks to their reason why they want to have industrial and retail there. That’s just going to take – if they do that, they’re just going to take away from other areas, and they’re going to rob Peter to pay Paul. (H6-1)



Twenty-five to 30 percent of our stores are vacant. And the people who are there and staying are holding on. This is not a thriving economy. The last thing we need is for this project to come in with retail. (H9-1)

As president of the Holbrook Chamber of Commerce, myself, my board, we've worked very hard and went to great lengths to keep our vacant rate at 12 percent, is what it is now. Prior to that, it was in the single digits before, of course, the economy decided to go into the tank. That being said, the only way we're going to be able to continue to preserve is to really seriously to take an in-depth look. And I caution, and I implore the Board to look at this project very closely. (H15-1)

Another thing with regard to the Chamber, that I greatly respect and patronize each of you, but I want to make, you know, the point that Bram [Weber] had mentioned earlier of what they're trying to attract in this project. And in speaking to him it seems like they're going after a very different target that what Main Street is going after. And when you look at national retailers, the way that these leases are structured, are very different that the way that leases are structured I the downtown. (H17-2)

Our opposition is also based on the negative impact that this plan would have on the economic viability of our downtowns and Main Street, along with the traffic congestion that will be added to an already overcrowded situation. (H22-2)

If you say yes to this proposed development, you are, in effect, saying goodbye to our downtowns. The fragile economy being what it is, most of our stores are just surviving, not thriving. (H24-2)

Sayville is a niche community. You have to realize that. It's not going to be affected by this major realty. Sayville will always be there. (H30-1)

Some of the vacancies that we keep talking about all around the Town of Islip, the reason why a lot of these buildings are vacant is because their antiquated technology is no longer viable for the companies that need the space that this particular venue would supply them with. (H42-1)

It is entirely possible and perhaps probable that the current tenant mix of this proposal would create increased vacancies within the downtowns and Sunrise Highway Corridor. Many existing tenants at these locations might be tempted to relocate to the Islip Pines site. (C1-3)

I would like the zoning to stay as is for this property. I loved my neighborhood. Adding more retail to the area isn't needed. We have a number of vacancies from the Bellport Outlets all the way to the Toys R Us shopping center. We need a revitalization to the area not more retail which would further increase the vacancy rate. (C3-1)

If we could get past the fear – and I've heard people say that they want to revisit how this thing is put together, this particular plan, let's do that. Let's not just shut the door on this. The Town needs the money. The people in this Town need the jobs, and the companies that want to come here are not going



to come to those closed stores. Sayville is a beautiful downtown. All the downtowns are beautiful. I don't personally see this taking from them. You guys have a niche. You have a unique quality about you. People who go to Sayville aren't going here, not in my view. (H42-3)

The proposed retail component of this proposal at 482,000 sq. ft. is larger than the combined totals of downtown Sayville, Bayport and Holbrook. Current vacancy rates in the above downtowns as well as the Sunrise Highway Corridor have been increasing significantly over the past five years. Previous reports from Suffolk County Planning have identified the area as being oversaturated with retail space. The developer has yet to justify the need or demand for increased retail space that seems to be the major facet of his proposal. (C1-1)

The builder has proposed National Brand stores that already exist around the area, would that mean store relocating and MORE abandoned buildings? (C8-8)

Serota attorney, Mr. Weber, states that: "The retail area of the project is not intended to compete with local store owners, said Weber, listing an Apple Store, Men's Warehouse, GAP, Carrabba's Italian Grill and Dick's Sporting Good as potential tenants for the space." First, there is already a Men's Warehouse in Gateway Plaza in Patchogue, just up the road. Why would we need another so close? Why would the retailer want to do this? Second, a GAP is mentioned. There was a GAP store in the Sun-Vet Mall in Holbrook that closed a few years ago. GAP is currently in a downsizing mode as far as stores is concerned. This is available information in their press releases. Why would they want to open a store when they just closed one in the immediate area? I question the validity of Mr. Weber's statements here. Since this is all available information from Google, why would he not have this information before presenting it? (C9-1)

Most of the proposed retail development is going duplicate stores already nearby in Gateway Plaza and Sun-Vet Mall just down or across the street. (C9-6)

There are so many vacant buildings of all sorts in this area currently. We do not need to contribute to that any more than we already have. (C10-4)

My biggest concerns and why I am against this development is the fact that there are an enormous amount of retail land, industrial real estate on the market in Islip whether it is rental or purchase. There is a huge number of affordable houses on the market. This will only make the properties that are available at a much greater risk of staying empty which in turn will hurt the rest of Islip. People do not live out here on the island to be living like Queens and Brooklyn. (C12-2)

I own my office building and it is partially vacant and has been for more than a year now. We have a shopping center diagonally across the street from us that is also experiencing vacancies. Retail stores and office buildings are not in demand right now. There is absolutely no need for more retail stores in this area. It is not going to be beneficial to anyone to have more empty space. Sun-Vet Mall which is just



across the street from the proposed project has a very high vacancy rate right now. Some of these buildings are facing foreclosure and are not paying their share of town or county taxes as a result. (C13-1)

As a community member we feel that adding more shopping to this area is a sin. There are empty stores throughout Holbrook in the Sun-Vet mall and surrounding areas including Sayville, Bayport and Patchogue. At this day in age, you would hope that you would try to fill in existing stores before building new ones.

Despite the intentions of Serota Properties, the negative effects this would have on our already fragile downtown area are obvious. (C16-1)

Given the recent "chain store" failures in nearby areas and existing shopping centers that are starting to resemble ghost towns, I fail to see how more retail would benefit the community. (C16-3)

We do not need more retail stores and commercial building here!! (C18-11)

As far as the anchor stores that have been proposed, since this project was first introduced, it seems that the names of the anchor stores keep changing. This should raise a flag, is there really an interest by these large stores or is this building with speculation that a large store will move into that space. (C7-5)

By decreasing the amount of retail, potential adverse impacts on the surrounding downtown areas would be limited since downtown retail revenues would be displaced with the new development. As part of a more compact site plan layout it is also possible to include more green space for passive/active use or enhanced drainage. (C26-6)

Within the proposal new retail stores will be constructed. How will this impact the current merchants on Main Street in Holbrook, and Sun-Vet and Sun Lakes shopping complexes? (C32-1)

**Response SO-1:**

A comprehensive Retail Market Analysis was completed as part of the DEIS (see Sections 3.9 and 4.9 and Appendix P of the DEIS for detailed information on the economic impacts of the proposed project). As noted in Section 4.9 of the DEIS, the socioeconomic analysis examined four central business districts (downtowns), including Sayville, Bayport, Patchogue and Holbrook, in the Towns of Islip and Brookhaven, as well as six shopping center nodes along the Sunrise Highway Corridor, including the Locust Avenue Node, Johnson Avenue Node, Broadway Avenue Node, Waverly Avenue Node, Route 112 Node, and Station Road Node, in the Towns of Brookhaven and Islip. The downtowns examined within the market analysis, with the exception of Holbrook, are located along Montauk Highway, between two and three miles from Islip Pines.



The market analysis revealed that the eight-mile radius<sup>7</sup> trade area examined in the DEIS contained over 6.9 million square feet of community, super community, regional and super regional retail space, not including smaller centers and downtown areas. See Appendix P of the DEIS for definitions of these types of retail centers. The amount of retail proposed as part of the Revised Conceptual Master Plan is 339,700 SF, which comprises 4.9± percent of this type of retail in the trade area.

Retail spending in the trade area, which includes the aforementioned downtown areas, is strong and projected to grow as population and disposable income rise and economic activity accelerates.

As recently as March 18, 2013, Long Island Business News, in its on-line publication found that, “of all its high-priced real estate, Long Island’s retail space is still its most valuable.” Long Island sports a dense concentration of well-to-do shoppers, and Nassau and Suffolk counties have millions of square feet of prime retail space “that is coveted by national chains, designers and boutique merchants alike.” “The Island’s largest mall, Roosevelt Field, is perennially listed as one of the country’s most profitable. Stores at the Garden City retail mecca average more than \$810 per square foot a year in sales, according to published reports, ranking it consistently in the nation’s Top 10.” “The National Association of Realtors group predicts that vacancy rates at U.S. retail properties will continue to ease from 10.7 percent in the first quarter of this year to 10.4 percent in next year’s comparable quarter. Long Island, which has always enjoyed a retail vacancy rate far lower than the national average, is posting current vacancies at 4.5 percent, CoStar reported. Markets with lower retail vacancy rates include San Francisco (3.5 percent) and Fairfield County, Conn. (4.2 percent), according to the NAR. With retail vacancy rates on the decline, the realtors’ group is forecasting that retail rents will rise by about 1.5 percent this year, and by 2.1 percent in 2014.”

Furthermore, it is estimated that approximately 131,612 households would be located within the eight-mile radius trade area (see Figure 1 in Appendix P of the DEIS) in 2015, and is expected to grow. Based upon these and other socioeconomic indicators of the trade area, the 339,700 SF of proposed retail space at Islip Pines represents less than one quarter of the approximately 1,715,808 SF of additional retail space in the trade area that the market analysis determined future retail spending could support in retail store group categories such as those proposed at Islip Pines.

As noted in Appendix P of the DEIS, the average household located within the trade area is estimated to spend approximately \$22,149, annually on goods and services that could be purchased within the trade area. This represents the current annual buying power among households located within the trade area. The average household expenditure expected at the project site was then applied to the 131,612 households projected to reside within the trade area in 2015. This results in a total buying power of

---

<sup>7</sup> As explained in Section 3.9 of the DEIS, to analyze market demand for the proposed use, *The Shopping Center Development Handbook*, published by the ULI, recommends delineating a trade area. The trade area is the area from which the bulk of the stores’ sales are likely to be derived. According to the *Shopping Center Development Handbook*, shopping centers similar in size to the proposed development have trade areas extending eight miles from the shopping center, and can typically be reached within 20 minutes by its trade area population. Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, a trade area was identified as including all households and businesses located within an eight-mile radius of the subject site. This is conservative, as it is typical in an area such as Long Island, for patrons to drive more than eight miles to a retail destination.



approximately \$2,915,074,188 in annual expenditures for goods and services that could be provided in the trade area. It is important to understand that this represents a conservative estimate, as it does not include the buying power stemming from the population residing outside of the trade area that will frequent the proposed retail due to its convenient location at the intersection of Sunrise Highway and Veterans Memorial Highway. Moreover, based upon the projected sales of the proposed development and the existing expenditures on similar goods in the trade area, it is assumed that the proposed retail development would capture only 15 percent of the retail potential in the trade area. This results in an annual absorption of approximately \$459 million in buying power. The remaining 85 percent of the retail potential represents the potential among existing retail establishments throughout the trade area, including those in the downtowns. The market analysis also found that visitors to the area are likely to increase the sales at existing, non-competing business establishments as a secondary benefit of the project, strengthening the local business climate.

The retail corridors and downtowns within the eight-mile radius trade area examined cater to local communities, and local area residents would continue to make a majority of their shopping trips to stores closest to their homes, where they have built personal relationships with the merchants. Additionally, it is important to note that the retail concentrations in the downtowns analyzed in this DEIS, tend to offer a variety of convenience goods stores and neighborhood service stores (e.g., bait and tackle shop, neighborhood restaurants, nail salon, tailor). The proposed project would be designed to be more regional in nature and would not compete with the existing neighborhood-oriented retail. It is, therefore, not expected that a large portion of consumer sales would be diverted from local stores to the proposed retail development within the proposed project. Furthermore, well-maintained and well-managed stores within the trade area should receive their proportionate share of interest from the increasing retail demand over time. As described above, the analysis of buying power, potential absorption, the ability to capture sales, and trends in retail sales reveal that the proposed retail square footage at Islip Pines can be comfortably supported within the trade area.

In addition, future households and employees of businesses within Islip Pines would offer potential sources of new demand for retail in the trade area, and would also be an important additional source of sales that would strengthen the viability of the proposed retail component of the development, and which would not draw people away from the existing downtowns. Specifically, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, at full build-out would add approximately 653 residents (as compared to 502 in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan) and 3,050 permanent jobs (as compared to 2,612 in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan) to the project trade area, thereby increasing the spending potential of the trade area. In the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, the daytime worker population in the proposed project employed at Islip Pines would add approximately \$7,859,508 to total retail expenditures in the trade area. With the worker population increasing in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see above) there would be a proportionate increase in retail expenditures in the trade area to approximately \$9,177,450, based upon the increase in jobs. Median household incomes in the trade area are projected to rise. As indicated in Table 5 of Appendix P of the DEIS, between 2010 and 2015 median household income is expected to rise from \$85,422 to \$96,216 (ESRI Business Analyst, 2010 and 2011), and with that, the average household



annual expenditures on goods and services is expected to increase in the trade area, thereby creating additional retail demand for the Revised Conceptual Master Plan.

Therefore, the retail development at Islip Pines would not significantly impact the viability of existing retail uses within the trade area, including the downtowns therein.

