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Figure 1  AERIAL VIEW OF THE STUDY AREA
1 Introduction

1.1 Project History

The buildings in Upper Port generally were developed after the railroad was established, about 140 years ago. The C-2 district of Port Jefferson (also known as Echo) was part of Port Jefferson Station at that time. When the Village was incorporated in 1963, it did not meet the minimum land area required by the State, and it was decided to annex the area of Upper Port. However, the school district lines were not moved and Upper Port is in the Comsewogue School District.

Uptown was a thriving area until the early 1980’s and was the service area for Port Jefferson. It is reported to have contained a hardware store, dry cleaners, barber shop, grocery store, ‘five and dime’, bakeries, butcher, appliance repair shop and bicycle store. Although there have been times of prosperity and decline, Uptown went into a serious and continuous decline, starting in the early 80’s. This was in part due to a Lawrence Aviation strike, the electrification of the LIRR Ronkonkoma line, resulting in a heavy loss of railroad commuters, and the recession of the early 80’s.

To date there have been no planning studies of Upper Port Jefferson. Whereas there have been Plans for Port Jefferson, Comprehensive Master Plan for Port Jefferson 1965, Village Plan Study 1987 and Comprehensive Plan Update 1995 have little to say about Upper Port. The Vision 2010 of 2002 has one paragraph that recommends tax incentives, lower parking restrictions an code changes, that the height limit Main Street might exceed 35 feet and states an interest in a YMCA on Village property. The 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update was commissioned by the Village in 2010 and this Study will be appended to that Report. The Comsewogue Hamlet Comprehensive Plan for Port Jefferson Station/Terryville, at the south border of Upper Port Jefferson, was approved by the Town of Brookhaven in April 2008.

Form Based Zoning Code

This Study is the result of a RFP of Village of Port Jefferson, July 2011. The Village discussed pursuing a Form Based Planning Study. Form Based planning uses physical form, rather than separation of uses of conventional zoning, as the organizing principle from which a Form Based Code would be developed. The Code, like the present Village Code, consists of regulations, not guidelines, adopted into the Village law. Form Based codes address the relationship between new and existing buildings in terms of the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another and facades. It is primarily concerned with the public realm including the scale and types of streets and blocks, signage and lighting, sidewalk materials colors and street furnishings. Although form is the primary design issue, the socio-economic existing and planned conditions, are also considered. Form Based design has been used to create new downtowns and neighborhoods and to preserve existing quality in downtowns and neighborhoods that have a definable character and form or a significant visual heritage. In areas where there is a true mix of forms and styles it is harder to find that specific or appropriate form. This is the case with Upper Port Jefferson. “Planners are trained to look at neighborhoods and see what they ‘could become’ and urban designers are trained to study form and decide what the form ‘should be’.” (“A Better Way to Zone”, D. Elliott) That is what this Study has attempted to accomplish.

Transit Oriented Development - TOD

Our definition of Transit Oriented Development is taken from general planning consensus that it is the “creation if a compact, walkable community centered around a high quality train system that makes it possible to live a quality life without complete dependence on a car for mobility or survival”. It is “a mixed-use residential or commercial area designed to maximize access to public transportation and often incorporates features to encourage transit ridership, surrounded by relatively high density within a ¼ mile walking radius. The fact that the LIRR only electrified the Ronkonkoma line has redirected even more car mileage of people using that system that have easier access to the slower Port Jefferson northern and Montauk southern routes is a problem that may need to be corrected in the future. With all the global concern for public transportation we should assume that the Port Jefferson Station can only become more important in the future. TOD theory is also based on a more general assumption that with world population growing, population growth at locations where there is public transportation is smart growth and most probably essential.
1.2 Upper Port Revitalization – Objectives

The following Objectives were presented at the Public Meeting on October 5, 2011.

1.2.1 General Identity

Create a neighborhood around Main Street and the LIRR

- Consider the potential for transit oriented development – T.O.D. related to the LIRR.
- Create a neighborhood community with local service oriented shops for the neighborhood and village.
- Review architectural guidelines for uptown conditions.
- Develop façade and storefront improvement guidelines.
- Encourage more housing to strengthen the neighborhood and help maintain Main Street commercial vitality.
- Create more public open space.
- Consider the train station area as a gateway to Port Jefferson from the south.
- Study existing and potential transportation including intermodal coordination.

1.2.2 Pedestrian Improvements

Create an aesthetically pleasing and safer pedestrian condition

- Examine sidewalk conditions.
- Identify pedestrian east-west connections.
- Create better pedestrian crossings.
- Study pedestrian links to surrounding residential areas.

1.2.3 Traffic and Parking

Create a better flow and traffic calming on Main Street and address parking needs.

- Study existing parking on Main Street.
- Study turning lanes, especially at North Country Road.
- Investigate use of the fire lane on north side of the LIRR in terms of traffic flow.
- Examine time limits on parking.
- Improve public transit stop conditions.
- Examine shared use of transit parking with downtown.
- Address problem of finding parking off Main Street.
Examine the potential of the topography.

Study shared parking opportunities.

Consider managed parking and a parking district.

1.2.4 Economic Development

Attract development that will create a more successful and vital neighborhood.

- Encourage service oriented commercial; food market etc.
- Review mix of owner and rental and mixed income housing.
- Formulate developer incentives for public amenities and affordable housing.
- Seek public/private partnerships.
- Consider creating a housing trust fund (see the Comprehensive Plan Update).
- Consider creating managed parking and a parking district (see the Comprehensive Plan Update).

1.2.5 Security

Create a more secure neighborhood

- Consider the effect of greater residential density on safety and security.
- Improve physical conditions such as pedestrian lighting.
- More police patrolling (consider a police substation).

1.2.6 Zoning and Guidelines

Recommend zoning changes for uptown development.

- Utilize form based planning to develop a form based code.
- Examine permitted uses in C2 district.
- Consider a maximum height change at Main Street.
- Consider zoning changes to encourage residential growth.
- Consider incentives to obtain desired commercial uses and their required areas.
- Study physical and use conditions on Oakland Avenue.
- Consider affordable housing and apartment sizes.
- Review architectural guidelines for uptown conditions to encourage a visually homogeneous image and scale.
- Create storefront improvement guidelines.
2 Existing Conditions Documentation and Analysis

2.1 Existing Conditions

2.1.1 Demographics – Table 1

Table 1 indicates the demographics from the 2000 and the 2010 Census reports by race for the Tract Blocks that are the eight block study area.

An examination of the eight blocks of tract number 1582.06 indicates that the total population showed an increase of 34 persons during the decade; or a 22.7% increase over 2000.

- The white population increased by three persons; for a 6.2% increase.
- The black population decreased by 12 persons; for a 63% decrease
- The Hispanic population increased by 48 persons; for a 76.2% increase, or 60.3% of the total population in 2010
- Asian and “other” classifications constitute 7.6% of the 2010 total, for a gain of 2 persons over the decade.

The 2010 population of 184 people represents between 50 to 60 families or dwelling units. 20% of the residential population live on Main Street between Linden Place and the LIRR tracks.

2.1.1.1 School Districts

Table - 1

DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract 1582.06</td>
<td>Tot. Pop.</td>
<td>Tot. Pop.</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3013</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BLOCK LOCATIONS

- 3013 Main Street – Linden Place – Texaco Ave. – Sheep Pasture Road
- 3015 Main Street – LIRR – Texaco Ave. – Linden Place – excluding Main Street buildings
- 3016 Main Street – LIRR – Texaco Ave. – Linden Place – Main Street buildings only
- 2035 Main Street – Perry Street – Walnut Street – North Country Road
- 2036 Oakland Ave. – Perry Street – Walnut Street – Elm Street
- 2030 Oakland Ave. – Elm Street – Walnut Street – North Country Road
- 2037 Oakland Ave. – Fire Lane @ LIRR – Main Street – Perry Street
- 3005 Oakland Ave. – Highland Blvd. – LIRR – Main Street – Fire Lane
The number of school-age children (5-19) in the study area at last count was 66. The area north of North Country Road and Sheep Pasture Road is in the Comsewogue School District. At the public meeting, the issue of re-districting to change the School district of upper Port to be in lower Port was brought up by numerous stakeholders. It is generally acknowledged that communities are built around their schools and that it would be desirable to link lower Port Jefferson with upper Port Jefferson through the school. The idea that the children attending school and their families should be connected to make a stronger community was expressed. A discussion with the Port-Jefferson Station-Terryville Civic Association and the two School districts is on-going regarding this.

School Districts in the area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>No. Schools</th>
<th>No. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Jefferson</td>
<td>PK-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comsewogue</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Sinai</td>
<td>PK-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Village</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Place</td>
<td>PK-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Country</td>
<td>PK-12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10,319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.2 Existing Conditions: Site Plans

As there are no existing accurate plans of the site other than the Tax maps which do not indicate buildings, Figure 1 – Plan of Upper Port Jefferson; as a line drawing and Figure 2 in color were generated as part of the data collection process. Figure 3 – View of Upper Port Jefferson; is a three dimensional projection of the Plan.
Figure 4  EXISTING SITE PLAN OF UPPER PORT JEFFERSON
2.1.3 Existing Conditions: Topography

Figure 4 – Topographic Plan of Upper Port Jefferson; indicates the topography of the site. This is important data because the site varies 18 feet from 176.1 feet to 194.1 feet NGVD. Oakland Avenue at Perry Street is 12.1 feet lower than Main Street at Perry Street. Texaco Street at Sheep Pasture Road is 16.7 feet above Main Street at Sheep Pasture / North Country Road. These variations have consequences on, and provide a potential, with one street being on a different floor level of a building than another street.
2.1.4 Existing Conditions: Property Ownership

Figure 5 – Tax Map and Figure 6 – Aerial view with property divisions map provides information on property divisions and ownership, both public and private.
Figure 8  AERIAL VIEW WITH PROPERTY DIVISIONS
2.1.5 Existing Conditions: Land Use and Zoning

Figure 7 – Land Use Plan; indicates existing uses of individual properties as of December 2011. Figure 8 – Existing Zoning Plan is the official Zoning Code for the Village of Port Jefferson. Land use may differ from Zoning because some properties were developed before the Zoning Code was enacted, and are therefore legally grand fathered, or were approved through a Zoning appeal. The entire site is Zoned C-2 and the Port Jefferson Village Zoning Resolution provisions for the C-2 Zone are outlined in Table –2. The Land use Plan indicates a more complex array of uses. It also indicates vacant buildings or ground floor spaces, as of December 2011.
Figure 10  EXISTING ZONING
2.1.6 Existing Conditions: Open Space

Figure 9 – Existing Public Open Space Plan; indicates developed and undeveloped public open pace. Texaco Park is a small park for active and passive recreation. The area on Highlands Boulevard from Oakland Avenue to the Highlands residential community is owned by the Village but is undeveloped open space existing in the C-2 Zoned area.
2.1.7 Existing Conditions: Village Owned or Managed Property

Figure 10 - Village Owned or Managed Property Plan; indicates Texaco Park, public parking on Oakland Avenue and the approximately 6 acre area along Highland Avenue from Oakland Avenue to the Highland residential community are owned by the Village of Port Jefferson. The parking lots on the east and west side of Main Street along the LIRR tracks and at the LIRR Station are owned by the LIRR and leased to the Village to be maintained for parking.
2.1.8 Existing Conditions: Building Height

Figure 11 – Building Height Plan; indicates the number of stories of the existing buildings on the site. This demonstrates that 36 out of 55 buildings are 1 story, 16 buildings are 2 stories. The existing C-2 Zoning Resolution permits a building height of 35 feet, or 3 stories, for any building. Figure 28 – Main Street shows the typical Main Street condition of one and two story buildings and the maximum build-out indicates the maximum height currently permitted.
### 2.1.9 Existing Proposed and Potential Development

Figure 12 – Proposed and Potential New Development Projects; indicates private projects that have been submitted to the Village Planning Department for pre-submission meetings since 2010. There are four proposals that propose 17,544 square feet of ground floor commercial space and 232 residential units – Table - 3. None of these projects propose the number of parking spaces required by the Village Zoning Resolution. Three of the four projects propose building heights that are above the maximum permitted by Zoning. Figure 12 also indicates properties that are vacant and/or recently purchased properties as potential development sites. The vacant property owned by the Village along Highland Boulevard from Oakland Avenue to the Highlands residential complex is a potential site for development – see Figure 37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Commercial (parking req.)</th>
<th>Residential (parking req.)</th>
<th>Parking proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Main - LIRR</td>
<td>34,568 sf</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>5,640 sf (56)</td>
<td>60 units (108)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Main - Perry (S)</td>
<td>22,358 sf</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>4,121 sf (41)</td>
<td>62 units (93)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Main - Perry (N)</td>
<td>20,000 sf</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>3,386 sf (34)</td>
<td>81 units (122)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Texaco, Linden</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80 units (120)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Main – N.Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Highland Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14  PROPOSED AND POTENTIAL NEW DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
2.1.10 Existing Conditions: Streets and Sidewalks

Figure 13-14 – Streets and Sidewalk Dimensions; indicates street and sidewalk widths at key locations. Street widths are relatively constant but sidewalk widths frequently vary. Main Street is predominantly 11–12 feet wide. It varies at the north end being 11'-0" at the block south of Perry Street and it tapers on the east side from 11'-6" on the north side of Perry to 5’–5” at the intersection with North Country Road. On the west side of Main Street the sidewalk is 12’ from the LIRR tracks to the private parking to the north and after that it tapers to 8’ at Sheep Pasture Road intersection. The sidewalks on Perry Street and Linden Place have a consistent width. There are no sidewalks on Walnut Street, except at the Church, and Elm Street, except on the north east side at Oakland Avenue. There is a small sidewalk on the east side of Texaco Avenue and none on the west side.

STREET AND SIDEWALK DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>STREET WIDTH TOTAL</th>
<th>PARKING LANE N/W</th>
<th>PARKING LANE S/E</th>
<th>SIDEWALK N/W</th>
<th>SIDEWALK S/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MAIN STREET</td>
<td>42'</td>
<td>7'-6&quot;</td>
<td>7'-6&quot;</td>
<td>8'-16'</td>
<td>5'–5&quot;–12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. COUNTRY TO PERRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MAIN STREET</td>
<td>42'</td>
<td>7'-6&quot;</td>
<td>7'-6&quot;</td>
<td>11’–12’</td>
<td>11’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERRY TO LIRR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>varies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LINDEN PLACE</td>
<td>28’-6”</td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>7’–6”</td>
<td>9’-6’</td>
<td>5’–2”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 PERRY STREET</td>
<td>34’</td>
<td>6’–6”</td>
<td>6’–9”</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 OAKLAND BLVD.</td>
<td>28’-6”</td>
<td>NO PARKING</td>
<td></td>
<td>4’</td>
<td>4’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5' PLANTING STRIP
### MAIN STREET – SIDEWALK DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIDEWALK WIDTH</th>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11'-6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9'-7&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9'-6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5'-5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12'-0&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11'-0&quot; w/ curb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11'-9&quot; w/ curb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12'-5&quot; w/ curb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15'-4&quot; w/ curb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8'-2&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STREET WIDTHS

- A 41'
- B 40'
- C 45'
- D 35'
- E 30'
- F 45'

**Figure 16** EXISTING MAIN ST SIDEWALK WIDTHS
2.1.11 Existing Conditions: Street Pattern - Street Direction

Figure 15 – Street Pattern; indicates the pattern and size comparison of the existing streets. Main Street is the only Street that is a through Street at both ends and Oakland is the only through street at one of its ends. Other than Main Street and its bounding streets of Oakland Boulevard, North Country Road and Sheep Pasture Road, the six block area consists of short non-through streets, having ‘T’ intersections at their ends. Only the northern border streets of North Country Road and Sheep Pasture Road are through east – west roads for the site. The drawing also indicates traffic direction. All streets presently are two way except Perry Street.

