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Introduction

A trip though East Patchogue along Montauk Highway looks a lot like a trip along any number of other commercial strips on Long Island or, for that matter, across the country: gas stations, drive-thrus, the occasional vacant lot and retail businesses of different kinds - some healthy, some struggling – but all of them automobile-oriented and set back behind ample parking lots. Over the years the focus became the size of the parking lot in front of the store without regard for appearance or appeal from the street. To the driver passing thorough this is “Anywhere USA”. But to Focus East Patchogue (Focus), there is the potential for part of this road to become something very different: a “place” with its own identity. And while it may not be possible to make a complete downtown or “Main Street” in the conventional sense of the words – like the Village of Patchogue immediately to the west – it is possible to move beyond the commercial strip to a place that is attractive, walkable, and a mixed-use destination that attracts high quality development.
Focus East Patchogue

Focus East Patchogue is a volunteer civic organization that has been working hard to make this vision a reality. Over the last several years, Focus East Patchogue has accomplished a great deal to improve the quality of life in this part of the Town and has been the driving force behind the following initiatives, most of which have occurred in partnership with elected officials from Suffolk County and the Township of Brookhaven:

- Infrastructure and aesthetic improvements including road paving, new sidewalks, architectural lighting, tree plantings, and placement of garbage receptacles.
- Advocated for the extension of a sanitary sewer main from the Village of Patchogue eastward to Phyllis Drive which is located in the unincorporated area of Patchogue. The existence of this sewer main has allowed several businesses to connect and abandon antiquated, polluting septic systems and will enable more dense, future development to occur in the area.
- Urged the operators of the Salvation Army located on East Main Street to renovate their building, greatly improving its appearance.
- Acquisition of the land next to Swan Lake which was re-made into parkland including walking paths, benches and access to the lake for fishing.
- Acquisition of the land that was home to a long vacant car dealership on the south side of East Main Street which was then re-developed into a nature preserve with walking trails, ponds and stream access.
- Created the Focus East Patchogue triangle located at the intersection of East Main Street and South Country Road including extensive landscaping and welcome signage.
- Encourages business to open in the area by providing a community forum for the presentation of development plans, petition drives and advocacy. New businesses to the area over the past ten years include: Lowe’s Home Improvement, Best Market, U-Haul and Giovanni’s restaurant. All of these businesses took the place of former businesses that had been closed for many years and detracted from the community.
- Maintains an ongoing campaign to fight graffiti and illegal activity at bus stop locations.
- Continues to push for improved maintenance of the 325 East Main Street shopping center and other poorly maintained properties.
- Opposed the planned opening of a Walmart which may have had adverse impacts on the area’s local businesses and community.
- Advocated for many years to relocate the County-run Medical Center from its East Main Street location where it has existed for over 30 years. After a prolonged effort that required the acquisition of property, the relocation is now scheduled to occur in 2019.
- Encourages sensible development in the area by providing a community forum for the presentation of development plans and advocacy. A current example is for the proposed mixed use residential/retail project by Northwind Realty located at the corner of Grove Avenue and East Main Street.

With this report, Focus will add to this list of accomplishments East Patchogue Corridor Opportunity Analysis. This study is part of Regional Plan Association’s on-going work for the Suffolk County IDA and is carried out in support of the Connect Long Island plan set out by Suffolk County Executive Steve Bel-lone. With this transportation and development plan in mind, RPA focuses on connecting local needs with regional opportunity. Working with the IDA and municipalities, RPA seeks to:

- Connect Suffolk County’s assets to the New York region’s economy
- Unlock and capture value in and around downtowns
- Enhance downtown live, work, play experience
- Identify key actions needed to promote economic development
A Community-Driven Process

Focus East Patchogue has been leading this process, providing the RPA team with the kind of intelligence and information that only local stakeholders can provide.

Over the last 17 months, Focus has organized several convenings of different sizes and configurations:

- **Site tour**: On May 3rd, 2017 Focus organized a drive tour of the entire corridor to help RPA understand the larger context and to settle on the strategic section of the corridor that became the area this study concentrates on.

- **Working Session**: On July 26th, 2017 Focus convened a meeting at the Patchogue Village Hall to review the first round of strategies and design concepts for the corridor. This meeting was attended by Focus board members, elected officials and county agency representatives. At this meeting, RPA used a physical model of the study area to introduce preliminary redevelopment concepts and the strategy to create two cross-access corridors parallel to Montauk Highway, to make sure the overall understanding of the corridor was correct. At this meeting the study area was expanded to the eastern municipal boundary at Medford Avenue.

