

**A. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

This chapter assesses the potential impacts of the Proposed Action on socioeconomic and fiscal conditions. The Proposed Action is the adoption of a Form-Based Code (FBC) for approximately 109 acres within the hamlet of East Farmingdale (the “Hamlet”) with the Town of Babylon (the “Town”) that envisions the voluntary redevelopment of privately owned parcels within the Project Site—the area proposed to be rezoned centered on the intersection of Broadhollow Road (NYS Rt. 110) and Conklin Street (NYS Rt. 24).

In addition, the proposed East Farmingdale FBC (the “EF-FBC”) would require that where 10 or more residential units would be connected to facilities of the Sewer District, 20 percent of such units shall be set aside as affordable units.<sup>1</sup> The Proposed Action could result in approximately 4,402 residents on the Project Site. This increase in population within the Town and the Hamlet would be consistent with past trends, which indicate that the population of the Town and Hamlet are increasing, with the Hamlet’s population increasing at a faster rate comparatively.

In addition, the multifamily units on the Project Site would be expected to absorb a portion of the anticipated population growth that is expected to occur within the Town irrespective of the implementation of the Proposed Action. Buildout of the Proposed Action would likely add additional renter-occupied units to an area of the Town and Hamlet where ownership housing currently dominates the market. Finally, the addition of residential buildings would be consistent with Town plans and community visions to create a mixed-use town center at the Project Site.

The Proposed Action is expected to generate approximately 1,177 new jobs on the Project Site upon full buildout, which is less than the number of jobs that could theoretically exist on the Project Site under full buildout under current zoning (2,593 new jobs). The Proposed Action, however, is more consistent with the public policies of the Town and Suffolk County than development under existing zoning. In addition, the Proposed Action would be consistent with, and employ the strategies recommended by, the Long Island Regional Economic Development Council (LIREDC). As recommended by the LIREDC, the Proposed Action could improve job access for thousands of people by locating residential uses within walking distance to a regional rail line and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, would encourage the revitalization and rebuilding of the East Farmingdale Downtown by encouraging a mix of land uses, and would integrate the principals of transit-oriented development (TOD) to help create a vibrant community.

The Proposed Action is expected to generate more property taxes per year than the Project Site currently produces or would be expected to produce if it were built out under the existing zoning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 213-584 of the EF-FBC.

**B. EXISTING CONDITIONS**

Much of the analysis in this chapter was based on the *East Farmingdale Downtown Center Planning Project Market Analysis* report produced by AKRF, Inc. in April 2017 and included as **Appendix D-3**.

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

This socioeconomic analysis evaluates the impact of the Proposed Action on three geographic areas: the Hamlet, the Town, and the Counties of Suffolk and Nassau (in aggregate, “Long Island”). The Project Site is fully within the Hamlet.

Over the past decade, the Hamlet’s population has increased at a faster rate than either the Town or Long Island. The Hamlet’s housing units are predominantly owner-occupied and single-family homes. The average household size is declining across all three geographies analyzed, as is the median household income. A growing population paired with a declining average household size and declining household income has resulted in increased demand for smaller units and rental units.

*POPULATION*

All three geographies experienced a growth in population since 2000 (see **Table 7-1**). The Hamlet grew from a population of 6,078 in 2000 to 6,484 in 2010—a growth rate of 6.7 percent. The Hamlet grew at a faster rate than the Town or Long Island during the same time period. Long Island grew at a rate of 2.9 percent to a total population of 2,832,882 people as of the 2010 Census. The Town had the lowest rate of growth (0.9 percent) between 2000 and 2010. In 2010, the population of the Hamlet represented approximately 3.0 percent of the Town’s population and 0.2 percent of Long Island’s population.

**Table 7-1  
Comparative Population Change—2000, 2010**

	2000	2010	% Change 2000–2010
Hamlet	6,078	6,484	6.7
Town	211,792	213,603	0.9
Long Island	2,753,913	2,832,882	2.9
<b>Sources:</b> U.S. Census Bureau 2000 and 2010 Census. Data downloaded through Social Explorer (accessed 2017).			

*MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME*

The median household income declined across all three geographic areas between 2000 and 2014 (see **Table 7-2**). Hamlet households experienced the greatest decrease in income with median household income declining by 15.6 percent from \$106,930 in 2000 to \$90,284 in 2014. In comparison, the median household income in the Town and Long Island declined by 8.0 percent and 5.0 percent, respectively. Whereas the median household income of the Hamlet was greater than that of the Town or Long Island in 2000, it was lower than the same in 2014.

**Table 7-2**  
**Median Household Income—2000, 2014**

	Median Household Income		Percent Change
	2000	2014	
Hamlet	\$106,930	\$90,284	-15.6%
Town	\$88,947	\$81,825	-8.0%
Long Island	\$100,592	\$95,597	-5.0%

**Notes:**  
1. The median household income for both time periods is presented in 2016 dollars using the U.S. Department of Labor’s First Half 2016 Consumer Price Index for the “New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island Area.”

**Sources:**  
U.S. Census Bureau’s 2000 Census and 2010–2014 American Community Survey (ACS).  
Data downloaded through Social Explorer (accessed 2016)

*AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE*

The number of households has increased and the average household size has decreased across all three geographic areas (see **Table 7-3**). The number of households in the Hamlet increased at the fastest rate (7.3 percent) from 1,829 households in 2000 to 2,079 as of the 2010–2014 ACS. The number of households in the Town grew by 2.9 percent to 71,074 households in 2014, and the number of households on Long Island grew by 4.5 percent to 958,252 in the same year.

**Table 7-3**  
**Number of Households and Average Household Size—2000, 2014**

	Total Households		Percent Change	Average Household Size	
	2000	2014		2000	2014
Hamlet	1,829	2,079	7.3	3.32	3.00
Town	69,048	71,074	2.9	3.07	2.98
Long Island	916,686	958,252	4.5	3.00	2.95

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau’s 2000 Census and 2010–2014 ACS. Data downloaded through Social Explorer (accessed 2016)

The average household size<sup>1</sup> in all three geographic areas decreased between 2000 and the 2010–2014 ACS. The trends in total households and average household size are consistent with a larger national trend of declining household size due to an increase in single households and a decrease in multigenerational living. Households on Long Island tend to be larger and to have decreased in size at a slower rate than the national average.<sup>2</sup> The average household size has remained relatively stagnant in most of Long Island, decreasing in the 14-year period in the two-county region by only 0.05 people per household. However, growth in the number of households outpaced population growth in all geographic areas, indicating a need for more housing units.

<sup>1</sup> A household, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, is “an occupied housing unit” and “includes all the people who occupy a housing unit (such as a house or apartment) as their usual place of resident... [including] related family members and all the unrelated people, if any, such as lodgers, foster children, wards, or employees who share the housing unit. A person living alone in a housing unit, or a group of unrelated people sharing a housing unit such as partners or roomers, is also counted as a household. The count of households excludes group quarters.”

<sup>2</sup> In 2015, for instance, the average national household size was 2.54 people, down from 2.62 in 2000.

*HOUSEHOLD TENURE*

The number of housing units in the Hamlet grew at a rate of 18.1 percent between 2000 and the 2010–2014 ACS (see **Table 7-4**). In comparison, the number of housing units in the Town and Long Island grew by 5.7 and 7.5 percent, respectively. As shown in **Table 7-4**, as population grows and the average household size declines, the real estate market has responded by providing more housing units, including a greater share of rental units, to the Hamlet market.

**Table 7-4**  
**Housing Units and Housing Tenure—2000, 2014**

	Housing Units		Percent Change	Owner-Occupied (%)		Renter-Occupied (%)	
	2000	2014		2000	2014	2000	2014
Hamlet	1,859	2,195	18.1	73.4	63.3	25.0	31.4
Town	71,186	75,236	5.7	73.2	69.0	23.8	25.5
Long Island	980,474	1,054,037	7.5	74.8	71.1	18.7	19.8

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau's 2000 Census and 2010–2014 ACS. Data downloaded through Social Explorer (accessed 2016)

In 2000, approximately three quarters of the housing units in the Hamlet, Town, and Long Island were owner-occupied (see **Table 7-4**). In 2014, however, the proportion of housing units that were renter-occupied increased by between 1 and 6 percentage points. The high rates of ownership could be a sign that there are not many rental options available in the market. The increase in renter- versus owner-occupied units is an indication that new housing units being created are mainly new rental apartments. The declining share of owner-occupied units shows that a general shift toward rental housing exists. It should also be mentioned that vacancies in all geographies increased in the same period by two to three percentage points.

