

9.0 ALTERNATIVES

No Action Alternative

The proposed action, one of rezoning some 24 acres of land, will not in and of itself result in any direct change to existing conditions in the project area. Any change in use would only be accomplished through the site plan approval process. The current zoning, R1-20 Single-family Residence District, presently supports eight single-family homes on individual lots, which in the No Action scenario, could remain occupied for the foreseeable future. If this remains the case, no change would be expected to the developed areas of the site, to natural resources in the area, to traffic in the area, or to other human resources. However, as the land is underdeveloped, there would continue to be the prospect that one or more property owners could make application in the future to change a land use or zoning designation within the BMT.

As explained previously, the current zoning designation of the subject site differs from all of the surrounding zoning districts -- R3, C2, C3 and R1-40 -- the first three which exist on adjacent parcels within the BMT. The No Action scenario would continue this incongruity into the foreseeable future.

C-2 vs. C-2R Zoning Alternative

The project applicant previously considered a zone change for the southerly portion of the subject properties from R1-20 to C-2 Commercial Hamlet Center District, and a change from R1-20 to R-3 on the northerly portion of the site. Such plan would establish commercial uses as allowed in the C-2 district, in accordance with zoning:

[1] Stores or shops for the conduct of retail business, bank, post office, restaurant and other places serving food and beverages, professional and business offices, and personal service establishments, including the grooming of house pets, except that no use shall be permitted where any part of the service is conducted outside the premises unless a special use permit has been issued....

[§300-21.C(8)(a)[1], as permitted by §300-21.C(9)(a)[1].]

Based on discussions with the Town during early review of the Bear Mountain Triangle Rezoning, the applicant revised its petition from C-2 to C-2R Commercial Hamlet Center District, which would continue to permit small scale retail and office development but would also provide more flexibility by allowing residential rental apartments above the retail or office space as stipulated in the text of the Zoning Code shown below:

[1] The same main uses as specified for the C-2 District

[2] Residential apartments, provided that each apartment is limited to two bedrooms per unit and no more than 1,000 square feet per unit and is located above a first-floor use. [§300-21.C(10)(a)[1] & [2]]

While the applicant's original concept plan included an 80-unit residential component, it did not consider mixing that use in the same buildings as commercial uses. However, the New Urbanist design model often incorporates residential uses on floors above the first floor as was common in the traditional hamlets in New York and New England. These units are typically rental units and would provide a component of the project suitable for lower cost housing, which the Town has voiced a desire to provide.

In the C-2R plan, the number of residential units would be increased by 16 dwelling units compared to the C-2 plan. These 16 additional units are proposed as affordable rental apartments. In providing this additional housing choice, the increased number of residential units would result in a potential additional population of 32 persons, including 5 school aged children attributable to the C-2R district zoning, as compared to the prior proposal for a C-2 district. The additional housing would not be expected to substantially increase the coverage of buildings on the site. The increased population could result in modest increases in parking, off-site traffic, sewer and water usage, and demand for community services including the schools. Since taxes on the apartments would be paid by the landlord or property owner and would be based upon the income value of the rental properties, the taxes generated by the space used for residential apartments would be substantially the same as for the commercial use of the same space.

RSP-1 vs. R-3 Zoning Alternative

The project applicant considered a zone change for the northerly portion of the subject properties from R1-20 to RSP-1 Age-oriented Community District, and change from R1-20 to C-2R on the southerly portion of the site. Such plan would establish an age restriction (55 years of age or older) in the community as allowed in the RSP-1 district, in accordance with zoning:

[1] Age-oriented communities ... in accordance with ... §300-123 through 300-151.
[§300-21.C(4)(a)[1]]

- A. One-family dwellings.
 - B. Two-family dwellings.
 - C. Row houses and multifamily dwellings.
- [§300-124, as permitted by §300-21.C(4)(a)[1].]

Based on discussions with the Town during early review, the applicant revised its petition from RSP-1 to R-3 Multifamily Residential District, so as to not limit occupancy of the project by age but allow for any demographic to live in the hamlet, as allowed:

[2] Two-family dwellings.
[300-21.C(2)(a)[2], as permitted by §300-21.C(3)(a)[1].]
[2] Multifamily dwelling
[§300-21.C(3)(a)[2]]

In providing this additional housing choice, there would be no change in the number of residential units being considered for development in the hamlet. The proposed R-3 zoning would potentially result in a slightly greater population than the RSP-1 as it could attract young couples and families as opposed to a restricted adult population. Demographic multipliers for age-restricted housing indicate there are 1.8 persons per two bedroom unit. Age-restricted housing does not typically include three bedroom units and there are no published multipliers for this size of housing unit so a direct comparison to the current proposed plan is not available. The RSP-1 alternative could thus be expected to house 144 seniors. The most notable difference in the population would be the absence of school age

children. This alternative would not fill the need identified in the Comprehensive Plan for diversity of housing for the general population.