There were many complaints about the quantity and flow of the traffic. Some of this is the general increase in traffic that is occurring all over Long Island. However, particular to the study area, is the ever growing hospitals and the new medical office complex that border the area to the north-east and east. Like lower Port, Main Street is also a State Highway, and there are the contradictory needs of thru and stop-and-go traffic. Upper Port traffic is further complicated due to the stoppage during train arrival and departure, which is slower moving at a terminal station.
2.1.12 Existing Conditions: Street Trees

Figure 16 – Street Trees Plan; indicates existing street trees. There are a few street trees on Main Street and there are locations where trees once existed. There are very few trees on the other streets in the study area. A number of trees have been planted on the east side of Oakland Avenue at the Medical Office Building complex. There is a row of trees along the north edge of the LIRR parking lot at the fire lane.
2.1.13 Existing Conditions: On-Street Parking and Regulations

Figure 17 – On Street Parking Regulations illustration is from the Nelson/Nygaard Report for the PJ BID of 2008. The regulations are the same as of this Report. There is one hour parking on Main Street, Perry Street and Linden Place and two hour parking on Walnut and Elm Streets and a portion of North Country Road. There is no standing on Texaco Avenue, the west end of Linden Place and on Oakland Avenue. There is no street parking in the study area that is over a two hour limit.
2.1.14 Existing Conditions: On Street and Public Off-Street Parking Utilization

Figure 18 – Off-Street Parking Utilization illustration is from the Nelson/Nygaard Report for the PJ BID of 2008. The conditions indicated have been verified, for weekdays, in this Study. The conditions are different on weekends. The 2008 report indicated that there was not a need for more parking, but that there was a problem of not utilizing off Main Street parking because of lack of signage and perceived security problems. The LIRR parking at the station is noted as at capacity, however the large Brookhaven lot off Railroad Avenue on the south side of the tracks is noted as 50-85% full.
2.1.15 Drainage Structure - Suffolk County Sewer System

Figure 19 – The existing SCSW Map indicates the present sewer system for uptown that continues down Main Street to downtown. The Map indicates that the eastern portion of the Study Area is not connected to the system and is served by private cesspools. A sewer district expansion of 250,000 gpd was created in recent years.
2.1.16 Drainage Structure - Street Storm Water Catch Basins

Figure – 20 indicates the street storm water drainage structures. There are six on Main Street, four at North Country Road and two at Linden Place. There are three on Walnut and one on Oakland. The LIRR parking lot has nine on the north side. There are none west of Main Street.
2.1.17 Existing Conditions: Curbs and Curb Cuts

Figure 19 – Curbs and Curb cuts plan indicates where there are curbs and curb cuts. It also notes curb conditions. The curbs along nearly all the streets are in poor condition. There are no curbs on Walnut Street and Elm Street or the west side of Texaco Avenue. There are large curb cuts in numerous locations. There are seven private curb cuts on Main Street from Perry Street to North Country Road. Walnut Street and Elm Street have no curbs and numerous and extensive cuts. Linden Place also has extensive curb cuts.
2.1.18 Existing Conditions: Public Bus Routes and Schedules

Figure 20 – Suffolk Transit Bus Routes; maps the buses that serve the Village of Port Jefferson. Six Suffolk Transit bus lines serve the Upper Port at the train station, stopping just north of the tracks north and south bound. Four of the lines provide a connection to lower Port (S60, S69, S76) and these buses average 3 trips per hour in each direction between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm. Three lines connect Upper Port, through lower Port, to SUNY Stony Brook, averaging two trips per hour, each way. The fare is $1.50 regular, $1.00 student, $.50 senior/disabled, $.25 transfer.
The following buses stop at Main Street and the LIRR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Route Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S60</td>
<td>Smith Haven Mall – SUNY - Gordon Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S61</td>
<td>Port Jefferson – Patchogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S62</td>
<td>Hauppauge - Riverhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S69</td>
<td>Stony Brook – Port Jefferson: nightloop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S76</td>
<td>Stony Brook Village – SUNY - Port Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Middle Island – Port Jefferson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.18.1 Suffolk Transit Bus Service to Port Jefferson Railroad Station

**5A:** Port Jefferson Plaza to Middle Island. From PJ Station stops at Mather Hospital, travels east on North Country Road and Rte 25A to Rocky Point, then south on Randall Road to Ridge and Middle Island. 8 trips per day Eastbound. 9 trips per day Westbound.

**S60:** Gordon Heights to Smith Haven Mall. From Gordon Heights through Coram north on Old Town road, then Terryville Road to Port Jefferson Plaza and LIRR train station. Stops at Mather Hospital and lower Port. West on 25A to 5 stops on the SUNY campus. North on Stony Brook Road to the Mall. 12 trips per day Southbound. 13 trips per day Northbound.

**S61:** Ferry Dock to Patchogue Railroad. Line with most frequent service to Train Station. 20 trips per day North and Southbound.

**S62:** Hauppauge to Riverhead. From Hauppauge industrial and Government complexes east to Mall. Continues east on Rte. 347 to Port Jefferson Station. East to Riverhead County complex via 25A. 14 trips per day East and Westbound.

**S76:** Port Jefferson Station to Stony Brook Village. Stops at Mather Hospital, lower Port, Stony Brook Train Station (adjacent to SUNY) and Stony Brook Village. 22 trips per day Eastbound. 23 trips per day Westbound.

**S69:** Night Loop. Departs south from Station to Mall and SUNY via Rte. 347. Returns via 25A to lower Port then Station. 2 loops per day.

Table – 4 Suffolk Transit Bus Schedules; indicates the frequency of stops at Upper Port.
There is no evident coordination of the bus scheduling with the scheduling of the LIRR trains or the BPJ Ferry – see Intermodal Connections.

### 2.1.19 Existing Conditions: LIRR Train Service and Operations

The Long Island Rail Road Penn Station – Port Jefferson commuter rail line has 21 stations and the ride is two hours long – Table 5. A few peak hour trains, that have fewer stops, takes between 1 hour and 44 minutes to 1 hour and 55 minutes. The fare to Penn Station is $16.25 one-way peak, $11.75 off-peak, $8.00 senior, with 10 trip, weekly and monthly available.

The peak hour weekly trains run 8 trains from 4:18 am to 7:35 am, averaging every 25 minutes, from Port Jefferson to Penn station in the morning, and 8 trains from 4:19 pm – 7:22 pm, averaging every 23 minutes from Penn station to Port Jefferson.

During off- peak hours, there are 13 trains from Penn Station to Port Jefferson and 11 from Port Jefferson to Penn Station. These average one per hour during the frequently traveled times. For the weekend schedule, there are 14 trains per day running in each direction and they average approximately every hour and a half. There are approximately 1,000 commuters that use the Port Jefferson station daily.

CASA and Dr. Koppelman met with Mitchell Pally, Suffolk County Executive on the Board of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority on November 15, 2011. There are no changes to the train schedule or the operation of the train station planned, although the station hours may be reduced. The MTA welcomes proposals for changes to the station and LIRR property and would consider participating in making agreed upon changes.
2.1.20 Existing Conditions: Bridgeport - Port Jefferson Ferry - BPJF

The Bridgeport – Port Jefferson Ferry service between these two towns is approximately a 1 hour and 15 minute ride across Long Island Sound, for vehicles and walk-on passengers. It operates normal, summer peak and holiday schedules. During normal service September 5 to May 1, it provides service every hour and a half from 6 am to 6 pm and every two hours from 6 - 8 pm. During the summer from May 1 to September 5 it provides service every hour and a half, and every hour on Friday and Sunday and Saturday mornings, leaving on the hour or half hour in most all cases. The fare is $18.00 foot passenger, $13.00 senior, $53.00 car & driver & $15.00 additional passenger, $30.00 motorcycle.

2.1.21 Existing Conditions: Taxi Service

Island Wide provides taxi service and has an office on Main Street in Upper Port. There are typically taxies from this and other companies at the train station for each incoming train. The fare is approximately $5. train to ferry.

2.1.22 Intermodal Connections

18 LIRR trains depart daily from the Port Jefferson station. 11 departures have potential Suffolk County Transit bus connections having an average of 2 different bus lines within a 15 minute time period. Trains departing before 5:59 AM or after 8:34 pm have no bus connections.

21 trains arrive daily to Port Jefferson. 13 of these have connections to Suffolk County Transit buses within a 15 minute time period with an average of 2 different bus lines. Trains arriving after 8:15 pm have no connections.

6 trains arriving between 9:53 AM and 7:00 PM have connections by bus to a departing Ferry within one hour of the train’s arrival. No connections are available from arriving ferries by bus to departing trains.

3 Urban Design Revitalization Recommendations

3.1 Goals

- House a neighborhood population that would help support and transform the existing commercial Main Street into a more vibrant shopping street serving local needs.
- Support the Main Street businesses with a walkable, cohesive community. Encourage pedestrian activity, social interaction, and transit ridership.
- Provide excellent local pedestrian access while accommodating automobile circulation. Safe and convenient sidewalks are critical to the success of walkable neighborhood businesses.
- Require design quality through design guidelines and zoning controls.
- Create a “friendly neighborhood” that adds to the quality of life. Design qualities and amenities, such as plazas, gardens, artwork, outdoor performance, farmers market etc. that are critical to a local neighborhood business district’s success, and that can foster smaller businesses, studios, and artist activities.

3.2 The Identity and Character of Upper Port

Upper Port Jefferson should become a strong residential neighborhood with a commercial Main Street that supports the needs of this neighborhood and the entire Village of Port Jefferson. A reinvigorated commercial street can foster good relationships throughout the various areas of the Village – Figure 39. The entire Study Area should become a more pedestrian friendly walkable community. Main Street is the primary north-south traffic route but also must address a pedestrian character. Perry Street and Linden Place should be developed into east-west pedestrian oriented streets as connections to Main Street with public parks at either end.
A vital civic place should be created around the Train Station to cater to the needs of riders and to form the gateway to Port Jefferson from the south – Figures 45 & 46. The LIRR station might change to commercial use. A public plaza from Main Street to the Station would help bring the two together making the Station visible from the Street. The plaza should also be a center for the neighborhood, a place to “see and be seen” with commercial activities at its defining edges to attract the neighborhood. The plaza should contain special paving, planting, trees and lighting and benches. –see Figure 45 & 46.

3.2.1 The Proposed Plan

In the survey created by the Comprehensive Plan Committee, rating the “appearance of the uptown area” received the most “not satisfied” votes of 28 items listed. How much to encourage Village authorities to “further development uptown”, was the most important initiative rating of 34 items listed.

This Revitalization Plan proposes work primarily in the public realm, i.e. streets and sidewalks, plazas and parks to create a pedestrian friendly, walkable community. However, there has been a strong interest on the part of several developers to build mixed-use projects on Main Street and residential on Linden and Texaco. The new medical office complex on the east side of Oakland Avenue should also have a significant impact on Upper Port. Thus this form based plan has taken these proposed developments into consideration. The Plan incorporates the developers proposals into two proposals for Upper Port that might also be seen as two possible phases of development. One is the concept of infill to line streets with appropriately scaled buildings, creating pleasing street spaces combined with better sidewalks paving, trees, lighting and street furniture – Figures 36-38. Infill, fills the gaps to create more coherent urban space. The second idea, or possibly phase, is build-out. Within the proposed zoning, the entire Upper Port Study Area could be replaced with new as-of-right buildings with the maximum build-out. However, this is however unlikely to happen, so this Plan indicates where new building would be permitted and where it would have the greatest impact of improving the visible character of Upper Port – Figures 39 & 40. Growth cannot be dictated, but can only be promoted by visual demonstration of the consequence of such, as illustrated by the Plan.

Urban and Architectural Guide Lines should be made to specifically address the Upper Port character and image. The Village should consider making the Guide Lines into a requirement rather than recommendations – see Figure.27. These should include:

Buildings:
- Entry set backs, shop windows, awnings and signs.
- Building materials
- Building alignments, heights and roof designs
- Building scale and proportion
- Façade composition and fenestration

Streets:
- Sidewalk materials and bump-outs
- Benches, planters, trees, lighting, refuse containers.
- Paths, walkways and easements.

3.2.2 Buildings

☐ In the C-2 zone, new construction should be build to the property line, maintain the common setback distance of its neighbors or at least one in case of discrepancies.

☐ New buildings should work with existing characteristic building patterns of quality found in the area. New buildings should look like characteristic Main Street buildings found in towns on Long Island – see Appendix 1. Renovations and new buildings must have a minimum 3 foot setback from the building line at storefront entries to accommodate door swings, provide shelter. These sidewalk articulations will establish a pedestrian scale.

☐ Buildings situated at corners should "wrap" the corner by continuing certain façade elements such as the cornice or horizontal accent band, or shop windows, etc.
In the case of large structures, the overall building mass should be made up of smaller components. A horizontal rhythm of about 25’ should be created with the fenestration to accentuate small scale verticality rather than long horizontality. Large, uninterrupted building masses should be avoided unless treated with appropriate fenestration. – Figure 27.

Attention should be paid to the line of sight down any street with consideration given to creating interesting visual elements to catch the viewer’s eye, such as at Perry and Linden.

Longer buildings can also provide fluctuations in the roofline to break up the long run and attract attention to key places such as entryways.

A single material should be used as the dominant theme in the facade, with secondary materials used to highlight and accent the design.

The use of textured materials or decoration (such as brickwork patterns) to accent portions of the facade is encouraged.

Humanly scaled, natural materials should be used around pedestrian areas.

Façade compositions should be made up of a discernable base, middle and top.

Long rows of windows should be offset by placing the windows in vertical groups to offset the horizontality of the building – Figure 27.

Elevations should have a strong and simple patterns which should be kept consistent, but may deviate in places to highlight important locations such as the entry to the building.

The design of storefronts should be complementary to the façade organization above.

Building identification and signs should be incorporated into the design of the façade.

Long continuous lengths of awnings are not recommended. A series of similar sized smaller ones is preferred. – Figure 27

3.2.3 Streets

The study recommends that sidewalk materials be concrete in a small scale, approximately 3 foot by 3 foot square pattern with score and expansion joints. The strip between the concrete sidewalk and curb is to be a standard red brick paver in a running bond.

Sidewalk bump-outs as indicated on the drawings are the width of the parking lane with the required accessible ramp. – Figures 29, 32 & 43

Benches, planters, trees, lighting, refuse containers should be installed throughout the widened Main Street to meet Village standards. – Figure 37. These should match or compliment the street furniture utilized in lower Port. See 3.4.11 for recommended tree types.