- **Stakeholder Workshop**: On October 10th, 2017 Focus convened the first of two larger sessions at the Mediterranean Manor. At this meeting, RPA presented the in-process research and design work and used the physical model during an interactive session to elicit comments. In addition to the attendees from the previous working session, other citizen stakeholders contributed including developers and land owners along the corridor and advocates for the Plaza Theater initiative. Also in attendance was Mitch Paley of the Long Island Builders Association who provided meaningful feedback to the overall development program.

- **Public Workshop**: On May 2nd, 2018 Focus convened a public workshop. Focus made an extensive outreach effort including newsletters, e-mails, announcements in local publications and direct phone calls. Over 100 people attended this session where RPA again presented the major strategies and design elements. At this meeting there was also a presentation by the Plaza Theater initiative. The developers of the Grove, a mixed-use development at a strategic corner along the corridor, were also present.
Use of the physical model

In order to help participants – and RPA - visualize the form of future development, a decision was made early on to build a physical model of the site. The model was not a highly refined presentation model but rather an interactive study model where sections could be removed or modified in real time during the stakeholder meetings. This enabled the transformation of the corridor to be demonstrated in stages, replicating the actual market-driven process which will also be incremental and take place over time. In this way it was also possible to demonstrate how each of the larger parcels could be redeveloped independently but in a way that would add up to a comprehensive and coordinated build-out. During the stakeholder working sessions, pieces of the model were lifted in and out and in some cases modified in real time. Finally, after consensus was reached on the overall three-dimensional vision shown in the model, the model was used to derive design guidelines for height, setback and siting as well as to estimate the square footage quantities in the schematic build-out program.

In the model, existing structures were built in wood. Dense blue plastic represents new structures.
Connecting East Patchogue

The entire East Patchogue commercial “strip”, from just east of Swan Lake to the municipal boundary, as labeled in the map above, is nearly a mile long. The capacity for new development is enormous so the transformation of this entire stretch into more of a pedestrian-oriented “main street” is at best a very long-term proposition and perhaps unrealistic. However, as it happens, the eastern quarter mile of this corridor that has been identified as the study area, is very strategic in several ways. There are several large parcels that are near each other and under consolidated ownership, so just one or two development projects can signal the transformation of the entire quarter mile segment. There is currently a proposal for a new mixed-use development at the corner of Grove Avenue and East Main Street that comports with the corridor redevelopment concepts promoted in this report. Also within this study area is the proposed Plaza Media Arts Center (PlazaMAC), a cultural destination that can give this segment a distinct identity.

Finally, this eastern segment connects seamlessly across the municipal boundary with Patchogue Village. It is barely a quarter mile from the East Patchogue town line to Maple Avenue where the road really starts to feel less like a “highway” and more like its local street name - East Main Street. This is the edge of downtown Patchogue Village which has been one of the true Long Island downtown revitalization success stories: the vibrant Patchogue Theater for the Performing Arts, new artists live/work space, attractive transit-oriented affordable housing and other new mixed-use developments. Here mixed-use buildings begin to define the space of the street, with storefronts along the sidewalk, offices and apartments above and parking behind. This is the model for the East Patchogue study area.

Focus East Patchogue has correctly identified this as an opportunity: to build on the energy of downtown Patchogue Village and grow it east, getting visitors and residents alike to walk just that extra quarter mile to East Patchogue and what will really feel like East Main Street. Streetscape improvements such as coordinated designs for landscaping, lighting, and wayfinding as well as new sidewalk oriented mixed-use buildings can make this happen. Patchogue Village also has a Long Island Railroad station and Focus has raised the possibility of a shuttle bus or rubber-wheeled trolley from the station to the portion of East Main Street in East Patchogue that is the target for transformation.
Study area context
Google Maps and RPA

Proposal for mixed use development at Grove Avenue
Google Maps and RPA

Typical redevelopment site.
See Page 20 for typical design guidelines.
Transit access is an important part of this vision of a compact, mixed-use place that is less auto-oriented. Currently, Suffolk County Transit provides bus service along Montauk Highway but the community has expressed concern about the maintenance of the existing bus shelters which have been attractors for graffiti and illicit activities. An inexpensive, early implementation initiative will be to upgrade the bus stops and bus shelters. Improvements include better lighting, real-time signage about bus schedules, and way-finding signs for East Patchogue. The locations of the existing shelters can be studied to see if there are better locations on the corridor that create less traffic friction on the road and provide more “eyes on the street” and the passive security that comes with that. In the future, as the cross-access corridor and associated build-out takes place (see page 14 for details), community stakeholders would like to study the possibility of having selected bus stations along the cross access corridors. This would be evaluated as the rest of the corridor evolves.
Starting with “Place”

A visioning exercise such as this is an opportunity to move beyond the many daily issues and think expansively about the long-term possibilities. Most importantly, it is an opportunity to start with this question: “What kind of place do we want this to be? What is its identity?”

