



## INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LINDENHURST

430 SO. WELLWOOD AVENUE - LINDENHURST, NEW YORK 11757

MAYOR  
MICHAEL A. LAVORATA

ADMINISTRATOR CLERK  
DOUGLAS MADLON

BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
JOAN M. MASTERSON  
PATRICK M. PICHICHERO  
RICHARD J. RENNA  
MARYANN WECKERLE

Dear Resident;

In reference to the Application from 75 East Hoffman Avenue LH, LLC to rezone the properties known as Lakeville Industries, 75 East Hoffman Avenue, 90 Mal Place, South Pennsylvania Avenue, 85 East Hoffman Avenue, 95 East Hoffman Avenue, 165 South Pennsylvania Avenue, 95 Mal Drive from Industrial and Residence to Downtown Redevelopment District - Proposed Multi-Residence. A Public Hearing was held and questions were directed to the Developer of the Proposed TriTec Multi-Residence Project. Please find attached the questions submitted from the public and answers to these questions written by the applicant, TriTec Developers.

Thank you for your interest and sharing with us your questions on this matter. Again, thank you for writing and the Village Board will take into consideration all of your questions and concerns before a final decision is made.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Lavorata  
Mayor

**VILLAGE OF LINDENHURST PUBLIC HEARING**

**SITE PLAN FOR PROPOSED MULTIPLE RESIDENCE DEVELOPMENT  
SCTM# 103-10-4-45.1, 45.3, 45.6, 45.7, 45.8, 45.9 AND 45.10**

**APPLICANT: 75 E. HOFFMAN LH, LLC  
APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS**

---

1. Response to comments by John Lisi:
  - a. The Village of Lindenhurst adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code.
  - b. The project is proposing to land bank parking in order to provide more green / open space. Additional parking will be built out in the land banked areas should there not be enough parking.
  - c. A traffic study has been performed, reviewed and adopted by the Village as part of the SEQRA process. There are three locations for entering and exiting the site.
  
2. Response to comments by Lenore [last name not provided]:
  - a. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code.
  - b. The process has complied with all 'public notice' requirements and has been the subject of multiple public discussions.
  
3. Response to comments by Maureen Savin:
  - a. The building has been designed and refined in order to satisfy comments from the Village and the Community. This includes reducing the height along Hoffman Avenue and adding arched window elements. Although it is located in an industrial and commercial zone, we have made additional refinements in form and material to add a more residential character to the building.
  
4. Response to comments by Mary and William Crump:
  - a. We have not applied for any subsidies and subsidies are not part of this site plan application.
  
5. Response to comments by Terence Whalen:
  - a. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed multifamily project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code.

- b. A floor-to-floor height of 10.8 feet would not allow enough space for structure and mechanical ventilation, particularly for a higher-end apartment building like the one proposed here.
  - c. A high percentage of the units are one-bedroom units and studios. Past experience has shown the projection to be much less than the occupancy figure stated by Mr. Whalen. In order to determine the residential population that would be generated by implementation of the proposed project, residential demographic multipliers were used for total population. Please refer to our project's Environmental Impact Study for more details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.
  - d. The building has been designed and refined in order to satisfy comments from the Village and the Community. This includes reducing the height along Hoffman Avenue and adding arched window elements. Although it is located in an industrial and commercial zone, we have made additional refinements in form and material to add a more residential character to the building.
6. Response to comments by Denis Garbo:
- a. In order to determine the residential population that would be generated by implementation of the proposed project, residential demographic multipliers were used for total population. Please refer to our project's Environmental Impact Study for more details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.
  - b. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District (DRD) Code. Our proposed project complies with the parking requirements set forth in the code, which are based on national and regional parking models for similar developments in similar locations.
  - c. A comprehensive traffic study was completed as part of the SEQRA process. The SEQRA process was completed and received a negative declaration.
  - d. Our proposed project complies with the height requirements set forth in the DRD code. The proposed height is similar, if not lower, than other developments in Suffolk County adjacent to Train Stations. In this project, the developer has agreed to lower the height along Hoffman Avenue by one floor in order to address this concern by the Village.
  - e. The new DRD code was created to encourage Smart Growth development. All future applicants must comply with the requirements laid out in the new code in order to be considered for approval by the Village.
7. Response to comments by Christine McCarthy:
- a. The existing Lakeville Building is not adaptable to apartments. We reviewed this and found that it lacked flexibility and required extensive upgrades. For many reasons, some of these being the vertical heights, the plan depth and width would not accommodate a high-quality development such as the one proposed. Additionally, the location of the building places it directly where the new project will require excavation for storm drainage.



details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.

12. Response to comments by Barbara Capella Loehr:

- a. Tax abatements are not included as part of this site plan application.
- b. The Applicant believes that such development would attract young singles and couples just starting out, as well as seniors who may want to downsize and rid themselves of the responsibility of single-family home ownership. Our proposed project anticipates the generation of 7.8 school-aged children. Thus, it is expected that the proposed action would not burden the local school district. In order to determine the residential population and school-aged children that would be generated by implementation of the proposed project, residential demographic multipliers were used for total population. Please refer to our project's Environmental Impact Study for more details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.