No new curb-cuts should be permitted on Main Street an other streets if possible. Existing curb-cuts should be eliminated or reduced to necessary widths where and when possible.
Figure 25  PROPOSED PLAN OF UPPER PORT JEFFERSON - PROJECTS AND INFILL
Figure 26  ORTHOGRAPHIC VIEW OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED - PROJECTS AND INFILL
Figure 28  PLAN DETAIL - POTENTIAL BUILD-OUT
A Width of building is aggravated by monotony of window rhythm.
Continuous awning emphasizes horizontal
Entry flush with building front. Does not provide interest on sidewalk and forces door to swing onto sidewalk.

Not Recommended

B Facade based on 19th century post office building - Main Street, Port Jeff
Cornice and brackets provide top for building.
Window placement suggests three vertical facades.
Awnings separate shop windows and are deep enough to shade sidewalk.
Recessed entry
Recommended for Main Street

C Pitched roofs suggest individual dwelling units.
Recessed terraces break plane of horizontal facade.
Rhythm of storefronts relate to fenestration above.
Multiple recessed entries.

Recommended for side streets

D Fenestration to suggest dwelling units - and turns corner.
Roof parapet reinforces fenestration
Corner building - recessed entry at corner
Individual awnings at series of shop windows.
Contemporary design with scaled articulation
Recommended for Main Street

Figure 30  ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES
The building shall be between 2 and 4 stories in height, except where otherwise noted in the block development plans.

No less than 80% of the ground floor shall have at least 12 feet clear height. Upper floors shall have 8’-0" typical clear height minimum, with the exception that uppermost floor may have rooms that meet NYS Building Code under a sloping ceiling.

The height of a pitched roof shall be measured at the ridge. The maximum slope shall be 8/12.

The STREET façade shall be built to the required building line (RBL) not less than 75% overall. There are no required side setbacks.

Entries must be set back 3 feet minimum.

Arcades may be approved and permitted if they enhance the pedestrian flow in the immediate context.

Parking for vehicles shall be at least 20 feet from any street frontage (except basement garages). Garage/parking entrances shall be no closer than 50 feet from any street intersection.
Primary ground floor facades on Main Street shall have no less than 60% fenestration. Awnings and overhangs are encouraged.

Upper story facades shall have between 30% and 70% fenestration.

Balconies and bay windows may project 18" beyond the required building line on the 2nd and 3rd stories.

The ground floor shall house only retail, office space and lobby access for upper story uses, except in the C-2R overlay zone where residential at ground floor is permitted.

Upper story uses may be residential or office space.

Fronting Main Street there shall be functioning entry doors at intervals not greater than 50 feet.
3.3 Land Use and Zoning

As indicated in the data collection there is a difference between the existing land use and the zoning. Ground floor commercial and upper floor residential is found in most of the buildings of more than one story on Main Street. This is only permitted as a “conditional-use” in the Village Code. There is ground floor residential on Walnut Street and Linden Place, which is not permitted in the Code. The automobile repair establishments located on Linden Place and Texaco Avenue are not permitted uses in the C2 district. As documented, presently very little off-street parking is being provided by Main Street commercial businesses.

Also of importance, the data collected indicates that there are only 50 to 60 residences presently in the study area. This does not constitute much of a neighborhood and certainly cannot sustain the commercial uses on Main Street. Thus Main Street commercial is forced to serve an outside population to survive economically. This Plan recommends that the C-2 Zoning be changed to permit mixed-use, residential over commercial. It also recommends that the off-street parking requirement be changed. The existing Main Street commercial area of approximately 75,000 square feet, mostly does not provide any parking and is grand fathered as ‘non-complying buildings’. Our observations and those of the BID report and the attached Traffic Report, indicate that there presently is not a parking problem, but rather a problem finding existing parking. Option B of the Study Plan provides 22 new on street parking spaces, which would accommodate 2,200 new square feet of commercial floor area under the current Code or 4,400 with the recommended changes - see Table 3. This Study proposes to create a walkable neighborhood with a commercial Main Street, and thereby, if existing commercial floor area is renovated or expanded by less than ten percent (10%), that no new parking would be required. Other recommendations pertaining to; Lot Depth, Side Yard, Rear Yard, and Floor Area Ratio are found in Table 2. A list of other Long Island town parking requirements is in Appendix 2.

Figure 33 PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES
This Plan proposes to change the zoning in the study area with a revised C-2 and new Zoning District overlays. An overlay district is a district superimposed upon another district, which supercedes, modifies or supplements the underlying regulations. The overlay districts are placed over the proposed C-2 and identify special provisions in addition to those in the under laying base zone. The overlay districts share common boundaries with the base zone and, in places, cut across property boundaries in keeping with the mixed-use intentions of the proposed zoning.

The Plan proposes to revise the existing C-2 Zoning that presently is very similar to the C-1 Zone. Day care, Preschools and Artist’s live/work housing should be permitted uses and Franchised automobile and boat dealers, including the sale and servicing of new and used cars and boats, accessory open-lot sales an the storage thereof; Motels, Utility structures; Newspaper printing; Retail food establishment that conducts its business at a drive-up window or door; should not be Conditional Uses. Proposed changes in bulk are made in Table 2.

The Plan proposes a C-2R Residential overlay - Figure 33. Zoning of properties on Walnut and Oak Streets Street that are presently predominantly single-family homes, the properties on both sides of Texaco Avenue and the western portion of Linden Place, would be changed to permit medium density town houses or multi-family dwellings – see Table 3. The intent is to permit and encourage the development of residential neighborhoods on both sides of Main Street. As an overlay, it would permit commercial uses in the area that would enhance the neighborhoods. The on-site parking requirement would be require that it be placed in the back of the buildings, through side lot drive ways. Relief could be granted based on a negotiated shared parking arrangement.

The Plan also proposes a C-2PO, Professional Office overlay along Oakland Avenue to concentrate commercial retail use on Main Street and to tie the eastern side of the Study Area to the office uses on the eastern side of Oakland Avenue as well as the hospitals – see Table 4. Residential uses would be permitted above the ground floor. Presently there are offices, medical offices in one-story buildings along the west side of Oakland and there is one multifamily residence. Parking would not be permitted in the front of the building. Shared parking agreements would be permitted for some relief of the parking requirement. This C-2PO overlay differs from the ZR 250-17 Professional Office P-O District in terms of Bulk and Parking Regulations. Office use would be permitted on the ground floor only and residential use would be a permitted use above. The Plan proposes that Oaklnd be developed as a tree lined boulevard and encourages the transformation, or replacement of the buildings with parking in front at the street, to mixed-use, built to the three story limit with parking to the back of building. Shared parking opportunities should be sought. Upper floor residential would make a better scale for the street and make it more of a 24-7 condition with “eyes on the street” for better security. On the east side of Oakland, a mixed-use building should be permitted at the private parking lot on the east side of Oakland Avenue to create more of a street wall.

The suggested changes to the zoning code (Chapter 250 of the Code of the Incorporated Village of Port Jefferson) are subject to a separate approval process by the Board of Trustees. The recommendations herein are intended to be a guide to the Board in the consideration of the changes and any subsequent amendments.
Table 2: Proposed Changes to C-2 Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-2</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Required:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (square feet)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (feet)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One side yard (feet)</td>
<td>0 except 12 ft. min</td>
<td>0 except 8 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both side yards</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback from curb</td>
<td>12 ft. min.</td>
<td>12 ft. min. or align with adj. blgs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard within 25 ft. of Res. Dist. boundary (feet)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (feet)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard within 25 ft. of Res. Dist. boundary (feet)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking spaces - Retail</td>
<td>1 per 100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 200 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking spaces - Offices</td>
<td>1 per 300 sq. ft. or per employee</td>
<td>1 per 400 sq. ft. or per employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking - Medical Offices</td>
<td>1 per 100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1 per 100 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking spaces – Residential not permitted</td>
<td>1.5 - Bonus 1.0 per one bedroom unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 per two bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 per three bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street Loading</td>
<td>1 per 25,000 sq. ft. or &lt;</td>
<td>1 per 25,000 sq. ft. or &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Permitted:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area ratio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height (feet)</td>
<td>35’</td>
<td>35’ – Bonus 45’ – after 12’ set back at 35 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stories</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 – Bonus 4 - with 4th story setback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3: A C-2R Residential overlay within the C-2 Zone**

Residential use with conditional use of ground floor commercial – retail or office.

**Minimum Required:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Lot (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Dwelling Unit (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width (feet)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Depth (feet)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (feet)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Lot Front Yard (feet)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Side Yard (feet)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both side Yards (feet)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (feet)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitable* floor Area Per Dwelling Unit (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>400 0 BR / 700 1 BR / 900 2 BR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking Spaces per Dwelling Unit</td>
<td>1.5 - Bonus 1.0 per one bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 per two bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 per three bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum Permitted:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Village code uses “Livable” but “Habitable” conforms to most codes

This proposal is based on the following assumptions:

- Minimum lot width is 50’ as there are two 50’ lots on Walnut (#11 & 13)
- Minimum lot depth is 100’ as it is the depth of all lots on Walnut
- Minimum lot area is 5,000 s.f. = 50’x100’
- Require one side yard @ 10’ wide for on site parking. Only one required
- Lot area per Dwelling Unit is 850 s.f. – 40’ x 50’ building 3 stories could have 6 units @ 1,000 gross s.f.
- Lot coverage is 40 % - 40’ x 50’ building w/ 20’ front yard, 10’ side yard, 30’ rear yard
- Parking requirement – We suggest keeping “Off-Street” rather than “On-Site” to provide a flexible possibility of adjacent site parking, or parking within a certain radius of the site. We also have suggested that an owner or developer could establish a shared parking arrangement.
Table 4 – C-2PO Office Overlay within the C-2 Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Required:</th>
<th>EXISTING P-0 ZONING</th>
<th>PROPOSED OVERLAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area (square feet)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot width (feet)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One side yard (feet)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 @ 8 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both side yards</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback from curb</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard within 25 ft. of</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Dist. boundary (feet)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (feet)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard within 25 ft. of</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Dist. boundary (feet)</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking spaces</td>
<td>250-17</td>
<td>250-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per 300 ft of floor area or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking spaces</td>
<td>not permitted</td>
<td>1.5 - Bonus 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Res. unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 per one bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 - per two bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 - per three bedroom unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Maximum Permitted:         |                     |                  |
| Floor area ratio           | ---                 | 2                |
| Lot coverage               | 25%                 | ----             |
| Building height (feet)     | 35                  | 45 w/ setback @ 35’ |
| Number of stories          | 3                   | 4                |

| Off-street Loading Requirements: |                     |
| 25,000 square feet of floor area or less | 1 | 1 |

Notes:
The smallest existing lot on Oakland is approximately 13,500 s.f.
Medical Office parking requirements would remain 1 per 100 s.f.
Figure 34  MAIN STREET SECTIONS
3.3.1 Building Height

The present C-2 code has a 35 foot, 3 story height limit. There have been development proposals presented to the Planning Board that request building to 5 stories on Main Street and rising to 6 in areas where the land slopes down as much as 12’ below Main Street. Examination of these proposals concluded that development should not be permitted above 4 stories and that the required on-site parking can be achieved with this much bulk. Figure 36 indicates the proposed street modifications to 45’ - 4 story; with 35’ street wall and a 12’ minimum setback or maximum 8/12 sloped roof on Main Street with the maximum height measured at the ridge.— Figure 34. The sites on the south-east and south-west corners of Main Street could get views to the harbor. The corners of North Country Road and Sheep Pasture Road could also get views and should be permitted to make a “special corner” in height and form (like the Hall of Fame Museum at Main and East Main downtown) to denote the north end of the neighborhood. This maximum height in the C-2R overlay is 35 feet and 45 feet on Perry, Linden and Texaco.

3.4 Pedestrian Improvements

This Plan proposes a number of pedestrian improvements that mainly revolve around sidewalk improvements. Main Street is considered the primary public street and sidewalks of the neighborhood. A secondary pedestrian oriented sequence is proposed to be on Perry Street and Linden Place to connect Main Street to the existing Texaco Park at the west, and to a proposed new park at Oakland Avenue at the east – Figure 27. Both of these propose reorganized street parking and wider sidewalks. The additional width would be developed as a strip of distinctive paving or planter strips and contain trees, planting or planters, pedestrian lights, and street furniture, such as benches and trash receptacles.

Sidewalk bump-outs (neck-downs) are proposed at the intersection of Perry Street and Linden Place and possibly on Main Street (DOT permitting). Crosswalks of brick patterned asphalt are to be provided to cross Main Street, Perry Street and Linden Place – Figure 43, 42 & 43. If the recommendation, in the Traffic Report, of a traffic signal is pursued at Main, Perry and Linden, this will further enhance the east/west pedestrian sequence.

There are not many opportunities for parking behind Main Street commercial, thus little need to have pedestrian alley access from front to back. However, there is an opportunity to create a pedestrian way from Main Street to Walnut and Oak Streets through private property that is presently not built on. The Village should consider obtaining an easement for this public way.
Figure 35  PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS
Figure 36  MAIN STREET IMPROVEMENTS
3.4.1 Main Street

Main Street varies in width. Pedestrian improvements are proposed in conjunction with change to on street parking, eliminating parking on the east side in order to create a center turning lane. – Figures 36-41. This turning lane will be for left hand turns at a number of locations. At the northern end, northbound on Main onto Sheep Pasture Road; southbound on Main onto Perry; northbound on Main to Linden; and at the southern end, southbound on Main to the “Station Street” which includes the entry to LIRR Station. The Traffic Report has an option of a traffic signal at the staggered intersection of Main Street with Perry Street as Linden Place as noted.

The sidewalk on both sides of Main Street will remain approximately 11’ wide at its southern end. On the east side, it currently tapers to 5’-5” at it northern end at North Country and Sheep Pasture Roads. The elimination of one lane of parking would permit the sidewalk at the northern end, east side, at North country Road, to be widened from 5’-5” to approximately 10 feet. Drainage would have to be engineered and relocated. The curbs will not be changed except for this widening.

The sidewalk on the west side of Main Street is about 11’ at the south end and continues at this width to near the north end at Sheep Pasture Road. This sidewalk has a peculiar step, generally 30” in from the curb. This cannot be eliminated and maintain the building entry and curb elevations without creating a steep pitch to the sidewalk that would be very uncomfortable. The plan proposes making the step more regular and visible through built-in raised planters. The width from street to step is proposed to be increased from 30” to 48” and align with the distinctive paving proposed for both sides of Main Street. Figure 38. New trees would align with existing.

3.4.2 Perry Street

Perry Street is proposed to be a pedestrian friendly street to make a east-west cross connection from Oakland Avenue and the new office complex, where a new public park is proposed, to Texaco Park to the west, via Linden Place. The intention is to bring the new office complex, and even Mather Hospital, into the neighborhood and Main Street retail. Thus a tree lined widened sidewalk condition is proposed. Perry Street is 34 feet wide and has parking on both sides and 6 -11 foot sidewalks. There are two options for changes to Perry Street – Figures 41 & 42.

Option A is to make Perry Street two-way with parallel parking on the south side (10 spaces) because of its relation to Main Street commerce. The road bed would be narrowed from 34’ to 31’ and requires new curbs and relocating one drain. The sidewalks would be approximately 6’-0” wide of concrete and 3’ of brick paving strip between the sidewalk and curb for trees and lights.