It is not just a matter of transforming the “Anywhere USA” commercial strip with new mixed-use developments. The study area needs to have its own identity and one that is distinct from Patchogue Village, even if the experience of moving across the municipal boundary is seamless. Rather than trying to invent or import something that is completely new, East Patchogue can build on activities and proposals that are already present or in process. This includes medical arts and most importantly, the Plaza Media Arts Center. The PlazaMAC (Media and Arts Center) founders see this as much more than an art movie house.

Modeled on successful media centers such as the Jacob Burns Film Center in Westchester County, the PlazaMAC would offer a full range of media-related activities to attract visitors: film festivals, courses for adults, course for students at all grade levels, internships, seminars and panel discussions with film makers, actors, critics and teachers. The conceptual design includes outdoor open spaces, retail and restaurants at street level.

Building on their work around Swan Lake, Focus East Patchogue wants there to be different kinds of open spaces along the corridor that can support different kinds of activities oriented towards families such as outdoor performance spaces or pocket parks for picnicking and other small gatherings.

In that spirit, initial redevelopment studies do not start with the constraints, and in particular, without regard for what the zoning might or might not allow or which land owners might or might not be interested. Instead, the vision starts with a comprehensive look at the potential massing and configuration of new buildings along the corridor that would begin to transform the “strip” into something that approximates a “main street” – mixed-use sidewalk-oriented buildings that manage the automobile but favor the pedestrian experience.
The corridor redevelopment shown in the model and illustrative plan is, of course, only one of several possibilities. Regardless, a set of guiding principles was agreed upon both for this study and for any future studies:

- protect single family residences
- clarify the boundary between the commercial properties and the neighborhood.
- incorporate existing sidewalk-oriented buildings
- enable incremental redevelopment in the context of a comprehensive plan

To make this easier to visualize, RPA built the physical study model of the corridor and its surrounding neighborhoods described in detail on page 6.

The form of the buildings – the “massing” – was guided by a common set of basic design strategies:

- Building frontages align with the sidewalk to define the space of the street
- The amount of land devoted to surface parking is reduced and the parking is located behind or to the sides of buildings
- The building massing changes to moderate the apparent scale of the buildings and facilitate transition to the smaller scale of the surrounding single family neighborhoods.

The physical model was then used to derive possible development programs for the entire study area and to test parking ratios. All of the information derived from the model can then be used to audit the existing zoning to discover the ways in which the existing regulations support or inhibit the vision (see Appendix, page 23).
Transforming a Corridor: Redevelopment

The typical commercial corridor is not easily transformed. There are literally dozens of landowners, each of whom has the right to do as he or she sees fit within local zoning rules, without regard for their neighbors, making a comprehensive vision very difficult to achieve. In addition, commercial properties may be narrow and, especially along older corridors, not very deep which constrains the capacity for developers to economically redevelop the properties with more intensive mixed uses.

Livingston Town Center mixed-use corridor redevelopment, Livingston, New Jersey

While there are only a handful of complete successes, this kind of transformation has been implemented before. In Livingston, New Jersey, a struggling shopping center along Route 10 was declared an area in need of redevelopment. The redevelopment plan, the Livingston Town Center, is a mixed-use project of 2-to-4-story red brick buildings matching the township’s Federal-style municipal building. The development steps down in scale from larger mixed-use buildings along the commercial corridor to single family houses that match the surrounding context. A new pedestrian connection links to the adjacent neighborhood.

Excelsior and Grand mixed-use corridor redevelopment project (north of Minneapolis, Minnesota).

