



January 12, 2012

Mayor Hartley Connett and Members of the Board of Trustees  
 Village of Dobbs Ferry  
 Village Hall  
 112 Main Street  
 Dobbs Ferry, New York 10522

**Re: Rivertowns Square Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

Dear Mayor Connett and Members of the Board of Trustees,

Cleary Consulting has been retained by the Village of Ardsley to conduct a technical review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Rivertowns Square mixed-use redevelopment project, prepared by VHB Engineering, Surveying and Landscape Architecture, PC, White Plains, NY, which was accepted by the Lead Agency as complete on November 22, 2011.

The following comments are offered:

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
<b>2.0 – Description of the Proposed Action</b>			
1	2-4	2.3	The discussion of the project’s 22 affordable units fails to document a commitment to meeting the terms of the County affordable housing settlement. Rather the DEIS indicates that the determination as to whether the 22 units would qualify as part of the 750 units mandated in the settlement will be left to future evaluations by the Federal Housing Monitor. Clearly, given that Section 300-11.3 of the Village’s Zoning Ordinance <i>mandates</i> the provision of affordable housing units by this project (or the financial contribution to an affordable housing fund) whether the 22 units qualify to meet the Village’s share of the 750 units represents a potential impact that must be evaluated in the EIS, and not deferred to a future point in time. The Applicant can demonstrate a willingness to comply with the objective of the settlement by documenting a commitment to the affordable housing formulas set forth in the settlement itself, i.e., <i>“At least 20% shall be affordable to and occupied by households with incomes below 50% of Area Median Income (“AMI”), with the remainder of such rental units affordable to and</i>

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			<i>occupied by households with incomes at or below 65% of AMI.”</i>
2	2-4	2.3	The proposed on-site amenities should be more fully described. How large is the fitness center, clubhouse, swimming pool and “cyber café”? Will these facilities be restricted to residents only? Are guests allowed? Can the clubhouse or any other facilities be rented out for use by outside groups? How would access to these facilities by non-residents be enforced?
3	2-5	2.3	The first paragraph states that “ <i>parking would be internal to the building and would not be visible from public streets.</i> ” In fact, as noted on page 2-5, and as depicted on Exhibit 2.1, <u>exterior</u> at-grade parking is provided along the circular drive at the main building entrance.
4	2-5	2.3	<p>The first paragraph states that “<i>the architectural character of the residential building <b>considers</b> both the Village’s Residential Neighborhood and Downtown District Design Guidelines...</i>” (<i>emphasis added</i>).</p> <p>Since the DEIS makes reference to the guidelines, the explanation should more properly address the Project’s <b>compliance</b> (not simply consideration) of all of the guidelines. The statement that the building resembles a “grand hotel” or several larger structures merged together over time” seems far fetched, and appears to be exactly what the design guidelines were intended to prevent. Rather than making a passing reference to consideration of the guidelines, the Applicant should specifically document the projects compliance/non-compliance with the seven categories set forth in the Residential Neighborhood Design Guidelines; including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Roof guidelines</li> <li>▪ Facades</li> <li>▪ Street layout and orientation</li> <li>▪ Building massing and scale</li> <li>▪ Major additions to existing homes</li> <li>▪ Contextual design</li> <li>▪ Homes on hillside areas</li> </ul> <p>As well as the 6 categories set forth in the Downtown District Design Guidelines; including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Building design</li> <li>▪ Public improvements</li> <li>▪ Streets and circulation</li> <li>▪ Pedestrians and circulation</li> <li>▪ Open space and landscaping</li> <li>▪ Parking</li> </ul>
5	2-5	2.3	The narrative description of the commercial component

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			indicates that 8 commercial buildings will be located on the south side of the site. This is somewhat confusing because the Conceptual Site Plan (Exhibit 2.1) indicates 4 new buildings as well as the existing Chauncey Square Shopping Center building. The hotel building is a mixed-use building containing the hotel and retail uses; however, it is graphically depicted as a single building with a single footprint. This confusing presentation should be clarified.
6	2-6	2.3	The architectural goal expressed in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> full paragraph to create a design ideal of a typical Westchester downtown, with individually varied storefronts, does not appear to be supported by the renderings, and particularly Exhibit 2.15a “Close Up From Lawrence Street”, which clearly depicts uniform building facades which do not vary between storefronts.
7	2-7	2.3	The discussion of access improvements describes the significant improvements proposed for Lawrence Street. The DEIS notes that improvements are intended to enhance the “local street network” and will facilitate access to the Saw Mill River Parkway. In fact, the major widening, re-direction and associated improvements to Lawrence Street will have major impacts to the larger regional roadway network. Not only will the improvements provide a new connection to Route 9A to the east, which is one of this portion of Westchester County’s most important north/south minor arterial roadways, but would also provide access to the New York State Thruway (Interstate Route 87). It cannot be overlooked that all of the east/west routes in the area that traverse the limited access highway barriers such as the Saw Mill River Parkway, the Thruway, the Sprain Brook Parkway, etc., are all heavily travelled. The improvements to Lawrence Street will establish the only east/west connection from Ashford Avenue in the north to Jackson Avenue in the south. The potential of this proposal to significantly influence existing and future traffic patterns is apparent, and should be acknowledged and fully analyzed.
8	2-8	2.4	The last sentence on this page indicates that “traffic engineering estimates” were used to determine the traffic generation of the former AKZO Nobel Chemical Company. This methodology should be explained. It would be expected that actual empirical data would be available to more precisely document this trip generation. The “estimate” that only approximately 1/3 of the employees at the plant drove to work appears to underestimate actual rates.