Option B is a plan to create a couplet of two one-way streets, with Perry Street going west and a new “Station Street” running east. Thus Perry Street would be one way running west with parallel parking on both sides (19 spaces). This also requires new curbs and relocating one drain (34’-28’ width). Sidewalks would be 10-11 ’ wide, 6-7’ concrete and 4’ distinctive paving for lighting and trees.

Another Option C would be a two-way street, with parking on both sides, which could be achieved if Perry Street properties were required to provide a 4-6 foot expansion of the sidewalk on their private properties. This might be possible since most of Perry is proposed to be developed except the building on the north-east corner from Walnut to Oakland (this property is presently being improved) where there would be no parking on this side.

The Traffic Report suggests an option of a traffic signal at the Main/Perry/Linden intersection.
Figure 37  MAIN STREET SIDEWALK CURB
VIEW OF EAST SIDE OF MAIN STREET SOUTH OF NORTH COUNTRY ROAD
Figure 40
MAIN STREET WITH PARKING ON WEST SIDE ONLY,
DISTINCTIVE SIDEWALKS AND PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS
3.4.3 Linden Place

Linden Place is also proposed to be a pedestrian friendly street to make the east-west cross connection from Texaco Park to Oakland Avenue and the new proposed public park via Perry Street. Thus a tree lined widened sidewalk condition is proposed as at Perry. Linden Place is 28 feet 6 inches wide feet wide and has two-way traffic, parking on the north side (9 spaces) and sidewalks that vary from 5'-2" to 9'-6". The proposed design also has two options – Figures 41 & 43.

Option A is for two-way traffic and no parking. There presently is no development proposed except at the north-west end of Linden where a 10’ setback has recently been approved. The street bed would be altered from 28.5’ to 24’ requiring new curbs (there is no drainage). The sidewalks will be 9-10 feet wide, 6'-0" wide concrete and 4’ of brick paving strip between the sidewalk and curb for tree trees and lights.

Option B is another couplet as at Perry, with Linden being one-way west and a new “Railroad Street” along the LIRR tracks running east with reorganized parking in this area and with no left turn at Main. It would have parallel parking on the north side (9 spaces). The street bed would be changed from 28.5’ to 20’ requiring new curbs, and sidewalks would be approximately 11’ wide, with 7’ concrete and 4’ for distinctive paving, lighting and trees.

3.4.4 Oakland Avenue

Oakland Avenue is a wide two way street with no parking. Presently, the existing buildings are set back quite a bit from the street. Except for one two story house, all the buildings are one story. There is parking in front of most of the buildings making an unpleasant vista. Perhaps over time, larger buildings, closer to the street will replace the existing and should be encouraged –see C-2PO zoning Table 4. The new Medical office buildings on the east side are set back a large distance and have parking lots surrounding them, including at Oakland. There is some new tree planting along the street. The sidewalks are 4’ wide on the west side and new ones on the east side are 5 feet wide and both sides have a 5’ grass planting strip to the curb. The plan proposes to create a dense pattern of street trees and, where possible, a double row on both sides of the sidewalk. The intention is to bring the new office complex, and even Mather Hospital, into the neighborhood.

3.4.5 Walnut Street

Walnut Street does not have sidewalks or curbs except on the north-east end at the church. The Plan proposes 4 foot wide sidewalks and 3 foot grass planting strip and curbs, with trees in the planting strip. There are numerous large asphalt connections (would be curb cuts) that should be reduced to small curb cuts. The street would remain two-way with parking on both sides.

3.4.6 Elm Street

Elm Street does not have sidewalks or curbs except on the north-east end at Oakland Avenue. The Plan proposes 4 foot wide sidewalks and 3 foot grass planting strip and curbs, with trees planted in the planting strip. The street would remain two-way with parking on both sides.

3.4.7 Texaco Avenue

Texaco Avenue is presently undeveloped and unorganized, with a large vacant lot on the corner of Linden a vacant former car wash establishment, a non conforming and newly expanded automobile repair establishment on the west side of the street, a disorganized termination at the south train tracks and single family residential to the north at Sheep Pasture Road. There is a small sidewalk on the east side with a large curb cut at the former car wash and there are no sidewalks on the west side. The Plan proposes that the sidewalk on the east side be rebuilt with a 4 foot sidewalk and a 3 foot planting strip with lawn, trees and lights. It also proposes curbs and trees on the west side and if the automobile repair site is changed to a conforming residential use in the future, that sidewalks and pedestrian lighting be required to be built at that time. As Texaco will remain two-way and Linden is proposed to be one-way west in Option B, the Plan proposes a new one-way east street, 'Railroad Street', connected with Texaco, to complete the couplet. Texaco is not wide enough for parking - Figure 41.
Figure 41  STREET AND PEDESTRIAN SPACE AT THE CENTER OF UPPER PORT
Figure 42  SECTION PERRY STREET PLAN A & B
3.4.8 New Sidewalks

Many of the existing sidewalks are in a deteriorated condition. The Plan proposes that a schedule for sidewalk re-building be developed to systematically bring the sidewalks up to a good condition. This should be coordinated with building projects where possible. New developments would be required to bring sidewalks abutting their property line up to Village standards by Code rather than at the discretion of the Planning Board review process. A common cement color and aggregate should be used throughout and divided into an approximately 3 foot by 3 foot grid of expansion and control joints. All the streets are proposed to have a paving or planting strip. In the case of the planting strip, the area should be grass lawn and trees with street lights. In the case of the paving strips, the paving material should be a standard red brick paver placed in a running bond with a brick border for trees – Figure 37.

3.4.9 Street Crossings

There is presently a problem for pedestrians crossing Main Street as there is no indication of legally having priority, and it is difficult at the pedestrian crossing at Perry and Linden to cross the street. The Nelson/Nygard traffic report for the BID noted that people will not park on one side of the street, that need to go to the other, because of this difficulty. There is also no crossing at the rail tracks to connect the parking at the west to the station at the east. The Plan proposes to resolve this problem by creating a major pedestrian crossing at Perry and Linden that has bump-out (neck-downs) at Main Street, Perry Street and Linden Place. The Traffic Report presents an option of a traffic signal at this intersection, which would greatly enhance pedestrian movement. The Plan also calls for a marked pedestrian crossing at the proposed Train Station Plaza. Bump-outs are indicated at every street that has parallel parking to occupy the parking zone. NYS DOT has concerns regarding bump outs in terms of snow removal but will review plans. Perhaps a marking system could be implemented for Main Street, both uptown and downtown in order to achieve bump-outs for better pedestrian conditions – Figure 41. All intersections must comply with the most recent ADA ramp requirements. The Plan proposes that all street crossings have a distinctive paving material that is acceptable to the DOT.

3.4.10 Lighting

Lighting is critical for both security and ambiance. Lower height level pedestrian lights are important for providing light under trees on tree lined street. The Plan calls for two types of lighting; one the standard high cobra for street lighting and the second, the 12 foot high pedestrian Dickens lights used throughout the Village. There are a few of the Dickens lights in place on Main Street. The first type of street light should be spaced to standards that provide optimum security. The pedestrian lights should be placed approximately every 60 feet on Main, Perry and Linden and Oakland, and every 80 feet on the residential streets.

3.4.11 Trees

Presently there are few streets with trees except on Main Street. The Plan proposes numerous street trees on all blocks – Figure 44. Paver and planting strips are proposed on all streets and provide a specified zone for these trees except on the west side of Main Street where new trees will be aligned with existing. Tree grates would not be required because of being located in this strip. There are trees on private residential properties near the streets but these do not fill the same role that street trees provide of a nice ambiance and scale on residential streets. Hearty “street trees”, that do not have roots that disturb sidewalk paving, having branches above head height and that have different colors and blooming periods; e.g., Bradford Pear, Sweet Gum and Green Ash are recommended.
Figure 44  PROPOSED STREET TREES
3.5 Public Parks and Plazas

The Plan proposes to re-develop the existing Texaco Park, to create a new plaza at the LIRR train station, and create a new park at the end of Perry Street on the east side of Oakland Avenue, where the Plan also proposes a relocation of the intersection of Highland Boulevards and Oakland to align with the new ‘Station Street’.

3.5.1 Railroad Plaza

The proposed plaza at the LIRR station attempts to accomplish several things. It is to serve as a visual gateway to Port Jefferson from the south on Route 112. Appropriate signage and the recently located clock assist in this goal. By removing the parking in this area, the Plaza will permit the elegant train station building to be visible, from and more related to, Main Street – Figure 45 & 46. It will also provide bus stop shelters on each side of Main Street. The Traffic Report indicates a pedestrian crossing to connect the bus stops and parking to the west to this plaza an station. Finally, the plaza is to become a neighborhood hub with special paving, raised planting with edges that are detailed to serve as benches, trees on the south side to make an edge at the platform and tracks. As noted, the station might be transformed if the tickets become sold only through vending machines, to include a commercial vender with snacks and newspapers etc. to be able to oversee and keep the station open for longer hours. The Village should be involved so as to help get the best use for the community and to keep the station open daily with long hours. This has worked well at other stations having a small business selling snacks and drinks and newspapers and magazines order to be encourage longer hours. A few tables and chairs might be added to attract neighborhood use as well. In meetings with Suffolk County Transit there is an interest improving the bus stops with passenger shelters and integration with the LIRR.

It is also hoped that any new development of the property on the north side of the station area would include commercial activity wrapping around the corner from Mains Street along ‘Station Street’ to enhance making the plaza into the intended neighborhood focus.

Figure 46  VIEWS OF STATION FROM MAIN STREET
3.5.2 Texaco Park Redevelopment

Texaco Park consists of 0.53 acres of open space. There is a half-court basketball court, a small equipped children's playground, and some benches, lawn and trees. The play area and equipment should be expanded, planting placed around the basketball court, an added hand-ball court and a better seating area for watching the children's play area as well as areas to be more surrounded by pleasant landscape planting. Issues of safety and security must be carefully considered in any re-development. Figure 47 provides a plan image of a possible redevelopment.
3.5.3 Highland Park

The Plan studied several scenarios for the approximately 6 acres of open undeveloped space along Highland Avenue that is Village Property. In each of these, the Plan proposes a public passive park at the intersection of Oakland Avenue and Highland Boulevard along with the relocation of Highland Boulevard further south to align with the proposed extension of Oakland at the new proposed ‘Station Street’. This park extends east, with a pedestrian and bicycle path to the housing developments at the eastern end of the public land, and along the section of woods at the south-east corner of the Medical Office property that was designated to remain natural “forest” – Figure 48. At the October 5, 2011 public meeting, there were questions about covenants made in the past, related to its future use. In a search by the Village, none were found (the Village believes that the developer (McNamara) deeded the property to the village in lieu of a recreation fee). Several basic land uses were presented to the public at the October 5, 2011 meeting, and another was added from this public discussion – Figure 49: A) park land with a passive park, public gardens and arboretum park, as discussed at the meeting; B) passive park and active park with softball and soccer field (limited usage times and no lighting for night time use); C) passive park with a community facility such as a YMCA; and D) passive park with a portion for residential development related to transit oriented principles of creating density in proximity to the train station. There could be a shop at the ground floor portion of buildings fronting on Highlands Boulevard. A larger community gardens, as a place of agricultural production, based on urban farming principles, and perhaps with a farm market, could bring revenue to the Village and might be considered as well. All of these possibilities need further discussion and development in relation to issues of Upper Port needs and transit oriented development concepts. There are presently security issues at the existing site. Costs related to development and maintenance if the Village keeps the site as public open space should be analyzed.

Figure 48  HIGHLAND PARK
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Figure 49  OPTIONS FOR VILLAGE OWNED SITE
At a meeting of the Board of Trustees, following the public presentation of the existing conditions and the possible development and recreational options for the six acre lot, the Trustees agreed unanimously that the six acre parcel should be reserved for a recreational purpose only, with a section to remain passive and the recreational component either active or passive, but not yet determined. In order to preserve and protect the parcel for this use only, the Board recommended recording a restrictive covenant, which should have been done when the parcel was dedicated to the Village for that purpose by the highlands developer.

3.6 Streets and Traffic

Modification to the Streets in the Study Area is a critical aspect of this Study and Plan. There is the general increase in traffic that is occurring all over Long Island which has been accounted for in the Traffic Report. Specific to the study area, is the ever growing hospitals and the new medical office complex that border the area to the north-east and east. As in lower Port, Main Street is also a State Highway, and each contradicts much of the needs of the other. There is also the particular case of stoppage during train arrival and departure. The Plan proposes a growth of residential population in order to create a revitalized neighborhood with vibrant commercial activity. The Traffic Report has examined the effects of an increase of 175 and 350 new residences, and an additional 10,000 square feet of commercial in the study area, and has determined that there is no significant impact on traffic if recommended improvements are implemented. The plan has accommodated the recommendations of the Traffic Report. Several changes are proposed in the Plan - Figures 36, 41 & 50. Pedestrian crossings on Main Street are discussed in the Pedestrian Improvements section of this report.

3.6.1 Remove Parking from the East Side of Main Street

Main Street is a State Road 25A. There is constant traffic and no pedestrian right-of-way, making it difficult to park on one side of the street with the need to cross to the other side. The Comprehensive Plan and the Comprehensive Plan Committee recommends 16 foot wide sidewalks. The Waterfront Revitalization Plan for lower Port recommends taking parking off one side of the street (east side) to achieve proper street lanes and parking widths and to increase the widths of the sidewalks. There has been the recommendation to do the same uptown. However the sidewalks are primarily 11’ wide uptown and seem adequate and the Traffic Report recommends creating a center turning lane for several intersections on Main Street. There is also the need for bus pull-off lanes. Thus, to achieve a more pedestrian friendly Main Street and pedestrian security at street crossings, the Plan proposes to remove parking from the east side of Main Street, create the center turn lane to improve traffic, and create a distinctive paving strip at the curbs for aesthetics, lighting, trees, trash bins and possible occasional benches – Figures 37 & 38. There are 20 spaces involved in the removal of parking on the east side and creating the pull-in/out parking zones as occurs downtown on the west side. The Plan endorses the Traffic Reports option of a traffic signal at Main/Perry/Linden. There is a preference for Option B of the couplet concept because for Perry and Linden, the sidewalks are wider, the streets are narrower, there is more street parking – Figures 41-43.

3.6.2 Left-hand Turn Lane at Main Street and North Country Road

There is a recognized problem caused by the employee arrival and departure patterns of the hospitals on Belle Terre Road. Conditions have recently changed from the south with the creation of single one-way lanes and removed the center turning lane from the railroad track to the 25A – 112 intersection at the south.

Although traffic backs up at the Main/North Country/Sheep Pasture intersection, trying to get the traffic to move more quickly contradicts the desire to have traffic calming for a pedestrian friendly Main Street. However, creating a left-hand turn lane as recommended in the Traffic Report for the Main Street northbound traffic at this intersection would contribute to a better flow during the hospital work shifts.