An even more dramatic transformation is the Excelsior and Grand project on I-90 just north of Minneapolis. This is a new town center that was created along a very wide, high-volume road lined with strip-retail uses. These uses were replaced by mixed-use buildings that defined the space of the street as well as a new public space that links to places beyond the corridor. The roadway continues to be a high volume road. But the lanes were narrowed and rationalized traffic-calming measures, including on-street parallel parking, were introduced to create a pedestrian experience; transit was properly accommodated. The before and after photographs show how dramatic this change has been.
The study area in East Patchogue has some distinct advantages. For one thing, there are quite a few large parcels. This is important, because it means that one or two initial projects could have an outsized impact on the transformation of the entire corridor. In addition, there are several locations where these large parcels are across the street from each other, which can create a recognizable destination node along the corridor with its own distinct sense of place.

The other favorable circumstance here is that the larger commercial properties are extremely deep. This enables one of the key strategies promoted in this vision: creating continuous “cross access” routes parallel to Montauk Highway.

Cross-Access Corridors

Cross access, as the term implies, is the ability for cars to move between properties without having to go back out into the public right of way. This is an important strategy: along the typical commercial corridor, every time someone wants to go from one destination to another, they have to pull out of one parking lot, merge with the existing traffic, and then pull into another parking lot creating more friction on the road and the potential for accidents with cars and people. Two destinations may actually be within easy walking distance of each other, but because the pedestrian conditions are poor – incomplete or badly designed sidewalks where cars are constantly pulling in and out – people feel compelled to drive from one place to another rather than parking once and leaving their car. The property owner stands to benefit by making his store easier to reach both by car and by foot, and will benefit as well from the overall improvement of the corridor environment which will attract more quality development.

Cross access is not without its challenges: business owners may not like the idea of someone parking in their lot and then walking to another store. Or there may be liability issues associated with sharing parking or allowing drivers from other properties to cross into their parking lots. If the cross-access easement is permanent, the land owner may not want the resale of his property burdened with additional conditions. Having said that, cross access is not a new concept and has been successfully demonstrated. In Garden City, it is possible to cross between large parking lots behind the buildings fronting on the west side of Franklin Avenue, the major commercial corridor. This part of Franklin Avenue also has several large office buildings and retailers. A long north-south corridor can be created by coordinating access between a limited number of properties so the impact on traffic along Montauk Highway from the new developments would be minimized. The condition in Seaford is more proximate to the situation in East Patchogue. Here, along the south side of Merrick Road, there are many smaller, irregularly-shaped parcels. While in this case the parallel east-west corridor has to accommodate a few twists and turns, it never the less creates the continuous cross-access necessary to keep traffic off of Merrick Road.

In the redevelopment concept, two continuous cross-access corridors are shown, one on the north side of Montauk Highway and one on the south. With the additional access created, the larger sites can now be developed in a more flexible way. Larger, pedestrian-oriented mixed-use buildings can be placed along the Montauk Highway sidewalks and the portions of the development sites that are away from the corridor can be more residential. This enables a contextual transition to the established single family neighborhoods along the corridor which in some locations creates a more rational residential edge to those neighborhoods.
The most ambitious version of this strategy is one shown above in which the cross-access corridor actually becomes what looks and feels like a public street: wide enough for slow-moving two way traffic, continuous sidewalks, street trees and other streetscape elements.

The road would be completed incrementally: as part of each new proposal, the developer would be required to build the section of the road on his property. A common set of design standards in the zoning and other municipal regulations would insure compatibility between segments. A Generic Environmental Impact Statement conducted by the Town could include this as a mitigation strategy creating a huge incentive for the developer who would save time and uncertainty by complying. One successful example of this is the Rye Hill Road Corridor Generic EIS in the Town of Monroe (Orange County, NY). Several large residential subdivisions were proposed in an area with important open space and water resources. The Generic EIS evaluated the cumulative impacts of these completely independent projects, both on water quality and traffic. Traffic mitigation included the mapping of a new parallel road through all of the developments. Each developer was required to build their segment of the alignment.
Plenty of Capacity for Change

The transformation of the corridor looks very ambitious because it is presented in a theoretical comprehensive “end state”. But in fact, in keeping with one of the guiding principles outlined on page 12, the sites have been modeled in a way that does not depend on a single coordinated design for the entire study area. In fact, it is unlikely that all of the development shown in the full build-out will ever materialize. Instead, a set of strategies is proposed, including the cross access strategy described here, that enables the transformation of the corridor in a way that is incremental but still coordinated so that the whole can be greater than the sum of the parts. By having a vision that does not depend on the cooperation of every landowner or compliance with a single design idea, the vision is more resilient over time as market conditions change.