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
9	2-10	2.5	Reference is made to the Village's Vision Plan (Adopted 9/29/10, prepared by Phillips Preiss Shapiro Associates) – which indicates that large scale intense development is recommended for the Chauncey Park neighborhood. The goals set forth in the Vision Plan reflect community consensus, but were not technically or quantifiably justified by the consultant preparing the document. Therefore, the scope, scale and intensity of the specific type of development that may occur in Chauncey Park was specifically <i>not</i> established. The Village of Dobbs Ferry subsequently adopted the Vision Plan as the Village's Comprehensive Plan requiring the preparation of a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS). While the GEIS indicated that the Village's existing utility infrastructure could accommodate the vision for Chauncey Park, it specifically indicated that a similar conclusion could not be drawn for traffic impacts, and that future traffic analyses would be required for individual development proposals. Therefore, no acceptable threshold of development exists for the area in the Vision Plan/Comprehensive Plan. The potential adverse impacts and technical merits of the Rivertowns Square project must be further evaluated (through this EIS review process), which may result in a conclusion that the proposal does indeed result in the creation of significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated and that the project, in its current form, must be modified.
10	2-10	2.5	<p>It is illustrative to note that on page 104 of the Dobbs Ferry Vision Plan, the document makes a point to call out the importance of coordinating traffic improvements with its neighbor – Irvington. Quoting from the vision plan:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>“Traffic does not end at the Village's border. Thus there are lessons to be learned from and good reason to coordinate with Dobbs Ferry's neighbors.”</i></p> <p>Ardsley is also one of Dobbs Ferry's neighbors, and this goal of coordination should also be applied to the east as well. Certainly when the potential traffic impacts are as significant as those associated with the Rivertowns Square project. A more active discussion with Ardsley is recommended – beyond the formal channels mandated by the SEQRA regulations and General Municipal Law 239m.</p>

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
<b>3.1 - Land Use &amp; Zoning</b>			
11	3.1-4	3.1	The 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet describing the GEIS Findings indicates only that traffic mitigation measures (“ <i>transportation related upgrades</i> ”) may be required to address project related impacts. In fact, project related adverse impacts might require any number of mitigation measures, including project reconfigurations, modifications or revisions, including reducing the scale or intensity of the project.
12	3.1-5	3.1	The 6 <sup>th</sup> bullet describing the GEIS Findings notes that project related tax revenue would be available to off set increased community service demands. It should be noted that some community services are inter-municipal, and would not benefit from increased tax revenues in Dobbs Ferry alone. Therefore, it is apparent that impacts to neighboring communities, such as the Village of Ardsley, should be addressed.
13	3.1-6	3.1	<p>The discussion of Westchester 2025 refers to 2 polices (#5 Locating Future Development and #8 Housing Demand) and ignores the remaining 14 policies, most of which have some relevance to Rivertowns Square. One policy is of particular relevance given the Village of Ardsley’s role in this process:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>“2. Home rule and Westchester County</b>  <i>The tradition of home rule is well-established in Westchester. Cities, towns and villages exercise direct control over land use. However, formal and informal arrangements between local governments on land use and infrastructure decisions have evolved and will need to expand. Water supply, sewage collection and treatment, transportation facilities, open space and energy supply require regional perspective. “Border wars” over the impacts of large development proposals must be avoided and approvals granted with broad consideration and mitigation of impacts. A new paradigm is needed, respectful of home rule yet able to require this broader perspective...”</i></p> <p>The potential adverse impacts of the Rivertowns Square project on the Village of Ardsley should be cooperatively addressed, and mitigated in a fashion that addresses the interests of both communities.</p>
14	3.1-8 & 9	3.1	The table appears to make incorrect references to policy 3.1 and 4.0.
15	3.1-12	3.1.1.2	As noted above, the statement that “ <i>the proposed uses</i>

