

5.0 Alternatives

Comment 5.0-1 (Letter #4, Doris F. Ulman, Attorney at Law, July 6, 2009): Summary of Project Alternatives:

- a. No action alternative - we recognize that this is not a viable alternative;
- b. No zone change - single family alternative - the Village of Pomona urges you to accept this alternative. This alternative is in compliance with the Ramapo Comprehensive Plan. This alternative can be sustainable and need not be the typical suburban sprawl. The Town of Ramapo permits cluster development which can be limited to a small area of the site, leaving the balance of the property as open space while limiting the number of units to the number presently permitted pursuant to the R-40 zoning district. This alternative would reduce land disturbance by 40%, eliminate the need for access onto Route 202, reduce traffic by 50%, reduce water consumption by one third, and substantially reduce noise and air pollution and water runoff,
- c. Adult student housing is not an alternative - there is currently an injunction against this type of development;
- d. Reduced build-out alternative - there is no reason to consider this as an alternative. The environmental impacts of the proposed project will not be substantially reduced if only 25% of the project is eliminated. The DEIS does not address these impacts.

***Response 5.0-1:** The comment above is correct in it's statement that Alternative A (no action) would not be a viable alternative. Also, the applicant has no intention of proposing Adult Student Housing on the property either. However, the No Zone Change Alternative would eliminate the proposed market rate multifamily housing, workforce townhouses, and the apartments for the community service workers. These aspects of the plan will enhance the diversity of housing in the Town of Ramapo and will include below market rate housing and diverse area for people to live in the Town.*

Comment 5.0-2 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): In summarizing the project alternatives, it is stated on Page 1-38 that there would be no increase in the diversity of housing in the Town of Ramapo under the single-family home alternative allowed as-of-right in the R-40 zoning district. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan did not envision diverse housing options in this part of the Town. Multi-family zoning districts were created for several sites in the Monsey area in close proximity to Route 59.

***Response 5.0-2:** Comment noted. However, this plan not only offers diversity of housing but it also offers market rate multifamily housing, workforce housing and apartments to community service workers, which is different then the other multifamily areas in the Town. This proposed development will enhance the capability and probability for a person that works in the Town to live in the Town and be able to afford it. Where as if the single-family alternative is only allowed this opportunity would not be available for people who need a below market rate place to live in the Town.*

Comment 5.0-3 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): In the discussion of the No Action, No Zone Change and Adult Student Housing Alternatives, it is repeatedly emphasized that the need for a diversity of housing options in the Town of Ramapo would not be met. Multi-family housing districts were

established in the Monsey vicinity to meet the need for a diversity of housing options. Most of these sites have not yet been developed.

***Response 5.0-3:** It is inappropriate to relegate multifamily housing exclusively to areas of dense commercial development similar to the area proximate to NYS Route 59. The confluence of NYS Route 306 and US Route 202 provide excellent access to the site, without disturbing the interior of residential neighborhoods. The people who choose to live in dwelling units other than typical single family houses should not be excluded from the northern portion of the Town of Ramapo. Neither the Village of Pomona nor the Village of Wesley Hills have provisions for any type of housing diversity other than up-scale single family housing. In today's Smart Growth environment, it is advantageous to provide a diversity of housing alternatives in more areas than just adjacent to strip commercial development.*

Comment 5.0-4 (Letter #15, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): The alternatives section should include a thorough evaluation of a clustered subdivision scheme under the R-40 zoning designation. Clustering was recommended for this site in the Town's Comprehensive Plan as a means of preserving and protecting its natural features. This option is not addressed in the Alternative Section of this document. The only references to clustering are when a comparison between the benefits of a clustered subdivision and this mixed-density development are discussed. There are no similarities in these two forms of residential development.

***Response 5.0-4:** The alternatives described in the Patrick Farm DEIS were requested during the scoping process and stipulated in the final scoping document. The final scoping document did not stipulate discussion of a clustered subdivision analysis for the DEIS for this project, therefore one was not completed.*

Comment 5.0-5 (Letter #16, Salvatore Corallo, Commissioner, County of Rockland Department of Planning, July 24, 2009): A clustered development alternative was not presented in the DEIS for Patrick Farm. An R-40 cluster development would result in far less site disturbance and larger areas of undisturbed open space thereby preserving more of the site's environmental features in a natural setting.

***Response 5.0-5:** See response 5.0-4 above.*

Comment 5.0-6 (Letter #19, John F. Lange, Senior Associate for Planning, Frederick P. Clark Associates, Inc.): The DEIS should provide the rationale for selecting the chosen alternative. The applicant should insure that the selected option has the least environmental impacts, or at least that the impacts have been mitigated to a sufficient degree.

***Response 5.0-6:** This particular plan was developed because it will provide housing diversity with regard to value, style and form of ownership, within the Town of Ramapo. This diversity would include workforce condominium flat units and the 24 apartments that would set aside for community service workers. If other plans were proposed the need for diversity would not be met.*

Through this SEQR process and as shown in the DEIS for the Patrick Farm proposed project any impacts associated with the proposed plan have been reviewed and mitigated.