

#### **4.0 ALTERNATIVES COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

**Comment 4-1 (Letter 24, Bob and Marcia Altabet, May 19, 2005):** We are concerned about traffic impacts associated with local roadway access in three of the project alternatives that do not provide access to Route 6, including the alternative with access from Jefferson Court. Such secondary alternative access points will become much more than merely fire access. The added traffic on these local roads will be a burden on the surrounding community.

*Response 4-1: Page 4-20 of the DEIS provides an analysis of traffic impacts of the alternatives that accomplish objectives of the Town's Arterial Access Management strategy by placing access only on local roads rather than Route 6. A "Sensitivity Analysis" was conducted for comparative purposes to represent the worst case for any residential alternative using a local road connection to Curry Street. Of the Curry Street intersections with local roads that have potential connections to the site, the Gay Ridge Road/Curry Street intersection has the most traffic. Over 40 percent of Curry Street traffic turns at Gomer Street Extension, leaving the more southerly Curry Street intersections with less traffic. Therefore, the sensitivity analysis examines effects of having the entire site traffic pass through one local intersection -- the Curry Street/Gay Ridge Road intersection -- whereas all of the residential alternatives examined use two access points. This provides a "worst case" scenario for the evaluation of traffic impacts on local roads.*

*The Sensitivity Analysis demonstrates that changing the access location, or where the traffic accesses the site, would potentially only reduce the effect at the US Route 6/Access, and would not affect other study intersections. Potential Curry Street access points, even if carrying all of the site traffic, would continue to operate at level of service B or better. As stated in the DEIS, providing subdivision access on local residential streets that connect with Curry Street would increase traffic on local streets without creating unacceptable intersection levels of service.*

*In response to NYSDOT policies related to Arterial Management, the project layout has been revised with access for residents and visitors from Gay Ridge Road only, and emergency access only from Route 6. Traffic impacts from this revised layout have been addressed in the DEIS under the Traffic Sensitivity Analysis, with no significant adverse traffic impacts identified.*

**Comment 4-2 (Letter 1, Yorktown Planning Department, June 13, 2005; Letter 2, Bruce Barber, June 13, 2005):** An R1-80 cluster plan should be submitted as the Comprehensive Plan may rezone this property to 2 acres.

*Response 4-2: An R1-80 Cluster Alternative was prepared by the Applicant at the request of the Planning Board, although the Applicant has indicated that this is not a feasible alternative for the project site, given the size of the project site, its access and site location, and availability of infrastructure including water and sewer lines.*

*Consistent with New York State Town Law Article 278 (Subdivision review; approval of cluster development), the Town of Yorktown's Cluster subdivision regulations found in Article XXV of the Town Code (Clustering and Flexibility Standards) are intended "to facilitate the adequate and economical provision of streets and utilities and to preserve the natural and scenic qualities of open land." However, according to the Applicant,*

*these regulations effectively render use of these provisions infeasible, since the formula used to determine permitted density under a Cluster layout pursuant to Article XXV significantly reduces the number of homes allowable in comparison to the number of homes permitted on an as-of-right basis under a conventional subdivision layout with larger lot sizes. This is contrary to typical practice in other municipalities whereby a cluster layout places the permitted density on a portion of the site, leaving the remainder as undeveloped open space or as a recreational facility.*

*As a result of the density calculation formula required for cluster development under Article XXV, Section 300-211 (Density Calculation), the R1-80 Cluster Alternative would result in only nine residential lots. This alternative would still require a wetland permit for the Gay Ridge Road connection wetland crossing. Lot sizes range from approximately one acre to approximately 1.8 acres under this alternative. The amount of environmental benefit derived from the R1-80 Cluster Alternative is therefore limited and is not commensurate with the reduction in the number of proposed dwellings, in the Applicant's opinion. Under this alternative, the number of proposed lots is reduced by two thirds in comparison to the proposed action, and is reduced by one quarter in comparison to the number of homes proposed pursuant to a conventional R1-80 subdivision.*