*HOUSING UNITS IN STRUCTURE*

Over three-quarters of the housing units in each of the geographies are single-family homes (see **Table 7-5**). As of 2014, approximately 78 percent of housing units within the Hamlet were single-family homes. This is an increase of more than 1 percentage point from 2000. In contrast, the proportion of single-family homes in the Town and Long Island declined between 2000 and 2014. In the Hamlet in 2014 there were no medium-scale multifamily buildings or “other” types of buildings. The proportion of large-scale multifamily buildings in the Hamlet, however, doubled between 2000 and 2014, from 6.6 percent of housing units to 12.3 percent of housing units, respectively. The comparison geographies of the Town and Long Island have a more varied mix of housing unit size than the Hamlet.

**Table 7-5**  
**Percent of All Housing Units by Unit Size—2000, 2014**

	Single-family home (1, detached)		Townhouse, Duplex (1 or 2 units)		Medium-scale Multifamily Building (3 to 19 units)		Large-scale Multifamily Building (20 or more units)		Other (Mobile Home, Boat, RV, van, etc.)	
	2000	2014	2000	2014	2000	2014	2000	2014	2000	2014
Hamlet	76.2	77.7	14.2	10.0	3.1	0.0	6.6	12.3	0.0	0.0
Town	77.3	76.8	11.5	11.7	5.7	6.2	4.4	4.4	1.0	0.9
Long Island	79.7	78.1	8.8	9.3	6.0	6.6	5.0	5.4	0.6	0.6

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau's 2000 Census and 2010–2014 ACS. Data downloaded through Social Explorer (accessed 2016)

## CONCLUSION

A description of the existing condition of demographics and housing availability shows that the Hamlet, Town, and Long Island may be underprepared for shifting demands in the housing market. In the three geographies analyzed, a growing population paired with a declining average household size and declining household income has resulted in demand for smaller housing unit sizes and renter-occupancy units. Many areas of Long Island have relatively unaffordable housing costs<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> and the lack of housing unit options contributes to the shortage of affordable housing options on Long Island as a whole.<sup>5</sup> Research conducted by Nielsen in 2014<sup>6</sup> and by Area Development in 2012,<sup>7</sup> suggests that two-thirds of young professionals seek to live in mixed-use urban centers, in close proximity to shopping, restaurants, and offices. This research further indicates that 40 percent of young professionals surveyed want to continue living in an urban setting in the future. Residents of the Hamlet and Town have expressed similar interests in encouraging a pedestrian-friendly, village-like center at the Project Site.

## EMPLOYMENT

The following is a discussion of the existing employment on the Project Site. In order to estimate the amount of workers currently employed by businesses located on the Project Site, businesses were categorized into land use types, including destination retail, local retail, restaurant, warehouse, movie theater, professional office, or wholesale trade. The building square footage associated with each business was determined based on data provided by the Town's Department of Planning and Development and summed by the land use type to estimate the total building square footage for each land use type. In order to estimate the amount of square footage devoted to restaurant uses within the total square footage of the Airport Plaza Shopping Center on the Project Site, classified as "destination retail," the average percentage of restaurant space within shopping centers of similar size was used.<sup>8</sup>

The number of employees for each land use type was then estimated by applying industry standard employment multipliers (number of employees per square foot) commonly used in State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) to the total amount of square feet (sf) in each land use category. In instances where field observations of the number of employees at a specific business were made during site visits in July and August 2017, the number of employees observed was used in place of industry standard employment multipliers. Buildings that are

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: <https://www.newsday.com/opinion/editorial/long-island-s-high-cost-of-living-can-t-go-on-1.10328771>

<sup>2</sup> Source: <http://newyork.cbslocal.com/2014/02/25/study-unaffordable-housing-has-pushed-young-adults-out-of-wealthy-suburbs/>

<sup>3</sup> Source: [http://www.longislandindex.org/data\\_posts/unaffordable-island/](http://www.longislandindex.org/data_posts/unaffordable-island/)

<sup>4</sup> Source: <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/26/nyregion/26long.html>

<sup>5</sup> "Housing Choice and Affordability on Long Island & Beyond: A Survey of Suburban NY Metro Area Residents." Prepared by Stony Brook University for the Long Island Index. December 2015.

