

ALTERNATIVES

Chapter Eighteen

ALTERNATIVES

Chapter Eighteen

Introduction:

The DEIS included a variety of alternatives that considered alternate building and parking layouts and uses. In addition to the alternatives included in the DEIS, the Lead Agency considered many other alternatives during the review of the DEIS documents prior to acceptance of the DEIS. Many of these alternatives were ultimately removed from the DEIS as they represented projects that did not meet the needs of the community, the goals of the Lead Agency, and/or the interest and ability of the project sponsor. The FEIS plan itself is an evolution of those alternatives and the preferred project now includes a hotel.

Comment ALT-1

A significant amount of cut and fill in addition to three (3) massive retaining walls are being proposed. The project sponsor should consider alternative landscape architectural plans that work with the site's contours and are less intrusive to the land while balancing the needs of the proposed development. (NYCDEP (11/12/2013))

Response:

As graphically set forth in the side by side comparison now provided in the Executive Summary, the applicant has significantly reduced (by 43,000+/- sf) the retail space that was the proposed action originally including reducing the number of parking spaces from 800 to 721+/- . The current plan is significantly less square footage than the several large existing shopping centers in town. In addition, the grading has been adjusted to reduce overall cuts and fills and to allow the project to remain in earthwork balance. Further reductions and adjustments are not within the range of reasonable alternatives that are feasible considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor (See 6NYCRR617.9(b)(5)(v)).

Comment ALT-2

The DEIS does not address and mitigate the potential impacts to water quality as a result of the signification increase in impervious surfaces and change in land use. Due to the extent of exceedingly steep slopes on the subject parcels and the adjacent State regulated wetland that feeds into New York City's Water Supply, DEP recommends that the developer explore alternative designs to reduce the project's footprint and area of disturbance that better fits the site topography in order to reduce the potential environmental impacts. (NYCDEP (11/12/2013))

Response:

The stormwater management section of the FEIS indicates the proposal will be designed to meet NYCDEC and NYCDEP requirements. See also Comment ALT-1 above.

Comment ALT-3

CHAPTER 16: ALTERNATIVES

1. *The FEIS should clarify the sewer/water generation rates between the three alternatives. The HC-1 Zone Alternative with Hotel provides a more detailed analysis that should be applied to the other alternatives as well. (AKRF (11/12/2013))*

Response:

The Hotel has been included in the primary plan. Please refer to water and sewer responses in the FEIS.

Comment ALT-4

2. *The sample water bill provided for the Hilton Garden Inn on page 16-15 does not include the total number of rooms. This should be provided by reference. (AKRF (11/12/2013))*

Response:

The calculation for water usage of the hotel was modified in the FEIS to use NYSDEC standards. This comment no longer applies.

Comment ALT-5

How do the potential impacts to the Tonetta Lake Area compare between the baseline potential RC development and the proposed HC-1 Zoning with respect to traffic, noise, visual impacts and light levels? (Kim Cercena (11/12/2013))

Response:

The baseline impacts vary very little between the RC alternative and the HC-1 proposal. In either instance, the same size area of the site will be disturbed. Visual and lighting impacts will be identical. The Ridgeline area would be disturbed in the RC proposal to the same extent as the primary proposal. Noise and air quality impacts would not change. Parking required for the RC alternative would be in the range of 900 ± spaces where as parking in the primary proposal reduces to 700 ± spaces. Multi story office buildings allowed in the RC zone would be about the same height as the proposed hotel in the FEIS

plan.

Comment ALT-6

We agree that a hotel is needed in the town and this location is well suited for it. (James Collins (11/12/2013), (Clare & Holger de Buhr (11/03/2013), (John & Karen Schlick (09/17/2013), (Public Hearing (11/07/2013)

Response:

The primary proposal has been modified to include a 100+/- room hotel.

Comment ALT-7

What is the anticipated indirect spending at local restaurants due to the proposed hotel? (James Collins (11/12/2013)

Response:

The expectation of spending on local restaurants could be as much as \$210,000 - \$638,000 per year depending on price of the meal. This calculation is based on 70% room occupancy for between 200- 365 days with one meal per day, at \$15- \$25, at local restaurants.

Comment ALT-8

II. *The DEIS Must Include an Analysis of a Range of Alternatives to the Proposed Project.*

However, other than the No Action alternative, the DEIS only evaluates alternative actions similar in size to the Proposed Project and likely to result in a similar impacts to water quality. Both the RC Alternative and HC-1 with Hotel Alternative would disturb wetland buffer areas (though the amount of disturbance is not quantified), result in a total area of disturbance of approximately 31 acres, and create approximately 30% impervious coverage, the same as the Proposed Project. Therefore, the two alternatives are not only similar in scale to the Proposed Project, but would similarly adversely impact water quality.

In order to satisfy SEQRA's mandate to evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives, additional alternatives must be considered. The alternatives

analysis in the DEIS must be expanded to include alternative actions that are smaller in scale and result in the creation of less overall site disturbance, reduced impervious coverage, and no wetland buffer disturbance compared to the proposed action. (Riverkeeper (11/12/13) (Public Hearing (11/07/2013)

Response:

The alternatives considered were directed by the lead agency and includes a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. Please refer to the responses to Comment ALT-1 and ALT-5.

Comment ALT-9

As per State Environmental Quality Review (SEQRA), we are proposing an alternative that is consistent with the Rural Code and Comprehensive and Croton Plan. It is the position of the Southeast Residents for Responsible Development that the Rural Commercial Code permitting a three-story hotel of approximately 100 to 120 rooms with conference center and fitness center; a 25,000 square foot retailer similar to the type of Home Goods; a 10,000 square foot family-style restaurant similar to the type of Cracker Jack and a bank, would fulfill the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, less on some of the unavoidable impacts to the enforcement traffic and , I recognize Rte 312 as a “commercial hub.” (Ann Fanizzi (11/12/2013) (Public Hearing (11/07/2013)

Response:

The RC zone does not permit retail uses such as a Home Goods. Dedication of the 52 acre site to a 120 room hotel/conference center and a restaurant would not generate sufficient revenue to finance the project.