Section 3.9.4 of the DEIS contained an inventory of vacancies in six shopping center nodes and four central business districts (downtowns). The six shopping center nodes examined were along the Sunrise Highway Corridor, and included the Locust Avenue Node, Johnson Avenue Node, Broadway Avenue Node, Waverly Avenue Node, Route 112 Node, and Station Road Node, in the Towns of Brookhaven and Islip; and the four central business districts (downtowns), included Sayville, Bayport, Patchogue and Holbrook, in the Towns of Islip and Brookhaven. As identified in Sections 4.9.4 of this DEIS, there are approximately 1,174 retail stores within the downtowns and nodes reviewed, of which approximately 85 stores (7.2 percent) were identified as vacant at the time of the survey. This existing low vacancy rate is evidence of the strength of the retail market in the trade area where visitors to the area are likely to increase the sales at existing, non-competing business establishments as a secondary benefit of the project, strengthening the local business climate. The low vacancy rate is characteristic of most of Long Island, as described by an online article from the Long Island Business New, dated March 18, 2013, entitled *LI's Priciest Retail Real Estate*. The article discusses vacancy rates of retail across the nation, (which have eased, but are still over 10 percent) and compares them with those of Long Island. The article states that "Long Island, which has always enjoyed a retail vacancy rate far lower than the national average, is posting current vacancies at 4.5 percent" according to CoStar. Furthermore, "with retail vacancy rates on the decline, the realtors' group is forecasting that retail rents will rise..." Some vacancy in a retail area can actually benefit a retail core as it allows for expansion of tenant spaces within an area, and can also help to keep retail rental rates from rising too quickly.

In terms of the overall economy, the Retail Market Analysis found in Appendix P of the DEIS identifies that spending in the trade area is strong and projected to grow as population and disposable income rise and economic activity accelerates.

As this project is undergoing environmental review and the requested change of zone has not yet been granted, specific tenants have not been secured. There are numerous prospective tenants that could be attracted to this facility and succeed, including unique retailers not currently located in the trade area and that do not compete with existing retail in the trade area. Section 4.9 of the DEIS and Appendix P evaluated the retail component of the proposed project. The applicant cited examples of typical retailers that locate in destinations such as that proposed for Islip Pines. The DEIS used conservative assumptions regarding the tenants that may locate at the site (e.g. the traffic volumes, water consumed, etc.) in an effort to offer a conservative assessment of the impacts, and to allow the Town and other involved agencies to take a hard look at the potential significant adverse impacts regardless of the specific tenants. Furthermore, the applicant is not proposing to build on speculation with hopes that tenants would



materialize once the project is constructed. The various project components would be developed as tenants are identified. Thus, it is not likely that stores would be built and become vacant quickly.

Based upon the foregoing the proposed project is not expected to adversely affect existing retail concentrations in the study area, is not anticipated to result in vacancies and, therefore, would not adversely affect neighborhood character within trade area, including the downtown areas.

**Comment SO-2:**

BFJ (consultant to the Town of Islip Planning Department) suggests that Serota Islip, LLC prepare a preferred alternative site plan as part of the FEIS that provided for a compact, mixed-use “life-style” center. There is currently a highly competitive retail market within the vicinity of the subject site, including several commercial site plan application along Sunrise Highway, which will likely affect the retail demand for the Islip Pines project. Our analysis of current market conditions also confirms that the amount of retail proposed by Serota Islip, LLC should be reduced by half. Furthermore, there is no significant demand for industrial uses. (C26-4)

[BFJ indicated:]

- There is little to no demand for industrial development in the area; therefore, industrial square footage should be greatly reduced
- The overall total leasable retail space should be reduced by half, from 408,673 [square feet] to roughly 164,000 [square feet] to 200,000 [square feet], which would better support market demand and reduce potential displaced revenues of downtown retail merchants
- A smaller cinema is recommended
- The number of dwelling units could be increased two to three times the 250 units currently proposed (C26-2)

BFJ’s proposed life-style center would include a smaller retail footprint and cinema, greatly reduced industrial space, more open space, and an increase number of dwelling units, including housing over stores. The amount of housing could be about 500 or more dwelling units; however, it is up to the developer and the exact number of units would depend upon the type of housing (e.g., townhomes, condos, single-family homes, etc.) and tenure (owner versus renter occupied). (C26-5)

The applicant should prepare a preferred site plan alternative that entails more compact, mixed use life-style center that includes more housing and open space, less retail, and substantially less industry. (C26-7)

Further discussion with the developer and Town officials is warranted concerning the retail component and a provision of creating more affordable residential units. (C1-5)



**Response SO-2:**

As discussed in Section 2.0 of this FEIS and shown on the Revised Conceptual Master plan (see Figure 1 and Appendix C), the applicant has prepared a Revised Conceptual Master Plan to address many of the concerns expressed on the previously-proposed DEIS Plan. The Revised Conceptual Master Plan reflects a compact, mixed-use modern development center and with many of the qualities suggested in the comments. Section 2.0 of this FEIS also provides information on how the Revised Conceptual Master Plan differs from the proposed project discussed in the DEIS. The Revised Conceptual Master Plan would combine residential, retail, office, industrial/research and development, commercial services, cinema and hotel uses, and would supply a significant amount of open space/recreational space and other amenities.

With respect to the commentator's suggestion that the amount of industrial space should be greatly reduced, representatives of the Town have correctly pointed out that there is a distinction between industrial zoning and industrial land uses. Thus, to ensure that industrial land uses (which include uses such as office and research & development) can be accommodated in this development, industrial uses are still included in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan and in the proposed IMUPDD. However, the proposed industrial buildings have been reduced in mass and divided into a number of smaller buildings, in a more campus-like setting, and moved to the eastern and southeastern portions of the site, which relates to the non-residential development along the east side of Beacon Drive. As indicated in Section 2.0 of this FEIS, the industrial component has been reduced significantly in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan and would be a more flexible space that allows research and development and office uses as well as industrial or warehouse, based on market demand. This was done to allow the proposed development the flexibility needed to be responsive to market demand and to make the space more marketable overall.

With regard to suggested increase in the number of residential dwelling units of two to three times that proposed in the DEIS, the applicant has reconfigured the proposed project to include a responsible number of additional residential units, which enhance the overall proposed development. Specifically, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan now includes 100 more residential units than formerly proposed. These would be market-rate units, and the 250 workforce housing units would remain. This number of additional residential units can be fit into the mixed use layout found in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan along with the other project components that have changed in response to the comments expressed during the preparation of the DEIS. The suggestion to double or triple the number of residential units could alter or even increase potential impacts on schools, peak hour traffic, water demand, and the amount of the sanitary flow capacity available to the applicants in the Parkland STP, for example. Nevertheless, while the plan presented in the DEIS included 250 workforce units, the number of residences in Revised Conceptual Master Plan has been expanded to include a reasonable number of residential units -- 350 residential units, 250 workforce and 100 market-rate. The traffic and sanitary flow analyses indicate that the additional 100 units would not produce a significant adverse impact.



Based on comments made on the DEIS, the amount of open space/recreational space and overall green space was increase from the previously-proposed DEIS Plan to the Revised Conceptual Plan. The amount of green space has been increased from 25.8 percent to 39.7 percent of the site, and green roofs and cool roof technology have been incorporated into many of the proposed buildings.

With respect to the recommendation to reduce the retail, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan does reduce the retail space from 408,673 SF to 339,700 SF. Based upon discussions and meetings with Town of Islip representatives, the retail component has been reconfigured from a main street-style, lifestyle center to shops located around a central civic (“great lawn”) space. In addition, many of the retail facilities now include offices/flex space above the shops to add to the mixed-use nature of the development.

The retail analysis prepared clearly demonstrates that the proposed retail development at Islip Pines is not anticipated to have a significant adverse impact on retail within the eight-mile trade area, including the downtowns. As indicated in Response SO-1, the market analysis revealed that the eight-mile radius trade area examined in the DEIS contained over 6.9 million square feet of community, super community, regional and super regional retail space, not including smaller centers and downtown areas. Thus, the amount of proposed retail (339,700 SF) at Islip Pines comprises only 4.9± percent of retail in the trade area. Therefore, the retail development at Islip Pines would not significantly impact the viability of existing retail uses within the trade area, including the downtown therein. In addition, Retail spending in the trade area, which includes the aforementioned downtown areas, is strong and projected to grow as population and disposable income rise and economic activity accelerates. Furthermore, it is estimated that approximately 131,612 households would be located within the eight-mile radius trade area (see Figure 1 in Appendix P of the DEIS) in 2015, and is expected to grow. Based upon these and other socioeconomic indicators of the trade area, the 339,700 SF of proposed retail space at Islip Pines represents less than one quarter of the approximately 1,715,808 SF of additional retail space in the trade area that the market analysis determined future retail spending could support in retail store group categories such as those proposed at Islip Pines.

As noted in Appendix P of the DEIS, the average household located within the trade area is estimated to spend approximately \$22,149 on goods and services that could be purchased at retailers in the trade area. This represents the current annual buying power among households located within the trade area. The average household expenditure expected in the trade area was then applied to the 131,612 households projected to reside within the trade area in 2015. This results in a total buying power of approximately \$2,915,074,188 in annual expenditures for goods and services that could be provided in the trade area. It is important to understand that this represents a conservative estimate, as it does not include the buying power stemming from the population residing outside of the trade area that will frequent the proposed retail due to its convenient location at the intersection of Sunrise Highway and Veterans Memorial Highway. Moreover, based upon the projected retail sales of the proposed development and the existing expenditures on similar goods in the trade area, it is assumed that the proposed retail development at Islip Pines would capture only 15 percent of the retail potential in the trade area. This results in an annual absorption of approximately \$459 million in buying power. The remaining 85 percent of the retail



potential represents the potential among existing retail establishments throughout the trade area, including those in the downtowns.

The analysis presented in the DEIS indicated that retail spending in the trade area, which includes the downtown areas, is strong and projected to grow as population and disposable income rise and economic activity accelerates. Therefore, while the applicant has reduced the amount of retail space as part of the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, based on the analyses performed, there is no substantiation for BFJ's recommendation to reduce retail use on this site to between 50 and 60 percent of what was previously proposed in the DEIS Plan. As indicated earlier in this section, as recently as March 18, 2013, Long Island Business News, in its on-line publication found that, "of all its high-priced real estate, Long Island's retail space is still its most valuable." Moreover, Long Island has a dense concentration of well-to-do shoppers. Furthermore, "Long Island, which has always enjoyed a retail vacancy rate far lower than the national average, is posting current vacancies at 4.5 percent, CoStar reported. . . With retail vacancy rates on the decline, the realtors' group is forecasting that retail rents will rise by about 1.5 percent this year, and by 2.1 percent in 2014." Thus, increasing the availability of retail space helps to keep retail rental rates stable. This not only helps larger, destination retail centers, but also helps downtown shopping areas.

With respect to the cinema, the commentator recommended a smaller cinema. A movie theater demand analysis was completed to gauge the potential effect of this use on existing movie theaters in the area (see Section 4.9 of the DEIS for the movie theater analysis). The conclusion presented in the analysis of movie theaters was that there is currently an unmet demand for 19 additional movie theater screens. Since the proposed movie theater would supply 16 of these screens no significant adverse impact on movie theaters is anticipated, and a smaller cinema is not warranted. Moreover, in the actual marketplace of movie theatre operators, the applicant reports significant interest in locating a 16-screen theatre at Islip Pines.

Overall, the applicant has considered the various comments on the previously-proposed DEIS and has responded by preparing a Revised Conceptual Master Plan that addresses many of these comments (e.g., reducing retail and industrial development and increasing the number of residential units and the amount of open space/green space) while still allowing for an economically viable development.

**Comment SO-3:**

I just thought that it would also be prudent to add an analysis of the types of jobs created by the proposal. We do see some raw numbers of both construction jobs and permanent jobs. And one of the things that we would like to do is to add a little bit greater analysis of those jobs, including the type of jobs, the quality of jobs, the wage rates, a comparison of wage rates under the existing zoning versus the proposed to give a more complete look on the multiplier effects and economic impacts of the project. (H4-9)



The third reason is job creation, another enticing aspect of keeping young business owners like myself to be able to attract new employees to my company that would increase the probability of my employees being able to work for me and live in one of the residential units. (H13-3)

It's a shopping mall. And the jobs there are minimum wage. This is not going to help the people who need jobs really on Long Island, our young people. They're not going to be able to afford to buy a home working at H&M, or whatever other restaurants are there. Maybe the industry pays a little bit more, but I don't think it's going to really help the kind of things that we need in Suffolk County. We need good paying jobs. And I would have loved for him to have put a corporation in there that paid well, with benefits, that would keep our young people here and put people back on the payroll; not a Chili's or a whatever else you want to put there. It's not going to work. (H25-5)

And again, Serota is going to bring the jobs local. They're going to be good union jobs, and there's going to be about 2,600 jobs after the fact. So I do really applaud them on that. (H27-2)

I've heard industrial. I've heard light commercial. They want to bring corporations in here, and they want to bring, you know, real companies in here. That's what I've heard. I don't hear McDonald's and Chili's, although, you know, the people who run the jobs that I'm talking about, they're good high paying jobs. (H42-2)

It is our opinion that though some temporary and permanent jobs will be created as a result of this project, many of those jobs will be simply transplanting jobs from one area of the town to another (especially in the retail sector). (C5-4)

Again, despite their intentions - 2,600 low wage retail jobs do not seem to be in the long term interest of our Long Island economy. (C16-2)

We understand why the town is trying to drive up revenue and offer more jobs to the community. However, making minimum wage at a retailer store, does not give anyone the revenue to keep a home in Holbrook or Long Island for that matter. And the way that the retail market is going, with internet sales taking over instead of people shopping in a store; who is to say that these stores will stay in business for long. Look around you, there are so many empty stores that this is likely going to happen at this development also. (C15-2)

**Response SO-3:**

The Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan would generate approximately 3,050 jobs (or 438 more than the proposed project discussed in the DEIS), based upon the proposed unit mix and amount of square footage proposed for each type of use. In terms of construction jobs, the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan would generate approximately 1,609 full-time construction jobs (or approximately 707 more construction jobs than under the previously-proposed DEIS Plan).



The Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan would provide a wide array of jobs in many fields and at many levels of responsibility and compensation. It is anticipated that a range of employment opportunities will be created that includes everything from janitorial staff, skilled maintenance staff, sales positions, medical professionals, IT positions, clerks, store managers, property managers, landscapers, specialty staff, office workers, hotel workers, industrial workers both skilled and unskilled, security personnel, business owners, CEOs and professional people in offices, and others. A summary of the types of jobs by type of use and their respective salary ranges is provided in the paragraphs below. The data are from the New York State Department of Labor for salary statistics in the Nassau/Suffolk region.<sup>8</sup> The information was reviewed and typical job categories and salary ranges were selected as representative of the workforce that may be employed at Islip Pines, by type of use.

### Industrial

The industrial development component is expected to generate 818 jobs. Industrial development component encompasses industrial, research and development and office uses. Representative job categories and their annual median salaries are included below.

- Chief Executives – varies, but generally over \$187,200
- Sales Managers – \$131,620
- Human Resources/Compensation Benefits Manager - \$108,890
- Industrial Production Managers -- \$102,720
- Computer Programmers - \$78,290
- Software Developers, Applications - \$89,630
- Industrial Engineers - \$85,100
- Industrial Engineering Technicians - \$63,400
- Commercial and Industrial Designers - \$58,250
- Accountants and Auditors - \$78,150
- Industrial Machinery Mechanics - \$52,040
- Office/Administrative Support - \$41,700
- Bookkeeping, Accounting and Auditing Clerks - \$41,720
- Word Processors and Typists - \$39,550
- Receptionists and Information Clerks - \$29,790
- Janitors and Cleaners, Except Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners - \$28,350

### Retail

Retail development, which also includes flex office space within mixed use buildings, is expected to generate a total of 1,758 jobs (849 retail jobs and 909 flex office jobs). The types of jobs within this category and their median salaries are contained below.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.labor.ny.gov/stats/lswage2.asp>, January 22, 2013



- Sales and Related Occupations - \$29,520
- Cashiers - \$19,530
- Retail Sales Supervisors - \$45,130
- Retail Salespersons - \$22,930
- Bookkeeping, Accounting and Auditing Clerks - \$41,720
- Word Processors and Typists - \$39,550
- Office/ Administrative Support - \$41,700
- Accountants and Auditors - \$78,150
- Security Guards - \$29,690
- Janitors and Cleaners, Except Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners - \$28,350
- Office and Administrative Supervisors - \$58,940
- Computer Programmers - \$78,290
- Software Developers, Applications - \$89,630
- Architects - \$85,750
- Lawyers - \$104,360

#### Commercial Services

The commercial services category includes the medical offices, daycare facility, banks, other financial institutions, etc. This use category is anticipated to generate approximately 166 jobs. Representative jobs and their median salaries are as follows.

- Medical and Health Service Managers - \$107,300
- Family and General Practitioners/Pediatricians - varies, but generally over \$187,200
- Physical Therapists - \$84,360
- Medical and Clinical Laboratory Technicians - \$68,360
- Licensed Nurses - \$51,690
- Radiologic Technologists and Technicians - \$70,050
- Childcare Administrator - \$75,120
- Childcare workers - \$26,090
- Bank Tellers - \$28,810
- Loan Officers - \$73,210
- Personal Financial Advisors - \$91,200
- Financial Managers - \$130,140

#### Entertainment/Hospitality

The hotel, cinema and restaurants comprise this category of uses within Islip Pines. It is anticipated that these uses would generate approximately 209 jobs. Typical jobs and their associated salaries are as follows.



- Lodging Manager - \$57,690
- Food Service Manager - \$72,660
- Concierge - \$28,730
- Hotel, Motel and Resort Desk Clerk - \$23,210
- First Line Supervisors of Housekeeping and Janitorial Services - \$59,110
- Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners - \$29,090
- Host & Hostess for Restaurant, Lounge, Coffee Shop - \$22,070
- Cooks, Restaurant - \$27,900
- Waiters and Waitress - \$21,630
- Dishwashers - \$19,110
- Usher, Lobby Attendant, Ticket Taker - \$19,370

### Residential

The residential use category is expected to generate approximately 14 jobs. The types of jobs associated with residential development and their median annual salaries are listed below.

- Landscaping and Groundskeeping Workers - \$27,530
- Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Occupations - \$29,610

### Civic

The civic uses within Islip Pines are expected to generate approximately 85 jobs. A representative sample of such jobs and their associated median salaries are as follows.

- Social and Community Service Managers - \$74,300
- Landscaping and Groundskeeping Workers - \$27,530
- Security Guards - \$29,690
- Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Occupations - \$29,610
- Recreation Workers - \$25,900

The types of jobs and range of salaries provided for as-of-right industrial development would be more limited since most of the uses found in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, as described above, would not be permitted in an as-of-right development. The type of jobs and salary ranges would generally be limited to those found in the "Industrial" category above. Based on an estimate of one job for every 500 square feet of floor space an as-of-right industrial development of approximately 2,035,172 SF would produce approximately 4,070 jobs if it could be fully occupied.

Therefore, while the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan is anticipated to generate fewer jobs than the as-of-right alternative, it would have a wider range of jobs, including higher-paying jobs as compared to the as-of-right industrial development. Also, from a practical perspective, the as-of-right industrial



jobs would not likely be realized because, as explained in Section 2.3 of the DEIS, the applicant has attempted to develop the site for over two decades for industrial purposes. Thus, the viability of maximizing the full development yield of the property with industrial uses is questionable.

It should be noted that the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan would also create 100 additional units of housing beyond that anticipated in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, or 350 units in total. This would add to the housing stock in the area and allow additional people to both live and work on the site and to live and work in the immediate area.

Overall, the proposed Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan through its mix of uses is anticipated to provide over 3,000 permanent jobs, which cover a wide range of occupations, skills and salary levels.

**Comment SO-4:**

I was thinking about the Islip Pines project and I wanted to let you know of some of the main differences between this project and a lot of projects like the Ronkonkoma Hub. First of all this project does not affect private property rights as far as I see it because the land is owned privately and he is looking to just rezone his property. Second I did not hear of the town applying for grants and bonds to finance this project but I do not know that for a fact. My concern is also if there will be Public/Private partnerships involved or just private development. This is definitely Smart Growth but so far it seems without the Private Property Rights issue. (C12-1)

**Response SO-4:**

The subject property is owned by the applicant and the development would be funded by the applicant, including burying of the LIPA lines. No public funds would be used to construct the proposed project, and individual property rights would not be affected. Islip Pines is a private development.

**Comment SO-5:**

Do we need any more big box stores? We don't need any big box stores. Thanks to Serota Properties, I've rediscovered mom and pop stores. That's where I do my shopping now. (H25-9)

And I don't know about anybody else in here, but if you travel three miles east of the building, and you get off over there, there was a big box thing that had Nike, Reebok, Liz Claiborne, and all that. It was called Bayport outlets. It's not there anymore on either side. Let's talk another big box outlet. Go four miles west. It was called Macy's in Bay Shore. That's not there anymore either. So as far as hearing about the big box outlets, I think the big box outlets want to be in Smith Haven Mall. They want to be in big malls. They don't want to be down over here. (H40-1)



It has been stated that they wish to develop “destination type” retail space, which would be unique and not directly compete with the existing downtowns. The proposal does contain 2 large “big box” structures, which according to the applicant’s attorney would possibly be a Dick’s Sporting Goods or Cabela’s. However, the plan also contains 4 smaller 25,000 sq. ft. retail buildings. These would be most likely be divided up to provide smaller stores and restaurants. This segment would be in direct competition to surrounding retailers. (C1-2)

It is our opinion that including large box stores and a large inventory of retail space in the project will do harm to existing businesses in near-by downtowns. We are currently suffering from a surplus of retail spaces in our town and creation of more space will certainly hurt current local retailers. The addition of a movie theater is also unnecessary as current theaters in the area are currently underutilized. (C5-3)

A ‘box store’ such as a Cabela’s or a Dick’s sporting goods is completely out of line for this area. I love Cabela’s, it’s a great store, but it is NOT for our community. (C10-6)

Despite all the anticipated back and forth that will go on I would like to offer a big picture alternative:

Simply say NO to any more retail development along Sunrise Highway! Why not be visionary and lead our Towns in the direction of a Store Size Cap Ordinance? Dozens of cities and towns across the country have enacted these ordinances. Size caps help sustain the vitality of small scale, pedestrian oriented business districts which in turn nurture local business development. They prevent the many negative impacts of big development, such as increased traffic congestion and overburdened public infrastructure.

*Examples of successful towns that have established a Store Size Cap Ordinance are Andover MA, Agoura Hills CA, Madison WI, Northampton MA, North Elba, NY, Skaneateles NY, Walpole NH, Westford MA, Warwick NY. An example of those that did not are suffering from Big Box Blight in Enfield CT.*

- Communities have enough spending power to support only so much retail
- Suffolk County Economic Development has for many years offered downtown Revitalization grant monies to downtowns. So our tax dollars are spent to help revitalize downtowns yet the Town’s code and ordinances support big retail development that contradict downtown revitalization?
- Our local ‘small’ business communities support the more than 100 local organizations that solicit for donations, raffle baskets and gift certificates (Boys and Girls Clubs, Church fundraisers, Little Leagues, School functions, and many many other charities). It is a well know fact that chain stores require your requests go to the corporate office where many requests are never answered. Large retailers make it very difficult to obtain a donation for a worthy local cause.

If you say Yes to this proposed development you are in effect saying Goodbye to our downtowns. The fragile economy being what it is, most of our stores are just surviving – not thriving. Add more chain



stores and Big Box within our 'local circle' and the hope that in the future we will have sustainable downtowns will be gone forever. (C35-1)

Simply saying no to any more retail development along Sunrise Highway. Why not be visionary and lead our towns in the direction of a store-size cap ordinance. I don't know if you guys were aware of this. Dozens of cities and towns across the country have enacted these ordinances. Size caps help sustain the vitality of small scale pedestrian-oriented business districts, which in turn nurture local business and development. They prevent the many negative impacts of big developments such as increased traffic congestion and overburdened public infrastructure. (H24-1)

**Response SO-5:**

While no specific tenants have been identified, Islip Pines contains two buildings, located along the stretch of roadway near the intersection of the Sunrise Highway North Service Road and Veterans Memorial Highway that could house large retail uses.

The Retail Market Analysis found in DEIS Appendix P indicates that there is sufficient disposable income in the area now and into the future to support attractive mixed use projects that respond to market needs. Part of the use mix in many successful projects has included large retail users. Retail spending in the trade area is strong and projected to grow as population and disposable income rise and economic activity accelerates (see Response SO-1). As noted in Appendix P, future retail spending could support approximately 1,715,808 SF of additional retail space in the trade area, in retail store group categories such as proposed at Islip Pines. The large retail stores shown on the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would consist of a total of 223,000 SF, which comprises only 13 percent of this figure. Furthermore, downtowns and other retailers on Long Island have succeeded despite the introduction of large retail stores, including the adjacent Costco, which was built in 1993, and Savers stores, located on the east side of Beacon Drive.

Large retail stores are not often directly included within malls since they need floor area and dedicated parking that malls typically do not provide. Large retail establishments are often found as stand-alone buildings or grouped along highly travelled thoroughfares. Many are very successful and have lasted decades in suburban locations. It is believed that these large anchor tenants that would be attracted to Islip Pines would have sufficient floor area, parking and a location on a major roadway that would enable them to succeed in this location.

Furthermore, the subject property is ideally located at the intersection of two major highways to support the two proposed large retail stores. It is very common to see large retail stores situated on major thoroughfares in Suffolk County. Since the subject site is large enough and will contain a mixture of uses, it can be configured in a manner that is sympathetic to the character surrounding community, which contains retail (including large retail), residential, industrial and office uses. The plans for the proposed project have been modified between the DEIS and the FEIS to present a Revised Conceptual Master Plan



that is even more consistent with the character, land use and aesthetic quality of the area than the project evaluated in the DEIS. The larger proposed retail buildings have been moved to a location along the roadway frontage of the property, along the Sunrise Highway North Service Road and Veterans Memorial Highway.

It should be noted that the Town of Islip Town Code does not contain a store-size cap ordinance (which would ostensibly impact proposed large retail stores), nor is one proposed at this time.

The analysis presented in Section 4.9 of the DEIS has determined that the type of proposed retail development that would locate within Islip Pines, including large retail stores, would not significantly affect the vitality of small-scale pedestrian-oriented business districts, such as the downtowns and hamlets, as the downtowns provide a very different shopping experience than that associated with large retail stores.

