

3.7 Historic and Archaeological Resources Comments and Responses

Comment 3.7-1 (Hearing, February 9, 2010 - Joseph Kozlowski, Friends of the Old Croton Aqueduct): We would like to see that maybe Teutonia Hall be redone with the Board's insight to make this a better project rather than just throwing up, you know, it looks like a box, a rectangular box with really nothing to it.

Response 3.7-1: *A building alternative that varies the massing and appearance of the proposed apartment building is presented in Section 1.0 of the FEIS. The Applicant is willing to pursue this alternative design at the City's request. This alternative design is intended to address a number of comments raised by the public and City officials. The applicant will preserve the Teutonia Hall facade and integrate it into the automated garage facade. However, the building is being demolished to remediate the site and remove underlying contaminated soils.*

Comment 3.7-2 (Letter 8, February 23, 2011, Kenneth Markunas, NYSOPRHP): The Phase IA document examined a larger APE than is identified in the DEIS. It is assumed this means that some parcels along the east side of Buena Vista Avenue which were originally considered for development have now been dropped from consideration. This is understandable, however, it should be specifically pointed out in the Historic Resource section to avoid confusion.

Response 3.7-2: *The Phase IA did examine a larger APE. At this time, the APE is limited to the parcels identified in the DEIS Project Description as follows:*

- Section 1, Block 512, Lots 1, 11, 13, 15, 17, 21, and 23
- Section 1, Block 511, Lots 24, 25, and 27

The parcels are shown in Figure 2-2 of the DEIS.

Comment 3.7-3 (Letter 8, February 23, 2011, Kenneth Markunas, NYSOPRHP): The Phase IA suggests that there is no potential for prehistoric deposits, however, OPRHP can not concur with that assessment for several reasons....Depending on when extensive filling occurred, it may have actually served to preserve rather than destroy prehistoric deposits. OPRHP recommends that any Phase IB investigations conducted take this into account and start from the assumption that prehistoric deposits may be present beneath the fill levels.

Response 3.7-3: *Cityscape: Cultural Resource Consultants, has recommended that a Phase IB be limited to the two residential properties to the south of the Brownfield site, on the west side of Buena Vista Avenue. A table documenting the rationale for this recommendation was transmitted to Douglas Mackey of the NYSOPRHP on April 22, 2011. The table is included as Appendix F of this FEIS. The response to the agency's review is also included which states: "After reviewing the additional information, OPRHP concurs with the recommendations of the Phase IA report regarding which lots are recommended for Phase IB testing." The Applicant will conduct a Phase IB study and submit its results to OPRHP and the Planning Board. The applicant will comply with requirements based upon the findings of the IB study.*

Comment 3.7-4 (Letter 8, February 23, 2011, Kenneth Markunas, NYSOPRHP): The DEIS states that "Cityscape, the Applicant's cultural resource consultant, has determined that no additional archaeological investigation is necessary for the properties on the east side of Buena

Vista Avenue since significant alterations are not proposed to these properties.” Later in this section additional comments are made regarding which lots on the west side of Buena Vista Avenue have been recommended for Phase IB survey. However, in our review of the report we can find no such statements. OPRHP suspects that there is a table missing from the version of the report submitted to us which may back up these claims. The report refers to a table which should identify the “potential of any lot to contain intact historic archaeological resources” (page 18), but no such table is within the version we received.

Response 3.7-4: Table A, included in Appendix F of the FEIS, lists the properties recommended for an additional Phase IB survey. The table was transmitted to NYSOPRHP for comment on April 22, 2011. The agency’s response is also included.

Comment 3.7-5 (Letter 8, February 23, 2011, Kenneth Markunas, NYSOPRHP): OPRHP concurs with the reports recommendation that Phase IB archaeological testing is needed on some parcels, however, as noted above, we recommend that the potential for prehistoric deposits located beneath fill be considered, and we can not concur on which specific parcels should be tested until the noted discrepancies have been addressed.

Response 3.7-5: See Response 3.7-3 and 3.7-4. As per the May 12, 2011 NYSOPRHP letter addressed to Lee Ellman, City of Yonkers Planning Director, the agency concurs with the DEIS recommendations: “After reviewing this additional information, OPRHP concurs with the recommendations of the Phase IA report regarding which lots are recommended for Phase IB testing. “ The letter is included in Appendix F of this FEIS.

Comment 3.7-6 (Letter 8, February 23, 2011, Kenneth Markunas, NYSOPRHP): Considering above grade historic resources, enclosed please find a list of adjacent and nearby resources that will likely be impacted in some form by the proposed project. The adjacent former Trolley Car Barn is National Register listed and a physical connection to the building is proposed under the current project plan. We will have to review the design and construction details of how the connection will be accomplished before we can offer our final comment and recommendations for the project.