<sup>6</sup> "Millennials – Breaking the Myths" Nielsen, 2014 <http://www.nielsen.com/content/dam/corporate/us/en/reports-downloads/2014%20Reports/nielsen-millennial-report-feb-2014.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> "Minding the Millennials in Real Estate Decisions" Area Development, 2012 <http://www.areadevelopment.com/workplace-trends/Q1-2016/Millennials-in-Real-Estate-345566.shtml>

<sup>8</sup> According to the Urban Land Institute (ULI) *Dollars and Cents* 2008 (Chapter 11), on average food service businesses occupy 7.6 percent of the leasable area in a Community Shopping Center (approximately 100,000 to 500,000 sf of leasable area).

currently vacant were excluded from the total square footage used in this analysis because there is no employment associated with vacant space. In instances where the building footprint size was not available, such as those of trailers, field observations were used to estimate employment.

The largest land use type and the type with the most employees within the Project Site is destination retail (see **Table 7-6**). A major contributor to the amount of destination retail space within the Project Site is the Airport Plaza Shopping Center. Other destination retail businesses within the Project Site are located on the east and west sides of Broadhollow Road, north of the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) tracks. Out of an estimated 907 total employees on-site, 423 employees (46.6 percent) are estimated to be employed at destination retail businesses. Examples of on-site destination retail businesses include Raymour & Flanigan, Estelle’s Dressy Dresses, Bed, Bath & Beyond, and PetSmart. The use type with the second-largest number of employees on-site is warehouse with an estimated 180 associated employees.

**Table 7-6  
Existing Businesses and Associated Employment**

<b>Non-Residential Use Type</b>	<b>Active Businesses (gsf)</b>	<b>Employment Multiplier</b>	<b>Estimated Existing Employment<sup>1</sup></b>
Destination Retail	316,963	1 employee per 750 sf	423
Local Retail	5,558	1 employee per 400 sf	12
Restaurant <sup>2</sup>	26,071	1 employee per 250 sf	104
Warehouse	180,000	1 employee per 1,000 sf	180
Movie Theater	81,355	1 employee per 600 sf	136
Professional Office <sup>3</sup>	0	1 employee per 250 sf	5
Industrial <sup>4</sup>	37,353	1 employee per 1,000 sf	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>647,300<sup>5</sup></b>	—	<b>907</b>

**Notes:**  
<sup>1</sup> Employment estimates are based on a combination of standard industry employment density ratios commonly used for SEQRA analyses as defined in the “Employment Multiplier” column, and field observations. Field observations were utilized to approximate employment for local retail (10 employees were seen on shift at the car wash and 2 employees were seen on shift at the gas station); professional office (5 employees were estimated based on the size of the trailer and vehicle counts); and industrial (10 employees were witnessed at the Edgewood Industries).  
<sup>2</sup> The gsf of restaurant uses on-site was estimated by applying the average percentage of restaurant space in a shopping center of this size as defined in ULI’s Dollars and Cents 2008 (Chapter 11).  
<sup>3</sup> ModSpace, a professional office land use on the Project Site, operates out of a trailer and a building footprint is not identified in the Town’s Geographic Information System (GIS) Data.  
<sup>4</sup> Edgewood Industries, an industrial business on the Project Site, operates out of a trailer and a building footprint is not identified in the Town’s GIS Data.  
<sup>5</sup> Total does not include a 4,621 sf building because it is vacant and does not contribute to the existing employment on-site.  
**Sources:** Town of Babylon Department of Planning and Development

**FISCAL CONDITIONS**

The parcels that make up the Project Site are owned by various entities. The owners pay property taxes to the Town, County, and school district in relation to their current assessed value.