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			<i>are consistent with the Vision Plan...</i> ” has not been adequately documented.
16	3.1-12	3.1.1.2	The statement that “ <i>The proposed development is, in the Applicant’s opinion, consistent with area land uses including existing similar developments within ½ mile...</i> ” is not supported by any evidence presented in the DEIS. Moreover, there are no “similar developments” within ½ mile of the site. The proposed development is, in fact, quite unique.
<b>3.2 – Soils, Topography &amp; Geology</b>			
17	3.2-8	3.2.3	Utilizing the Dobbs Ferry Village Code available from the Village’s website, the sections of the Zoning Ordinance cited in the DEIS with respect to steep slopes (§300-11.9.B) actually references a section addressing Apartment Districts, and not steep slopes. No reference to steep slopes was noted in the ordinance on the website. Given the fact that on-line reference to municipal ordinances has become commonplace, the inability to properly locate the above referenced ordinance makes accurately reviewing the DEIS impossible.
18	3.2-8	3.2.3	<p>Given the Site’s proximity to the Saw Mill River, impacts to steep slopes are a significant concern due to the potential for increased erosion and sedimentation. The Applicant discusses an array of measures to mitigate these potential impacts. While not quantified in the DEIS, a significant portion of the Site’s 2.39 acres (13% of the disturbance area) of excessively steep slopes will be impacted by the proposed development, particularly the area behind the northwest corner of the multi-family building as well as south of the Building C Supermarket, west of Building F. Mitigation through the implementation of an erosion and sediment control plan, temporary erosion control measures and on-site pollution prevention <b>may</b> serve to adequately mitigate potential impacts <b>if</b> maintained in good working order throughout the build-out of the project. Maintaining these mitigation measures in perfect working order, throughout the 18 month to 2-year construction period of this project, will be a challenge.</p> <p>Therefore, the Applicant should have first explored the much more successful mitigation measure of <b>avoiding</b> the areas of steep slopes in the first place.</p>
<b>3.3 – Vegetation, Wildlife &amp; Wetlands</b>			
19	3.3-12	3.3.4	The last paragraph in this section reads: “ <i>As long as the existing buffer area on the property is maintained in a natural condition, any environmental impacts to the</i>

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			<p><i>function of the stream corridor that enters the property are anticipated to be negligible.”</i></p> <p>While the 8.3 acre northern portion of the site currently contains 2 paved surface parking lots and an old laboratory building, the proposed development in this area will result in a net <i>increase</i> in impervious surfaces. As the Village does not define buffer areas – wouldn’t the expansion of impervious surfaces in this area – which is proximate to the stream corridor, and therefore realistically a buffer area, be <i>inconsistent</i> with the above statement? If appears that the project <b>is</b> disturbing existing natural areas, and as such potentially creating an adverse impact.</p>
20	3.3-13	3.3.5	<p>The DEIS notes that... <i>“The Village parcel is an important refuge for existing and more common species of wildlife.”</i> How do these species distinguish the Village property from the northern portion of the Site? As noted in the DEIS, these areas share similar ecological characteristics. Therefore, it would appear that the northern portion of the Site is also an important wildlife refuge. This is further reinforced by the 3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph on page 3.3-13, which reads <i>“The contribution from the Site to biodiversity is minimal, other than the value of the forested buffer along the section of the stream that enters the property along the northern side.”</i></p> <p>The encroachment of the proposed multi-family building into this area appears to represent a significant potential adverse impact. Project alternatives, including reducing the scale of the multi-family building, or redesigning its footprint, should be considered.</p>
21	3.3-15	3.3-5	<p>The Mitigation Measures section of the DEIS indicates that... <i>“A mitigation plan will be prepared for the minor encroachment within the buffer area.”</i></p> <p>If a potentially adverse impact has been identified, the DEIS <b>must</b> provide specific measures to appropriately mitigate that impact. Referencing that a mitigation plan <i>“will be prepared”</i> is inadequate and does not meet the requirements of the SEQR regulations.</p>
<b>3.5 - Utilities</b>			
22	3.5-1	3.5.1.2	<p>Table 3.5-1 provides estimates of the water demand for the project (59,568 gpd). An assessment of whether the UWNR water supply distribution network can support the project was <i>not</i> conducted. The DEIS states that</p>