**Comment SO-6:**

While the corridor study makes the case to discourage more retail sprawl, it makes it an equally compelling case – it – should retain industrial zoning. The study concludes that industrial vacancy rates on Long Island, and Islip in particular, are very low, stating convergence of industrial land and the uses should be avoided. I would just ask that the Town Board give credence to the planning experts who have particularly seen and examined this area for the past three decades, reinforce our existing retail areas, surge retail sprawl, and avoid the rezoning of industrial areas. (H22-3)

As far as light industry, how many more unoccupied places do we need? Look at the trade zone by MacArthur Airport; 60,000 square feet is advertised as vacant. (H25-12)

I feel that you really need to take a look at the amount of vacant light industry and business addresses. Drive up and down Veterans Memorial Highway from the Long Island Expressway to Sunrise Highway and you will see the amount of vacant light industry addresses that exist, including the Trade Zone at MacArthur Airport. Drive north and south on Lincoln Ave. in Holbrook from Sunrise Highway to Furrows Rd. and you will see the same many vacancies. By adding additional light commercial buildings there will probably be more vacant addresses. If we filled the current vacancies we would create more permanent employment now, not hoping for the future. Yes, by building we can create employment for the construction industry, but these are just temporary jobs, once the construction is done, so are the jobs. (C7-3)

The same holds true for office space. There is just about the same amount of office space available now along these same routes, plus much more along Sunrise Highway, why would you want to approve the construction of a multi-floor office building if it is to create more vacancies. (C7-4)



There are currently over 65 commercial and industrial properties vacant/for rent in a 3 miles radius from the development site (see attachment A). What sense does it make to add to this glut? The DEIS does not address what to do with all this available space, yet tries to twist numbers to say that the new development would have strong demand. This seems untrue. (C17-4)

**Response SO-6:**

While the property is currently zoned Industrial 1 and is within the Industrial Corridor District of the Town of Islip, as explained in detail in Section 2.3 of the DEIS, the applicant has been attempting to develop this property for industrial purposes for two-plus decades. The applicant has not been able to develop this property for industrial purposes as there has been no demand. Due to the lack of substantial interest in developing the parcel under the as-of-right zoning, job creation has not occurred.

As noted in Section 2.3 of the DEIS , the Long Island Business News on September 20, 2011, reported “the Long Island industrial real estate market has more space available than it had at the start of the year. About 5.3 million square feet of industrial space came on the market in the first eight months of 2011 and less than 2.4 million square feet of that was absorbed,” according to Greiner-Maltz, a Plainview-based real estate consultant. While inventory has increased, absorption of this inventory is considerably lagging, and, according to Cushman & Wakefield, rents have declined due to the large available inventory. Zoning and planning principals have changed and modernized in the decades since the applicant purchased the property. Therefore, the Town asserts that, at this time, development of this property, as proposed, should be viewed as a way to create Islip’s next great community. Therefore, the objectives of the Town, at this time, are to allow the development of the property with a mix of uses that would allow for a development that can function cohesively, while providing a pedestrian-friendly and an economically beneficial environment within the Town of Islip.

at this time, are to develop the property with a mix of uses that would allow for a development that can function cohesively, while providing a pedestrian-friendly and an economically beneficial environment within the Town of Islip.

In response to the DEIS comments, an updated search of relevant references was checked, and based on the sources identified below, the industrial market on Long Island is best characterized as flat to stagnant. Cushman & Wakefield’s *Marketbeat Industrial Snapshot, Long Island NY* for the third quarter of 2012 shows that the vacancy rate for Long Island overall is at approximately 12 percent while leasing activity is down 31.9 percent from last year (from 2,903,596 square feet in 2011 to 1,977,103 square feet in 2012). The report includes industrial market data for Central Suffolk County, the location of the subject property, which indicates a vacancy rate of 12.6 percent (higher than both the Western and Eastern Suffolk County industrial markets) and an average rental rate of \$5.49 per square foot (lower than both the rental rates for the Western and Eastern Suffolk County industrial markets).



Several recent articles from Long Island Business News support the statement of a flat industrial market on Long Island, including *Large deals shine in industrial RE market* (David Winzelberg, March 29, 2012) and *Consolidation Driving LI industrial RE market* (David Winzelberg, January 25, 2013), which indicate that supply still outpaces demand in the Long Island industrial market and consolidation of existing industrial facilities constitutes the majority of recent lease and sales activity. Further, the New York State Department of Labor indicated that the manufacturing sector on Long Island lost 1,500 jobs in December alone.<sup>9</sup> Based on the foregoing, it can be concluded that the industrial market on Long Island is weak to flat.

In order to address the fact that the industrial market is weak, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan included in this FEIS (see Figure 1 and Appendix C) identifies space that could be used for industrial, office or R&D purposes. The advantage of having this type of flexible space is that the space can be filled based upon market demand. Thus, if office space is not in demand, but R&D, or light industrial space is in demand, then the space could be built to fit the needs of specific tenants. As discussed above, the applicant is not proposing to build on speculation with hopes that tenants would materialize once the project is constructed, although the new zoning is needed to indicate to potential tenants that the development of the mixed-use Islip Pines is a realistic possibility.

The various project components (including industrial/office) would be developed as tenants are identified.

Overall, research indicates that the market for industrial development has been and continues to remain flat. However, the proposed IMUPDD zoning ordinance still allows for a considerable amount of industrial development on the site within the IMU-I subdistrict, but the Revised Conceptual Master Plan incorporates reconfigured buildings that would accommodate a broader range of uses, including office and R&D. This flexibility will allow the applicant to better respond to market demands, while not eliminating the potential for future development of industrial uses on the site.

**Comment SO-7:**

And in terms of their hotel, there are ten hotels about a five minute drive from this site, for a total of 1,500 hotel rooms. Suffolk County Tourism says that in 2009/2010, there's about 63 percent average occupancy. That means there are 500 rooms unused on average in the hotels. They're proposing to build 200 more rooms. What is that going to do? Who is that going to take away from? (H6-2)

I work at one of the closest hotels in the area and we are regularly are at 40 percent occupancy, when this hotels opens it may cost me my job. (C8-3)

The hotel is completely out of line as we do not need such a gigantic structure hovering over our homes. MANY hotels already in the area are hardly to capacity. (C10-5)

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.labor.ny.gov/stats/lon/index.shtm>



Hotel what for – 14 in the MacArthur area – only 60 to 70 percent full. (C18-6)

He may decide to go for a 7 story hotel and after that what could we do - - it will never be fixed. (C18-9)

Regarding the plans to build a hotel-there are 1,409 rooms within a six minute drive of the site. This represents almost 500 empty rooms based on an average occupancy rates (see attachment B). What sense does it make to add a 200 room hotel when such oversupply exists? The DEIS actually lists an additional 29 hotels in a greater coverage area than I indicate, which can only add to the excess capacity. How can the DEIS make a claim that more hotel room is necessary. (C17-5)

**Response SO-7:**

As discussed above, the applicant is not proposing to build on speculation with hope that tenants would materialize once the project is constructed. The various project components (including hotel) would be developed as tenants are identified. Moreover, financing would not be available for development of such uses without identified tenancies. However, the new zoning is needed to indicate to potential tenants that the development of the mixed-use Islip Pines is a realistic possibility, as noted above.

As discussed in Section 4.9 of the DEIS, the hotel room occupancy, room rates, and room revenues for hotels in western Suffolk County declined from 2001 through 2009. The total number of accommodations including hotels, motels, inns, and bed and breakfasts decreased from 171 in 1997 to 161 in 2007. However, the total sales increased from \$149 million in 1997 to \$265 million in 2007, along with an increase in total annual payroll and total employment.

Data from the Long Island Visitors Bureau<sup>10</sup> was reviewed to obtain updated information on hotel occupancy and average room rates. The data obtained for Suffolk County as a whole indicates that for 2010, 2011 and from January through November 2012 the average room occupancy rates were 62.6, 66.0, and 65.0 percent, respectively. The average daily room rates for 2010, 2011 and from January through November 2012 were \$113.36, \$115.72, and \$123.57, respectively which indicates that room occupancy has stabilized and that daily rates are increasing both of which point to a demand for hotel space.

Additionally the Town Board's renewed intense focus on expanding flight possibilities at MacArthur Airport gives additional potential to the market demand for a Class A business hotel at Islip Pines.

The project site is located at a distance of fewer than three miles from MacArthur Airport which offers lower parking fees and airfares than the larger metropolitan airports in New York City and New Jersey, and serves the populations of Nassau and Suffolk Counties. As presented on page 250 of the DEIS, hotels located near MacArthur Airport are operating at a relatively higher occupancy rate (in the range of 85 percent) than other hotels located in the ten-mile radius of the project site. Therefore, based on the proximity of MacArthur Airport, the proposed construction of a 200-room hotel on the project site could

---

<sup>10</sup> Pers. Comm. Janet Clark, December 26, 2012 and hotel statistics provided as a follow-up.



be supported and is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to other hotel businesses in the project area.

Another factor to consider that is different from many Suffolk County hotels is that the proposed hotel would be partly supported by the proposed project itself since it is expected that there would be visitors to the office, industrial, medical and retail components that may require a hotel stay.

As discussed in the DEIS, the maximum height of the hotel would be five stories (or approximately 60 feet, which was reduced to three stories in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan) which is consistent with most hotels and many buildings in Suffolk County, and it would be setback a considerable distance from existing homes so that it would not visually crowd (or hover over) the existing community. The maximum height of the hotel (or any building on the subject property) is controlled by the zoning ordinance. In the case of the proposed zoning ordinance (IMUPDD), the maximum height is 60 feet. Therefore, buildings on the site could not exceed 60 feet in height, unless a variance was granted.

**Comment SO-8:**

The think with the movie theater, you know, we have Island 16, there are 16 theaters in Deer Park, people go there. Patchogue 13, which is about a mile away from the site closed because they didn't apparently have enough business because of the other theaters. (H6-3)

The Patchogue theater closed a number of years ago, Commack Multiplex closed recently, and there is a multiplex theater in Holtsville and Ronkonkoma. (C7-6)

The movie theater across Sunrise Hwy went out of business why would a theater on the other side of the hwy prosper? (C8-10)

The proposed development has a movie theater in it. The UA theater on the south service road of Sunrise Hwy just closed recently. Why would we want to open a movie theater across the road from where one just closed? If it existing theater wasn't successful, why would his one be? (C9-7)

This whole building proposal is outrageous! Five story building, movie theater – (one just closed movie theatre in Commack). We have cinema 16 not more than 15 minutes from here – we do not need another movie house here. (C18-5)

And further, the DEIS proposes a 16 screen movie theater as part of the mix use. There is a 16 screen theater just a few miles away to the northeast (Island 16), as well as 16 screen theater in Deer Park (about 20 minutes away to the west). This does not make sense, especially since a 13 screen theater (Patchogue 13) closed up less than one mile from the site. (C17-6)



A new multiplex movie theatre is in the plans. A multiplex theatre in the same general area (south side of Sunrise Highway just east of location) was shuttered about 5 years ago for not support. (C32-2)

I am in favor of this project because I'd like to see a movie theater close to home and would welcome restaurants. This would also create jobs. (C31-1)

**Response SO-8:**

There is a trend in modern development to include a mix of uses in close proximity to allow people to cross use the facilities. It is not uncommon to see new facilities include a movie theatre (such as Regal Cinema in the Tanger Center in Deer Park) as part of the use mix. In fact, mixed-use developers recognize theaters as an integral part of a development's success. People are more attracted to a development with multiple uses and activities available. Theatre facilities constructed 10 - 15 years ago when stadium seating became popular are seen as old and vulnerable as the industry is now including giant IMAX screens, digital projection and sound technology and upscale amenities like on-site bars and restaurants. Older stand-alone theatres are falling into that category and are in danger of closing as the market evolves. Moreover, as is standard in the movie theatre industry, old theatres are retired and repurposed, and new theatres are constructed. Rarely are existing theatres renovated.

As indicated on page 288 of the DEIS, within the primary and secondary cinema trade areas there is an unmet demand for 19± movie screens. The proposed project would offer 16 screens, leaving an unmet demand of 3± screens. Additionally, the proposed movie theater would be state-of-the-art, and, therefore, is expected to attract patrons from outside the trade areas defined in this study.

Thus, the proposed cinema is expected to be an ongoing viable business offering modern technology, as well as aesthetic and comfort features to theater-goers.