**C. FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION**

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

According to the Suffolk County Planning Department, Suffolk County’s population is projected to increase by 151,150 people (10.1 percent) between 2010 and 2035, and Nassau County’s

population is projected to increase by 83,268 people (6.2 percent) during the same time period. According to the same source, the Town’s population is expected to increase by 14,697 (6.9 percent) between 2010 and 2035.<sup>1</sup> Population projections were not estimated for the Hamlet for 2035. However, the Hamlet’s strong past and projected near-term growth indicates that it is likely to also experience population growth over the decade to come.

Current trends of decreasing household income, decreasing household size, decreasing variety of housing type, and a growing renter population are expected to continue. Together with continued population growth, Long Island’s current residential housing stock, which is saturated with owner-occupancy, single-family dwellings, will not meet the demand for new types of housing.<sup>2</sup>

**EMPLOYMENT**

*CONSTRUCTION*

As described in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” in the Future without the Proposed Action (the “No Action” condition), the Project Site could be built out to its maximum potential under the existing zoning, resulting in an estimated 1,619,839 gsf of space, or an increment of nearly 1 million sf from the current condition. The total cost of this potential new construction is estimated to be approximately \$177,845,448 (see **Table 7-7**).<sup>3</sup> Construction of these new buildings would result in increased temporary construction employment on the Project Site, which would likely be spread over a long period of time.

**Table 7-7  
Construction Cost of Full Buildout under Existing Zoning**

Use Type	Existing sf	Total Allowable sf under Existing Zoning <sup>1</sup>	Incremental sf Under Existing Zoning	Cost of Construction per sf	Total Cost of New Construction
Destination retail	316,963	417,250	100,287	\$200	\$20,057,400
Local Retail	10,179	105,453	95,274	\$200	\$19,054,800
Restaurant	26,071	34,319	8,248	\$270	\$2,226,960
Warehouse	180,000	345,621	165,621	\$96	\$15,899,616
Hotel and Convention Center	0	250,000	250,000	\$215	\$53,750,000
Movie Theater	81,355	81,355	0	\$190	\$0
Professional Office	0	130,000	130,000	\$189	\$24,570,000
Doctor’s Office	0	20,000	20,000	\$189	\$3,780,000
Industrial	37,353	235,841	198,488	\$194	\$38,506,674
<b>Total</b>	<b>651,921</b>	<b>1,619,839</b>	<b>967,918</b>	—	<b>\$177,845,448</b>
<b>Note:</b> <sup>1</sup> As developed by AKRF, Inc. See Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this DGEIS.					
<b>Sources:</b> Urbanomics; AKRF, Inc.; Town Department of Planning and Development.					

<sup>1</sup> Suffolk County Department of Planning, Planning and Research Division, “Population Projections,” Peter Lambert, 2015. <http://www.suffolkcountyny.gov/Departments/Planning/Divisions/PlanningResearch.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> For a more detailed analysis of the Hamlet’s housing market, residential market trends, and the mismatch between supply and demand, please see AKRF’s East Farmingdale Market Analysis in **Appendix D-3**.

<sup>3</sup> Based on construction cost data provided by Urbanomics, estimated cost of construction is based on the amount of space by use type and the cost per sf of constructing each use type including: \$189 per sf of office space; \$96 per sf of warehousing spaces; \$200 per sf of retail space; \$174 per sf of manufacturing space; and \$215 per sf of hotel space.

*OPERATION*

Industry standard employment multipliers were used to estimate the number of new jobs that could be generated from the operation of new businesses that could be built on the Project Site under the current zoning in the No Action condition (see **Table 7-8**). Based on a hypothetical estimated program of uses, there could be approximately 1,687 new employees on the Project Site in the No Action condition. The largest number of jobs would be within the Professional Office and Hotel/Convention Center use types. Workers in these industry sectors would have varying levels of education and income. Together with the estimated 907 number of workers that may be currently employed on the Project Site, in the No Action condition, a total of 2,593 workers could be employed by businesses within the Project Site.