3.6.3 A proposed “Station Street” from Main Street to Oakland Avenue

Another proposal made in the Comprehensive Plan Update, is to create an eastbound by-pass street on the south side of the LIRR lot, at the present private drive-way alley that extends through Village property at the parking lot. There is a designated fire lane on the Tax Map that was incorporated within the LIRR side of the property line
and within the parking lot of the Railroad station. A one-way east street to Oakland Avenue combined with a turn into the LIRR station could be created either in the existing alley, through negotiation with the property owner, or through modifications of the LIRR parking lot. This would be a by-pass to alleviate traffic on Main Streets and turns onto Perry and North Country Road. The entry into the train station, presently off of Main Street, would be located on this new street so that there is a single intersection at Main. This is recommended as one option in the Traffic Report to create a couplet of one-way streets with Perry Street (see 3.4.2 Perry Street) – Figure 41.

### 3.6.4 Curbs and Curb Cuts

Many curbs in the Study Area need to be repaired or are far below standards – Figure 19. New street width changes are being proposed requiring new curbs. The Plan proposes that a schedule of curb replacement be developed along with sidewalk repairs and improvements.

There are also areas that do not have any curbs and these should also be scheduled to be installed along with recommendations for sidewalks that the Plan proposes.

There are many curb cuts in the Study Area and while most are necessary to serve off-street vehicular needs, there are also numerous curb cuts that are excessively long. The Plan proposes that curb cuts be modified and sizes minimized to essential needs. The Plan also recommends that no new curb cuts be permitted on Main Street and other streets without careful consideration by the Planning Board regarding their consequences for traffic flow and on-street parking.

New sidewalks and curbs and street modifications must be required as Site Plan improvements when and where new development is proposed.

### 3.7 Parking

#### 3.7.1 On-Street Public Parking

The Plan proposes changes to existing on-street parking. Option B has an increase in 22 on-street spaces, while Option A has a decrease in 7. Option B permits more parking for Main Street commercial activity since most all of these do not have on-site parking; a situation that is grandfathered – see 3.7.2 Off-street parking. This is necessary to be able to maintain commercial vitality and viability to serve neighborhood and Village needs. The on-street parking is also valuable for encouraging an increase in residential development to create a balanced neighborhood.

#### 3.7.2 Off-street Parking

Almost none of the Main Street commercial properties and few of the properties in the Study Area provide off-street parking to meet present Zoning Code requirement. As most of these precede the code, and others may have been exempted through Zoning appeal, these conditions are grandfathered and developments of these would not required to meet Code if they are not expanding a non-complying use. Article IX – 250-39 A. of the Village Code states that nonconforming uses “shall not be enlarged, altered, extended, reconstructed or restored”, and 250-39 D. “reestablished if such use has been discontinued or abandoned or not used for any reason for a period of one year or more”, or 250-39 E. “damaged to the extent of more than fifty percent of the replacement cost”, should be modified. The Plan recommends that reconstruction, restoration, alterations and enlargements of less than 10% of the existing commercial footprint should not require on-site parking so that the desire to create a good massing of Main Street would not be compromised. The Plan also recommends removing the requirements of D. and E. on Main Street. Residential development in a mixed-use building in the C-2 and C-2R overlay, would be required to provide parking to meet the proposed code – see Table 2 & 3. The owner/developer could propose a reduction to the Planning Board based on creating a shared parking agreement, and purchase relief based on a Village Parking district payment plan. The Plan recommends that Article VII – 250-27 B. (2) be modified in the C-2 District to permit the Planning board to provide parking relief “within 200 feet of the village parking lot”. The Plan also recommends that private parking in the middle of blocks create pedestrian pathway connections to existing streets.

A number of private properties have their own off-street parking that relate either correctly or not to the parking
Figure 50 PROPOSED TRAFFIC AND SIDEWALKS
3.7.3 Public Off-street Parking

The Village owns or maintains parking at four locations in the Study Area. One is a village owned lot on Perry and Oakland (70 spaces), and the other is on Linden Place near Texaco Avenue (27 spaces). Both lots are for Village Residents at all times and are unrestricted 6pm - 5am. The Village has had a long term-renewable maintenance agreement with the LIRR for the parking at the train station (119 spaces that do not meet dimension standards; or 109 spaces if properly laid out), and west of Main Street along the tracks (24 spaces). Thus the Village owns or maintains 240 (230 by code) off-street spaces in the Study Area along with the on-street parking. This parking will be metered in relation to the Village parking management plan. The possibility to have the LIRR parking for residents only was discussed in developing a new agreement with the LIRR and the Plan recommends that all, or the parking on the west side of Main Street that is listed as “Municipal Parking” in the previous agreement with the LIRR, be residents only.

The Plan has recommendations for each of the areas – Figure 57 & 3.12 Block Studies. For the parking lot at Perry and Oakland the recommendation is to structure a public/private partnership with either of the two Owners of private property on the block or a third party. This would entail a parking structure for the entire block that would contain 219 parking spaces and be shared in an equitable way between the property owners and the Village to provide parking for the owner’s developments and the existing 70 Village spaces – see Appendix 3. This would be at grade on Oakland but below grade at Main Street due to the topography. Entries would be created in relation to the organization or subdivisions of the different constituents. The air-rights above the present Village parking property would be sold or leased through a legal agreement to be able to develop housing above. This would create a better physical condition along Oakland Avenue and for the north side of the train station area where the public plaza is proposed.

The Plan recommends a reorganization of the Train Station area as previously noted to create a neighborhood plaza, a gateway to Port Jefferson from the south and a stronger relation of the Train Station building to Main Street. To achieve this, the number of parking spaces is changed from 109 (noted above) to 112, for a gain of 3 spaces – see Fig. 52. This parking lot would be metered from 5 am to 11pm for commuters, with rates to be determined by the Village parking Committee and approved by the LIRR. It should be available only to Village residents for all times or from 11pm. to 4 a.m. as negotiated.

For the public parking on the west side of Main Street, along the train tracks, the Plan recommends a better organized layout. The LIRR municipal lot is a triangle with a poor layout that must be combined with Village property to achieve a more rational and efficient plan. Better lighting is required to discourage vagrancy, and a row of evergreen trees planted at the rail track line to visually improve the area is proposed. The Village Parking at the western end of Linden and connected with the LIRR parking would be reconfigured and combined with a development proposal on the lot west to the west with lighting, planting and a hedge proposed along Linden. Two layout options have been developed with the criteria of maximum utilization and must be reviewed for traffic safety issues. In option A there is a layout that achieves 102 spaces when combined with the LIRR lot, which is an increase of 51 spaces – see Fig. 53. For Option B, the proposed ‘Railroad Street’ becomes a through one-way street running east from Texaco to Main Street as a coupled with Linden Place, which would be on-way west. The extension of Texaco to link with ‘Rail Road Street permits less parking than Option A, providing 90 spaces, which is an increase in 39 spaces – see Figure 54. Therefore the total increase in Village off-street parking spaces is 99 for Option A or 87 for Option B. This parking would be metered and for Village residents only as established by the Village Parking Committee and approved by the LIRR.

The Plan also recommends creating 45 new parking spaces on Highland Boulevard, centered on and connected with stairs to the end of the platform at the pedestrian overpass and where Highland is straight road. This would provide an alternate kiss-n-ride drop-off location- Figure 55. A ticket machine would be located at the existing passenger shelter at the overpass. This should create more available parking in the study area by shifting some LIRR parking away from Main Street. This parking would be metered.

With these proposed changes 86-104 new parking spaces are created along the southern edge of the study area. These would all be metered parking as discussed above.
3.7.4 Time Limits

The Plan proposes to change the parking on Main Street from one hour to 20 minutes to accommodate short time pick up usage with the longer times just off Main on Perry and Linden which is proposed to be changed from 1 hour to 2 hour to permit longer stays for shopping and restaurants. The parking on Walnut and Oak is proposed to be changed from 2 hours to 4 hours to permit longer periods of stay since it is not an area where turn over is needed or desired – Table 5.

Table 5: Proposed Changes for Parking Time Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Present Parking</th>
<th>Present Time</th>
<th>Proposed Parking</th>
<th>Proposed Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street – east side</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– west side</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Street – north side</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A – south side</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Street – north side</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B – south side</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden Place - north side</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A - south side</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden Place - north side</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B - south side</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street - east side</td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– west side</td>
<td>not marked</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Avenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texaco Avenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Pasture Road</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country Road-south side</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 hr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total on-street parking: **64**  
Option A: **57**  
Option B: **86**

Note: Present and parking times are not in effect on Sunday and nights. If and when street parking becomes metered down town, the up-town would similarly become metered with times appropriate to the location.
Figure 51  PLAN OF PARKING AT SOUTH
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Figure 53  PARKING ON RAILROAD STREET - PLAN A
Figure 54  PARKING ON RAILROAD STREET - PLAN B
Figure 55  HIGHLANDS BOULEVARD PARKING AND REALIGNMENT
Figure 56  BUS STOP PLAN
3.7.5 Signage

The Plan proposes to develop better signage to communicate to drivers on Main Street that there is public parking on Perry and Linden and the public lot at Oakland.

3.7.6 Shared Parking

The concept of shared parking is that parking spaces are shared by more than one user group, commercial patron and employee and residential that require parking at different times and that allows parking lots to be used more efficiently. This happens naturally for on-street public parking that accommodates commercial uses in the day and residential uses at night. This could be structured for private parking lots through agreements. Parking is often used only part time by a particular group and thus those needing weekday peaks, evening peaks or weekend peaks can share the same spaces. Lots are vacant at night and weekends. In Upper Port there are a few places that shared parking could be organized. The medical office building complex on the east side of Oakland is vacant at night and there are 66-128 spaces adjacent to Oakland Avenue and the west end of Highlands Boulevard, or more, that could be negotiated, by the Village or private developers, as shared parking for residential use. The Medical Park land banked a deck for additional parking at its southern end. This could be a potential public-private partnership agreement in the future. The church on North Country Road is used at only limited times and the commercial and office buildings on the west side of Oakland are vacant at night and thus could be subject to similar shared parking considerations.

3.7.7 Managed Parking and Parking District

Following the Comprehensive Plan recommendations this Plan recommends that the managed parking system utilized by the Village for downtown be extended to the up town public off-street parking. If the Village goes to on street managed parking, the uptown should do the same. Also, if the Village creates a Parking District for downtown, the same should be considered for uptown. Uptown business rentals are reported to be approximately half of downtown rental rates. Vacancy rates are similar or slightly lower than lower Port.

1.8 Transportation

3.8.1 Long Island Rail Road

As noted in Existing Conditions, there are several modes of public transportation at the Port Jefferson train station including several bus lines and taxi service. As with Long Island in general, the train provides only east-west service and only busses provide north-south service. Because the train line ends at Port Jefferson, the buses must also provide service to the east. As noted there are not many linkages in the two systems. The train takes approximately 1,000 commuters daily to and from Port Jefferson. When the Ronkonkoma line was electrified the trip from New York City to Ronkonkoma was reduced to 40 minutes less than the Port Jefferson ride. Rider-ship increased dramatically from Ronkonkoma and decreased at stations on the north and south shore lines. Much more driving results from this change. However, the Metropolitan Transit Authority has no plans to change this situation. There was a plan to add a second rail line from Huntington east to permit trains to pass each other between stations. There was also a plan to create a train storage yard in Huntington to add more trains, but both of these initiatives have had public resistance and are on hold.

A study could be made to determine if a single train car, like the Princeton ‘dinky’ could run from Port Jefferson to Stonybrook, coordinated to faculty and student needs could be achieved within present schedules and succeed. LIRR says that it would have to be a different less heavy car.

3.8.2 Suffolk County Transit - Buses

Meetings were conducted with Chris Chatterton- Planner for Suffolk County Transit, Department of Public Works – Transportation Division (SCT). There are no plans to modify Suffolk County Transit – S.C.T. bus service but proposals for modifications can be made and considered. The system is undergoing a G.I.S.
upgrade that will make the system more efficient. The bus system works with certain stops that are a hub for transfers and the buses are timed for these connections. There presently is one at the Port Jefferson Shopping Plaza to the south. The train station area is an appropriate location to be a hub but has not been because the stop for southbound busses is between the LIRR tracks and Sheep Pasture Road and neither stop has passenger shelters. The Plan proposes bus pull-off and stopping lanes to assist traffic flow on both sides of Main Street at the train station and provides bus shelters on both sides of Main Street near the train station for intermodal possibilities – Figure 56. A pedestrian crossing at the bus stops is also proposed.

Consideration was given to bringing the northbound bus stop to the Train Station. SCT felt that there should be parity for northbound and southbound travelers. The present northbound busses have a pull-off lane so they do not block traffic although traffic has to let them back into the lane of travel. The present southbound stop at the laundry on Main Street is dysfunctional because it blocks traffic and is not at a sensible location. Some of the bus lines that go east on North Country Road or north on Belle Terre road should be able to use the new ‘Station Street’ rather than North Country Road.

For the northbound buses, since the center turn lane has been removed south of the tracks, there is enough room to have a dedicated bus lane starting south of the tracks. There is enough area for the required ‘track’ stop to be in this lane. There can be a similar dedicated bus stop lane on the west side of Main Street for southbound buses, with the reconfiguration of the proposed ‘Railroad Street’. Shelters and a pedestrian crossing are necessary – Figure 46 & 56. This must be analyzed by SCT. An alternative could be to put both bus stops and shelters on the south side of the tracks where there is more space. The crosswalk should be on the north side in any case.

CASA has provided this plan to SCT for review and comment and SCT will provide guidelines for pull-off lanes and turning radiuses.

3.8.3 Intermodal Transportation Coordination

There are a few connections between the LIRR train, Suffolk County Transit bus and the Bridgeport-Port Jefferson Ferry as noted in the existing conditions analysis. It is easier to use a taxi to connect the train to the ferry and the cost is only about $3.50 more. The train to bus connections are more to connect east west train service and the bus that predominantly provides the north-south service. The Bus cannot both deliver to the train and wait to pick up from the train since this would be a along wait. Also a designed system breaks down whenever the train or bus is late several minutes late is not considered officially late by both the LITT and SCT. It is complicated to determine whether it is more important to have a bus deliver to the train or vice-versa at different time of the day. The plan recommends assessing needs for this connection and discussing these with S.C.T. A more detailed proposal for intermodal connections could be made by a transportation planner with the information provided in this Study.

The bicycle path which continues to be developed in the abandoned Route 25A right-of-way from Setauket, will be just south of the LIRR station should be developed as an intermodal system with the LIRR. LIRR bicycle storage units were located in the Village parking lot, have recently been removed, but bicycles racks or storage should be installed at the station.

3.8.4 Shuttle

In the spring of 2001, the Village commissioned a commissioned a private company to operate a trolley bus for free on weekdays and weekends between the train station and the harbor on Main Street and loop back on East Broadway and Belle Terre Road to serve the hospitals. This was funded by a grant but was expensive and lasted only one summer. The effect of the trolley on downtown parking needs was not assessed. There have been on-going discussions of doing something similar on the busy weekends of the summer to connect the train to downtown and to permit parking in the train station lots to alleviate the shortages downtown. The Port Jefferson Business Improvement District – B.I.D., ran a continuous loop mini shuttle bus to try to get employees to park in outlying areas to open up more downtown parking. The need for increased parking is for approximately 11 or 12 busy summer weekends downtown and for the special events like the Music and Dickens Festival. It would provide a connection of uptown to downtown, but the benefit to uptown businesses and residents is most probably minimal. There are several shared
parking options for downtown, so the need to use uptown parking, with a shuttle to downtown, is in the distant future.