**Comment SO-9:**

What's wonderful about this property is the fact that it's industrial. We have no jobs for our children. When they say that you can work and live in a place, if you're working a retail store, you're making minimum wage. You're supposed to buy a \$300,000 apartment upstairs. Come on. Get real. We have many, many, many houses that are for sale in Sayville now at the prices that they use to be in the '70s. You can buy a house for \$200,000 that used to be \$500,000, a high ranch. We are broke. (H16-1)

I don't want to see affordable living. Affordable living is here now. Our houses took such a hit on the process that by putting houses catering to people that are not making enough money for the down payments, you're going to hurt the rest of us homeowners. People are already foreclosing because what they owe on their houses - they bought their houses for much more. (H33-2)



As far as new jobs, as many people have said, working at Chili's, working at McDonald's, you're not going to buy a house. You're not going to buy that affordable housing. It's not happening. (H33-3)

And if you think 250 units of workforce housing are going to keep the best and brightest on Long Island, you're missing the boat because it's not. (H36-3)

If the concept of workforce housing is one of the driving forces behind the development, perhaps the concept might be better suited for a downtown location. If the carrot of increased tax revenue is another driving force, I ask you at what price? (H37-3)

Adding more housing in the form of apartments is not what Holbrook needs. There are a number of apartments for rent and for purchase already here in the town. Adding more will decrease everyone's property value even more than it has already decreased because of the economy. More housing will increase traffic, increase classroom sizes in our schools and decrease the amount of resources currently available to our residents. (C3-2)

The definition of workforce housing that will apparently be distributed by lottery to lower income families is in direct opposition to the adjacent residential developments and there is a big fear of an additional loss of property value because of this. The planned residential community would also abut the existing FedEx Ground distribution center. (C9-8)

By placing 200+ units of workforce housing, homeowners' home prices will suffer. These units are not going to be sold for \$310K as "SLATED". Sounds to me like they will be reserved as LOWER INCOME HOUSING. If they are sold as low-income housing, the prices of homes in the area will decrease and harm our community's homeowners. Even if they are to sell for \$310K as proposed, there are entirely way too many homes for sale in our community. There are too many foreclosures in our neighborhood. We don't need "AFFORDABLE HOUSING". This is the time of affordable housing. Homes have decreased thousands of dollars. The housing crisis has already arrived, and for people who may not have been able to buy a home, this is the time they can. For those who cannot buy a house, there are over 5 nice apartment communities WITH VACANCIES within blocks. Renting does not equal shame and I don't know where society has come up with the notion that everyone MUST own a home, which for some is living beyond means. Instead let's help people to accept financial responsibility for them. (C33-8)  
What will this project do for the property values of the housing that is available and already existing in Holbrook? (C23-6)

**Response SO-9:**

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan includes a reasonable number of additional housing units, which, in part, addresses the recommendation of the Town's consultant for an increase in the number of housing units within the proposed development (see Comment SO-2). Therefore, the Revised Conceptual Master



Plan includes 250 workforce units (as was previously proposed) and adds 100 market-rate units, for a total of 350 residential units.

In comparison to the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Figure 1 and Appendix C) divides the proposed units among eight three-story buildings located in the northern portion of the site, south of the proposed athletic fields and north of the proposed on-site retail facilities. The units are part of a mixed use area that integrates a number of residential and non-residential uses within one site.

According to Section 2.5 of the DEIS, the *Suffolk County Workforce Housing Needs Assessment and Responses*, prepared by the Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University, and the *Suffolk County Workforce Housing Commission Accomplishments and Recommendations* report, prepared by the Suffolk County Workforce Housing Commission, Suffolk County has a severe and demonstrable need for housing priced for Long Island's workforce, especially young people who have recently joined the workforce and middle-class families.

Based upon the proposed IMUPDD zoning, the initial sales price of each workforce housing unit, and the subsequent resale price of each such unit, shall equal a multiple of one hundred percent of the estimated median family income for the sale year for the Nassau-Suffolk, NY HUD Metro FMR Area as determined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). At the time of resale of workforce housing units, the maximum permitted sales price shall be increased to include the actual cost of any permanent capital improvements that have been made to the dwelling and as adjusted for inflation. For illustration purposes, based upon 2012 HUD data, the initial sales price of a one-bedroom workforce unit would be \$215,000 and the sales price of a two-bedroom unit would be \$322,500 (i.e., the 2012 median family income of \$107,500 times two for a one-bedroom and time three for a two-bedroom unit). See the proposed IMUPDD zoning for the definition of workforce housing (see Appendix D of this FEIS).

If rental units are proposed in this sub-district, the rent for such units shall be calculated using the estimated median family income for the rent year for the Nassau-Suffolk, NY HUD Metro FMR Area as determined by HUD. Federal rent subsidies shall not be permitted for these units.

The workforce housing anticipated as part of the proposed action is considered affordable under the terms and definition supplied by HUD and promulgated in New York General Municipal Law, Article 16-A - 699 "the Long Island Workforce Housing Act." The units must be available at a price concomitant with the income ceiling levels defined by therein. Housing that is not subject to these criteria can be sold at the market rate with no imposed ceiling based on income levels.

The Long Island Workforce Housing Act, defines affordable workforce housing as being for individuals and families at or below 130 percent of the median income for the Nassau-Suffolk primary metropolitan statistical area as defined by HUD and adjusted for family size. Below is the 2012 median income for the



Nassau-Suffolk primary metropolitan statistical area by household size for persons at 100, 120 and 130 percent of median income:

	100 Percent of Median Family Income	120 Percent of Median Family Income	130 Percent of Median Family Income
Family of One	\$75,250	\$90,300	\$97,825
Family of Two	\$86,000	\$103,200	\$111,800
Family of Three	\$96,750	\$116,100	\$125,775
Family of Four	\$107,500	\$129,000	\$139,750

In addition, according to the United States Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, the median family income for Holbrook was reported at \$102,653.<sup>11</sup> This demonstrates that, contrary to the commenter who is concerned about low-income housing, the persons that could reside in these workforce units could be existing residents of Holbrook who earn at or above Holbrook’s median family income. Thus, the income characteristics of residents of the workforce housing proposed in this development would not be expected to be different from those already residing in the hamlet of Holbrook. Accordingly, even though impacts to property values are not a proper SEQRA consideration (see Response CSF-2), given that the income characteristics of the residents of Islip Pines would be similar to those of the residents of the hamlet of Holbrook, no adverse impact on property values would be expected.

**Comment SO-10:**

Smithtown has still never recovered from the Smith Haven Mall. And I really fear that that’s going to happen to Sayville. Almost everyone on this Board has walked the streets of Sayville and have seen what a beautiful town it is. I wonder if you can imagine what it would be like if it turned into what Smithtown was. (H9-2)

First of all, this is going to impact the businesses in Islip, you, our Town. I don’t know how it couldn’t. I don’t know how you couldn’t impact Main Street. There’s not enough businesses out there. I mean, it’s not just here in Islip. It’s Huntington, in that stretch of – we have so many empty stores. You’re not going to get it from anywhere because it’s not anywhere to be found. So I want you to just really, really be careful. But anybody who’s telling you this isn’t smart growth, you need to do your research on it. (H12-2)

I believe this project is important to the growth of this town. I have several employees who live in this town, and also like myself, support the project. When on lunch, there are not many places where they can eat, shop, and relax all in the same area. They both currently live at home, and when they’re ready to move out of their parent’s houses, if they cannot afford houses in this area, they may be forced to find a new job due to the greater travel that they would have to make. (H13-1)

<sup>11</sup> <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml> (2007-2011 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)



When I look at this project, I see a tremendous economic impact or opportunity. And I think we would be short-sighted not to fully examine that and see what the opportunities are there. (H17-1)

Islip Pines has brought forth a development that can answer a host of issues we are facing today in one project. We, as a Town, need to compete against southern states and attract an industry which brings jobs and increases our tax base that allows for our young to stay and raise families. With good projects like Islip Pines, we have a responsibility to our Town, our business, our families to take an important step of putting the Town of Islip on the right track of accomplishing jobs, housing, and back to fiscal health. The time is now. Opportunities like Pines don't happen that often. We need to support this project and move the Town of Islip into a positive future. (H18-1)

I feel that Islip Pines will creatively combine residential, retail, recreational, and industrial/commercial uses to bring new energy and economic development to the Town of Islip, and we need it. Serota Properties, they set aside funds so that they can begin work immediately. A lot of projects in Brookhaven, in Riverhead, in Islip Town, they're getting approved, but they're not starting because they don't have the money. And if they don't have the money, then you don't have the money. (H19-1)

We are writing in support of Islip Pines; a proposed mixed-use development in Holbrook in the Town of Islip. With the economy struggling to emerge out of the recession, Islip Pines is precisely the type of economic development Long Island needs as it will result in millions of dollars in private investment and sorely needed jobs. (C4-1)

Islip Pines will combine residential, retail, recreational, and industrial/commercial uses in an underutilized property that will spur new economic growth in the Town of Islip. This project will create construction jobs and permanent executive, management, small business, service, entrepreneurial, and meaningful entry-level jobs. In fact, it is estimated that Islip Pines has the potential to generate approximately 900 construction jobs and 2,600 permanent jobs. As a whole, the development of Islip Pines will significantly benefit the residents of the hamlet of Holbrook, Sachem Central School District, the Town of Islip and Suffolk County. (C4-2)

The point of all this is that a reckless progression of development, when there is little demand, cannot be good for the town, and potentially could bring a version of urban blight to Islip. Is it a wise decision to rob Peter to pay Paul, or otherwise cannibalize existing business, just so Serota can engage in fantasy? Is it possible that the lure of additional tax revenue would be offset by decreased revenues elsewhere? (C17-7).

What type of home and business owner assistance do you plan to offer for the homeowners who lose the value in their homes due to this being built and for the business owners whose patrons are nowhere to be found because they are busy in the "BIG BOX STORE"? Instead of worrying about what money the center could MAYBE generate, why not invest in our downtown and hold events like Patchogue and give incentives for business owners to open companies in our town? After all, more business space in an



already vacant business setting just equals MORE empty businesses. More housing for people, who can't afford housing, just means MORE foreclosures and housing issues. This is just more of the same problem with a pretty little bow on it. (C33-10)

**Response SO-10:**

The applicant owns the property that is the subject of this application, and has the right to request a change of zone for the property to permit development of the proposed mixed-use community. Moreover, the Town has agreed to review the application for rezoning of the subject property, and will make its ultimate decision based on a comprehensive review of the record before it (including comments received). While the applicant does not own property within the downtowns mentioned in the comment, property owners within the downtowns can choose to redevelop and revitalize those properties that are situated within the downtown (e.g., Tri-Tec in the Patchogue downtown).

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan offers a significant investment in the area and it supplies approximately 3,050 jobs and approximately \$9,177,450 in spin-off revenues as well as a considerable amount of revenue in the form of annual real estate taxes (\$8.58 million) and sales taxes (\$7.84 million), all of which add to the economic vitality of Islip and the area. Approximately 0.18 acre of Town of Islip property (at Veterans Memorial Highway) is proposed to be acquired, but there would be no direct displacement of residences or businesses resulting from the development. Thus, no homeowner or business displacement would be needed in that regard. The amount of retail space added by the plan is small compared to the amount of retail found within the trade area. With 339,700 square feet of retail space, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan represents only 4.9 percent of the total existing retail (6.9 million square feet) in the trade area and thus would not have as large an influence as many commenters on the DEIS discussed. The plan would add workforce housing to the area which would house approximately 653 residents that would purchase goods locally and elsewhere.

In addition to the socioeconomic benefit provided by the Revised Conceptual Master Plan it also provides multiple benefits including increased recreation/open space (including athletic fields and a large central open space, new medical office space, and introduction of a new mixed-use project that will have a strong sense of place. Further, there were no significant adverse impacts identified, that were not proposed to be mitigated.

As discussed in Section 4.9 of the DEIS and in the Retail Market Analysis in Appendix P of the DEIS, the proposed retail development would capture only a small percentage of the retail potential among the residents of the trade area. The retail concentrations within the trade area currently contain a wide variety of existing community, regional and super-regional shopping centers, and the proposed retail development at Islip Pines would provide another option for the trade area which will enhance the overall experience for shopping in the trade area.



While not reevaluated for the FEIS, based on the projected retail sales of the proposed project that was discussed in the DEIS (with approximately 408,673 square feet of various types of retail uses), the existing expenditures on similar goods in the trade area, would have captured approximately 15 percent of the total retail potential in the trade area (an eight-mile radius from the project site). This was estimated, in the DEIS, to result in an annual absorption of approximately \$459 million in buying power. With the amount of retail space being reconfigured in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan to approximately 339,700 SF, it is a reasonable extension that the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would represent a similar, though slightly lower, level. The remaining 85 percent of the retail potential represents the potential among existing retail establishments and shopping centers throughout the trade area.

**Comment SO-11:**

Serota has owned this property for over 27 years.

Again, they're paying taxes. They're paying taxes today at the rate of \$500,000. That's a lot of money to pay for a piece of vacant raw land.

Again, if developed, this property here could generate in excess of six million dollars in tax revenues. That's not including sales tax and everything else that goes along with the development after that.

But six million dollars in property taxes a year. So in ten years the Town of Islip is going to recognize 60 million dollars in tax revenues just on the land. That's not including all the other stuff that's going to come with sales tax. I believe these tax dollars should be welcomed here in the Town of Islip, and anywhere on Long Island. (H27-3)

The second positive point of this project is the greater revenue and taxes that will be generated. (H13-2)

There's a challenge here. And I think that five and a half million dollars over what we're currently getting on the property would be welcomed by the Town and the budget at the Town. (H17-3)

We feel the short term influx of revenue to the town is not worth the long-term problems associated with creating an urban environment in the middle of a suburban town. (C5-6)

The town should be ashamed of themselves to even think that this is a good possibility for its taxpaying citizens. (C15-3)

**Response SO-11:**

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan would generate revenue from sales tax from its retail components as well as real estate tax revenue. The revenue generated by the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would be permanent and not temporary, although certain multiplier effects would occur relating to the temporary



construction jobs created during the build-out period. The Revised Conceptual Master Plan would also generate a long-term positive effects from employee spin-off revenue.

The retail component has been reconfigured in the Revised Conceptual Master Plan. With these changes the amount of general retail space would be 339,700 SF. Of the approximately \$7,838,395± in sales tax revenue that could be generated by this square footage of retail space, Suffolk County (at 4.25 percent) would realize approximately \$3,862,397±, annually and New York State's share of the sales tax revenues (4.0 percent) would be approximately \$3,635,198. The Metropolitan Commuter Transportation District tax, at 0.375 percent, would be \$340,799.78, annually. Additionally, the sales tax generated by the movie theatre and the restaurants would add to these sales tax totals. A certain amount of these taxes would not be net income to Suffolk County or New York State as some of those sales are already taking place at existing establishments either in the County or in the State. It is projected, however, that the majority of sales taxes generated by the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would represent a net increase to taxing jurisdictions.

