February 9, 2017

Town of Islip
Zoning Board of Appeals
655 Main Street
Islip, NY 11751
Attn: Olga Murray

Re: Pilgrim State Property – Heartland Town Square
Local File No.: CZ2003-014
S.C.P.C. File No.: ZSR-17-02

Dear Ms. Murray:

The Suffolk Planning Commission at its regular meeting on February 1, 2017, reviewed the referral from the Town of Islip entitled, “Pilgrim State Property – Heartland Town Square” referred to it pursuant to Section A14-14 thru A14-25, Article XIV of the Suffolk County Administrative Code.

The attached Resolution signifies action taken by the Commission relative to this application.

Very Truly Yours,

Sarah Lansdale
Director of Planning

Andrew P. Freling
Chief Planner

APF/od
cc: Ron Meyer, Town of Islip, Commissioner of Planning
Sean Colgan, Town of Islip, Senior Planner
ZSR-17-02

Resolution No. ZSR-17-02 of the Suffolk County Planning Commission
Pursuant to Sections A14-14 to thru A14-25 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections A14-14 thru A14-25 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code, a referral was received on 12/29/2016 at the offices of the Suffolk County Planning Commission with respect to the application of “Pilgrim State Property – Heartland Town Square” located in the Town of Islip, and

WHEREAS, said referral was considered by the Suffolk County Planning Commission at its meeting on February 1, 2017, now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Suffolk County Planning Commission hereby adopts the report of its staff, as the report of the Commission, Be it further

RESOLVED, pursuant to Section A14-16 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code and Section 239-m 6 of the General Municipal Law, the referring municipality within thirty (30) days after final action, shall file a report with the Suffolk County Planning Commission, and if said action is contrary to this recommendation, set forth the reasons for such contrary action, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Suffolk County Planning Commission Approves the referral of Pilgrim State Property, Heartland Town Square from the Town of Islip for the application to 1.) amend the Zoning Chapter (68) of the Code of the Town of Islip to establish a Pilgrim State Planned Redevelopment District (PSPRD) and 2.) to change the zoning classification of certain parcels comprising approximately 452 acres of land to said PSPRD and for 3.) adoption of the Conceptual Master Plan for the proposed Heartland Town Square development project with the following conditions as modifications and with the following comments:

Conditions:

1. Fifteen 15% of all residential units shall be set aside as workforce housing units.

   Reason:
   The Suffolk County Legislature amended §740-45, to set affordable housing requirement for out of district sewer connections to 15%. The amendment is applicable to formal certification by the Sewer Agency after the effective date. The petitioners are proposing 10% of the units to be affordable units.

2. Development of the Heartland Town Square project shall provide connection to the Deer Park LIRR train station via paved street access for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians through the Heartland Business Center and for possible other future transportation uses.

   Reason: This will reduce the need for motor vehicles and the shuttle bus from entering state and county road right of way and reduce trip generation onto said roadways.

3. The approval of Heartland Town Square application shall comply with the conditions of mitigation as enumerated by the SEQRA Findings Statement.

   Reason: Efforts of the Town Board and Town Planning Board through the numerous meetings, hearings and work sessions have resulted in reasonable and rational mitigations and warranties to monitor the subject development application and make appropriate adjustments as future situations may dictate.
4. The Town of Islip shall continue to monitor traffic issues as the project proceeds and shall establish periodic milestone reviews commencing at 50% occupancy.

Reason: Earlier monitoring of transportation metrics to measure the effectiveness of proposed mitigations is warranted. The same rationale applies to continuous milestone reviews as the project proceeds to Phases 2 & 3. The effectiveness of congestion mitigations should be tested over time.

5. The Town of Islip shall examine the water drawdown from the project in terms of long term area impacts, in terms of surrounding impacts, not site specific impacts, in cooperation with the Suffolk County Water Authority.

Reason: Contributing to Regional monitoring of groundwater level impacts and effects on fresh surface water bodies is sound planning, particularly with respect to large projects with treated waste water discharges directed to Suffolk County Bays and the Atlantic Ocean.

6. Applicant shall use Rain Sensors to control irrigation needs where applicable.

Reason: Not withstanding other conservation techniques, irrigation of landscaped areas is likely to be the biggest component of groundwater use. Additional irrigation methods are to be considered.

7. Applicant shall look into the feasibility of putting the traffic light at the entrance to Pilgrim State Property from Commack Road, (CR4) at the commencement of the project.

Reason: Left turn movements from the subject property are problematic to and from CR4 in the existing condition. Facilitating the traffic signal will alleviate turn movements issues sooner than later.

8. The Petitioner shall certify to the Town of Islip Building Department that all contractors and subcontractors for all retail, commercial and industrial work on the Heartland project are participants in an apprenticeship training program approved and certified by either New York State Department of Labor or United States Department of Labor.