The vision starts with an idea about what East Main Street might look like unconstrained by zoning or short-term market realities. The physical model creates a visual reference for a potential development program so that stakeholders can understand what a certain amount of development looks like in terms of scale and character for the area.

Despite the fact that all of the development shown is unlikely to take place except over the very long term, the exercise has real value: By looking at the large sites collectively, it is possible to get a sense of the parameters related to bulk (height and setback), site coverage and parking that should be used in an audit of the current zoning.

From this physical model RPA determined the total square footage and parking requirements and after consulting with the development community, the likely mix of residential and commercial demand for the corridor. Currently, the corridor is mainly one-story commercial and industrial uses. There is currently about 105,000 square feet of floor area about 10% of which is office and the rest is more or less evenly split between retail, institutional and industrial uses.

Under the development scenario this would increase to 650,000 square feet of mixed-used development along the corridor. 328 new apartments would be built. Retail square footage would about double (from 47,150 square feet to 96,930 square feet) as would industrial square footage (from 23,200 square feet to 45,400 square feet). Office space would increase from 11,400 square feet to 42,400 square feet. The redevelopment of the health center would see institutional uses drop from 23,250 square feet to 3,200 square feet, although some of the retail or office space could be used to house needed health, educational, or civic institutions instead.

One of the discoveries of this analysis is that the kind of place-making density shown here – mixed use buildings with high site coverage – creates a deficit of surface parking by conventional suburban standards. While the development scenario allows for 568 parking spaces, 1246 parking spaces would be needed under the current zoning standards, leaving a parking gap of 678 spaces. This is mainly driven by the retail development, which has a much higher per-square-foot parking requirement than other uses. For instance, if the proposed retail space were instead office space the parking gap would be reduced to 225 spaces, and if it were residential space the parking gap would be reduced to just 109 spaces. This parking gap suggests that a comprehensive strategy for parking will be needed for the core of the study that creates more flexibility including reduced requirements, shared parking, remote parking, and incentives for structured parking such as not counting in height and floor area totals. During the public workshop, one suggestion was that a centralized parking structure would be a huge asset. This is an excellent idea although there are significant cost implications.
Implementation

Conduct Zoning Audit

Using the redevelopment studies as a guide, conduct an audit of the existing zoning regulations to find out where they support or inhibit the vision. Of particular interest are regulations related to these parameters:

- Parking requirements
- Parking flexibility
- Site Coverage
- Height restrictions
- Use limitations

A strategic aspect of this, in part driven by market forces, is to determine what changes should be made to the underlying zoning and which should be part of a special permit process that would give an incentive to the developer to support the vision by providing various community benefits such as open spaces, streetscape improvements along their frontage, and especially, building the portion of the cross access corridor on their property.

Create a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS)

In New York State, larger scale projects require compliance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act. This is often a cumbersome, expensive and time-consuming process. A Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) is a broader and more general environmental impact statement that sets forth development standards and review thresholds not for any one project, but for future developments, usually for a larger or more complicated area. Impacts are considered collectively and over time in the larger area. By exempting future conforming projects, there is a strong incentive for developers to conform with the GEIS plan to save the costs and time of an individual EIS. This can be a useful tool for comprehensive, long term planning and implementation over a large or complex geography. A portion of the cost of preparing the GEIS can be placed on developers. Because it is not as detailed as typical EIS, careful consideration is required of how large an area to study, how long a time period to consider, and what data to gather and analyze. In terms of municipal capacity, a GEIS does create an on-going administrative burden as developments take place. Also, there is an initial cost in creating the GEIS and the various technical findings needed to support it.

Consider Creating a Floating Zone for Larger Redevelopment Sites

A floating zone is a set of use-specific zoning regulations that is not mapped until an applicant comes forward with a proposal for a site that meets the criteria set out in the regulations. The ability to create a floating zone is completely dependent on the Town of Brookhaven’s willingness to put forth such a proposal. The floating zone would be developed in concert with the Town of Brookhaven. The criteria in this case could include a minimum acreage requirement that covers the larger redevelopment sites identified and mapped here. The floating zone can help facilitate the kind of development in the community vision by including development of a use that the community wants to encourage and can add flexibility to enable zoning to accommodate new land uses. The floating zone for these sites would include the massing and design guidelines described below as well as the special cross-access requirements. This can be a very effective tool but it does create additional administrative burdens. If design guidelines are involved, these need to be developed and a design review process will be needed. Also, applicants will need to demonstrate that they are not having an adverse impact on adjacent property owners by providing various community benefits such as design excellence and cross access corridor on their property.
Create Design Guidelines That Support the Vision