An analysis was completed of the contribution to property tax revenues from the proposed project that was analyzed in the DEIS (see Table 58 on page 269 of the DEIS) to all taxing jurisdictions. The results of that analysis indicated that, when fully built, the proposed project analyzed in the DEIS would contribute approximately \$5,497,331 in total annual real estate taxes. However, within the Revised Conceptual Master Plan the use mix on the site and potential nature of the industrial/office space on the site has been revised to address comments made during and after the public comment period on the DEIS. It is anticipated that the Revised Conceptual Master Plan would generate approximately \$8,581,890 in real estate taxes, annually. This is an increase of \$8,169,868 over the existing condition and is approximately \$2,672,537 more than for the previously-proposed DEIS Plan.

**Comment SO-12:**

There are at least two major retail development applications that have been submitted to the Town of Islip within the trade area: 1) the Richlaine Enhancements LLC proposal for three big-box stores totaling 190,000 square feet (located across the subject site on Sunrise Highway and Sylvan Avenue); and 2) a 120,000 to 150,000 square foot Walmart store located less than five miles from Islip Pines, in East Patchogue, Town of Brookhaven.. A third major retail development has also been conceptually discussed with the Town Planning Department for a new +/- 135,000 square foot Target store located at the Attias Flea Market site. The applicant should discuss how these proposed retail projects affect the projected retail demand for the subject site. (C26-8)

**Response SO-12:**

The Richlaine Enhancements LLC proposal includes three large retail stores totaling 190,000 square feet (located across the subject site on Sunrise Highway and Sylvan Avenue), and a 120,000 to 150,000-SF Wal-Mart store is proposed to be located less than five miles from Islip Pines, in East Patchogue, Town of



Brookhaven. Furthermore, according to the Town a new approximately 140,000-SF Target store would replace the Attias Flea Market, which is located on a 12±-acre site at the intersection of Broadway Avenue and Sunrise Highway in Sayville. The combined total of these three developments would provide in the range of 480,000 square feet of new retail development if built. The presence of these three proposals in relatively close proximity to Islip Pines points to the fact that developers are confident that the area can support a fair amount of new retail development which ultimately benefits the shopping in the trade area. As stated in the DEIS future retail spending could support approximately 1,715,808 square feet of additional retail space in the trade area in retail store group categories such as proposed at Islip Pines. If Islip Pines were combined with these three developments the total amount of new retail space would be approximately 819,700 square feet or approximately 47.8 percent of the additional retail that could be supported in the trade area. Based upon this analysis, the trade area can support Islip Pines as well as the aforementioned other proposed developments.

---

### **3.1.10 Aesthetics and Cultural Resources – ACR**

#### **Comment ACR-1:**

You have a site plan with respect to the buildings to the furthest north on the property. Have you made any analysis relative to the buildings to the south which will be, as I understand it, taller buildings? (H2-1)

#### **Response ACR-1:**

The visual impacts of the proposed buildings have been considered during the environmental review process. The buildings contained within the Revised Conceptual Master Plan have been carefully sited as to minimize their impact to their adjacent neighbors while at the same time creating compact footprints that would allow for maximizing green space. Buildings are also massed to provide the most light and natural ventilation, while maintaining a workable, efficient floor plan.

As noted in Section 2 of this FEIS, within the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, no building is proposed to be more than four stories in height with the majority of the proposed buildings between one and three stories. The exceptions are the several four-story industrial/office buildings, which have been removed from the northern portion of the property and oriented toward Beacon Drive and Sunrise Highway, thereby minimizing potential visual impacts to the residential community to the north. The height of the proposed hotel has been reduced from five stories to three stories, and it has been relocated to the eastern portion of the site amongst the proposed industrial/office buildings. As noted, the tallest buildings (four stories) will be located closest to the off-site industrial and retail facilities to the east and toward Sunrise Highway to the southeast. Furthermore, while the residential buildings are three stories in



height, their minimum setback from the northern property line (adjacent to the off-site residences) is over 520 feet.

Based upon the changes made to the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan, there would be fewer visual impacts as compared to those associated with the previously-proposed DEIS Plan, due to the following: the heights of the buildings have been lowered across the site; the tallest buildings are proposed to be located adjacent to off-site non-residential uses to the east; more natural vegetation has been retained on the site (especially around the perimeter of the property); and a 160-foot buffer has been retained along the northern property line (including 80 feet of LIPA right-of-way and 80 feet of existing natural vegetation), including 300 feet, at minimum, to the closest building, a children's daycare center. Overall, no significant adverse visual impacts are anticipated.

**Comment ACR-2:**

Have you done any analysis relative to the view that our neighbors are going to have to look at south to that particular hotel? (H2-2)

Your opinion is that those neighbors won't be able to see those buildings [the hotel]? (H2-3)

I live across the street from where this monster [hotel] is going to be built. As you can see by their maps, their community dwarfs our community. So, I don't - I can't understand how what I could walk to, I can't see five floors up in the air. I could see the high tension wires that are there, but somehow I'm not going to see the hotel. (H10-1)

A five floor hotel will grossly overshadow any other building in the area and be an eye sore to our community. (C8-4)

A telephone pole is about 50 feet tall. A hotel building is about 200. Now, I live where that other picture was taken looking in. I think I can see a building that's 200 feet tall, or the equivalent of about two or three telephone poles in height. And that's basically from that artist's rendition. I got a gut feeling I can see a lot more than what they're saying we can see there. (H40-3)

A five floor hotel will grossly overshadow any other building in the area and be an eye sore to our community. (C8-4)

**Response ACR-2:**

As noted in Section 2.0 and shown on the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the height of the proposed hotel has been reduced from five stories to three stories and has been relocated from the western portion of the site to the eastern portion of the site, between the proposed industrial/office buildings. The hotel would be internally oriented toward the central civic space and would be situated parallel to Beacon



Drive. The hotel, which is proposed to be located over 1,200 feet from the nearest home to the north, is not expected to be visible from this area, since the Revised Conceptual Master Plan includes a fence, and a 160-foot-wide buffer, which includes a stand of pine trees that would be augmented by additional plantings. Moreover, the proposed hotel would be located amongst other buildings and screened by the proposed residential buildings located to the north and west. Therefore, hotel is anticipated to have little visual impact on the neighboring residences to the north.

**Comment ACR-3:**

The Planning staff is making the recommendation that there should be creative use of drainage areas for decorative civic focal point. (H4-2)

**Response ACR-3:**

The Revised Conceptual Master Plan incorporates landscape elements, retention ponds and fountains with decorative water spray at both major entrances to the development and the large pond within the central civic area, which will also be utilized as part of an overall water resource recovery system. This pond area will be used a central gathering place for the community and will contain seating and a promenade walkway. In addition, rain gardens will be incorporated throughout the development as part of the overall stormwater management system.

**Comment ACR-4:**

I had a beautiful view for the last 36 years. It sure would be a shame to lose it. There's an aerial view (indicating). It looks like Queens, where we came from. (H14-1)

**Response ACR-4:**

The Conceptual Master Plan has been revised to provide a more natural buffer along the northern property line. Whereas the previously proposed DEIS Plan included the 80 foot LIPA right-of-way, plus a man-made berm within an 80-foot area, the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan maintains the 80-foot area south of the LIPA right-of-way in its natural state. The need for the removal of trees in this area to create a berm has been eliminated, as the berm has been eliminated.

While the subject property is predominantly wooded at the current time, it has been zoned for industrial/office development since the mid-1980s. The potential that the site would be developed in the future has always existed, since it has been zoned for industrial/office use and prior to that for commercial (retail) use, and the Town has always viewed the subject property as an opportunity for economic development and job creation. As discussed in Section 7.2 and illustrated in Appendix R of the DEIS, the as-of-right development under prevailing industrial zoning would allow approximately 2,035, 172 SF of industrial development across the entire property. As explained in Section 7.2.10 of the DEIS,



the property would be completely covered with buildings and parking, with significantly less landscaping and natural vegetation as compared to the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan. It is anticipated that no building on the site would be more than two stories in height. As no specific industrial users have been identified, it is not possible to determine the aesthetic character of the buildings. However, it is assumed that there would be less architectural variety amongst the buildings on site under this alternate as compared to the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master plan, wherein there would be a variety of uses, architectural styles, massing and height. Thus, as-of-right development under prevailing zoning is expected to have a greater overall visual impact as compared to the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan.

**Comment ACR-5:**

I'd like them to – I'd like the Board to think about a different proposal, and maybe Serota development, to do a minimum of 100 feet of natural woodland, leave, and then behind the natural woodland, a 15-foot sound wall erected on the south side. Not only would this be aesthetically more appealing but more important, the trees and the sound wall would help buffer the noises from years of construction, and from the large industrial and major retail buildings, and their delivery trucks, tractor trailers, garbage trucks. (H20-2)

A buffer zone between our community and the proposed needs to be larger than planned for privacy and security concerns. (C8-9)

The land to be developed is south of Glen Summer Road, in Holbrook and all that would separate this wonderful community would be a small strip of berm which they claim would serve as a sound barrier. (C14-1)

The proposed Serota development is a 80' buffer extending from LIPA lines including a proposed berm with fencing on top resulting in destruction of 50' – 60' natural woodland leaving only 20' of trees remaining. This is a northern exposure – nothing will grow. It will look like a “wasteland” (Is Serota going to get gardeners to keep it green). (C18-1)

To put up “fencing is absolutely ludicrous” – (it will not work as a sound barrier anymore than my fence will keep out my neighbors noise out) (C18-2)

Allow 100' of natural woodland buffer plus a Sound Wall, similar to what is used on the highways – that is why they don't put wooden fences on highways because wooden fences are useless! (C18-3)

Also a solid wall cannot be penetrated through as a wooden fence will start deteriorating! Therefore permitting anything or anyone from coming into our community. This is serious security matter also! (C18-4)



Noise abatement walls must be constructed adjacent to our Autumn Ridge Community perimeters along Nicolls Road, Colin Drive and Beacon Drive. (C20-3)

We apologize, but because there's a sump at the end of our street, the buffer cannot extend. You will have nothing in between there except for the nature of a sump. If you stand – if they did the wonderful visual planning that was done in my backyard, on my deck, anywhere in my backyard, you will see directly to the majority of this site. (H41-1)

The DEIS also does not fully address the problem of visual sight lines from the adjacent residential areas since they took only one view from one spot to demonstrate what the addition of 2 - 5 story buildings would be like. This is inadequate. (C17-9)

**Response ACR-5:**

As discussed in Section 2.0 and as illustrated on the Revised Conceptual Master Plan, the applicant has reconfigured the proposed uses and created a Revised Conceptual Master Plan. As previously described in Section 2, the industrial buildings and their associated service areas and driveways have been relocated from the northern portion of the property to the eastern and southeastern portions of the property and oriented toward Beacon Drive and Sunrise Highway. Therefore, the noise associated with garbage trucks, delivery trucks and tractor trailers servicing such industrial buildings in that location would be removed from the northern portion of the property that is adjacent to existing residences. In addition, the distance between the closest internal roadway and the northern property line has been increased to approximately 425 feet. The closest building to the northern property line is a small day care facility that is set back approximately 300 feet. The next closest buildings are the proposed multi-family residential buildings, which would be located approximately 525 feet from the northern property line.

Furthermore, athletic fields (which are not proposed to be lighted) have been proposed in the northern portion of the site, in place of the industrial buildings shown in the previously-proposed DEIS Plan. A six-foot high fence is proposed to be installed at the edge of the playing fields, thus creating a 160-foot buffer between the playing fields and the northern property line, 80 feet of which would remain naturally wooded. It is expected that the proposed buffer and fence, and the removal of the industrial buildings to the eastern and southeastern portion of the property would minimize adverse noise and visual impacts and provide adequate security to the surrounding neighborhood.

Noise impacts to the Autumn Ridge Community generated from traffic along Nicolls Road and Colin Drive are pre-existing and implementation of the proposed development is not expected to increase these impacts significantly. A natural area, approximately 240±-feet wide at its most narrow point, would be left intact in the northeast portion of the subject property to provide a buffer between the proposed development and the Autumn Ridge Community.



Specifically, with respect to the residences north of the existing recharge basin, the six-foot high chain-link screen fence with vinyl slats is proposed to be installed just north of the playing fields, a minimum of 160 feet from the residential property line to the north. It should be noted that the proposed fence would follow the line of the westernmost baseball field and run to the south of the existing recharge basin, which is also currently fenced. This will obscure views of the site from the area north of the existing recharge basin, and from the northern residential area, in general. Also, instead of removing the trees at the northern portion of the property in order to create a berm (which was proposed in the prior Conceptual Master Plan in the DEIS and was cited in several of the comments), but which was not the majority opinion, these trees would remain to form a natural buffer between the proposed development and the residences to the north. The areas to the north of the fence would remain in their existing condition. Therefore, the maintenance of the existing vegetation and fencing around the recharge basin (see Figure 1), and the additional placement of a six-foot high fence with vinyl-slats to the south of the recharge basin fence (see Appendix C) will minimize views from the houses along Bishop Lane into the proposed Islip Pines development.