Two bedroom age-restricted units would have a lower assessed valuation than the larger A and C units in the R-3 zoning proposal. For the purpose of this analysis, it was assumed that all the senior units would have assessment values comparable to the B units of the proposed zoning. It was also assumed that this alternative would include the affordable apartments proposed as part of the C-2R hamlet development. The combined population would total 176 persons including 5 students that live in the C-2R apartments.

The cost of municipal services for this population is \$91,850 compared to an anticipated Town tax revenue of \$234,004, resulting in a net benefit of \$142,154 from this alternative, compared to a net benefit of \$105,811 for the proposed R-3 plan.

The cost to the School District would be limited to the students in the C-2R apartments and would total \$44,555 compared to an anticipated school tax revenue of \$928,595, resulting in a net benefit of \$884,040 from this alternative, compared to a net benefit of \$504,779 from the proposed R-3 plan.

The RSP-1 alternative would not result in any reduction of impervious surfaces on the site, and would result in only very modest decreases in off-site traffic generation, sewer and water usage, and demand for community services than the R-3 plan. More to the point it would not address the need for housing stock available to all age groups.

Single Family Housing Development Alternative

Population

It is unlikely the subject property will remain as single-family, over-sized lots or underdeveloped indefinitely. The subject site is currently zoned R1-20 for single family residential development on one-half acre lots. Infrastructure demands (roads and stormwater management) and environmental limitations (slopes and wetlands) typically limit development potential to about 65 percent of a site. The project site totals 23.61 acres. Based upon the constraints listed above the yield of this site is estimated to be 30 single family homes.

Demographic multipliers published by the Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR) were used to project the future population of Single Family development of the Bear Mountain Triangle Rezoning area. As shown in Table 9-1, a thirty unit subdivision of four bedroom single family homes can be expected to house 3.67 persons per unit including an average of 1.05 students per unit. The projected population would be 110 persons including 32 school age children.

| Table 9-1 Population Projections Single Family Residential Development | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Unit Type | Number of Units | Population Multiplier | Population | School Age Children Multiplier | School Age Population |
| 4 Bedroom Single Family House | 30 | 3.67 | 110 | 1.05 | 32 |
| TOTAL | 30 | | 110 | | 32 |

Source: Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, June 2006. Table prepared by TMA, 2015.

Based upon a projected market price of \$525,000 per house, the market value of this development would be \$15,750,000. Using the current 2015 equalization rate of 2.56 percent, the total future Assessed Value for this single family analysis is estimated to be \$403,200.

Current and Projected Revenues

Table 9-2 compares the revenues which could be generated by the property in a single family development to the revenues to be generated after the Bear Mountain Triangle proposed rezoning were to take place and be developed. Revenues are based on 2015 tax rates (2014-2015 tax rate for the Yorktown Central School District).

As presented in Table 9-2, annual revenues to the Town of Yorktown as a result of Single Family development of this site are projected to be approximately \$98,533. The tax revenues to Westchester County would be approximately \$56,819 annually, thus the total municipal revenue is estimated to be \$155,352. Once the sewer district is extended to include this area, the properties would pay additional taxes to the Sewer district, in addition to usage fees.

| Table 9-2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Projected Taxes Generated by the Bear Mountain Triangle | | | |
| Single Family Development compared to Proposed Rezoning R-3 and C-2R | | | |
| Taxing Authority | Single Family (SF) Development Projected Taxes (\$) | Bear Mountain Triangle Proposed Rezoning Projected Taxes (\$) | Net Increase Between SF & Rezoning Projected Taxes (\$) |
| Westchester County | \$56,819 | \$140,180 | \$83,362 |
| Town of Yorktown | \$62,333 | \$153,785 | \$91,452 |
| Mohegan Fire District | \$24,531 | \$60,522 | \$35,991 |
| Yorktown Consolidated Water District | \$4,780 | \$11,792 | \$7,013 |
| Emergency Medical Services | \$1,585 | \$3,911 | \$2,326 |
| Westchester County Refuse | \$5,304 | \$13,087 | \$7,782 |
| Town of Yorktown Refuse | \$12,170 | \$38,943 | \$26,773 |
| Total Town of Yorktown | \$98,533 | \$243,097 | \$144,564 |
| Total Municipal | \$155,352 | \$383,277 | \$227,926 |
| Yorktown Central School District | \$391,008 | \$964,679 | \$573,671 |
| TOTAL | \$546,360 | \$1,347,957 | \$801,597 |
| Notes: | | | |
| Municipal taxes are based upon Town of Yorktown 2015 Tax Rates. | | | |
| Yorktown Central School Tax Rates are for the 2014-2015 school year. | | | |

Annual revenues to the Yorktown Central School District would be approximately \$391,008. The difference between the school tax revenues generated by single family development and those that can be expected from the proposed rezoning annually is \$573,671

Table 9-2 also indicates the net increase in revenues over single family development as a result of the proposed rezoning which in total is projected to be more than \$800,000 annually.