The massing studies can be used to develop a set of development design guidelines that will support the vision. If additional height and bulk is allowed, this needs to be moderated by design guidelines that would insure the context-sensitive transition to the surrounding single-family neighbourhoods. The guidelines can address both issues of building bulk and siting as well as site planning.
Building related guidelines should include, but not be limited to, these:

- Mandate “build-to lines” that require buildings to be in a consistent relationship to adjacent buildings and close to the frontage
- Require minimum amounts of transparency for buildings along the sidewalk
- Require height and setback transitions where new developments abut residential

Site planning guidelines should include, but not be limited to, these:

- Disallow parking between the street and the building frontages, keeping parking on the sides and behind buildings
- Introduce green infrastructure strategies for storm water management
- Require connections from the sidewalks to the front doors of buildings that are not along the sidewalks
- Require cross-access
- Reduce driveway widths
- Complete gaps in sidewalks

The design of Montauk Highway should be considered

Initially this can focus just on the stretch that is within the core study area. Some possibilities include these:

- Widen sidewalks
- Provide space for bicyclists on multi-use paths and delineate bike lanes on adjacent streets
- Use a uniform lane width of 11 to 12 feet as a maximum
- Apply traffic calming tools such as narrower roadway widths, street trees, curb extensions
- Make intersections pedestrian friendly and improve driver visibility of people walking using the following design treatments:
  - Reduce turning radii
  - Provide clearly marked crosswalks for each point of crossing
  - Increase lighting
  - Remove blind spots for drivers by T-ing off intersecting roadways
- Introduce pedestrian scale lighting
Implementation Resources: County, State and Federal Resources

Community Development and Housing Funding

New York State Programs

Consolidated Funding Application (CFA)
The CFA has been designed to give economic development project applicants expedited and streamlined access to a combined pool of grant funds and tax credits from dozens of existing programs. The CFA is a modern and easy-to-use online application that allows businesses and other entities to apply for multiple agency funding sources through a single, web-based application. It is the primary portal for businesses to access state agency resources, including resources for community development, direct assistance to business, waterfront revitalization, energy and environmental improvements, government efficiency, sustainability, workforce development, and low-cost financing. Funding is currently available for Community Development through several programs.

- **New York Main Street Program.** NYMS provides resources to invest in projects that provide economic development and housing opportunities in downtown, mixed-use commercial districts. A primary goal of the program is to stimulate reinvestment and leverage additional funds to establish and sustain downtown and neighborhood revitalization efforts.

- **Community Development Block Grant Program.** NYS CDBG funds provide small communities and counties in New York State with a great opportunity to undertake activities that focus on community development needs such as creating or expanding job opportunities, providing safe affordable housing, and/or addressing local public infrastructure and public facilities issues.

  NYS CDBG applicants must address and resolve a specific community or economic development need within one of the following areas:
  - Public Infrastructure
  - Public Facilities
  - Microenterprise
  - Community Planning

  Funding is also available for Arts & Culture Initiatives, Environmental Improvements, Energy, Education/Workforce Development, Sustainability Planning & Implementation, Waterfront Revitalization, Environmental Protection, Recreational Trails, and other community improvement projects.

Empire State Development Grants
Capital grant funding from the Regional Council Capital Fund is available through the State’s Regional Economic Development Council Initiative, which helps drive regional and local economic development across New York State in cooperation with 10 Regional Economic Development Councils (“Regional Councils”).

Capital grant funding is available for capital-based economic development projects intended to create or retain jobs; prevent, reduce or eliminate unemployment and underemployment; and/or increase business or economic activity in a community or Region.

New York State Historic Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credit
This tax credit applies to properties which are approved for the federal rehabilitation tax credit in eligible census tracts. Owners can receive an additional 20% of the qualified rehabilitation expenditures up to $5,000,000. In order to qualify, the placed-in-service date must be after January 1, 2010. There is no application form. After Part 3 of the federal application is approved by the National Park Service and the state fees are paid, The New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation will issue a certification allowing owners to take the state credit. (https://parks.ny.gov/shpo/tax-credit-programs/)

Suffolk County Programs

Suffolk County Downtown Revitalization Grants
Suffolk County Downtown Revitalization Grants help towns, villages and community organizations expand on their efforts to enhance their downtowns, attract visitors and shoppers into the area, and thereby stimulate economic activity in these important centers. Since its inception the Downtown Revitalization Grant Program has funded projects such as street lights, sidewalks, public restrooms, off street parking lots and renovating alleyways which lead from parking areas to the main street. Eligible applicants must be local business or community groups partnering with a local municipality (town or village).