*A comparison of the impacts of the R1-80 Cluster Alternative, the current Revised Plan, and the previously analyzed alternatives follows in Tables 4-1 and 4-2:*

| <b>Table 4-1<br/>Alternative Impact Comparisons: Open Space and Natural Resources</b> |   |                          |                                    |                                  |                                     |   |                        |                                 |                                       |                            |
|---|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Alternative</b>  | <b>Area of Concern</b>  | <b>Developed Area</b>    |                                    |                                  | <b>Open Space Resources (acres)</b> |   |                        | <b>Natural Resource Impacts</b> |                                       |                            |
|   |   | <b>Residential Units</b> | <b>Impervious Surfaces (acres)</b> | <b>Lawn/ Landscaping (acres)</b> | <b>Water Quality Basins</b>         | <b>Wetlands, including Water Surfaces</b> | <b>Woods (uplands)</b> | <b>Meadows</b>                  | <b>Total Construction Disturbance</b> | <b>Wetland Disturbance</b> |
|   | <b>No Action</b>  | 0                        | 0                                  | 0                                | 0                                   | 5.60                                      | 21.76                  | 15.81                           | 0                                     | 0                          |
|   | <b>Revised Plan - FEIS Mitigation Alternative</b>               | 22                       | 3.70                               | 16.60                            | 1.20                                | 5.40                                      | 10.20                  | 6.10                            | 22.10                                 | 0.25                       |
|   | <b>DEIS Proposed Action</b>                                     | 34                       | 5.84                               | 17.68                            | 1.11                                | 4.88                                      | 8.94                   | 4.72                            | 24.62                                 | 0.72                       |
|   | <b>Cluster Park Alternative (R4)</b>                            | 39                       | 4.49                               | 23.07                            | 0.86                                | 4.86                                      | 7.08                   | 2.82                            | 28.42                                 | 0.74                       |
|   | <b>Connection of Gay Ridge Road to Jefferson Court (R5)</b>     | 35                       | 4.08                               | 25.27                            | 1.01                                | 4.71                                      | 5.73                   | 2.37                            | 30.36                                 | 0.89                       |
|   | <b>Connection of Gay Ridge Road to Stonewall Court (R6)</b>     | 34                       | 4.05                               | 23.35                            | 1.28                                | 4.68                                      | 7.12                   | 2.69                            | 28.67                                 | 0.92                       |
|   | <b>Loop Road Option (R3)</b>                                    | 35                       | 3.80                               | 21.30                            | 1.18                                | 3.88                                      | 7.40                   | 5.61                            | 26.27                                 | 1.72                       |
|   | <b>Connection of Gay Ridge Road to Route 6 (R2)</b>             | 34                       | 3.92                               | 23.50                            | 1.07                                | 4.45                                      | 7.28                   | 2.96                            | 28.49                                 | 1.15                       |
|   | <b>Reduced Density Alternative (24-lot conventional layout)</b> | 24                       | 6.10                               | 13.08                            | 0.76                                | 4.74                                      | 12.78                  | 5.70                            | 19.94                                 | 0.86                       |
|   | <b>R1-20 Cluster Alternative</b>                                | 39                       | 4.51                               | 10.32                            | 0.76                                | 5.29                                      | 14.09                  | 8.20                            | 15.59                                 | 0.31                       |
|   | <b>R1-40 Cluster Alternative</b>                                | 19                       | 2.65                               | 6.87                             | 0.76                                | 5.29                                      | 18.58                  | 9.02                            | 10.28                                 | 0.31                       |
|   | <b>R1-80 Cluster Alternative</b>                                | 12                       | 2.73                               | 6.83                             | 0.56                                | 5.57                                      | 18.04                  | 9.44                            | 10.12                                 | 0.03                       |
|   | <b>Office Alternative (C1)</b>                                  | 0                        | 11.17                              | 6.29                             | 1.85                                | 5.53                                      | 10.97                  | 7.36                            | 19.30                                 | 0.07                       |

Source: Ralph G. Mastro Monaco, P.E., P.C.