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			<p><i>“UWNR will provide a hydraulic analysis of their water infrastructure once fire and domestic demands of the project are established...”</i></p> <p>The water demand was established in Table 3.5-1 (i.e. 59,568 gpd). This important assessment should be made at this time.</p>
<b>3.6 – Traffic &amp; Parking</b>			
23	3.6executive-2	--	<p>The statement in the first full paragraph that the majority of future supermarket customers are already shopping at existing supermarkets in the area, requires further clarification. Existing supermarkets exist to the west of the Site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stop &amp; Shop – 390 Broadway</li> <li>▪ Main Street Grocery – 90 Main Street</li> <li>▪ Willoughby’s Food Market – 107 Main Street</li> <li>▪ JJ Beans – 19 Cedar Street</li> </ul> <p>And east of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DeCicco’s Grocery Store – 21 Center Street</li> <li>▪ Foodland Market – Saw Mill River Road</li> <li>▪ ShopRite – 278 Tuckahoe Road</li> <li>▪ A&amp;P – Nepperhan Avenue</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore likely that locating a new supermarket in the middle of the existing supermarkets, will result in changes to trip generation patterns. Trips that might have formerly been directed along Ashford Avenue in the north, or Jackson Avenue in the south, may now be diverted along Saw Mill River Road through Ardsley, to Lawrence Street and then to the Site. These changed traffic patterns must be adequately accounted for and properly analyzed.</p>
23	--	--	<p>A Google search of “Food Emporium Dobbs Ferry” produces an address of “20 Livingstone Avenue” – which is the address of the Project Site. Is Food Emporium the tenant of the proposed supermarket in the Project?</p>
24	3.6executive-2	--	<p>The claim that <i>“a substantial portion of the future site driveway volumes are comprised of pass-by vehicles”</i> should be more fully documented and justified. Contrary to this statement, it would appear that the proposed project would have a comparatively low percentage of pass-by trips. It would be expected that virtually all of the hotel trips would be new to the traffic network, as would the majority of the 226 apartment generated trips. Likewise, depending upon the nature of the retail tenants, many of those trips would also be expected to be new trips. Furthermore, the proposed</p>

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			improvements to Lawrence Street will also facilitate access to the site, thereby encouraging new vehicle trips to the area. Finally, the Site's relatively isolated location undermines the concept of pass-by trips, as few vehicles travel down Ogden Avenue in the first place, unless traveling to the Site, or the Village's DPW facility.
25	3.6executive-3	--	The improvements to Lawrence Street that attempt to improve " <i>local traffic circulation</i> " will serve to facilitate large-scale regional traffic circulation, including east-west circulation between the Villages of Dobbs Ferry and Ardsley. Comments such as "The improvements <i>would substantially increase the capacity of the (Lawrence Street and Saw Mill River Parkway) intersection</i> " and the improvement to Lawrence Street will " <i>provide a more direct route for motorists...</i> " and " <i>provide substantial additional capacity</i> " must be more fully evaluated, particularly with regard to the potential impacts to east/west traffic.
26	3.6executive-4	---	The section addressing Roadway Improvements does not assign any responsibility for the various mitigation measures identified. These measures can only be accepted by the Lead Agency as realistic and appropriate mitigation measures when an agent is directly responsible for their implementation. Typically, when the subject action is responsible for the adverse impacts, it would be expected that the Applicant would incur the cost of implementing the required mitigation measures.
27	3.6executive-5	--	The DEIS relies upon the improvements of Phase 2 of the Route 9A/Ashford Avenue improvements of the Ridge Hill Inter-municipal Intersection Improvement Committee and the escrow account established for that effort. In fact, the Route 9A Phase 2 improvements have not been approved by the Committee, and funds may not be available, depending upon the actual costs of the Jackson Avenue improvements. Therefore impacts to the intersection attributable to the Rivertowns Square Project should be quantified and funded by the Applicant.
28	3.6executive-5	--	The Route 9A/Ashford Avenue improvement was designed to mitigate traffic growth through 2028, including Ridge Hill traffic. It did not include traffic generated by Rivertowns Square or the Stew Leonards extension.
29	3.6executive-5	--	The improvements to the 9A/Ashford Avenue intersection referenced in the DEIS (scheduled to commence in 2014 - 2015) are exclusively limited to

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			<p>the rehabilitation of the existing bridge structure. The existing roadway configuration is not being modified to accommodate future traffic conditions, in any meaningful way.</p> <p>The DEIS suggests that the Ridge Hill Intermunicipal Intersection Improvement Committee improvement funding will be used to mitigate adverse traffic impacts created by the Project at this intersection. This funding was not intended to be used to mitigate the traffic impacts of future development projects. The developer is attempting to co-opt this funding to mitigate adverse traffic impacts created by the Rivertowns Square project. SEQR requires that the Applicant be held financially responsible for mitigating the adverse impacts created by the proposed action. Furthermore, it is very unlikely that the Ridge Hill Committee will allocate money for this intersection since it does not have money available at this point. See also comment #55.</p>
30	3.6executive-5	--	The Applicant's reliance on Ridge Hill funds to mitigate project related traffic impacts represents an inappropriate mitigation measure. The Ridge Hill funds were intended to address traffic impacts that did not include or take into consideration the Rivertowns Square project. Tapping into these funds to mitigate the adverse impacts associated with the Rivertowns Square project represents a serious concern. The Applicant must be financially responsible for mitigating the adverse impacts created by the Rivertowns Square project.
31	3.6-1	3.6.1	The dates of when the manual and ATR traffic counts were conducted should be supplied to assure that the counts reflect appropriate traffic conditions (i.e. schools were in session, non-vacation periods, etc.)
32	3.6-2	3.6.1	The Scoping Document identified 11 intersections where qualitative intersection analyses would be suitable (rather than quantitative analyses) based on the anticipated traffic volumes through the intersections. This judgment was made <b><i>before</i></b> any traffic analysis was conducted, and as such was not based on any empirical evidence. Now that the traffic analysis has been conducted, the Applicant should revisit the 11 intersections to determine if a more thorough qualitative analysis is required.
33	3.6-18	3.6.2	Another area development that the traffic study should include is the Elm Street Sports Group indoor sports training facility, located on Elm Street in the Village of