3.9 Development

The Study involves two kinds of development. One is the development of the public realm with the design of public spaces such as plazas and parks, sidewalk improvements, etc. to enhance their character and function, and revisions to streets to improve the flow of traffic. The second is private development of buildings with commercial and residential use to create a better balance between these two uses in order to create a more coherent and vital neighborhood. The development of the public realm has been described and discussed in other sections. Through proposed changes to the Zoning Code as discussed, the Plan is intended to cluster the commercial use on Main Street and to encourage residential development over Main Street commercial, by creating a mixed-use category. On the blocks that are to the east and west of Main Street, a new residential overlay zone, C2-R and C-2-PO are proposed to create neighborhoods – Figure 31 & 32.

The Urban Land Institute (ULI) has developed information on creating neighborhood business districts in a walkable cohesive community. Some of their criteria are:

- A “convenience shopping center” is 3-20 stores, 10-30,00 s.f., for under 20,000 market population, under a 2 mile market radius.
- A “neighborhood shopping center” is 10-40 stores, 30,000-100,000 s.f., a market population of 10-30,000 people in a 1-3 mile radius market area.
- Of the 10-30,00 population for a neighborhood center, 1/3 should be within a ¼ mile radius, 1/3 within a ½ mile radius, and 1/3 within an easy drive.
- 2,000–3,300 minimum residents are needed within ¼ mile to support a neighborhood business node.
- 1,000 households are needed to support a 15,000 square foot grocery.

To be noted from this; Upper Port Jefferson has the existing 75,000 square footage, which is enough commercial space for a neighborhood business center, but the residential population is not enough to sustain the smaller convenience shopping center. ULI studies suggest that the existing population of under 200, or approximately 60 households needs to be increased households, within the study area, which is within a ¼ mile radius.

As there are no sewer lines east of Main Street, in the Study Area, it is recommended that a study be made and plan developed for extending the existing sewer line to this area to permit the proposed development. A Suffolk County; Suffolk county Capacity Study for Port Jefferson, Riverhead/Calverton, Patchogue and Sag Harbor (CP 8185), study for extending the sewer from the Highlands condominiums along Perry Street to connect to the existing system would provide the opportunity to run service under Walnut, Elm and Oakland Streets.

The Traffic Report indicates that an increase in 350 residential units does not create a significant impact on traffic if a number of recommended changes are implemented. The Plan recommends an increase in at least 500 units in order to create neighborhoods to the east and west of Main Street and to contribute to a successful commercial Main Street although this is far below ULI recommendations. More than this would be difficult to the resolve the requisite parking needs.
Figure 57  PRESENT POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
### 3.9.1 Commercial Development

All of Main Street has commercial uses on the ground floor and there is a small amount of office use on floors above ground. There is a continuous and changing vacancy condition, which grew worse between 2005 and 2010. These figures are from the Suffolk County Planning Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Storefront</th>
<th>Non-Retail</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Total Stores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Port Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Port Jefferson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several commercial stores that have been located on Main Street for decades, such as the Army-Navy, antique/thrift shops, auto parts, Lenny’s Shoes, and the Tara Inn. Presently rents for commercial space are about $10.00-$11.00 per square foot/year which can be compared to $20.00-$25.00 per square foot/year downtown. There are some vacant infill sites where commercial could be developed on Main Street. And some existing buildings could be enlarged or reorganized to have a better relation to the sidewalk and street. From Village information, there is approximately 75,000 square feet of existing commercial floor area on Main Street. There is approximately 7,500–10,000 square feet of possible infill as indicated on the Block studies. Commercial could also grow by turning the corners of Main street on Perry Street, Linden Place and the proposed extension of Oakland Avenue along the north side of the LIRR site. However, according to ULI figures, an increase in commercial area is not desirable and without a large increase in residential, has the risk of high vacancy or uses catering to automobile traffic. If this existing area were to be rebuilt and require parking per present Code, requiring one parking space per 100 square feet of retail area, approximately 800 cars would be required, or 400 with the proposed change. The 2.7 acres needed to park 400 cars is not available and would not be conducive to neighborhood development.

It is hoped that more convenience shops might come to enhance a growing residential neighborhood community. This should be encouraged, perhaps with incentives or bonuses. In particular, there is an expressed need for a grocery store that would require 7,150 square feet of floor area.

The preponderance of small-scale medical offices on Oakland Avenue within the Study area, and the medical offices on the east side of Oakland Avenue provide a good niche identity for uptown. This use might continue to grow and should become more integrated into the community, serving neighborhood needs.

There is recent research generated by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) regarding creating a walkable neighborhood with its requisite business district:

- Each household can support 15 square feet of neighborhood retail space – 500 residences = 7,500 square feet retail; or 75,000 square feet retail requires a population of 5,000. (Alternatively, each household can support 72 square feet of local and larger retail centers. 11.6 square feet food/grocery; 13.9 square feet of eating/drinking places; 13.4 square feet department/variety; 4.5 square feet apparel; 3.1 square feet drug store.)

- Other neighborhood uses: each household can support 15-30 square feet of non-retail and institutional uses.

- 500 to 1,000 residences within a ¼ mile walking distance to business centers appears to be a useful goal to produce pedestrian activity and encourage the types of businesses not wholly dependent on a sub-regional customer base.

- Development patterns with 2,000 – 3,300 population are needed to support a neighborhood business node. Minimum density needed: 5-10 dwelling units per acre (du/acre) within a ¼ mile radius (125 acres) = 625 -1,250 households
  Preferred Density: 1,500 units within a ¼ mile radius and another 1,500 within an easy drive.

  For comparison: Upper Port has 60 families in less than a ¼ mile, or 125 acres = 2 du/acre
Goal: to provide a large percentage (30-75%) of households within a ¼ mile radius to support frequent transit service, reduce the need for parking and lower vehicle trip miles.

Parking – If too little parking is provided for potential customers outside the walking distance, business suffers. Alternatively, if large parking lots are provided, they will diminish pedestrian access and disconnect near-by residences – the very characteristics that are needed for a walkable business district to thrive. Therefore parking requirements for retail businesses should be set as low as possible – see Table 2. Design requirements, and perhaps structured parking requirements, should be established to reduce parking lots negative impact on pedestrian and neighborhood qualities.

Actions are needed to increase parking efficiency, such as on street parking optimization, shared parking, lot directional signage.

Shopping centers use a factor of 4 cars/1,000 s.f. (1/250 s.f.) of retail space which might also be adequate for a small downtown parking requirements

3.9.2 Residential Development

For Upper Port Jefferson to succeed as a vital neighborhood, a growth in residential development is necessary. The demographics from the 2010 census, indicates that there are only 184 people living in the area, which translated to 50-60 families or dwellings. As noted, there have been several mixed use developments proposed over the past two years. This form based study developed a design that increases physical bulk and a mix of functions to address this in the Project area. This proposed development has a commensurate parking proposal to provide the required spaces as per the revised Code – see Table 2, 3 & 4. The desired physical bulk and functional mix has been applied to the development sites where private development has already been proposed on the Block Studies. Proposed changes in the code would permit residential development to occur on Walnut and Texaco Streets in order to create small scale neighborhoods achieve the desired village character including the Main Street commercial.

The need for affordable housing on Long Island is important to consider also. Nancy Rouch Douzinas of The Long Island Index wrote in December 2011:

“Back in 2004, the first Long Island Index uncovered the extent of the Brain Drain. The exodus of talented young people, and the underlying need for more affordable housing, received much public and media attention, and in a poll later that year, 72% of Long Islanders rated the lack of affordable housing as either a “Very Serious” or “Extremely Serious” problem. Yet in the years since, we’ve made hardly any progress. In 2010 the Index investigated solutions. We published a study of Long Island’s downtowns that identified 8,300 acres of empty lots and surface parking lots-enough space to build, comfortably, tens of thousands of affordable homes. Building in town takes advantage of transit facilities and other infrastructure. Regenerates blighted area. And create vibrant social centers that attract the talented young people employers need. Yet support for such development is tepid. Participants in focus groups express concerns. Will higher density affordable housing bring neighborhoods down, instead of building them up? Will it replace empty lots with eyesores? It turns out that, while Long Island dithers all these years, folks cross the country were working. Thinking, planning and building places that answer the need of the new millennium.”

In order to maintain and grow a cultural and economic diversity in Upper Port, it is recommended that an 80/20 mix of market rate to work force rate housing be required (New York State requires 90/10). Stonybrook University new and visiting faculty and graduate students should be considered a viable market for Upper Port residential growth.

According to a Nassau and Suffolk County Planning Departments, the Long Island Planning Council and the Long Island Housing Partnership study, for Suffolk County the ratio is 0.18 school-age children per dwelling unit in multifamily housing complexes. At 350s unit there would be 63 school age children. Distributed evenly over 12 grades, there would be 5 ¼ students increase per grade. At 500 units there would be 90 children or 7 ½ per grade.

3.9.3 Public or Institutional Development

There presently are no public or institutional uses in the Study area, although the hospitals and the medical office buildings line the north and east boundary. There is not necessarily a need for any public uses. The area is covered by the Village Constabulary and Suffolk County police and the Port Jefferson Fire Department. The post office is less than a mile south on Route 112. There was a suggestion at several public meetings of providing a sub-station for the Suffolk County police or the Village Constabulary. It also seems that a child-care facility would benefit the interest to enhance the neighborhood character of the area and might serve, the neighborhood as well as the medical office park and the nearby hospital employees.
3.10 Economic Development

This Study proposes that more residents are needed uptown to make a successful and vital neighborhood with a successful commercial Main Street. There have been preliminary projects proposed and discussed with the Port Jefferson Planning Department for Main Street sites over the past few years. These proposed ground floor commercial space on main Street, replacing approximately the same amount, and an increase in units replacing existing units. This indicates an interest for residential development in Upper Port. However, these proposals were requesting relief from approximately 100 parking spaces of the 360 required. The Plan tries to define a condition that works both with developer’s economic needs and public good.

3.10.1 Public/Private Partnerships

Public and private partnerships provide a mechanism to achieve good planning and economic benefits for both the public and the private. The Plan has identified several opportunities in Upper Port.

The plan proposes one such partnerships between the Village and the Owners of the properties of the north-west and south-west corners of the block Site # 1 that have proposed development of their sites. The Village owned public parking site and the two private owned parcels constitute the whole block. The Plan proposes one such partnership between the Village that owns the parking lot at Oakland Street, between Perry and the Fire Lane, the Owner of the property on Main Street, the Fire Lane and the Village parking, and the property Owner of the property on Main Street, Perry Street and the Village parking. This whole block is probably the most important site in the Study Area, because all the buildings have been proposed to be replaced with new development and the Village parking lot could participate in these developments.

The block also has a potentially useful topographic condition of being 10-12 feet higher on Main Street than on Oakland Avenue where the existing Village parking is located. The south side of the block forms one side of the proposed train station plaza and should become a participant in the interest to create a vital public place here. The proposed Partnership is to build a joint parking lot of approximately 218 spaces, at the elevation of Oakland, to accommodate parking for the Village and the two development lots (another level of parking could be by ramping down to below Oakland Street and achieve approximately 400 spaces in total) – see Table 4. The Village would sell or lease the rights to build two stories of residential above, to one of the Owners or a third Developer. Whether the Village continues to own its parking area or makes an agreement for its use in a revenue sharing agreement would need to be structured – Figure 29, Block Study Site 1 & Appendix 2.

There is a potential on Main Street, Linden Place and Texaco Avenue to develop joint relationships to build on the periphery of the block and create shared parking relationships to increase the functional organization of parking and optimum ingress and egress in the center or below grade. Separate development of residential along Texaco and Linden and infilling mixed use on Main Street could benefit by combined parking on the inside of the block. One large parcel is being developed and is in Planning. The Village should discuss future partnerships to rationalize common parking needs.

3.10.2 Incentives and Bonuses

The Village could structure a number of incentives or bonuses into the Zoning code. Tax abatement and/or zoning relief are commonly used as incentives. Presently the C-2 Code requires parking for all Commercial uses of 1 parking space for 100 square feet of commercial floor area, one space for every 300 square feet of office floor area and this Plan proposes changing these to 200 s.f. for commercial and 400’ for office – Table 2. Residential parking requirements have also been proposed to changed – Table 3. Very few Main Street commercial and office properties provide parking and are presently, “grand fathered” nonconforming uses. They cannot continue as nonconforming uses if they are “enlarged, altered, extended, reconstructed or restored”, in which case the parking requirements would apply. The Plan proposes to modify this – see 3.7.2 Off-street Parking.

Given the present Upper Port situation, it would be impossible to bring Main Street Commercial up to code in terms of the parking requirements (75,000 existing s.f. requires 584 parking spaces assuming 1/3 non-retail), and maintain Main Street with a continuous street wall. Parking would have to go in front, beside or behind a new commercial use, which is not recommended because it would require extensive curb cuts or destroy the desired “street wall”. This plan proposes to remove the parking requirement for Main street commercial and office use, knowing that it cannot expand very much and there is presently adequate on street parking for the potential build out. Although more successful businesses would bring more traffic, business related to the walkable community should help alleviate parking demand.
The Code requires parking for residential use. To encourage building Main Street to be mixed-use with up to a four story build out, this Plan proposes to make modifications to the Code parking requirement – Table 2, 3 & 4. With Planning Board concurrence a shared agreement or purchase of relief from parking requirements would be used to create the pedestrian and parking improvements recommended in this Study. Two Bonuses are proposed to encourage larger lot developments, which would bring more significant change to the present uptown conditions.

Bonus 1 - Any proposed development with a lot larger than 20,000 sf or 75 linear feet on Main Street frontage in the C-2 Zone would have the possibility to add a fourth floor, from 35’ to 45’ height, with a 12 foot set back from the street wall or within a pitched roof with dormers for residential use. Smaller lot developments on these streets could purchase this Bonus for a price to be set per unit on the fourth floor. This provides equanimity and encourages uniformity of the street wall.

Bonus 2 – Any proposed development with a lot larger than 20,000 sf or 75 linear feet in any of the proposed zoning districts, C-2, C-2R and C-2PO would have the possibility to change from the required residential parking requirement of 1.5 space for a studio or one bedroom to 1.0 spaces. Smaller lot developments on these streets could purchase this parking relief for $15,000. per parking space reduce.

Bonus fees paid to the Village for bulk would be utilized for Upper Port infrastructure projects as 3.10.3 of the Revitalization Study. Fees paid for parking relief would be put into an Upper Port parking fund with uptown parking fees from managed parking, pay-for-parking and parking district.

3.10.3 Public Projects for Uptown Revitalization

There are Municipal needs for uptown that need funding. These projects could be accomplished with Grants (G), Code requirements of Developer (R), Developer Incentive or Bonus (B).