**Table 7-8**  
**Number of New Jobs on the Project Site in the No Action Condition**

<b>Non-Residential Use Type</b>	<b>Incremental sf Under Existing Zoning</b>	<b>Employment Multiplier</b>	<b>New Employment<sup>2</sup></b>
Destination Retail	100,287	1 employee per 750 sf	134
Local retail	95,274	1 employee per 400 sf	238
Restaurant	8,248	1 employee per 200 sf	41
Warehouse	165,621	1 employee per 1,000 sf	166
Hotel/Convention Center	250,000	1 employee per 3.5 rooms plus additional for convention center at 1 employee per 1,000 sf	345
Movie Theater	0	1 employee per 600 sf	0
Professional Office	130,000	1 employee per 250 sf	520
Doctor's Office	20,000	1 employee per 450 sf	44
Industrial	198,488	1 employee per 1,000 sf	198
<b>Total</b>	<b>967,918</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1,686</b>
<b>Notes:</b>			
<sup>1</sup> As developed by AKRF, Inc. See Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this DGEIS.			
<sup>2</sup> Employment estimates are based on industry standard employment densities commonly used in SEQRA analyses that are defined in the "Employment Multiplier" column.			
<b>Sources:</b> AKRF, Inc.;			

**FISCAL CONDITIONS**

In the No Action condition, there could be an increase in the assessed value of the Project Site from construction of new buildings. As described more fully in Chapter 2, "Project Description," nearly 1 million sf of building space could be added to the Project Site under existing zoning. This development could include destination retail, local retail, warehouse, entertainment, hotel-convention center, professional office, doctor's office, and industrial land uses. **Table 7-9** shows the total amount of new development permitted within each area sub-group under existing zoning (the "Existing Zoning Buildout"). The market value of new development is assumed to be equal to total construction costs. The Town assesses improvements for commercial properties at 1.12 percent of its market value. Multiplying the market value of new development by 1.12 percent yields the assessed value of new development within each area sub-group that has the potential of being constructed within the Project Site. In aggregate, the assessed value of new construction on the Project Site in the No Action condition is estimated to be \$1,991,870.

**Table 7-9**  
**Assessed Value of New Development in No Action Condition**

Area Sub-Group	Incremental SF Under Existing Zoning <sup>1</sup>	Assessed Value <sup>2</sup>
Seven Daughters	75,223	\$171,301
Northwest Retail	47,344	\$107,680
Western Industrial	110,458	\$130,946
NYSDOT-LIPA	261,462	\$496,079
Movie Theater	262,240	\$629,418
Airport Plaza	211,191	\$456,446
<b>Total</b>	<b>967,918</b>	<b>\$1,991,870</b>
<b>Notes:</b>		
<sup>1</sup> The buildout under existing zoning was developed by AKRF, Inc. and is based on a potential scenario of development on the Project Site under the existing zoning. <sup>2</sup> The cost approach method was used to estimate the assessed value of new development by using construction costs to represent the market value and then applying the mill rate for commercial properties (1.12 percent).		
<b>Sources:</b> AKRF, Inc.; Urbanomics; Town of Babylon Tax Assessor.		

## D. POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

### DEMOGRAPHICS

The Proposed Action would facilitate the development of an estimated 2,681 residential units within multifamily buildings. In addition, the EF-FBC would require that where 10 or more residential units would be connected to facilities of the Sewer District, 20 percent of such units shall be set aside as affordable units.<sup>1</sup> Based on the Long Island average household size of 1.15 persons per studio unit, 1.44 persons per one-bedroom unit, 1.83 persons per two-bedroom unit, and 2.85 persons per three-bedroom unit, the multifamily residential buildings on the Project Site would be expected to have a population of approximately 4,402 people (see **Table 7-10**).<sup>2</sup> This increase in population within the Town and Hamlet would be consistent with past trends, which indicate that the population of the Town and Hamlet are increasing, with the Hamlet’s population increasing at a faster rate comparatively. In addition, the multifamily units on the Project Site would be expected to absorb a portion of the anticipated population growth that is expected to occur in the Town in the No Action condition. The units set aside as affordable units would increase the housing choice options for current and future Hamlet residents and help address the current issues of housing affordability in the area.

The Proposed Action is likely to result in the addition of rental units in multifamily buildings to an area where single-family and owner-occupied housing currently dominates the market. Providing rental units in multifamily buildings will increase the housing options available to prospective residents and will provide the Hamlet and Town with a competitive advantage compared to other parts of Long Island that do not have a variety of options.

<sup>1</sup> Section 213-584 of the EF-FBC.