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			Ardsey.
34	3.6-19	3.6.2	The "Future Traffic Conditions without the Project" section attributes traffic generation volumes to the vacant office and lab buildings located on the site, as if they were to be re-occupied. As noted throughout the DEIS, the Applicant claims that the re-occupancy of these buildings by a similar use is highly unlikely. Attributing traffic to these buildings inflates the future traffic conditions, and therefore diminishes the apparent impact of the project on future traffic conditions.
35	3.6-20-23	3.6.2	It is noted that numerous intersections throughout the study area currently, and in the future, will operate at failing Levels-of-Service (LOS F).
36	3.6-25	3.6.3	How was it determined that 2% of the future supermarket customers are expected to be customers already coming to the area to use the New York Sports Club?
37	3.6-25	3.6.3	One of the underpinnings of the traffic study presented in the DEIS relates to an assumption that customers traveling to the new supermarket in the Rivertowns Square project are already traveling on the area roadways. The basis for this assumption is presented in Appendix H, a competitive analysis prepared by G. Gregory Trusk & Associates. That analysis identifies 10 supermarkets in the study area. This list however, appears to be incomplete, and fails to include any of the markets located in the Village of Dobbs Ferry identified in comment #23 above (except the Stop and Shop). It does not appear that this study accurately identified the actual competitive market conditions.
38	3.6-26	3.6.3	Given the apparent omission of local supermarkets from the Trusik & Associates report, the anticipated arrival and departure distribution patterns of supermarket customers appears questionable. Furthermore, proposed roadway improvements noted in the DEIS will influence travel distribution patterns (for better or worse), as will evolving roadway network congestion conditions. As a result, the arrival and departure distribution patterns utilized in the traffic study must be further justified.
39	3.6-26	3.6.3	It is unclear how the Saw Mill Lofts residential development in Greenburgh, offers realistic comparative residential trip distribution patterns for this project.
40	3.6-26	3.6.3	How was census data used to justify that 20% of the residential trips would travel to the train station?
41	3.6-26	3.6.3	The last full paragraph on this pages notes that " <i>The projected distributions reflect travel times.</i> " Have the

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			travel times been adjusted to reflect roadway congestion, including the numerous failing intersections noted above?
42	3.6-26 - 27	3.6.3	As noted above, the portion of by-pass trips is questionable. In fact, using the language in the DEIS, "... <i>pass-by vehicles, which are vehicles that would be traveling past the Site regardless of whether or not the property were developed, such as traveling between work and home</i> " would in fact be very low, and not " <i>a substantial portion of future site driveway volumes</i> " as claimed by the applicant. Pass-by trips today are almost exclusively limited to trips to the Chauncey Square Shopping Center or the Village's DPW facility (both of which are destinations at or adjacent to the Site). Therefore, the traffic analysis may underestimate new vehicle trips to the study area.
43	3.6-27	3.6.3	A 2013 design year has been utilized. Is this a realistic design year? How would the phased development of the Site affect this?
44	3.6-27 – 33	3.6.3	In some instances, the narrative description of intersection operating conditions in the future with the project, does not fully disclose the anticipated conditions. For example, it is noted that intersection #9 (Jackson Avenue/Revensdale Road & Route 9A) will "... <i>continue to experience peak hour delays, the overall delays will be significantly reduced...</i> " This language suggests that mitigation has successfully addressed a condition that operated at LOS F during weekend peak hours, when in fact, the intersection would continue to operate at a failing LOS F. Flipping back and forth in the DEIS to determine the Levels of Service at the various intersection or referring to Table F-1 which is 15 pages later in the DEIS is inconvenient and confusing. Rather, the narrative should plainly present the impacts of the project, even if they are unfavorable.
45	3.6-33	3.6.4	The proposal to provide a total of 1,181 parking spaces or <i>582 spaces more</i> than what is required in the Village Code is a disturbing impact that will result in the creation of (or preservation of existing) impervious surfaces, that might otherwise be eliminated. The presence of impervious surfaces so close to the Saw Mill River represents a serious environmental impact that could obviously be avoided by keeping closer to the minimum requirement of the Village Code – instead of nearly <i>doubling</i> the required number of parking spaces.  What is more troubling is that the additional spaces are not required for a particular tenant, but rather "... <i>the</i>