Main Street
- Sidewalk improvements of widening, repaving, special paving, bump-outs, lighting, street furniture, signage, new curbs, (alteration of level change on west sidewalk). – G, R, B.
- Realignment of the street with removal of parking on the east side, creating a third lane for turning and providing a light at Perry Street and Linden Place. - G
- Creating a combined turn into the LIRR station and by-pass from Main Street to Oakland Avenue and connection to private parking through the creation of a new ‘Station Street’. – G, B

Perry Street
- Sidewalk improvements of widening, repaving, special paving, bump-outs, trees, lighting, signage, new curbs. – R, B

Oakland Avenue
- Sidewalk improvements of planting strip, lighting, trees, signage, new curbs. –R, B

“Station Street’ – Main Street to Oakland Avenue
- Public/Private partnership easement for new one-way street east and parallel parking - B
- New combined entry into LIRR parking. - B or G

Walnut Street
- Sidewalk improvements of new and repaving, planting strips, bump-outs, lighting, signage, new curbs. – R, B

Elm Street
- Sidewalk improvements of new and repaving, planting strips, bump-outs, lighting, signage, new curbs. – R, B

Linden Place
- Sidewalk improvements of widening, new paving and repaving, special paving, bump-outs, lighting, signage, new curbs. – R, B

Texaco Avenue
- Sidewalk improvements of new, planting strip, lighting, signage, new curbs. - R
Highland Boulevard
- Realignment with the Oakland extension - G
- Realignment with parking at LIRR over pass – 50 spaces - G

Parking
- Fee in lieu of Commercial parking requirement. - B
- Shared parking.
- Restructure parking and street along west side Main at LIRR tracks, repaving, trees, lighting, signage, new curbs.

Parks and Plazas
- Refurbish Texaco Park
- New park at the end of Perry Street
- LIRR plaza – special paving, planting, trees, lighting, street furniture, signage, restructure parking. – G

Drainage and Sewer

3.11 Security

Issues of security were brought up at every public meeting. Stakeholders expressed a concern with a growing homeless problem and a perceived problem with the Pax Christi program just east of the LIRR station at the public meeting. However, Suffolk County Police did not corroborate this at the October meeting. The Village must address this problem with their constabulary and their relationship with Suffolk County Police. A Plan can attempt to provide what police enforcement might physically need to assist in being responsive and keeping the peace if identified. The Plan also addresses the issue more fundamentally in creating a neighborhood by increasing the residential population in a mixed-use pattern so that the entire area is a 24-7 situation with “eyes on the street” (Jane Jacobs). There is also literature on what has been called “defensible space” (Oscar Newman) that could be applied. Both Jacobs and Newman advocate attracting people onto the street to walk to shops, work or transportation.

3.12 Block Studies

As part of the analysis of the Area and development of this Plan, each individual block was studied as a site for development. As there are only 6 blocks in the area and they are quite varied, it seemed appropriate to address the issues that were particular to each in terms of problems or opportunities – Figure 57. (note: The existing floor area, use and parking charts on the Block Studies was from a 2005 tabulation provided by the Village)

- Site 1 – Main Street, Perry Street, Oakland Avenue, Oakland Avenue extension - Fire Lane – Figure 58

This Block is extremely important for its location next to the LIRR Station and because development has been proposed, and is possible, for the entire site – see Public – Private Partnership Section. It also relates to Perry Street where pedestrian oriented improvements are proposed. Both the existing conditions and the proposed are illustrated. Another level of parking could be developed below the proposed level at the elevation of Oakland Avenue, thereby accommodating approximately 400 spaces. This would more than double the exiting Village parking.

- Site 2 – Main Street, North Country Road, Walnut Street, Perry Street – figure 59

This important block on Main Street is bounded by Perry Street where pedestrian improvements are proposed, and a significant development has been proposed for the south end of the block. Development has been proposed for several combined sites that front Main, Perry and Walnut Streets with parking at the elevation of Walnut and one level below Main on the southern end of the block. The Study encourages remaining within the proposed height limit and parking requirements. The north-west corner of this block has been substantially vacant for the past few years with one story, indistinctive buildings. The Study encourages that a distinctive building be built on this site with four or perhaps more stories that would have good views north and act as a gateway at the north end of the neighborhood.
- **Site 3** – Perry Street, Walnut Street, Elm Street, Oakland Avenue – Figure 60

This block is extremely mixed with office buildings on Perry and Oakland and residential on Walnut and Elm Streets. The Plan proposes to increase the characteristics of both these situations, with the encouragement that the Office buildings might evolve into mixed-use three story buildings with parking at the back rather than the front, and that Walnut and Elm Streets become stronger and denser with residential development. This requires curbs, sidewalks and tree lined streets. It could be a key to creating the mixed-use boulevard proposed for Oakland Avenue to tie the Medical office complex on the east side, into the neighborhood.

- **Site 4** – Walnut Street, North Country Road, Oakland Avenue, Elm Street – Figure 61

This block is similar to Site 3 on the west side of Oakland Avenue. It too is mixed-use with a church and office buildings on North Country and Oakland and residential on Walnut and Elm Streets. The Plan proposes to increase the characteristics of both these situations, with the possible Code provisions, to allow Office buildings to evolve into mixed-use three story buildings with parking at the back rather than the front, and that Walnut Street becomes stronger and denser with residential development. Along with Site 3, it could be a key to creating the mixed-use boulevard proposed for Oakland Avenue to tie the Medical office complex on the east side, into the neighborhood.
Block 6 - Main - Perry - Oakland - LIRR tracks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Base Floor</th>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>retail - 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>retail - 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>+70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1, 2.3, 2.300</td>
<td>retail - bar</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LIRR station</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(118)</td>
<td>LIRR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>office temp. res.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>office</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>open space PJ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>retail - 2 + res. 31</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134.5</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 5 - Main - N. Country - Walnut - Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>retail - 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>retail - 4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>retail - bar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>retail - fire/vacant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-13</td>
<td>12,390</td>
<td>retail - NAPA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>retail - bar Tara Inn</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>office</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>retail - diner</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>office</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>retail, 5 apts. 2 cottages 7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5 bigs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>hose + garage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-192.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Block 5 - Oakland - Perry - Walnut - Elm

27+25  4,439  med. office  28  27  - 1
24.1  n.s.  multi family  3  3  -
26.1  5,234  med. office  18  22  + 4
29  5 family  8  0  - 8  2 story
30  6,210  comm.  21  4  17  2 story

78  56  -22
Block 5 - N. Country – Oakland – Elm – Walnut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Floor Area</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>office</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>church</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>parsonage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>med. office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73  80  +3
### Block 4 - Main - Linden - Texaco - LIRR tracks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 + 31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Village Parking</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>retail, office, res.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4,460</td>
<td>retail, res.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5,807</td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>res. - 9 apts.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>retail - auto</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>retail - auto, elect.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 4 – Main – Linden, Texaco, Sheep Pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>retail, office, res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,658</td>
<td>parking – private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>retail – antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>retail – food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 4</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,090 + 2,308</td>
<td>retail, res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>parking – for 21, 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>retail, office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Site 5 – Main Street, LIRTR, Texaco, Linden Place – Figure 62

This Block is the most residentially dense in the Area with apartments over Main Street Commercial and Section 8 housing on Linden Place. It also has non-conforming uses at the west end and parking along the south boundary at the LIRR tracks and some public parking in the middle of the block. The Plan proposes to transform Linden Place into a pedestrian friendly and residentially developed street. To that end, non-conforming uses might change over time to residential development. The Plan proposes evergreen trees along the LIRR boundary and the northern property lines with better organized parking. It would be nice for Linden, if the Village parking site were sold for residential development but with the limited amount of available public parking, the present lot should remain with better landscaping to enhance the street. The Plan also proposes a redeveloped Texaco Park that takes over Texaco Avenue at its southern end.

- Site 6 – Main Street, Linden Place, Texaco Avenue, Sheep Pasture Road – Figure 63

This is the largest block in the Study Area. The Plan proposes to infill the parking lot on Main Street with a mixed-use building and adding onto other existing Main Street buildings to replace parking in their front setbacks. A major project of single or interrelated residential development on the vacant properties along Texaco Avenue is proposed in relation to the proposed new residential zone. Over time the non-conforming use on the west side, along with those on Linden, could become developed as residential use in accordance with the proposed residential zoning.

3 GEIS

The GEIS SEQR work is being done as part of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update and will be included in that Plan report.

5 Conclusions

This study proposes the following:

5.1 General Identity

Create a neighborhood around Main Street and the LIRR

- Uptown should be both a transit oriented development – T.O.D. related to the LIRR, and a neighborhood community with local service oriented shops for the neighborhood and the Village at large.
- Expand architectural guidelines for uptown conditions to encourage a visually homogeneous image and scale
- Create storefront improvement guidelines – awnings, canopies – building and façade design guidelines.
- Encourage more housing to strengthen the neighborhood and help maintain Main Street commercial vitality.
- Create more open space - a train station plaza, and east side park on Village land at Highland Boulevard.
- Develop the train station area as a gateway to Port Jefferson from the south.
- Propose intermodal coordination between LIRR, Suffolk County buses and BPJ Ferry.
- Continue to encourage modification to the school district to socially connect the Upper Port neighborhoods with lower Port.
5.2 Pedestrian Improvements

Create an aesthetically pleasing and safer pedestrian condition

- Increase Main Street sidewalk widths and reduce street width.
- Sidewalk design and repair, distinctive paving, lighting, trees, and signage.
- Pedestrian east-west connections on Perry Street; to connect Main Street to the medical park and Mather Hospital, and Linden Street; Main Street to Texaco Park.
- Create better pedestrian crossings and neck-downs on Main Street at Linden Place and Perry Street and possibly at the train tracks to improve Main Street commercial access.
- Add sidewalks to Highland Boulevard and connection to LIRR platform. Create a pedestrian path from Highlands housing to the train station and Main Street.

5.3 Traffic and Parking

Create a better flow with traffic calming on Main Street and address parking needs.

- Propose parking on west side of Main Street only, to enlarge sidewalks, provide safety and create turning lanes – right hand lane at North Country Road.
- Investigate changing the fire lane on north side of the LIRR to become a one way street – east to connect with Oakland as a by-pass to the hospitals, and re-route Highland Boulevard to align with the fire lane at the Oakland intersection.
- Propose short term – 20 minute parking on Main Street.
- Provide bus shelters at bus stops on both sides of Main Street.
- Consider Developing a shuttle program to better connect upper and lower Port and to utilize LIRR parking for summer weekend use.
- Address problem of finding parking off Main Street with signage, lighting and security. There is presently not a parking shortage.
- Propose parking under buildings, utilizing topography, at below Main Street level, or behind buildings in the middle of blocks.
- Study consolidating parking into shared parking in each block.
- Propose shared parking with medical office complex and other opportunities.
- Provide managed parking and a parking district to match downtown.

5.4 Economic Development

Attract development that will create a more successful and vital neighborhood.

- Encourage service oriented commercial; food market etc.
- Mix of owner and rental and mixed income housing.
- Developer incentives for public amenities and affordable housing 80/10 required and 80/20 bonus.
- Public/private partnerships at LIRR to Perry Street block and possibly other sites.
- Create a housing trust fund if implemented downtown.
- Create managed parking and a parking district to match downtown.

5.5 Security

Create a more secure neighborhood
- Increase pedestrian lighting.
- More police patrolling (consider a police substation).

5.6 Zoning and Guidelines

Recommend zoning changes with a *form based code*.
- Change C-2 to permit mixed use commercial with residential above.
- Create a maximum height change bonus.
- Create zoning changes to residential between Main and Texaco Streets and at Walnut between Main Street and Oakland Avenue.
- Provide incentives to obtain desired commercial uses and their required areas.
- Permit mixed-use on Oakland Avenue with setbacks to create a tree lined street.
- Encourage affordable housing. Apartment sizes are established in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Expand architectural guidelines for uptown conditions to encourage a visually homogeneous image and scale.
- Create storefront improvement guidelines – awnings, canopies – building and façade design guidelines.
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APPENDIX 1

CHARACTERISTIC BUILDINGS ON LONG ISLAND MAIN STREETS
APPENDIX 2

PARKING REQUIREMENTS COMPARISON
## COMPARISON OF PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northport</td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>1 space/200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookhaven</td>
<td>retail (J-2)</td>
<td>1 space/150 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>office/medical</td>
<td>1 space/180 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>1 space/180 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>1 space/3 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithtown</td>
<td>retail &amp; restaurant</td>
<td>1 space/100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community shop</td>
<td>1 space/125 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sub-regional shop</td>
<td>1 space/143 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellport</td>
<td>Main St. business</td>
<td>1 space/150 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>dept. store</td>
<td>1 space/200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>furniture store</td>
<td>1 space/500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prof/med office</td>
<td>1 space/200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restaurant in shopping</td>
<td>1 space/200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>1 space/50 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>convenience mart</td>
<td>1 space/150 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronkonkoma TOD</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1 space/375 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southold</td>
<td>retail shop</td>
<td>1 space/200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bank</td>
<td>1 space/100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>antiques/gallery</td>
<td>1 space/250 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restaurant/bar</td>
<td>1 space/100 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patchogue</td>
<td>retail</td>
<td>1 space/150 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>office</td>
<td>1 space/150 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restaurant</td>
<td>1 space/100 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3 – UPPER PORT - AREA DENSITY STUDIES

Studies based on privately owned lots in study area total 507,400 sf = 11.65 acres

Case 1 – Based on existing C-2 Zoning – retail at ground floor and permitted residential above - FAR 2

Buildable Area @ 3 stories = 1,014,800 sf - 66% coverage = 338,300 sf coverage

Commercial - 1/3 floor area (minus 10,000 sf access to residential) = 328,300 sf minus 75,000 sf existing retail = 253,300 sf

Residential - 2nd & 3rd floor residential (3 story limit) = 676,500 sf
Less 20% circulation = 541,200 sf of units @ 800 sf = 676 units

Units / Acre - 676 / 11.65 = 58

Comments: 300% increase in commercial not reasonable. High lot coverage and density acre. Too many residential units.

Parking required existing C-2

Commercial – new 253,300 sf @ 100 sf/car = 2,533 cars

Residential - 676 units @ 1.5 cars/unit (1 & 2 BR) = 1,014 cars

Total – 3,547 cars @ 300 sf/car = 1,064,100 sf
actual open area = 33% x 507,400 = 167,400 sf (16% area required for parking)

Comment: No way to accommodate parking for 300 % increase in commercial area. Impossible to achieve parking requirement without large garages. Plan advocates little growth of commercial.

Case 2 – Based on existing C-2 Zoning with 40% Lot Coverage

Buildable Area @ 40% Lot Coverage = 507,400 s.f. x .4 = 202,960 sf

Commercial - 1 story retail = 202,960 sf (minus 10,000 sf for residential access) minus 75,000 existing = 117,960 sf

Residential - 2nd & 3rd floor residential = 405,800 sf
less 20% circulation = 324,640 sf @ 800 sf/unit = 406 units

Units / Acre = 406 / 11.65 acres = 35

FAR = 202,960 sf + 405,800 / 507,400 = 1.2

Comments: No need for nearly 150% increase in Commercial

Parking

Commercial – new 117,960 sf = 1,180 cars

Residential - 406 units @ 1.5 = 609 cars

Total – 1,789 cars total @ 300 sf/car = 536,700 sf
available area 60% of 507,400 = 304,440 sf (57% area required for parking)
Comments: Cannot accommodate residential parking requirements without garages above or below ground. If commercial increase is limited to 10,000 sf = 100 cars, 659 cars total must be accommodated.