Reason: Assurance to Industry safety standards and a high quality of workmanship are more readily adhered to via apprenticeship training.

Comments:

1. Further investigation of the feasibility of LIRR passenger rail connection to the Heartland Town Square development site and improvement of the Heartland Station in the future should be investigated prior to approval of Phases 2 and the improvement of DU3. A right-of-way should be established and maintained for future rail linkage.

2. The Suffolk County Planning Commission offers the following comments on the proposed Article:

   a. The authority to approve incremental development in the proposed Article is delegated to either the Commissioner of Planning or the Planning Board but it is not clear which one under what circumstance.

   b. There are no architectural elements in the code.

   c. The code should provide for a mechanism of certainty in maintaining concierge and shuttle services.

   d. Additional Parking Demand Reduction Techniques should be considered including a covenanted program to require separate fees for parking and encouraging the utilization of pre-tax transit commuter benefits as long as they exist.
The proposed Use Regulations within the intended Article attempt to prohibit use. It would be easier to list the permitted uses intended for the PSPRD and expressly prohibit all uses not enumerated. This would shorten the legislation and in this way evolving land use trends not envisioned by code as prohibited (oxygen bars, vape shops, etc.) could be accepted via the use variance process. This would better allow for an analysis of the proposed use, including the uniqueness and frequency of the request its potential harmful effects and the likelihood that the use will or will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

3. The applicant should be advised to contact the Suffolk County Department of Health Services and the Suffolk County Department of Public Works for wastewater treatment considerations of the proposed HTS development.

4. The applicant should be advised to contact the Suffolk County Department of Public Works and the NYS Department of Transportation for approvals for coordination of all roadway congestion mitigations itemized on page 18-20 of the Town of Islip SEQRA Findings Statement for HTS Dated November 17, 2014.

5. The applicant should be encouraged to contact Suffolk County Transit to coordinate bus accommodations for the proposed development and future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) accommodations for the proposed development.

6. The applicant should be encouraged to review the Suffolk County Planning Commission publication on Managing Stormwater-Natural Vegetation and Green Methodologies and incorporate into the proposal, where practical, design elements contained therein.

7. The applicant should be encouraged to review the Suffolk County Planning Commission Guidebook particularly with respect to energy efficiency and incorporate where practical, applicable elements contained therein.

8. The applicant should be encouraged to review the Suffolk County Planning Commission Guidebook particularly with respect to public safety and universal design and incorporate where practical, applicable elements contained therein.

9. Recognition of the Suffolk County designated Prime Farm Soils occurring on site is warranted and a greater effort to incorporate options for community gardening or other appropriate uses of the farm soil should be included in planning additional amenities for the “Common Areas.”

10. The applicant should be encouraged to revisit and explore the feasibility of some form of restricted access for the improved Fish Path signalized intersection into the Heartland Town Square.

11. The applicant should meet with the Nassau Suffolk Building Trades under the direction and guidance of the Suffolk County Commissioner of Labor in order to ensure an agreement is reached between the Applicant and the affiliates of the Nassau Suffolk Building Trades related to an individual or master labor plan between the Nassau Suffolk Building Trades and the Applicant.

12. The Applicant should continuously monitor the wastewater flow from Phase I buildout and report use generated flow from the development for information related to the initiation of Phase 2.

13. The Town of Islip should reconsider that section of the EIS dealing with tax impacts upon the Brentwood School District and look again at the issue and the tax analysis. The Town should also consider reservation of land for a possible new school.

- The Suffolk County Planning Commission Guidebook for policies and guidelines can be found on the internet at the below website address:
  http://www.suffolkcountyny.gov/Portals/0/planning/Publications/SCPCguidebk12r.pdf
### COMMISSION ACTIONS ON ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>RECUSED</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON, RODNEY - At Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASEY, JENNIFER - Town of Huntington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARTRAND, MATTHEW - Town of Islip</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHU, SAMUEL – Town of Babylon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDZELLA, JOHN – Town of Riverhead</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPOSITO, ADRIENNE - Villages over 5,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINN, JOHN - Town of Smithtown</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERSHOWITZ, KEVIN G. - At Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAUFMAN, MICHAEL - Villages under 5,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY, MICHAEL – Town of Brookhaven</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITT, ERROL – At Large</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAMER, SAMUEL – Town of East Hampton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOREHEAD, NICHOLAS – Town of Shelter Island</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANAMENTO, NICHOLAS - Town of Southold</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT - Town of Southampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motion:** Commissioner Chartrand  
**Present:** 14  

**Seconded:** Commissioner Chu  
**Absent:** 0  

**Voted:** 14  

**Recused:** 0  

**DECISION:** Approved