<sup>2</sup> The average household size by the number of bedrooms in a unit was estimated by Urbanomics using the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2011–2015 ACS Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) files for Long Island, which are a set of untabulated records about individual people or housing units.

**Table 7-10**  
**Projected Population of the Proposed Action**

Project Component	Number of Units <sup>1</sup>	Population per Unit <sup>2</sup>	Total Population
Multifamily Housing	2,681	—	4,402
Studio Unit	536	1.16	622
One-bedroom Unit	1,073	1.44	1,545
Two-bedroom Unit	804	1.83	1,471
Three-bedroom Unit	268	2.85	764

**Notes:**  
<sup>1</sup> The breakdown of units by number of bedrooms was estimated by Urbanomics.  
<sup>2</sup> The average household size by the number of bedrooms in a unit was estimated by Urbanomics using the U.S. Census Bureau's ACS Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) files, which are a set of untabulated records about individual people or housing units.  
**Sources:** AKRF, Inc.; Urbanomics; U.S. Census Bureau's 2010–2014 ACS. Data downloaded through Social Explorer (accessed 2016).

**EMPLOYMENT**

*CONSTRUCTION*

In the Future with the Proposed Action (the “With Action” condition), the Project Site could be built out with a total of 3,136,122 gsf of building floor area.<sup>1</sup> The total cost of construction for these buildings is estimated to be approximately \$612,107,418,<sup>2</sup> which is approximately 3.4 times the cost of the new construction in the No Action condition (see **Table 7-11**). As such, it is likely that full buildout of the Project Site under the EF-FBC would result in more construction-related jobs than buildout of the Project Site under the current zoning.

**Table 7-11**  
**Construction Cost of Full Buildout under EF-FBC**

Use Type	Total Allowable sf under EF-FBC <sup>1</sup>	Cost of Construction per sf	Total Cost of New Construction
Destination retail	100,000	\$200	\$20,000,000
Local Retail	55,308	\$200	\$11,061,600
Restaurant	55,308	\$270	\$14,933,160
Hotel and Convention Center	95,000	\$215	\$20,425,000
Professional Office	130,000	\$189	\$24,570,000
Doctor's Office	20,000	\$189	\$3,780,000
Residential	2,680,506	\$193	\$517,337,658
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,136,122</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>\$612,107,418</b>

**Note:** <sup>1</sup> As developed by Dover, Kohl & Partners and AKRF, Inc. See Chapter 2, “Project Description.”  
**Sources:** Urbanomics; AKRF, Inc.; Town Department of Planning and Development.

<sup>1</sup> As developed by Dover, Kohl & Partners. See **Appendix C-1** for a detailed spreadsheet.

<sup>2</sup> Based on construction cost data provided by Urbanomics, estimated cost of construction is based on the amount of space by use type and the cost per sf of constructing each use type including: \$189 per sf of office space; \$96 per sf of warehousing spaces; \$200 per sf of retail space; \$174 per sf of manufacturing space; and \$215 per sf of hotel space.

OPERATION

Industry standard employment multipliers were used to estimate the number of permanent jobs that could be generated upon full buildout of the Project Site under the EF-FBC (see **Table 7-12**). Based on the previously described estimated program of uses, there could be an estimated 1,151 employees on the Project Site in the With Action condition. This compares to an estimated total of 907 employees that currently work within the Project Site and 2,593 employees that theoretically could work on the Project Site if it were built out under existing zoning. One of the largest differences in the type of non-residential development in the With Action condition compared to the No Action condition is that there would be no warehouse or industrial uses within the Project Site under the EF-FBC. Rather, it is anticipated that the largest employers would be within Professional Office and Restaurant use types, which are industries that require varying levels of education and pay different salaries than warehouse or industrial uses.

**Table 7-12  
Number of Jobs on the Project Site in the With Action Condition**

Use Type	gsf <sup>1</sup>	Employment Multiplier	Employment <sup>2</sup>
Destination Retail	100,000	1 employee per 750 sf	133
Local retail	55,308	1 employee per 400 sf	138
Restaurants	55,308	1 employee per 200 sf	277
Hotel	95,000 (136 rooms)	1 employee per 3.5 rooms	39
Professional Office	130,000	1 employee per 250 sf	520
Doctor's Office	20,000	1 employee per 450 sf	44
Residential	2,680,506 (2,681 units)	1 employee per 25 residential units	107
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,136,122</b>	—	<b>1,151</b>

**Notes:**

<sup>1</sup> As developed by AKRF, Inc. See Chapter 2, "Project Description."