**Case 3 – Based on Proposed C-2, C-2R, C-2PO Zoning**

**Buildable Area** – based on proposed setbacks and height and parking bonuses

- **C-2**  
  150,000 sf  3.44 acres - 70 % Commercial – 70 % Residential (30’ rear yard)

- **C-2R**  
  277,000 sf  6.36 acres - 40 %

- **C-2PO**  
  80,000 sf  1.84 acres - 54 % Office with Residential above

**C-2**

**Buildable**

Possible Commercial – 70% x 150,000 sf = 105,000 sf – 75,000 sf existing = 30,000 sf new

Possible Residential – 70% x 150,000 sf = 105,000 sf x 2.7 floors (4th fl. setback) = 283,500 sf – 20% circulation = 226,800 sf / 800 sf/unit = 283 units

FAR – 388,000 / 150,000 = 2.59

Units/Acre - 283 units / 3.44 acres = 82

**Parking**

Commercial – 30,000 sf – 3,000 sf residential circulation = 27,000 sf / 200 sf/car = 135 cars

Residential – 283 units x 1.2 cars (2/3 1BR & 1/3 2 BR) = 340 cars

Total – 475 cars x 300 sf / car = 142,500 sf  (377’x377’) or 95% of the site area.

**C-2R**

**Buildable**

Possible Residential – 40% x 277,000 sf = 110,800 sf x 3 floors = 332,400 sf – 20% circulation = 265,920 / 800 sf/unit = 332 units

FAR – 332,400 / 277,000 = 1.2

Units/Acre – 332 units / 6.36 acres = 52

**Parking**

Residential - 332 units x 1.2 cars = 398 cars x 300 sf/car = 119,400 sf  (345’x 345’)

**C-2PO**

**Buildable**

Possible Office – 54% x 80,000 sf = 43,200 sf

Possible Residential – 54% x 80,000 sf = 43,200 sf x 2 floors = 86,400 sf – 20% circulation = 69,120 sf / 800sf/unit = 86 units

FAR – 129,600 / 80,000 = 1.6

Units/Acre – 86 / 1.84 = 47

**Parking**

Commercial – 43,000 sf – 3,000 sf residential access = 40,000 sf / 250 sf (50% office & medical) = 160 cars

Residential – 86 units x 1.2 cars = 103 cars

Total – 246 cars x 300 sf/car = 73,800 sf (270’x270’) or 91% of the site area.

**Summary**

Possible new commercial area – 28,000 sf  Parking – 135 cars x 300 sf/car = 40,500 sf (200’x200’)

Possible new office area – 40,000 sf  Parking – 160 cars x 300 sf/car = 48,000 sf (220’x220’)

Possible new residential – 700 units  Parking – @ 1.2 = 840 cars x 300 sf/car = 252,000 sf (500’x500’)

**Comments:**
- As per the Plan, Commercial area should be limited to 12-15% growth or approximately 10,000 sf, 50 car parking.
- Although it is possible to add over 700 residential units if all sites were fully built out, it can be assumed that the likelihood of a successful uptown growth would be about 50% of the maximum or about 350 units with 400 car parking = 126,000 sf (350’x350’).
- Although it would be good both socially and physically to build out the west side of Oakland Avenue with ground floor office and residential above, a few sites seem unlikely to change and the parking required would probably have to be in costly below grade garages. The residential component above compounds the parking issue.
- For the above reasons, although the amount of commercial and office space and residential units could perhaps be capped with a maximum, there is a self-regulating situation created by the parking requirements.
Maximum number of Residential Units

Projected development based on proposed C-2, C-2R & C-2PO (Case 6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 40%        | 280          - about what is proposed by developers to date

Maximum possible projected parking:

Needed for 70% maximum build-out

500 units x 1.5 (existing Code) = 750 cars or x 1.2 (proposed code) = 600 cars

Proposed to Provide

- Total on street parking proposed: 86 cars (option B)
- Village parking proposed:
  - 70 Oakland Lot
  - 107 Railroad St.
  - .45 Highlands Blvd.
  - 222 cars
- Possible shared parking: 128 Oakland Med. Offices
- Total provided: 436 cars
- Proposed private development:
  - 60 Marley/Lefkowitz
  - 45 Katter south
  - 41 Katter north
  - 83 Gitto
  - Total proposed: 229 cars

Possible parking provided underground:

- Total lot area = 507,400 sf / 300 sf/car = 1,690 cars / 1.5 = 1,126 units present Code or / 1.2 = 1,408 units

Parking that can be provided with proposed overlay zoning:

- C-2 max. possible - 283 units - 340 residential cars required + 50 cars for 10,000 s.f. new commercial = 390 cars x 300 s.f. = 117,000 s.f. = 78 % of C-2 under ground area.

125 currently proposed by developer projects below grade in C-2 area only 125 / 1.2 = 104 units

Issues:

One level Parking below entire C-2 site produces 150,000 s.f. / 300 s.f. = 500 spaces

C-2R max possible - 332 units - 398 residential cars required.
If parking built under all of the C-2R zone 923 cars be accommodated = 764 units

Issues:
Assuming a maximum projected parking under buildings only: 40% x 277,000 sf = 110,800 / 300 sf = 369 cars / 1.2 cars = 308 units + parking for 24 units on grade = 332 units

C-2PO max. possible 86 units - 103 residential cars required + 266 commercial cars = 369 cars.
If parking is located under the entire C-2PO site, 80,000 / 300 s.f. = 266 cars can be accommodated. 263 spaces required in Case 3.

Office requires 160 cars thus permitting 106 cars for residential units / 1.2 = 88 units

If parking is located only under buildings, 54% x 80,000 = 43,200 sf / 300 = 144 spaces. 119 spaces would have to be on grade = 35,700 sf (190'x190') = 45% of the site area (compared to 46% of un-built site)

**Issues:**
Could substitute off-site or shared parking for on-site and on-grade parking.

**Assumptions developed from Barnum House at 464 Main Street:** rental apartment building with ground floor commercial.

There are 30 rental units. 20 one bedroom and 10 two bedroom.

The number of spaces that were required under the present code:
- 20 one bedroom units @ 1.5 parking spaces = 30 spaces
- 10 two bedroom units @ 1.5 parking spaces = 15 spaces
- Total required = 45 spaces

The number of spaces that would be required under proposed code:
- 20 one bedroom units @ 1.0 parking spaces = 20 spaces
- 10 two bedroom units @ 1.5 parking spaces = 15 spaces
- 35 spaces

**Present Barnum condition:**
- (1) one bedroom unit has 0 cars
- (13) one bedroom units have 1 car each
- (6) one bedroom units have 2 cars each
- (0) two bedroom units have 0 cars
- (5) two bedroom units have 1 car each
- (5) two bedroom units have 2 cars each

0 cars = 0 cars/unit are needed
13 cars = 1.33 cars/unit are needed
12 cars = 1.2 cars/unit are needed
0 cars = 0 cars/unit are needed
5 cars = 1.5 cars/unit are needed
10 cars = 2 cars/unit are needed

40 cars = 1.33 cars/unit are needed

**Conclusions:**
1. Under present Code, Barnum is providing 5 spaces too many, or 1 space too many for every 6 units. (this should be different for uptown considering walkable public transit).
2. Under the proposed Code, if 35 spaces are required and provided, 5 have to be parked on the street, Village lots or shared parking - or 1 out of every 7 actual cars would have to be accommodated off site.

Using these numbers, we can assume the following:
- If there are 500 new units, the proposed code would require 1.2 cars per unit (2/1 one bedroom to two bedroom ratio), 600 parking spaces would be accommodated on site.
- Using the Barnum situation of 1.33 actual needed cars per unit, 665 cars would need to be parked. 65 cars would have to park on the street, Village parking or shared paring.

The number of on street, Village and possible shared parking (12.17.12 Memo):
- On Street (option B) = 86
- Village off-street = 222
- Possible shared = 128
- 436 parking spaces

With only 65 needed for new development, 371 spaces would accommodate *grandfathered* situations or a reserve pool for “paid for parking” consideration by the Planning Board.
APPENDIX 4

PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP STUDY
Study for the Public/Private partnership for the Main/Perry/Oakland/LIRR Block

Campani and Schwarting Architects were asked by the Village to do a study of the potential to create a shared development of this important block in Upper Port because two developers are proposing to develop their properties on the western end of the block and the Village owns the parcel to the east end, used as off-street residents parking. This suggests the possibility to develop a carefully considered entire block both physically and functionally and increase the development potential of all three sites.

Each site would require parking to meet Village code in relation to its proposed plans. The developer for the south-west site, 1605 Main Street, Charles Lefkowitz proposes a mixed use building with retail on Main Street, residential to the east and above and parking below grade at Main Street and on grade at the east end. The development for the north-west site, Sunset View Villas, Kent Katter also proposes retail on Main Street, residential to the east and above and parking below grade at Main Street and on grade at the east end. The eastern site is on grade Village Residents parking for 70 cars. This site has the potential to be developed while maintaining the on grade parking. This could be accomplished as a ‘public/private partnership’ with either of the two adjacent developers or a third developer building on top and possibly additional parking below the Village parking.

These three projects could be accomplished independently within each property (Drawing 3 & 4) or there could be a joint relationship regarding the parking organization that would be independent of the properties above (Drawing 5). This has the advantage of achieving up to 16% more parking spaces, which would permit more as-of-right development for the properties above. This is demonstrated in the following diagrams:

Drawing 1 Ground Floor Plan at Main Street
This Plan indicates three developments within existing property lines.

The south-west site study plan indicates 7,000 square feet of commercial area on Main Street and fronting the LIRR. There is presently approximately 4,800 square feet of ground floor retail on the site and the developer is proposing approximately 5,640 square feet. The reason there is more retail space proposed, is that it is in what the proposed Plan has identified as the gateway to the Village. This retail would front on a public plaza in front of the LIRR Train Station.

The north-west site plan indicates 5,000 square feet of commercial area on Main Street and Perry. There is presently approximately 2,500 square feet of ground floor retail and the developer is proposing 5,540 square feet.

The eastern site indicates residential development over Village parking. This development is set back 20 feet from Oakland to provide tree planting that is proposed for all of Oakland.

Drawing 2 Second and Third Floor Plans
This plan indicates the residential development above the ground floor that, with a fourth floor that is set back, achieves the unit count on the Potential Development figures.

Drawing 3 Parking Option 1 Plan
This plan indicates a parking layout that follows property lines. This plan is at the grade of Oakland, which is one level below Main Street grade. This is itemized in the
Potential Development figures. The eastern site indicates public parking on the ground floor and private parking one level below for the above residential units.

Drawing 4 Parking Option 2 Plan
This plan indicates an alternative layout for parking that follows property lines. It presents more parking spaces but is a more complicated layout that might be OK for assigned residential parking.

Drawing 5 Shared parking Option Plan
This plan indicates a parking layout that does not follow property lines. It has 152 spaces for the residential developments and 70 parking spaces for Village public parking – total 222 spaces. Multiple entry and exit possibilities are indicated.

Drawing 6 Views
These are sketches looking at the building massing to illustrate the ideas of the Plan’s visual guidelines for massing and scale.

There is also the possibility to put another level of parking below Oakland. Utilizing the shared parking option plan but adding ramps to below, there would be 204 on each level – total 408 spaces. This would provide 204 private spaces on the lower level and 204 public metered spaces on the on-grade with Oakland level.

A conventional parking garage costs for a below grade structure are $40,000 per stall (according to R.S. Means). The shared parking option plan structure would cost $9 M and the two level structure would cost approximately $1.6 M.

This study included an investigation into a parking garage on the Village site. This investigation indicated that a conventional garage would not be feasible because of the inefficient shape of the site. Ramps to upper levels would reduce the ground level from 70 to 52 spaces and the upper level would also have 52 which yield a total gain of 34 spaces. Another level is not possible in terms of ramping. An automated garage is possible if it could sort out the public from the private uses.


1605 Main Street – Marley Site (excluding Lefkowitz site)

Commercial 5,250 s.f. – (approx. 5,000s.f. existing)

Residential Units
| Ground Floor | 15 –15 -1 BR |
| Second Floor | 21 –16 -1 BR & 5 -2 BR |
| Third Floor  | 21 - 16 -1 BR & 5 -2 BR |
| Fourth Floor | 9 - 8 -1 BR & 1 -1 BR set back |
|       | 66 55 11 |

Commercial parking 0 - 27 required @ 1 / 200sf

Residential Parking
On site 74 - 72 required @ 1 / 1 BR and 1.5 / 2 BR
Shared 84 of 211

Sunset View Villas - Katter Site

Commercial 5,000 s.f.

Residential Units
| Ground Floor | 11 – 11 –1 BR |
| Second Floor | 14 – 12 –1 BR & 2 –2 BR |
Third Floor  14 – 12 –1 BR & 2 –2 BR
Fourth Floor  14 - 12 -1 BR & 2 –2 BR set back

53  47  6

Commercial Parking  0  - 20 required @ 1 / 250 sf

Residential Parking
On site  48 or 52  - 56 required @ 1 / 1 BR and 1.5 / 2 BR
Shared  56 of 211

Village Site

Residential Units
Second Floor  20 – 20 –1 BR
Third Floor  20 – 20 –1 BR
Fourth Floor  16 – 16 –1 BR set back

56  56

Public Parking  70 at grade

Residential Parking  56 below ground - 56 required @ 1 / 1 BR

Summary - Totals

Total number of Residential Units proposed  175  184 required parking

Total parking – shared (152 + 56 below) = 208  + 63 public

Total parking - separate sites  178  + 63 public

note: The Upper Port Study recommends: 1 for 1BR; 1.5 for 2; 2 for 3 BR
Addendum – Developer’s Proposed Projects

1605 Main Street – Marley - Lefkowitz Proposal – 2008 proposal

Lot Size 34,568 sf.
FAR 2 – 69,130 sf permitted 2.2 – 75,916 sf proposed
Blg. Ht. 37 to mid pitch on Main – 3 story on main w/ 4th story set back
Commercial 5,640 sf 56 parking required - 0 proposed
Residential 60 units – 12 1BR, 48 2BR;
Parking - 90 required – 60 proposed; Study proposes 60 or 84 (see note)

Sunset View Villas – Katter Proposal – 11.14.11 proposal

Lot Size 20,000 sf
FAR 2 – 40,000 permitted 3.2 - 63,885 sf
Blg. Ht. 49' to mid pitch on main – 5 stories, 60' to ridge on ½ of Perry – 6 stories
Commercial 5,550 sf 56 parking required – 0 proposed
Residential 62 units – 49 1BR, 13 2BR
Parking - 93 parking required – 45 proposed

Oakland/Perry/ LIRR – Village Site

Lot Size approx. 24,440 sf
FAR 2 – 48,880 permitted
Blg. Ht. 40’ to mid pitch
Commercial none
Residential approx. 54 1BR units
Parking – 81 required – Study proposes 54

Public Parking 72 spaces (in public/private partnership)
Public Parking 72 spaces (in public/private partnership)

Parking – grade 0 at Oakland & -10’ at Main Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needed - present Code</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lefkowitz</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katter</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village–private</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village-public</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>70 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>