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			<p><i>types of retailers that are likely tenants of the Project.”</i> These tenants may or may not locate to the Site.</p> <p>Such an approach appears extremely ill conceived, given the extraordinary stormwater management, drainage and flooding conditions that exist along the Saw Mill River corridor.</p>
46	3.6-33	3.6.4	What accommodation has been made if the negotiations between The New York Sports Club and Chauncey Square for a long-term parking lease fail? Are alternative parking spaces available?
47	3.6-34	3.6.5	It is unfortunate that the WCDOT is unwilling to adjust the Route 5 bus to provide service to the Site. Absent a convenient public transit infrastructure, reliance on individual passenger vehicles will be the only transportation alternative available to new residents and visitors to the site.
48	3.6-34	3.6.5	How far is the nearest Bee-Line bus stop to the Site. Is this location realistically accessible to the Site’s residents and visitors?
49	3.6-34	3.6.5	The applicant should consider offering services to facilitate transit options, such as a shuttle to the train station, etc.
50	3.6-34	3.6.6	Clarification is requested regarding the proposed bike lane on Danforth Avenue. Is this a dedicated bike lane demarcated with pavement markings, a separate lane apart from the roadway?
51	3.6-34	3.6.7	How would existing Ardsley residents that currently purchase permits to park at the Dobbs Ferry train station be accommodated if those permits are reassigned to residents of Rivertowns Square?
52	3.6-40	3.6.13	The proposed improvements to Lawrence Street represent a significant concern, as the proposed improvement will create a new, much improved east/west connection, and the only such connection between Ashford Avenue in the north and Jackson Avenue in the south. This connection has the potential to create new traffic patterns, which do not presently exist, and new traffic volumes that must be accommodated.
53	3.6-41	3.6-13	Monitoring is proposed to address the potential necessity to increase the queue length of the Saw Mill River Parkway northbound left turn lane at Lawrence Street. Given the fact that currently 5% of the time the vehicles exceed the turn lane storage capacity and extend into the travel lanes, and recognizing that the Project will only add to this condition, it is unclear why this needs to be monitored. It would appear that the

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			extension of the left turn lane is necessary and should be constructed with the rest of the Project.
54	3.6-42	3.6.13	Who will be responsible for the various mitigation measures (#1, 3 & 4) identified that do not indicate, <i>“The Applicant is willing to implement the improvements”?</i>
55	3.6-43	3.6-13	<p>While the DEIS notes that the Route 9A/Ashford Avenue intersection will experience future delays regardless of the Project, the Project will make those delays worse.</p> <p>The Applicant states that the necessary improvements <i>“...could be provided with Ridge Hill funds.”</i></p> <p>The design of the 9A improvements have not yet been approved by the Ridge Hill Intermunicipal Intersection Improvement Committee. Any improvements to the Route 9A/Ashford Avenue intersection are dependent upon the cost of the improvements to the Route 9A/Jackson Avenue intersection, and funding from the escrow fund for the Ashford Avenue intersection may be limited or non-existent.</p> <p>While the Applicant notes that <i>“No final determination can be made without discussions with and approval by the committee involved with allocating the funds”</i>, the Applicant can certainly commit to funding whatever gap in financing may exist, in order to mitigate the impacts created by the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant should also detail specifically what improvements are envisioned at this intersection to mitigate adverse impacts. Major improvements to this intersection would be very difficult given the physical limitations of the area.</p>
56	3.6-44	3.6.13	The DEIS notes that the WCDOT is unwilling to provide bus service to the property due to the less than desirable radius of the 9A/Lawrence Street intersection. Extensive improvements are proposed to this intersection that would improve the radius. Has this information been presented to the WCDOT, and if it has, would WCDOT reconsider providing bus service to the Site?
57	3.6-44	3.6.13	Section h. indicates that Dobbs Ferry may wish to restrict heavy delivery vehicles on local streets. The assumption is that all heavy truck traffic would then be directed along Lawrence Street to 9A and the Village of Ardsley. This may represent a significant impact to