**Table 4-2**  
**Alternative Impact Comparisons: Community Resources and Traffic**

| Alternative   | Community Resources |                   |            |   |                                      |                        |                            | Traffic                       |                                      |                     |
|---|---------------------|-------------------|------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
|   | Area of Concern     | Residential Units | Population | Recreation Fields:<br>Baseball / Soccer | Water<br>Demand/Sewage<br>Flow (gpd) | School-age<br>Children | Cost to School<br>District | Revenue to<br>School District | Access                               | Traffic Generation* |
| <b>No Action</b>  |                     | 0                 | 0          | 0 / 0                                   | 0                                    | 0                      | 0                          | \$10,399                      | none                                 | 0/0                 |
| <b>Revised Plan - FEIS<br/>Mitigation Alternative</b>                   |                     | 22                | 80         | 0 / 0                                   | 7,960                                | 26                     | 358,712                    | \$127,808                     | Gay Ridge Rd                         | 25/27               |
| <b>Proposed Action</b>  |                     | 34                | 123        | 0 / 1                                   | 12,300                               | 30                     | \$361,140                  | \$362,122                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 33/41               |
| <b>Cluster Park Alternative<br/>(R4)</b>                                |                     | 39                | 141        | 1 / 1                                   | 14,100                               | 34                     | \$409,292                  | \$415,375                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 37/46               |
| <b>Connection of Gay Ridge<br/>Road to Jefferson Court<br/>(R5)</b>     |                     | 35                | 127        | 1 / 1                                   | 12,700                               | 31                     | \$373,178                  | \$372,773                     | Jefferson Ct.<br>and Gay<br>Ridge Rd | 33/41               |
| <b>Connection of Gay Ridge<br/>Road to Stonewall Court<br/>(R6)</b>     |                     | 34                | 123        | 1 / 0                                   | 12,300                               | 30                     | \$361,140                  | \$362,122                     | Stonewall Ct.<br>and Gay<br>Ridge Rd | 33/41               |
| <b>Loop Road Option (R3)</b>  |                     | 35                | 127        | 1 / 0                                   | 12,700                               | 31                     | \$373,178                  | \$372,733                     | Stonewall Ct.<br>and Gay<br>Ridge Rd | 33/41               |
| <b>Connection of Gay Ridge<br/>Road to Route 6 (R2)</b>                 |                     | 34                | 123        | 1 / 0                                   | 12,300                               | 30                     | \$361,140                  | \$362,122                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 33/41               |
| <b>Reduced Density<br/>Alternative (24-lot<br/>conventional layout)</b> |                     | 24                | 87         | 0 / 1                                   | 8,700                                | 21                     | \$252,798                  | \$255,616                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 27/30               |
| <b>R1-20 Cluster Alternative</b>  |                     | 39                | 141        | 0 / 1                                   | 14,100                               | 34                     | \$409,292                  | \$415,375                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 37/46               |
| <b>R1-40 Cluster Alternative</b>  |                     | 19                | 69         | 0 / 1                                   | 6,900                                | 17                     | \$204,646                  | \$202,362                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 23/24               |
| <b>R1-80 Alternative</b>  |                     | 12                | 43         | 0 / 1                                   | 4,300                                | 10                     | \$120,380                  | \$127,808                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 17/16               |
| <b>R1-80 Cluster Alternative</b>  |                     | 12                | 43         | 0 / 1                                   | 4,300                                | 10                     | \$120,380                  | \$127,808                     | Gay Ridge Rd<br>and US Rt. 6         | 17/16               |
| <b>Office Alternative (C1)</b>  |                     | 0 <sup>1</sup>    | 0          | 0 / 0                                   | 16,690                               | 0                      | 0                          | \$261,834                     | US Route 6                           | 273/188             |

\*Traffic Generation includes a.m. peak hour/ p.m. peak hour trips excluding seasonal trips (2/20) for recreation field.

<sup>1</sup> zero residential units and 160,000 square feet of office space.

Source: Tim Miller Associates, Inc.

**Comment 4-3 (Letter 3, James D. Benson, New York City Department of Environmental Protection, June 14, 2005):** The DEIS includes several alternatives that appear to offer viable plans for development with fewer adverse environmental impacts, for example the Reduced Density Alternative, the R1-20 and RI-40 Cluster Development Alternatives and R1-80 Alternative. The DEIS fails to detail any compelling reason why these alternatives are not consistent with the goals of the applicant. Prior to dismissing any alternative that contains clear advantages, the DEIS should include all the necessary information/data that allows an evaluation of the alternative under SEQRA. DEP urges the Board to consider such alternatives in greater detail.

***Response 4-3:*** *The project has been revised to address concerns over wetlands and slopes impacts, and access, and currently includes 22 proposed homes. This revision of the proposed action provides a layout with fewer adverse environmental impacts and consistent with planning objectives of the Town.*

*In the Applicant's opinion, the alternatives with substantially fewer proposed lots would not be economically feasible, considering the costs of installing the necessary infrastructure on the project site. Another important consideration relates to the location of the project site and its available municipal water and sewer service, factors that make the project site appropriate for development at the density that the site was rezoned for. The Town of Yorktown is an area with high demand for new housing, and substantially limiting the amount of development permitted on the project site to less than 22 homes would make the project not viable for the Applicant to pursue.*