

## **V. ALTERNATIVES**

### **A. No Action**

The SEQRA process requires that the DEIS analyze a No Action alternative. For the purposes of this DEIS, no action means that the site would remain undeveloped, with only the existing houses and buildings remaining on the site. The no-action alternative would eliminate all of the impacts of the proposed Project including those resulting from population generated, additional traffic volumes, additional impervious surfaces, vegetation and wildlife habitat loss, grading and tree removal.

While this alternative would eliminate certain adverse impacts, it would not have any beneficial impacts such as increased tax revenues, and an increase in the housing stock of the town.

### **B. Conventional Layout**

The Project Site is zoned R-40 Single-Family Residential. The as-of-right count as established as part of the Conventional Plan allows for 16 lots, refer to Exhibit II-2. The Conventional Plan comprises 16 detached single-family homes.

#### **1. Land Use and Zoning**

The Conventional Plan would utilize a road configuration comparable to the one contemplated for the Proposed Action with the exception of new Road C to access the proposed empty-nester residences. The lots shown on the Conventional Plan conform to the R-40 zoning requirements as illustrated below.

**Table V-1  
Zoning Conformance (R-40 Zoning Districts)**

Category	Required (R-40 District)	Provided																
		Lot 1	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4	Lot 5	Lot 6	Lot 7	Lot 8	Lot 9	Lot 10	Lot 11	Lot 12	Lot 13	Lot 14	Lot 15	Lot 16	Lot 17*
Minimum Lot Area	40,000 sq. ft.	45,750	40,395	42,145	43,700	50,000	42,065	40,650	41,640	40,500	44,155	45,140	47,170	40,295	40,050	62,535	149,370	330,368
Minimum Lot Width (feet)	100 ft.	211	165	148	150	175	196	242	237	150	170	235	145	125	150	108	107	320
Mean Lot Width (feet)	150 ft.	220	158	159	150	175	193	216	237	150	166	157	219	238	164	166	212	335
Minimum Lot Depth (feet)	175 ft.	193	270	260	295	285	215	175	175	270	270	175	220	180	240	375	600	700+
Minimum Building Height (feet or stories)	2.5 stories or 35 ft	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	3
Minimum Front Yard (feet)	60 ft.	79	67	63	60	60	62	60	60	97	73	70	87	65	80	152	97	663
Minimum Side Yard (feet)	25 ft.	26	31	25	25	25	43	58	32	25	25	26	27	29	32	29	29	415
Minimum Rear Yard (feet)	50 ft.	62	143	142	172	173	56	59	66	122	147	81	109	56	87	65	>280	417
Maximum Building Coverage (%)	10%	9	10	10	9	8	10	10	10	10	9	9	9	10	10	6	3	2
Minimum Floor Area (sq. ft.)	1,200 sq. ft.	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	3,311
Open Space (sq. ft.)	1,200 sq. ft.	39,816	35,308	37,058	38,565	44,959	36,563	34,541	35,003	35,195	38,227	38,475	41,654	34,829	34,198	57,250	143,507	284,630

Source: WSP Sells

\*Existing Waterhouse Lot

2. Site Disturbance

With respect to the Conventional Plan meeting the requirements of the Town Code, the layout needs to fit into the topography to limit the need for retaining walls. Generally walls adjacent to residential buildings are limited to 6 feet or less. As depicted in Section 218-12.F of the Zoning Ordinance, walls and fences in any residence district shall not exceed four feet in height in any front or side yard, or six feet in height in any rear yard, measured above the natural grade. As depicted in Exhibit V-1, all lots (except lot 12) conform to this requirement. The use of retaining walls has been kept to a minimum and designed to minimize grading and additional impact on disturbances to slopes and vegetation.

Proposed construction activities as part of a Conventional Plan would call for 8.32 acres to be disturbed including 17,053 cubic yards of cut and 27,483 cubic yards of fill.

3. Comparison of Impacts

Given that the conventional plan would be limited to single-family residential, not age targeted, there would be some slight variations with respect to anticipated socio-economic impacts. Based on the multipliers utilized in Section III.J of this DEIS, it would be anticipated that an additional seven people, including five public-school school-age children could be expected from a single-family Conventional Layout. The Conventional Layout would yield approximately an additional \$86,448 in total additional tax revenue due to larger building size.

**Table V-1  
Comparison of Proposed Action, Conventional Plan,  
and Alternate Access Site Layout**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Proposed Action</b>	<b>Conventional Plan</b>	<b>Alternative Site Layout (No Through Road)</b>
<b>Number of Units</b>	16	16	14
<b>Number of Residents*</b>	51	58	52
<b>Public School-age Children*</b>	9	14	13
<b>Open Space (acres)</b>	8.29	1.37	5.06
<b>Water Use (gpd)</b>	37,026	39,426	34,497
<b>Trip Generation Peak AM</b>	24	23	22
<b>Trip Generation Peak PM</b>	50	22	19
<b>Total Property Tax Generated</b>	\$535,000	\$621,448	\$547,408

\*Based on Rutgers University multipliers

Source: WSP Sells and Saccardi & Schiff, Inc. calculations

The comparison outlines in Table V-1 above illustrates a Conventional Plan would generate greater overall property taxes. However, a Conventional Plan would also

generate greater impacts as it relates to on-site residents, the number of school-age children, site disturbance and trip generation. The as-of-right plan would not address the need for housing for empty-nesters, nor would it utilize clustering as a means to preserve natural features and open space.

### **C. Conservation Layout with All Homes Clustered**

A conservation subdivision layout with all homes clustered has been requested by the Lead Agency as an alternative. This configuration could, in the Applicant's opinion, be designed using the layout illustrated as part of the Proposed Action with a portion of lots 1 through 8 reserved as open space. Site disturbance impacts would remain essentially the same as those described as part of the Proposed Action. This is not an alternative the Applicant is interested in pursuing.

### **D. Alternative Site Access (No Through Road)**

An alternative site access layout has been prepared and provided as Exhibit V-2. This alternative contemplates access from Washburn Road with an approximately 900 linear foot access road (Road A). A total of eight residential lots would access Road A in this configuration. A second cul-de-sac (Road B) would extend approximately 600 linear feet from its intersection with Road A. Six residential lots would be provided access off of Road B. Residents, impacts to community services, and utility demand are all presented in Table V-1 for comparison purposes. A 4.85-acre portion of the site would remain as open space as part of this alternative layout.

### **E. Reduced Density Subdivision That Avoids Steep Slopes, Ridgelines And Other Site Constraints**

The adopted Scope calls for a reduced density subdivision that avoids steep slopes, ridgelines, and other site constraints. In order to obtain access to the site from either Carleton Avenue or Washburn Road, disturbance or impacts to the existing steep slopes on the site would need to occur. The design of the roadways included attempts to avoid disturbance or impacts to steep slopes over 25% as well as avoid disturbance of any steep slopes whenever possible. See Exhibit V-3, Reduced Impact Layout.





Exhibit V-2

**ALTERNATIVE SITE ACCESS LAYOUT**

**TACONIC TRACT**

Town of Mount Pleasant, New York

*Saccardi & Schiff, Inc. - Planning and Development Consultants*

DATE: September 30, 2009  
SOURCE: WSP Sells



**LEGEND**

- SLOPES 15% - 25%
- SLOPES 25% - 35%
- SLOPES > 35%

Exhibit V-3  
**REDUCED IMPACT LAYOUT**

**TACONIC TRACT**  
 Town of Mount Pleasant, New York

*Saccardi & Schiff, Inc. - Planning and Development Consultants*