Jumpstart Suffolk
Jumpstart Suffolk program is a comprehensive economic development plan to encourage, foster and enhance the planning and development of regionally significant developments in and around Suffolk’s downtowns. It is sponsored by Suffolk County’s Department of Economic Development and Planning and is intended to promote mixed-used residential and commercial developments located around transit nodes.
New York State Programs

Consolidated Local Street and Highway Improvement Program (CHIPS)
CHIPS provides State funds to municipalities to support the construction and repair of highways, bridges, highway-railroad crossings, and other facilities that are not on the State highway system.

The authorization for the CHIPS Program is contained in Section 10-c of the State Highway Law. Funds are apportioned to municipalities annually by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) pursuant to a formula specified in this section of the Law.

Upon approval of the State Budget, NYSDOT determines each municipality’s final CHIPS Capital apportionment for the new State fiscal year and notifies them of the available amount via the letter for the scheduled June payment and a posting to the Capital Apportionment Balances link on the CHIPS website.

PAVE-NY
The recently adopted five-year State Transportation Plan (2015/16 – 2019/20) provides $100 million per year through the PAVE NY program to assist municipalities with rehabilitation and reconstruction of local highways and roads. Funds are apportioned by NYSDOT according to the percentage of funds each municipality received under the SFY 2016-17 CHIPS Program.

PAVE-NY follows all the programmatic and reimbursement requirements of CHIPS, with one notable exception — eligible project activities are limited to Highway Resurfacing and Highway Reconstruction. PAVE-NY eligible activities are eligible for reimbursement as of April 1, 2016. A CP75 form has been created to submit reimbursements under the PAVE-NY Program.

Note: These two NYS funding options are not grant programs which are applied for, however, their funding could still be deployed strategically in support of downtown redevelopment and revitalization.

New York Metropolitan Area (NYMTC) Programs

Transportation Alternatives Program
The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) encompasses most of the activities previously funded under the Transportation Enhancement Program (TEP), Recreational Trails Program (RTP), and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program.

TAP funding is available to projects which improve the quality of life of the community, as a whole as well as providing economic and social benefits. TAP funds can be used for a variety of alternative transportation projects, including the construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities; conversion of abandoned railroad corridors for trail use; and infrastructure-related projects to provide access for and improve the safety of children, older adults and individuals with disabilities.

CMAQ
The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds surface transportation improvements or transportation programs that improve air quality and mitigate traffic congestion.

Section 5310 – Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities
The Section 5310 Program is intended to enhance mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities.

It provides funds for transportation projects and/or programs that serve the special needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and complementary paratransit services under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
EPA’s Smart Growth Program
Consisting of both technical assistance grants and an implementation assistance program, EPA’s Smart Growth program encourages incorporating smart growth techniques into future development, and provides assistance to implement solutions on complex or cutting-edge issues, such as stormwater management, code revision, transit-oriented development, affordable housing, infill development, corridor planning, green building, and climate change. Applicants can submit proposals under four categories: community resilience to disasters, job creation, the role of manufactured homes in sustainable neighborhoods, or medical and social service facilities siting.

Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) Funding
The Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development, or BUILD Transportation Discretionary Grant program, provides a unique opportunity for USDOT to invest in road, rail, transit and port projects that promise to achieve national objectives. Congress has dedicated nearly $7.1 billion for ten rounds of National Infrastructure Investments to fund projects that have a significant local or regional impact.

The eligibility requirements of BUILD allow project sponsors at the State and local levels to obtain funding for multi-modal, multi-jurisdictional projects that are more difficult to support through traditional USDOT programs. BUILD can provide capital funding directly to any public entity, including municipalities, counties, or others. (www.transportation.gov/BUILD-grants/apply)

Federal Historic Structure Investment Tax Credit
Owners of income producing real properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places may be eligible for a 20% federal income tax credit for the substantial rehabilitation of historic properties. The final dollar amount is based on the cost of the rehabilitation; in effect, 20% of the rehab costs will be borne by the federal government. The work performed (both interior and exterior) must meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and be approved by the National Park Service. (https://parks.ny.gov/shpo/tax-credit-programs/)

Funding sources for road improvements in New York Metro Area: Federal Programs for Transportation & Community Development
The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the United States Department of Commerce’s Economic Development Administration (EDA), as well as other agencies and several interagency initiatives all provide implementation funding for downtown revitalization, transportation and infrastructure upgrades, and other community improvements. While some programs are conducted through the States, other provide direct funding to municipalities or local non-profits. Some of these are:
After engaging with the community to determine what a new corridor might look like from a design perspective, RPA then used certain standards to see the practical effects of this: how many homes could be built, how much new commercial and office space would be created, and what the likely parking needs would be. RPA did this for eight different large potential development sites.