13. Response to comments by Michael DiGiuseppe:

- a. The Applicant believes that such development would attract young singles and couples just starting out, as well as seniors who may want to downsize and rid themselves of the responsibility of single-family home ownership. Our proposed project anticipates the generation of 7.8 school-aged children. Thus, it is expected that the proposed action would not burden the local school district. In order to determine the residential population and school-aged children that would be generated by implementation of the proposed project, residential demographic multipliers were used for total population. Please refer to our project's Environmental Impact Study for more details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.
- b. Tax abatements are not included as part of this site plan application.

14. Response to comments by Kim Woodworth:

- a. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code. The proposed height is similar, if not lower, than other developments in Suffolk County adjacent to Train Stations. In this project, the developer has agreed to lower the height along Hoffman Avenue by one floor in order to address this concern by the Village.
- b. Anyone is permitted to submit an application to reside in our project. All applicants will undergo strict background and credit checks.
- c. Tax abatements are not included as part of this site plan application. The Applicant believes that such development would attract young singles and couples just starting out, as well as seniors who may want to downsize and rid themselves of the responsibility of single-family home ownership. Our proposed project anticipates the generation of 7.8 school-aged children. Thus, it is expected that the proposed action

would not burden the local school district. In order to determine the residential population and school-aged children that would be generated by implementation of the proposed project, residential demographic multipliers were used for total population. Please refer to our project's Environmental Impact Study for more details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.

- d. A traffic study has been completed, reviewed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.

15. Response to comments by Janet Peterson:

- a. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code.

16. Response to comments by Bob Weiden:

- a. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code.
- b. The proposed height is similar, if not lower, than other developments in Suffolk County adjacent to Train Stations. In this project, the developer has agreed to lower the height along Hoffman Avenue by one floor in order to address concerns by the Village.
- c. A traffic study has been performed, reviewed and adopted by the Village as part of the SEQRA process.
- d. A Sewer Capacity Letter had been obtained from the Suffolk County Department of Public Works acknowledging that the site is located in the sewer district and that capacity is available for the proposed project.
- e. Our proposed project anticipates the generation of 7.8 school-aged children. Thus, it is expected that the proposed action would not burden the local school district. In order to determine the residential population and school-aged children that would be generated by implementation of the proposed project, residential demographic multipliers were used for total population. Please refer to our project's Environmental Impact Study for more details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.

17. Response to comments from Kenny St. John:

- a. It is our belief that this site is not appropriate for retail space. We aim to complement and promote retail growth along Wellwood Avenue, which currently faces some vacancy issues; retail at this proposed development site would likely detract from that goal. Success within the Village Downtown will support the success of our project, and vice versa.
- b. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with the use in the code.

18. Response to comments from Jackie Herig:

- a. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code.
- b. It is our belief that this site is not appropriate for retail space. We aim to complement and promote retail growth along Wellwood Avenue, which currently faces some vacancy issues; retail at this proposed development site would detract from that goal. Success within the Village Downtown will support the success of our project, and vice versa.
- c. Tax abatements are not included as part of this site plan application.
- d. This site is not being acquired through eminent domain. An existing contract is in place with the current landowner.
- e. The new DRD code was created to encourage Smart Growth development. All future applicants must comply with the requirements laid out in the new code in order to be considered for approval by the Village.
- f. A Sewer Capacity Letter had been obtained from the Suffolk County Department of Public Works acknowledging that the site is located in the sewer district and that capacity is available for the proposed project.
- g. Our proposed project anticipates the generation of 7.8 school-aged children. Thus, it is expected that the proposed action would not burden the local school district. In order to determine the residential population and school-aged children that would be generated by implementation of the proposed project, residential demographic multipliers were used for total population. Please refer to our project's Environmental Impact Study for more details regarding population generation, which was completed and adopted as part of the SEQRA process.
- h. The existing Lakeville Building is not adaptable to apartments. We reviewed this and found that it lacked flexibility and required extensive upgrades. For many reasons, some of these being the vertical heights, the plan depth and width would not accommodate a high-quality development such as the one proposed. Additionally, the location of the building places it directly where the new project will require excavation for storm drainage. Further, none of the existing buildings or resources on-site, including the Lakeville Building are identified as a historic site by the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory. Additionally, a decent portion of the Lakeville Building complex was torn down in the mid-twentieth century (specifically, the 1960s, according to aerial photography). Based on the foregoing, the integrity of Building 1 has been substantially reduced.

19. Response to comments from Shawn Cullinane:

- a. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with all height, setback, density and parking requirements in the code.

- b. The proposed height is similar, if not lower, than other developments in Suffolk County adjacent to Train Stations. In this project the developer has agreed to lower the height along Hoffman Avenue by one floor in order to address this concern by the Village.
- c. The existing Lakeville Building is not adaptable to apartments. We reviewed this and found that it lacked flexibility and required extensive upgrades. For many reasons, some of these being the vertical heights, the plan depth and width would not accommodate a high-quality development such as the one proposed. Additionally, the location of the building places it directly where the new project will require excavation for storm drainage. Further, none of the existing buildings or resources on-site, including the Lakeville Building are identified as a historic site by the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory. Additionally, a decent portion of the Lakeville Building complex was torn down in the mid-twentieth century (specifically, the 1960s, according to aerial photography). Based on the foregoing, the integrity of Building 1 has been substantially reduced.
- d. The Village of Lindenhurst has adopted a new Downtown Redevelopment District Code. Our proposed project complies with the requirements in the code. There are no requirements in the code to replace existing overhead utility lines with underground lines.