Overall, the relocation of the more intensive industrial uses and their associated service areas and driveways from the northern portion of the property and their replacement with less intensive recreational uses, the retention of 80 feet of natural vegetation and the installation of the six-foot fence instead of the berm, as well as the increased distance of the nearest structures (with the exception of the day care facility) will assist in attenuating noise from construction and operation, since large-scale buildings would be located farther away from the northern property line and a wide vegetated buffer would be maintained. The relocation of the industrial buildings and their associated service area away from the northern portion of the property and their replacement with less intense recreational and open space uses would minimize adverse noise and visual impacts in the post-development phase of the project.

**Comment ACR-6:**

The ball fields or the open space, are we talking high lights that are going to be glowing in the dark into my second floor bedroom? Am I going to be seeing those lit up at night? That's a question I would like answered. (H25-2)

**Response ACR-6:**

While the athletic fields have been relocated to the northern portion of the site, they are not proposed to be lighted. Furthermore, the Revised Conceptual Master Plan contains a 160-foot wide buffer (including an 80-foot-wide natural area) between the athletic fields and the northern property line. Further, any lighting on the parcel outside the recreational areas would comply with prevailing Town zoning requirements.



**3.1.11 Alternatives – AL**

**Comment AL-1:**

In my opinion, something like this would be better suited for, like, the Ronkonkoma train hub, which they're trying to develop. You already have public transportation there, buses that come; something that would ease the traffic congestion that's going to happen when this thing – if it get built. (H37-2)

**Response AL-1:**

The comment is noted. The applicant owns the property that is the subject of this application, and has the right to request a change of zone for the property to permit development of the proposed mixed-use community. Moreover, the Town has agreed to review the application for rezoning of the subject property.

**Comment AL-2:**

The increase in tax revenues from this development would be advantageous to all municipal taxing authorities but might not be as lucrative under possible alternatives. (C1-4)

**Response AL-2:**

As required by the Final Scope (see Appendix A of the DEIS), the Islip Pines DEIS examined four alternatives in Sections 7.1 through 7.2, including No-Action, Development in Accordance with Prevailing Zoning, Retail/Industrial Alternative and Retail/Commercial/Open Space Alternative. This alternatives analysis included an examination of property taxes for each alternative broken down by municipal taxing jurisdiction. Table 76 - Comparison of Alternatives, contained in the DEIS, showed that the previously-proposed DEIS Plan would generate the highest annual gross property tax revenue amongst all the alternatives examined. This remains the case for the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan, as seen in the chart below.

PARAMETER	Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan	Previously-Proposed DEIS Plan	No-Action	As-of-Right	Alternate 1	Alternate 2
Gross Property Tax Revenue	\$8,581,890	\$5,909,354±	\$412,022	\$3,123,378±	\$4,422,158±	\$3,990,403±



**Comment AL-3:**

I fail to see how the Serota properties have the best interest of the Parkland community when have placed the “big box” stores with their loading docks (not to mention the lights that will be shining through the night) butting directly against the residents of Glen Summer Road. Why can’t they go back to the drawing board and redesign these buildings so that those “big” stores or industrial facilities butt up with Costco. Would that make more sense? (C14-10)

**Response AL-3:**

As discussed in Section 2.0 of this FEIS, and as shown on the Revised Conceptual Master plan, the applicant has redesigned the proposed Islip Pines development to relocate the industrial buildings to the eastern portion of the site, and orient them toward Beacon Drive (away from the residential uses to the north). These buildings have also been reduced in mass, they have been divided into a number of smaller buildings, their height has been increased from two to four stories and they have been placed in a more campus-like layout. Further, the industrial buildings have been changed from solely industrial to industrial/R&D/office space.

In addition, the larger retail facilities have been relocated to the “front” of the site along the Sunrise Highway North Service Road and Veterans Memorial Highway. The proposed cinema has been relocated to the western portion of the site, proximate to the off-site Federal Express facility.

**Comment AL-4:**

Chapter 7.0 – Alternatives and their potential impacts:

- Add a 15% minimum provision of office square footage in the As-of-Right alternative. This would also increase sewage generation.
- Reduce amount of projected Industrial square footage to approximately 1.85 million square feet.
- Increase amount of projected Natural area that would be preserved under the As-of-Right alternative. Planning Board would mandate a cluster subdivision thus preserving more open space than projected.
- Add analysis of job quality and wage rates, not simply raw numbers of job creation of pages 325 and 337.  
(C25-5)

I am making the recommendation also that the amount of projected industrial square footage should be reduced to about 1.85 million square feet. The reason this is true is because typically in order to do a real napkin sketch analysis of as-of-right yield, we usually take out 15 percent of the property just for roads, and recharge basins, and so forth. When one applies a 35 percent FAR over the entire site, over only 85 percent of the site, it actually reduces some of the projected as-of-right industrial square footage. So I make that recommendation as well. (H4-7)



Because the Industrial 1 District and the Industrial Corridor District allow a wide range of uses as-of-right, we'd like to see a 15 percent minimum provision of office space in that as-of-right analysis. (H4-6)

**Response AL-4:**

The DEIS includes the following alternatives, which were identified during formal scoping process and set forth in the Final Scope:

- No Action (site remains as it currently exists)
- Redevelopment in accordance with prevailing zoning

The applicant also analyzed two additional alternatives in the DEIS:

- Alternate 1 - Retail/Industrial Alternative
- Alternate 2 - Retail/Commercial/Open Space Alternative

All of these alternatives are included in the DEIS, Sections 7.1 through 7.4, respectively. In addition, Table 76 of the DEIS provides a summary comparison of the quantitative impacts of all four alternatives with the proposed action.

The applicant will continue to work with the Town, through the site plan review process, to refine various elements of the plan.

With respect to job quality and wage rates, see Response SO-3, which summarizes the wages for different job classifications associated with the Revised Conceptual Master Plan. The mix of uses within the Revised Conceptual Master Plan as compared to the as-of-right alternative would generate a greater variety of jobs at varying levels and pay scales.

---

**3.1.12 Procedure – PR**

**Comment PR-1:**

Would you also be open to the possibility of perhaps a roundtable with a representative of the residents groups – I know you've done a lot of outreach, but even still we have probably more than 200 people here tonight. Would you do a roundtable with the Chambers and some of the residents to try to come to more of a common ground here? (H1-9)



Councilwoman Bergin-Weichbrodt suggested a round table with the Serota Organization and residents of the Parkland Development, a great idea, to discuss a more doable plan; I would encourage you to do so and would like to sit on that round table. (C7-9)

**Response PR-1:**

Since 2008, the applicant has met with or discussed the proposed Islip Pines development with representatives of the following civic and community organizations:

- Parkland Civic Association (several)
- Holbrook Manor Fire Company and Holbrook Ambulance
- Bayport-Blue Point Civic Association
- Members of Parkland Community not part of Civic Association
- Bishop Lane Civic Association
- Sachem School District
- Sachem Youth Athletic Council

In addition, there has been outreach to Sayville Chamber of Commerce, Holbrook Chamber of Commerce and the Bayport-Blue Point Chamber of Commerce.

There has also been direct in-person contact or attempted in-person contact (in lieu thereof written information on the development delivered to residences) with over 200 homes in the immediate community including homes within the Parkland community, Bishop Lane community and the Autumn Ridge community.

The applicant has heard the comments at the public hearing and reviewed all the comments included in the written correspondence and has prepared the Islip Pines Revised Conceptual Master Plan (see Section 2.0 and Appendix C) in response to such comments.

Moreover, the applicant has met with representatives of the Parkland Civic Association to discuss with them the Revised Conceptual Master Plan presented in this FEIS.

**Comment PR-2:**

Has the applicant met with you [David Genaway] and the deputy commissioner to go over the site plan? (H1-10)

**Response PR-2:**

The applicant has met with members of the Town Planning Department (including Mr. Genaway and Mr. Zapolski) on several occasions.



**Comment PR-3:**

Also, can you give me an idea on when we go through this timetable, how long the applicant has before this comes back before the Town Board for a vote? (H1-11)

**Response PR-3:**

The statutory timeframe is that an FEIS is to be filed by the Town within 45 days of the close of the public hearing or within 60 days of the filing of the DEIS, whichever occurs later. However, the Planning Department continued to provide comments to the applicant up until February 14, 2013. The Town has requested that the applicant prepare the FEIS for its review and approval for filing. The applicant has reviewed all the comments and has prepared a Revised Conceptual Master Plan, which addresses many of the comments. The applicant has also prepared responses to all substantive comments in the FEIS based upon the Revised Conceptual Master Plan. This FEIS is being submitted to the Town Board, with a request that it be filed. When the Town finds that the FEIS is acceptable for filing, it will do so and issue a notice of completion of the FEIS. The FEIS is then circulated to all involved agencies, for a minimum public consideration period of ten days.

Thereafter, the Town Board can issue a Findings Statement, which concludes the SEQRA process. Once the SEQRA process is concluded, the Town Board can render a decision on the application.

The Town may then officially refer this application to the Suffolk County Planning Commission (SCPC) pursuant to New York State General Municipal Law and the Suffolk County Charter. The SCPC will then issue a recommendation to the Town Board.

The Town Board will also simultaneously refer the matter to its Planning Board for a recommendation.

The recommendations of the SCPC are binding on the Town Board. However, if the SPCP issues any recommendations, the Town Board may only override those recommendations by a supermajority vote (minimum 4-1 vote).

**Comment PR-4:**

I just wanted to sum this up by having you explain, if this application to change the zone is approved, after that, site plan review would still continue where major modifications could be made to this plan; is that correct? (H1-12)

**Response PR-4:**

The application for creation of a new zoning district and the request for change of zone of the subject property is simultaneously being considered with the environmental review. Upon completion of the



SEQRA process a decision on the zoning application can be made. Should such zoning be applied to the subject property, a site plan review process would occur, wherein site plan modifications could result. Upon receipt of an approved site plan, building permits may be processed.

**Comment PR-5:**

Now, I will tell you that the developer has been communicating with us, has reached out to us. We've had several meetings with them back in '08 when the first hearing was coming, and then we heard from them this January. And we have been in contact with them since then. They have provided us with answers. (H26-1)

**Response PR-5:**

The comment is noted. The applicant has met with numerous groups throughout the environmental review process (see Response PR-1).

**Comment PR-6:**

Please have a Town meeting. Please have the Parkland residents involved. The developer has been great, but sitting here tonight, all my speeches that I was going to make, I don't know what's being built yet. There's too many things that can change. You can't pass this zoning law without talking to us. I implore it. (H26-3)

**Response PR-6:**

The application and environmental assessment form (EAF) for proposed action was brought before the Town Board in 2007. Since that time, there have been several opportunities for public participation in the environmental review process. A Draft Scope was submitted by the applicant to the lead agency, and public scoping was conducted. The public was able to submit written comments and a public scoping session was held on November 18, 2009, wherein the public was able to provide input as to the topics to be analyzed in the DEIS. The applicant prepared a DEIS for the proposed action, and during that time, the applicant had several meeting with members of the Parkland Civic Association. In addition, a public hearing was held on the DEIS that was accepted by the lead agency as adequate for public review on March 22, 2012. At that time, members of the public were given the opportunity to speak about the environmental aspects of the application. In addition, the comment period for the DEIS was held open for an additional 10 days past the date of the hearing, in accordance with the SEQRA regulations.

In addition, as explained in Response PR-1, the applicant has had numerous meetings with various interested parties.



**Comment PR-7:**

The other major thing I just want to say is notification. In good faith, don't notify the minimum. I walked around and told everyone I could find about this meeting tonight. Why didn't the developer? Wasn't it important? Didn't they want that good faith out there? Don't you want to tell everyone this is the best thing? That's the way this was presented (indicating), hand delivered to my home. And I don't know how many of you received it. But this is what one block in my development got. One block. Where's the good faith? (H33-4)

The entire Holbrook area should have been notified regarding what is being proposed. This does not affect the residents who live directly behind the proposed sites. There are small business owners who live and work here who would be affected by this. This could harm Main St. and the homeowners around Main St. This affects commuters as they will be affected by increasing traffic and new traffic patterns. This affects commercial landlords along Sunrise Hwy and Main St who are struggling to fill vacancies. (C33-1)

My name is Lou Azzara. I'm the president of the New England Village Home Owners Association. It's a civic association in Holbrook. We were never contacted. We were never contacted by the Serota people as far as the community outreach program. (H11-1)

**Response PR-7:**

In addition to notifying the Parkland Civic Association, Autumn Ridge Homeowners Association, and the Bishop Lane community regarding the hearing, the homeowners who live within the Town of Islip's notification area, were all visited individually to provide information and notice of the hearing. As noted in Response PR-1, over 200 homes were contacted individually and many more were left information at their homes if they were not home to receive it in person.

Furthermore, the applicant has followed the hearing notification procedures as outlined in the Town Code. The applicant has provided the Town with the appropriate documentation indicating its compliance with the Town's hearing notification regulations.

**Comment PR - 8:**

I question whether the call of this meeting is even correctly done. I heard the developer say this isn't smart growth. It's mixed use. The call is wrong. I'm sorry, that's what it says. (H21-5)

**Response PR-8:**

The application is, in part, for the creation of a new zoning district which was entitled the Islip Smart Growth Planned Development District at the time of application. Therefore, the notification is correct



with respect to the use of the term “smart growth.” Moreover, the applicant has followed the hearing notification procedures as outlined in the Town Code. The applicant provided the Town with the appropriate documentation indicating its compliance with the Town’s hearing notification regulations in the form of the required affidavits. The Planned Development District title has been changed to the Islip Mixed Use Planned Development District to better reflect the concept plan that has been revised pursuant to public comment and submitted as part of this FEIS.