<sup>2</sup> Employment estimates are based on industry standard employment densities commonly used in SEQRA analyses that are defined in the "Employment Multiplier" column.

**Sources:** AKRF, Inc.; Dover, Kohl & Partners;

The LIREDC states in their 2017 *A Region in Motion* strategic plan document that for Long Island to build a sustainably strong economy, substantial investments in infrastructure must be made. Key strategies promoted by LIREDC include rebuilding and expanding infrastructure to improve job access and revitalize downtowns and transit hubs; and developing innovation and industry clusters in transformative locations across the region by integrating the smart-growth principles of TOD and vibrant community life. As described more fully in Chapter 3, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the Proposed Action is consistent with the goals and objectives of the LIREDC.

While the Proposed Action would introduce fewer permanent jobs to the Project Site than the No Action condition, the Proposed Action would improve job access for thousands of people by locating residential uses within walking distance to a regional rail line, the LIRR. The Proposed Action would also result in the revitalization and redevelopment of the East Farmingdale Downtown by encouraging a mix of land uses and discouraging land uses that are not consistent with a pedestrian-oriented downtown development. The Proposed Action would also support high-density development around the proposed Republic LIRR station. While there would be fewer jobs on the Project Site in the With Action condition compared to the No Action condition, the benefits created by the Proposed Action (e.g., increased job access; increased housing choice; support of a mixed-use downtown) outweigh the potential larger number of permanent jobs.

**FISCAL CONDITIONS**

The residential and commercial land uses that could be built under the EF-FBC would provide substantial additional property tax revenue to the Town, County, and school district. In addition to 2,681 housing units, buildout under the Proposed Zoning could result in office, retail, hotel, restaurant, and doctor’s office uses on the Project Site. **Table 7-13** shows the likely maximum amount of new development on each area sub-group under the EF-FBC (the “EF-FBC buildout”) as developed by Dover, Kohl & Partners (see **Appendix C-1**). The market value of new development was estimated by assuming that market value will be equal to total construction costs. Applying the Town’s 1.12 percent assessment rate to the market value yields the assessed value of new development within each area sub-group. As the assessed value of new development in the With Action condition is more than twice as much as that of the potential new development in the No Action condition, the property tax revenue generated by the Project Site from full buildout in the With Action condition would be greater than that of the No Action condition. Similarly, new development within the EF-FBC would have an assessed value of approximately \$2.19 per sf, which is approximately 6 percent higher than the per sf assessed value of new construction that could be built on the Project Site in the No Action condition. Therefore, development in the With Action condition, even before accounting for the additional value created by the transit-oriented nature of the development, would be anticipated to have a higher assessed value than, and therefore generate more property taxes than, similarly sized development in the No Action condition.

**Table 7-13**  
**Assessed Value of New Development in With Action condition**

<b>Area Sub-Group</b>	<b>EF-FBC Buildout (gsf)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Assessed Value<sup>2</sup></b>
Seven Daughters	748,692	\$1,628,944
Northwest Retail	322,488	\$697,090
Western Industrial	129,102	\$279,067
NYSDOT-LIPA	651,696	\$1,416,677
NYSDOT	465,348	\$1,009,141
Movie Theater	490,992	\$1,086,402
Airport Plaza	793,152	\$1,747,423
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,136,122</b>	<b>\$6,855,603</b>
<b>Notes:</b>		
<sup>1</sup> The buildout under existing zoning was developed by Dover, Kohl & Partners and is based on a potential scenario of maximum possible development on the Project Site under the proposed EF-FBC.		
<sup>2</sup> The cost approach method was used to estimate the assessed value of new development by using construction costs to represent the market value and then applying the assessed value rate for commercial properties (1.12 percent).		
<b>Sources:</b> AKRF, Inc.; Urbanomics; Dover, Kohl & Partners; Town Tax Assessor.		

\*