**Standards used were the following:**

85% of the newly created space was set for residential uses. This was determined after consultation with developers as to existing market conditions, as well as likely uses which would result from the configuration of the developments. Because many existing commercial, industrial, and agricultural (in the form of the greenhouse between Case and Avery north of the existing Health Center) spaces were expected to be retained, the overall mix of uses ended as the following:

- **Residential uses (new and existing):** 410,000 square feet (62%)
- **Retail uses (new and existing):** 96,930 square feet (15%)
- **Commercial uses (new and existing office and institutional):** 45,600 square feet (7%)
- **Industrial uses (new and existing):** 45,400 square feet (7%)
- **Agricultural uses (greenhouse):** 53,370 square feet (8%)

**Total: 651,300 square feet**

New apartments were calculated as an average 1000 Square feet each, with another 20% of the overall residential space of the building used for common areas. This resulted in 328 new apartments.

**Parking needs followed existing zoning rules, and were calculated as follows:**

- **Residential space:** 1 parking space per dwelling unit
- **Retail space:** 1 parking space for every 150 square feet
- **Commercial space:** 1 parking space for every 450 square feet
- **Industrial space:** 1 parking space for every 250 square feet
- **Agricultural space:** 5 spaces total

**Total: 1,246 needed parking spaces**

### Appendix: Determining Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>National Grid site</th>
<th>Parking lot</th>
<th>Salvation Army/ vacant lot</th>
<th>Goodyear site</th>
<th>Strip Mall Site</th>
<th>Health Center site</th>
<th>Greenhouse site</th>
<th>Brookhaven Heart site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Conklin SE</td>
<td>Conklin SW</td>
<td>Grove SE</td>
<td>Grove SW</td>
<td>Evergreen SE</td>
<td>Case NE</td>
<td>Behind Health Center</td>
<td>Case NW (midblock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot size (SF)</td>
<td>113,256</td>
<td>83,635</td>
<td>121,532</td>
<td>101,059</td>
<td>128,066</td>
<td>143,312</td>
<td>137,650</td>
<td>99,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (SF)</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>21,150</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>23,250</td>
<td>59,300</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Uses</td>
<td>Office &amp; Industrial</td>
<td>Retail and Industrial</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Retail and Industrial</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Institutional (Health Center)</td>
<td>Agricultural (Greenhouse)</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed (SF)</td>
<td>87,300</td>
<td>107,700</td>
<td>131,400</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>110,800</td>
<td>59,300</td>
<td>58,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Stories</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot Coverage</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed FAR</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Parking Spaces</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6</td>
<td>3, 4, 6</td>
<td>3, 4, 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Uses</td>
<td>Residential, (40,000 sf), Retail (15,700 sf), Office (10,200 sf), Industrial (21,400 sf)</td>
<td>Residential (97,500 sf), Retail (10,200 sf), Office (11,400 sf), Industrial (24,000 sf)</td>
<td>Residential (120,000 sf), Retail (5,800 sf), Office (8,000 sf), Industrial (24,000 sf)</td>
<td>Retail (13,900 sf), Office (6,800 sf), Industrial (24,000 sf)</td>
<td>Residential (100,000 sf), Retail (7,600 sf), Institutional (3,200 sf)</td>
<td>Residential (5,930 sf), Agricultural - Greenhouse (53,370 sf)</td>
<td>Residential (52,500 sf), Retail (5,800 sf)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Plan Association is America’s oldest and most distinguished independent urban research and advocacy group. RPA works to improve the economic competitiveness, infrastructure, sustainability and quality of life of the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan region. A cornerstone of our work is the development of long-range plans and policies to guide the growth of the region. Through our America 2050 program, RPA also provides leadership in the Northeast and across the U.S. on a broad range of transportation and economic-development issues. For more information visit, www.rpa.org.
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