---

### **3.1.13 Miscellaneous– MS**

#### **Comment MS-1:**

Understand our concerns are not depriving the union workers of building a residence in the area, but it’s the industry, the five-floor hotel, the noise, the light factor. They’re all going to have a bearing on our little community right next door. (H10-3)

#### **Response MS-1:**

The comment is noted. The prevailing zoning permits the construction of over two million square feet of industrial and/or office space on the property.

#### **Comment MS-2:**

We also want the developer to be very specific regarding noise mitigation during and after construction. I’d like to know, has a noise study been done showing noise levels during each phase in active construction? And if this has been done, where did they measure from? (H20-3)

#### **Response MS-2:**

While the impact on noise was not identified by the Town Board as potentially significant and was not included in the Final Scope issued by the Town Board, the proposed Islip Pines development includes measures to minimize noise impacts. During construction, construction equipment would be required to have installed and properly operating appropriate noise muffler systems.

With respect to the operational phase of the project, as discussed in Response ZLU-10, the relocation of the industrial buildings with their associated service areas and driveways to the eastern and southeastern portions of the property and their replacement with a 160-foot-wide buffer (80 feet of which will remain in its natural vegetated condition), and open space and recreational uses will minimize noise impacts to the proximate sensitive receptors, including the residential area to the north. Further, a six-foot high chain-link screen fence with vinyl slats is proposed to be installed just north of the playing fields, a



minimum of 160 feet from the residential property line to the north. The closest proposed internal roadway to the north has been relocated to approximately 425 feet from the northern border of the site, thereby minimizing potential noise impacts from internal roads to sensitive receptors.

Moreover, the design of this development will serve to help attenuate existing roadway noise to the residences to the north as well as to the proposed residences in Islip Pines. The existing residences to the north are located 2,400 feet from the Sunrise Highway North Service Road. The intervening proposed buildings, the fence and the increased vegetated buffer to the north will all assist in minimizing the noise from Sunrise Highway and the Service Road. The NYSDOT has indicated that “vegetation can reduce highway traffic noise,” and the proposed retention of the vegetated buffer along the northern portion of the site will serve this function.

In addition, during both construction and operation, activities would be performed at the times permitted by the Town of Islip, in accordance with Chapter 35, Noise, of the Town Code, as explained herein. For example, with respect to construction and operational noise, §35-3 indicates that the following are prohibited:

*G. Heavy equipment. The operation of any pile driver, pneumatic hammer, derrick, electric hoist, bulldozer, grinder or other appliance or heavy equipment, the use of which creates a noise disturbance, except between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and except in cases of urgent necessity or in the interest of public safety.*

*H. Loading and unloading. The loading or unloading of any vehicle, boat, barge or train or the opening and destruction of bales, boxes, crates and containers or the loading or unloading of any materials, equipment or garbage cans so as to create a noise disturbance.*

*I. Construction or repairing of buildings. Any construction, excavation, demolition, alteration or repair which creates a noise disturbance, except between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekdays and except in cases of urgent necessity or in the interest of public safety.*

*M. Domestic equipment. The operation of or permitting to be operated any power saw, drill, sander, router, lawn or garden devise, leaf or snowblower, insect control device or domestic equipment so as to create a noise disturbance, except 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, and except in cases of urgent necessity or in the interest of public safety.*

Based on the foregoing, no significant adverse noise impacts are expected.

**Comment MS-3:**

The proposal also calls for the burying of north-south LIPA high lines along their property. Who pays for that? Does Serota pay for that, or do we as LIPA customers pay for that? I think we're going to have to pay for that if they're going to bury them. (H25-8)



**Response MS-3:**

The applicant is proposing to incur of the cost of burying the LIPA lines.

**Comment MS-4**

This room holds about 125 to 130 people. But you're not seeing what was outside. What was outside was over another 100 people out there, and they're union people. But I want to make mention about the fact that they're union people. They're also taxpayers. They're residents, and they live in this Town, and they're all for this project. They want to see this development go. (H27-1)

**Response MS-4:**

The comment is noted. The Town of Islip Town Board, in accordance with the SEQRA process, will consider all substantive comments made at the DEIS public hearing and all written comments received, as well as all of the information included in the DEIS and FEIS. The Town Board will then make a determination with regard to the proposed action.

**Comment MS-5:**

I am concerned about noise and light pollution. (C8-7)

**Response MS-5:**

With respect to noise, see Responses MS-2 and ZLU-10.

As described in Section 4.4.1 of the DEIS, the proposed zoning (IMUPDD) contains a section on exterior lighting, which indicates the following:

***Exterior Lighting***

- A. *All exterior street and pedestrian lighting fixtures and columns shall be consistent throughout each subdistrict of the IMUPDD.*
- B. *All lighting shall be positioned or shielded so as to illuminate the development parcel only and there shall be no spillover of any lighting onto any residential lot.*
- C. *All lighting adjacent to a buffer zone shall be positioned in such a manner so as to eliminate glare on adjoining properties.*

The proposed athletic fields located in the northern portion of the property are not proposed to be lighted.



Overall, there will be no light spillover onto adjacent properties and roadways from the Islip Pines development. Moreover, the applicant will comply with Town zoning requirements with respect to lighting.

**Comment MS-6:**

I will preface my remarks by acknowledging that Serota Properties currently has the right to develop this property as industrial, and that they are seeking a zoning change to develop their property to mixed use. Either way, the potential for increased revenues for the town is a strong enticement and can be difficult to resist. Surely, in a perfect world, such a development could be a win-win for all concerned parties. However, this possible achievement must be tempered by the realities of the world as it is: the poor economy, the existing environmental conditions, the quality of life currently enjoyed, and the impact on the community for years to come. (C17-1)

**Response MS-6:**

The comment is noted. As required by SEQRA (§617.11(d)), the Town of Islip Town Board, as lead agency, in its Findings on the proposed action, must:

- (1) consider the relevant environmental impacts, facts and conclusions disclosed in the final EIS;*
- (2) weigh and balance relevant environmental impacts with social, economic and other considerations;*
- (3) provide a rationale for the agency's decision;*
- (4) certify that the requirements of this Part have been met;*
- (5) certify that consistent with social, economic and other essential considerations from among the reasonable alternatives available, the action is one that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable, and that adverse environmental impacts will be avoided or minimized to the maximum extent practicable by incorporating as conditions to the decision those mitigative measures that were identified as practicable.*

Therefore, the Town Board will consider all of the information that is part of the record in making SEQRA Findings, prior to making a decision regarding the application.

**Comment MS-7:**

Our concerns are about sewage, traffic, low water pressure (it is too low now – what will happen later?) (C18-8)



**Response MS-7:**

With respect to sewage, see Response WR-6. The Parkland STP has the capacity to collect and treat the sewage effluent anticipated to be generated by the proposed Islip Pines development. With respect to water pressure, see the Response WR-1, which indicates that the SCWA does not have a concern that the Islip Pines development would have a significant adverse impact on the water pressure in the area. Finally, see Section 3.1.5, Transportation and Parking, in this FEIS and Sections 3.5, 4.5 and 5.5 in the DEIS, with respect to traffic concerns.

**Comment MS-8:**

Please do not allow this to happen here. We homeowners pay high taxes to keep our area clean, quiet and to maintain our quality of life, without worrying about Serota ruining it for all of us! I don't see him giving back to the community - just destroying it. (C18-10)

**Response MS-8:**

The comment is noted.

**Comment MS-9:**

Please do not allow Islip Pines to be built. It will kill the area plus bring incredible congestion. Taxes are great but at what costs. There are enough stores as it is. Look at the number of empty stores at the Sun-Vet Mall and along Sunrise Highway in Islip. (C19-1)

**Response MS-9:**

With respect to traffic congestion, see Response TP-21. In addition, with respect to empty stores, see Response SO-1. Total gross tax revenue from the Revised Conceptual Master Plan is expected to be \$8,581,890, annually, based on the current tax rate. Also, see Response MS-7 regarding the Town's responsibilities with regard to Findings and the decision on the application. The Town will weigh all aspects of the proposed action prior to making a decision on the application.

**Comment MS-10:**

This proposal is too massive in size for the area and contains too much concrete and steel and not enough green area. (C20-10)



**Response MS-10:**

The comment has been taken under consideration, and the Revised Conceptual Master Plan increases the amount of green/open space on the site from 40.00± acres to 56.82± acres. In addition, the use of green roofs has been incorporated into the design of many of the buildings within Islip Pines.

**Comment MS-11:**

It will be unwise to consider a project this size for the Holbrook and the surrounding areas. It is massive and out of boundaries with Town of Islip's Master Plan. As a resident of Holbrook and a business owner I oppose such a massive project. I ask you kindly to oppose the Islip Pines project. (C21-1)

**Response MS-11:**

The comment is noted.

**Comment MS-12:**

Trish [Bergin-Weichbrodt] spoke to a Rich Mikucki. He called to find out what the next step in the application process for Serota was and indicated his support of the project. (C22-1)

**Response MS-12:**

The next step in the process is the preparation of this FEIS. Once the FEIS is filed by the Town Board, it can make its findings and conclude the SEQRA process. Once the SEQRA process is concluded, the Town Board can make a decision regarding the application.

The support of the project is noted.

**Comment MS-13:**

To *disapprove* of this project is to halt the evolution of Long Island's eastern end. Our Island's proximity to the economic powerhouse that is Manhattan is advantageous in the value of attraction to corporations and thus; jobs.

To *disapprove* of this project is to turn your back on a large swath of capable and talented youth that will be forced to exodus southerly.

I will resign from explaining further benefits of this modern construction in order to let my previous points mentioned marinate more effectively in the minds of the powers at hand.



Lastly, I want to express my gratitude for your time in reading and my hopes of your expedition in working to **approve** future projects that lie in the same grain and evolution as "Island Pines" [sic]. (C30-1)

**Response MS-13:**

The comment is noted.

**Comment MS-14:**

If Mr. Serota has an occupant ready and would like to erect an office building to house a major corporation who will offer REAL CAREERS and benefits to our workforce, then let's talk. But people are learning to be conservative spenders and the time of opulence is over. I ask, PLEASE do not allow this to happen to our BEAUTIFUL HOLBROOK. (C33-11)

**Response MS-14:**

The comment is noted.

**Comment MS-15:**

We the Myers family at 58 Glenmere Way, Holbrook, New York are writing to you because we are concern about the project that is before you. We feel that with this development our neighborhood will become unsafe for use and the neighborhood children to live in. (C34-1)

**Response MS-15:**

The comment is noted.

**Comment MS-16:**

Mitigation Fees – As has been done previously in the Central Islip Planned Development District, the Town Board required that the developers pay a mitigation fee for downtown revitalization to alleviate impacts to downtown businesses imposed by the proposed retail development. In Central Islip, four developments with a combined total of 761 residential units and 330,000 square feet of retail space contributed \$1,000,000 to revitalizing the downtown. Discussion of a similar fee for the Islip Pines PDD should be included in the FEIS. (C36-4)

Transportation connections – Consideration should be given to public transportation connections to existing downtowns and other commercial areas along Sunrise Highway including MacArthur Airport. Such connections might include new Suffolk Transit Bus Routes or alteration to existing routes. (C36-5)



Linkages to existing commercial area and/or downtowns - In-kind construction – Physical capital improvements to downtown areas which could supplement existing public works projects including the possibility of sewer infrastructure planning and/or construction. (C36-6)

Linkages to existing commercial area and/or downtowns - Joint marketing – signage and internet web presence. (C36-7)

As a clarification to the concept of a “downtown mitigation fee” referenced in my previous letter, this was offered as one of several solutions that may assist the Town Board in mitigating any impacts to the nearby downtowns. The example cited in my letter pertained to the Central Islip Planned Development District. In that particular case, a consortium of 4 developers contributed a total of \$1 million for upgrades to the CI downtown. If any mitigation fee is required by the Town Board in connection with this application, the exact amount would need to be calculated. Again, any *combination* of any of these ‘linkages’ may suffice as well. (C37-1)

**Response MS-16:**

As explained in Responses SO-1 of this FEIS, and Section 4.9 and Appendix P of the DEIS, the proposed project is not expected to have significant adverse impacts on downtown areas.

Notwithstanding this, the applicant is proposing to develop civic uses that are available to the public. Specifically, the applicant is proposing athletic fields, tennis courts, a tennis pavilion, a youth/senior center, and a large central civic space (“great lawn”), including a pond, outdoor cinema/stage, walking trails and arboretum. The applicant has indicated that the cost of construction of these facilities is approximately \$2.5 million to \$3.0 million. Moreover, the value of the land on which these amenities will be constructed ranges from approximately \$11.9 million to \$12.5 million. Accordingly, the proposed Islip Pines development is making a significant contribution for publicly-accessible facilities.

The applicant will be constructing public amenities on the site at its own expense.

Furthermore, as explained in Section 1.0, as the Town Board prepares its Findings Statement and ultimate decision on this matter, as required by the SEQRA regulations, it will weigh and balance relevant environmental factors with economic and social factors. In addition, the Town Board’s Findings Statement will set forth the required mitigation measures, which will be included as conditions to any approval issued. The Town Board will work with the applicant to develop Covenants and Restrictions, which will be filed to ensure that all practicable mitigation measures are implemented to minimize potential significant adverse impacts.