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			Ardsley. Can Ardsley similarly restrict deliveries on its roadways to avoid adverse impacts due to truck deliveries?
58		Table F-1	It is noted that upon completion of the Project, 7 of the 32 intersections analyzed (22%) will operate at a failing Level of Service F during either the morning, evening or Saturday peak hour.
<b>3.8 – Visual/Aesthetic/Neighborhood Character</b>			
59	3.8-7	3.8.2	The last paragraph on this page makes the claim that the project is “... consistent with the Village’s Vision Plan recommendations.” As noted in comment #9 above, such a claim cannot yet be fully established until this SEQR EIS review process is completed.
60	3.8-8	3.8.2	It was noted that the Site exists within a 2-mile stretch of the Saw Mill River Parkway between Farragut Parkway and Ashford Avenue where the more typical wooded character of the Parkway gives way to open vistas of adjacent commercial and industrial buildings. The DEIS states that the Project “...would not significantly alter the visual character or experience of the Saw Mill River Parkway.” The Project does nothing to reestablish the traditional wooded “parkway” character that is prevalent in other portions of the corridor. Has the Applicant or Lead Agency given any consideration to enhancing the character of the corridor through the addition of new landscaping or plantings?
61	3.8-8	3.8.2	Have sound barriers been considered as a method to mitigate visual impacts created by the Project?
62	--	3.8.2	The DEIS does not adequately evaluate the visual impacts created by the Project, nor does it offer the type of mitigation measures typically utilized to address adverse visual impacts.
<b>3.9 – Socio-Economics</b>			
63	3.9-3 – 4	3.9.1	The statement made in the DEIS that; “ <i>These types of stores (the type proposed by the Project) outside of a traditional downtown do not function as convenience retail, but rather provide a specific/unique good or service that draw visitors/shoppers to the specific destination.</i> ”  This statement contradicts the claims made in Section 3.6 Traffic and Parking, that a high pass-by percentage should be applied to the project.
64	3.9-5	3.9.1	The field survey conducted for the DEIS identified that the vacancy rate in the Ardsley business district is 17% (compared to 14% in Dobbs Ferry). What impact will the new retail facilities in Rivertowns Square have on the retail occupancy rate in the Village of Ardsley –

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			particularly given improved east/west connections along Lawrence Street?
65	3.9-8	3.9.1	The DEIS notes that “ <i>High land costs and long-term investment returns have limited the number of hotel developments...</i> ” Should the developer of Rivertowns Square find that the economics of the hotel component of the project are no longer viable, how would the project be modified? Would it be conceivable that the hotel be converted to additional residential units?
66	3.9-12	3.9.2	The DEIS makes the point that the Project would not result in any new costs to the Village’s transportation fund to maintain the existing Village roadways in the project area. It was noted through visual observation of the Site that the existing roadways are actually in poor condition. The fact that no residents live in the area likely diminishes complaints about potholes, etc. With 453 new residents living in this area, it is likely that poor roadway conditions would not be tolerated. Therefore, discounting road maintenance costs does not appear justified.
67	3.9-13	3.9.2	The second paragraph indicates that the “ <i>...actual service cost increases for the Police Department would be anticipated to be minimal...</i> ” The only support for this conclusion is the statement that the Police Department already patrols the area. Upon completion of the Project, including new retail uses, a hotel and 453 new residents, it is inconceivable to conclude that the demand for police services at the site would not increase.  Moreover, it is common practice for a DEIS to include correspondence from the Police Department, which provides an assessment of anticipated police demands. No such correspondence was referenced.
68	3.9-13	3.9.2	The paragraph regarding Fire Department operations is addressed similarly to the Police Department discussion. The DEIS concludes that, “ <i>No significant increase in calls or operational expenses would be expected as a result of redevelopment.</i> ” Once again, it is far fetched to believe that adding 223 new dwelling units, a 107 key hotel and nearly 100,000 square feet of retail and restaurant space, would not result in the potential for increased fire calls. Once again, no documentation from the Fire Department is provided to support this claim.
69	--	3.9.2	The DEIS did not address emergency services (ambulance, medical facilities, hospitals, etc.), as required in the Scoping Document. This impact on

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			Ardsley's emergency services, which provide mutual aid to Dobbs Ferry, must be adequately addressed.
70	3.9-13	3.9.2	The high end residential market targeted by the Project will typically include a large portion of older empty nesters, and retirees. These individuals tend to place a higher demand on emergency and medical services. This fact has not been addressed in the DEIS, and requires careful evaluation and analysis.
71	3.9-15	3.9.2	The DEIS reaches the conclusion that the Project will not result in any increase in expenditures by the Village of Ardsley for the use of recreational facilities in Ardsley (typically available to residents within the Ardsley Union Free School District). No support is provided for this conclusion, and it would typically be expected that correspondence would be included in the DEIS documenting this claim.
72	3.9.15	3.9.2	<p>It is noted that some portion of the Site's resident, employee or visitor vehicular trips would utilize roadways within the Village of Ardsley, but the DEIS then concludes that there would be "...no significant increase in variable costs related to road maintenance." Once again this statement is unsupported by any documentation.</p> <p>Roadways in the Village of Ardsley, particularly along the Saw Mill River corridor are in need of constant maintenance, even more so now that flooding has apparently become more prevalent. The roadway improvements to Lawrence Street proposed by the Applicant will make that east/west connection much more attractive to the traveling public, and as previously noted in these comments, it is believed that the proposed uses at the site will generate <i>new</i> vehicle trips. Collectively, these factors point to a more realistic conclusion that the Project may in fact result in physical impacts to Ardsley's roadways, which will require increased maintenance, and therefore increased municipal expenditures.</p>
73	3.9-16	3.9.2	The narrative addressing the construction period indicates that the Project will have an 18-month to two-year construction period. It is noted that the traffic analysis utilized a 2013 full build-out date. It appears that there is a significant discrepancy embedded in the DEIS between these two dates. If in fact, full build-out is not expected until 2014, then the traffic study would have to be recalibrated and the traffic analysis re-done.
74	3.9-22	3.9.2	The first paragraph notes that the 55,000 square foot supermarket proposed within the Project would result