As described in Section 3.0, the Town municipal expenditure for Town services is estimated to be \$522 per person. A single family development on this site would add approximately 110 persons to the population of the Town. Based on a per capita cost of \$522, the additional costs to the Town of Yorktown are projected to be up to approximately \$57,420. As presented in Table 9-2, the municipal tax revenues to the Town from a single family development on this site would amount to a total of \$98,533 thus, **after** covering the cost of municipal services, the project will result in a modest annual net benefit to the Town of \$41,113.

Yorktown Central School District

It is estimated that a single family development may add up to 32 students to the Yorktown Central School District. For purposes of this analysis, the instructional and transportation costs associated with the addition of 32 students to the Yorktown School District were examined. Costs were compared with anticipated tax revenue increases to the District, to determine the fiscal impact which would result.

As detailed in Section 3.0, the per student programming and transportation costs to be raised by property taxes is estimated at \$10,250. Thus, School District costs to be paid by tax revenue to educate the additional 32 students from a single family development at Bear Mountain Triangle is estimated to be \$328,000.

The proposed Bear Mountain Triangle Rezoning would generate a total of \$391,008 in annual property revenues to the Yorktown School District. Costs to the School District are

estimated to total \$328,000, thus after covering costs the Yorktown School District would realize a net benefit of \$63,008 annually.

Other Considerations

The single-family alternative would likely result in less impervious surfaces on the site than the proposed plan, and would result in lower traffic generation, sewer and water usage, and demand for community services than the proposed plan. Thirty single family dwellings would generate 35 P.M. peak hour trips.

Industrial Zoning Alternative

In past decades the Town considered directing commercial or light industrial land use to the Bear Mountain Triangle. The 1970 Town Development Plan identified the BMT site as a candidate for laboratory-office or general light industry, although the Plan recognized that identifying this land for non-residential development could have a detrimental effect on neighboring residences and it would be difficult to attract developers. In spite of the Plan recommendations, there was no interest in the 1970s for industrial development at the BMT. Again in the 1980s the Town gave serious consideration to rezoning of the BMT area to light industrial and highway interchange uses. However up until the present day, there was no sewer infrastructure that would be necessary to support increased development of this area, and significant road improvements would also be necessary.

In response to interest and consideration of a previous light industrial rezoning proposal for this property, the potential environmental effects of a light industrial zoning alternative has been evaluated. A conceptual design of an Industrial Alternative is shown in Figure 9-1. This alternative has been prepared consistent with the bulk regulations of the M-1A zone where the minimum lot size is 5 acres and the lot coverage is restricted to 30 percent. Parking as shown would accommodate 2 spaces for every three employees consistent with the M-1A zone requirements. Figure 9-1 illustrates the wholesale disturbance to the rolling hillsides of this site and shows the environmental implications of a large scale building on the site.

A fiscal analysis of the Industrial alternative indicates that Town Tax revenue would be \$188,926 compared to \$243,097 for the proposed Commercial/Residential rezoning. Tax revenues to the Yorktown Central School District would be \$749,714 compared to \$964,679 from the proposed Commercial /Residential rezoning.

Other Considerations

The alternative with 308,250 square feet of industrial space would likely result in greater impervious surfaces on the site than the proposed plan, in greater traffic generation, and lower demand for community services than the proposed plan. This plan would generate 299 P.M. peak hour trips. Potential sewer and water usage would be dependent on the type of uses present.

Comprehensive Plan Recommendations

Preparation of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan took more than a decade and involved hundreds of hours of public comment and municipal review. Many elements of the Plan were considered, revised, extensively vetted and modified. As part of these discussions, and as a result of many voices being heard, the 2010 Comprehensive Plan specifically identified the Bear Mountain Triangle as an area where mixed use, hamlet development would be desirable. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan affirmed the Town's priority for residential development in general. The subject area remained zoned as an R1-20 district pending infrastructure improvements to support hamlet development and pending development of a master design plan for such hamlet development. Specifically, Section 2.0 of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan identifies detailed recommendations for development of this area as a higher density, mixed use hamlet.

The hamlet concept has been solidified through the recent development of the Town's master plan layout for this area as shown in Figure 1-3. The required infrastructure in terms of road improvements and sewer infrastructure as a result of the pending Costco project set the stage for the recommended hamlet development thus eliminating any further consideration of an industrial use of this site.