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			in a 16.8% reduction is sales to DeCicco's Market in Ardsley. Given the well know slim margins at grocery stores, how would such a reduction in sales affect DeCicco's? While the DEIS notes that DeCicco's sales would remain above the industry standard, costs for independent markets far exceed industry standards for the major chains. Furthermore, reduced sales may trigger reductions in rents which may induce a reduced tax rate, which would have an adverse economic impact.
75	3.9-22	3.9.2	Should DeCicco's be driven out of business by the Project, how would the vacant space be re-utilized, given the likelihood that no other small supermarket would be able to financially compete in this market area with the new 55,000 square foot supermarket at the Site fully operational? This is a potentially significant adverse impact to Ardsley's business district.
76	3.10-9	3.10.3.3	Correlating the Rutgers school children generation ratios with actual data from nearby developments provides a more justifiable multiplier result. However, the Applicant's conclusion that the school district will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the 31 children generated by the Project must be confirmed by the School District.
<b>3.13 - Construction</b>			
77	3.13-5	3.13.2	The discussion under the heading "Delivery of Materials" does not address the nature and associated impacts of material deliveries. What will the frequency of delivery of building materials be during the construction period? How many trucks, and what size, per day?  It is noted that Lawrence Street will be the main access route for truck deliveries. This route will likely result in impacts to Ardsley's roadways.
<b>4.0 - Alternatives</b>			
78	4.0.3	B	The Applicant concludes that the re-occupation of the campus is "...not a feasible or realistic alternative." This conclusion cannot be so simply dismissed, given the recent major investments in the Towns of Greenburgh and Mount Pleasant at the BMR Landmark site (the former Union Carbide headquarters) – where that former office and research campus has been the subject of recent major reinvestment and expansion, with additional approvals pending, to accommodate biomedical research operations. The market demand for these types of sites is demonstrable, within the

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			vicinity of this Site.
79	4.0.5	C	<p>The discussion of the Alternate Mix of Uses notes that the Project was already modified from the time the Scoping Document was adopted, to the submission of the DEIS, namely the supermarket was reduced in size from 70,000 square feet, to 55,000 square feet in size, and 3 additional residential units were added.</p> <p>While the reduction in the size of the supermarket represents an attempt to address the intent of this alternative, the reduction does not change the nature or relative impacts of the supermarket significantly. The 55,000 square foot supermarket would still be a very large, regionally dominant facility, the reduction of 15,000 square feet notwithstanding.</p> <p>The increase of 3 dwelling units, while likely insignificant given the large scale of the Project, does not address the intent of this Alternative – which was designed to <i>minimize</i> impacts, not increase them.</p>
80	4.0.5	C	Alternative C in the Scoping Document calls for exploring an alternative mix of uses, including <i>replacing</i> the supermarket, as well as alternative sizes of <i>all</i> buildings.
81	4.0.6	C	Given the fact that the DEIS has disclosed the potential for adverse impacts associated with the supermarket, replacing that use with a less impactful use, as called for in the Scoping Document, should be addressed.
82	4.0.6	C	The DEIS indicates that the only other realistic alternative to consider would be replacing the hotel with some other commercial use. In reality, the far more obvious alternative would be to replace the hotel (essentially a residential building) with a new multi-family residential use. Numerous examples exist of hotel – residential use conversions.
83	4.0.6	C	The most significant deficiency of the Alternatives section is the failure to explore a reduced scale project to mitigate impacts that would otherwise be created. The Scoping Document specifically calls for the evaluation of alternative sizes. A site development plan that considers fewer residential units, a smaller hotel, and/or less retail square footage, which would logically result in less disturbances to steep slopes, less impervious surfaces, reduced traffic impacts, and associated site development environmental impacts, should be presented.
84	4.0.9	D	The evaluation of the relocation of the existing Stop and Shop to the Site was evaluated in the Alternatives

#	PAGE	SECTION	COMMENT
			section. However, it does not evaluate the relocation of any of the other area supermarkets to the Site. What types of impacts would be created in those instances?

On behalf of the Village of Ardsley, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the DEIS, and we look forward to the opportunity of reviewing the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely,

*Patrick Cleary*

Patrick Cleary, AICP, CEP, PP, LEED AP  
 Cleary Consulting

cc: Mayor Porcino & Members of the Village of Ardsley Board of Trustees  
 George Calvi, Village Manager  
 Robert Ponzini, Village Attorney