Response 3.7-6: Comment noted. The architect has prepared a schematic plan of the proposed connection - see Figure 1-12 of the FEIS. An elevated walkway will be constructed to connect the two buildings together. The connection will be located on the southerly wall of the Trolley Barn building which will adjoin the new apartment building. As can be seen in Sheet A1.4 of the building floor plans (Appendix C of the DEIS), this connection will be hidden from view of Buena Vista Avenue since the new apartment building’s northeasterly corner will be only one (1) foot distant from the southeasterly corner of the Trolley Barn building. The connection is also recessed between the buildings 50 feet from the westerly adjoining corners of each building. Given this deep inset and the height of the new apartment building, it will not be visible from vantage points west.

Comment 3.7-7 (Letter 8, February 23, 2011, Kenneth Markunas, NYSOPRHP): Although Teutonia Hall is not listed in the National Register, it has been determined to be eligible for listing and the demolition or relocation of a listed or eligible property is considered the definition of an adverse impact/effect under state and federal law....if and when a state or federal review for the project is initiated, we will have to ensure that reasonable alternatives for

retaining/reusing Teutonia Hall in its current location have been considered before we can concur with the proposed project.

Response 3.7-7: *The DEIS, in Section 5.3, addressed an alternative of preserving Teutonia Hall in its current location. In addition to the reasons set forth in Section 5.3, preservation of Teutonia Hall is in conflict with the Applicant's objective and requirement to remediate the project site, which is a NYSDEC-designated brownfield site. Appendix J of the DEIS contains the Remedial Investigation Report for the subject property. The results of soil boring and soil gas samples indicate that the site has concentrations of tetrachloroethylene (PCE) and trichloroethylene (TCE) exceeding the semi-site specific target soil concentrations. To remediate the subsurface conditions, the Applicant will be demolishing the buildings on the brownfield-designated sites. Preserving the entirety of Teutonia Hall is not a feasible option for the applicant and does not meet the goals of NYSDEC for the clean-up of a brownfield site in a residential neighborhood.*

Comment 3.7-8 (Letter 8, February 23, 2011, Kenneth Markunas, NYSOPRHP): The other National Register eligible and listed properties on the attached form (including the Palisades Interstate Park a National Historic Landmark) in the vicinity of the project will have impacts/effects related to viewshed issues. Impacts of this nature are considered "indirect" but they can have a substantive negative result when historic landscapes are involved.

Response 3.7-8: *An existing view of the project site and its surrounds from the Palisades Interstate Park is presented in Figure 3.6-3, Photo a1, of the DEIS. A panoramic view is also presented in Figure 3.6-5, Photo c. The potential change in the viewshed with the proposed project, including other proposed projects that have been approved, is shown in Figure 3.6-22 of the DEIS. In the Applicant's opinion the proposed project will not have an adverse impact on views from the Palisades Interstate Parkway, as it is being introduced into a developed and urbanized landscape. Furthermore and in response to agency and public comments, the Applicant proposes an alternative facade treatment to address opinions regarding the compatibility of the new apartment building with its environs. The building alternative is presented in Section 1.0 of the FEIS. A letter seeking clarification regarding potential visual impacts has been sent to OPRHP (see Appendix F).*

Comment 3.7-9 (Letter 9, February 24, 2011, Patricia Dow, Majority Leader, Yonkers City Council): Historic Resources (Page 1 -18) - What steps or procedures will the developer utilize in removing the facade to avoid crumbling?

Response 3.7-9: *In 2009, the Applicant retained Thor Engineers to develop construction plans for purposes of installing temporary shoring to support the existing masonry facade in place. The Applicant will shore up the facade specifically to eliminate the potential for the facade to collapse prior to dismantling it.*

Comment 3.7-10 (Letter 11, February 25, 2011, Diedre Rylander, Member-at-large, YCSD): Cartographic research conducted indicates that the structures located on the southern portions of the project area date to the mid 19th century. However, there is no discussion of the potential historic significance of the former stable building and homes cited at:

Lot 13 43-47 Buena Vista Ave Abandoned Commercial
Lot 21 6l Buena Vista Ave Multi Family Residential

Lot 23 65 Buena Vista Ave Multi Family Residential

which appear to date from the 1850s to the latter part of the 19th century. This in and of itself would render them potentially historically significant, given the backgrounds indicated in Table 2. Yet there is no historical or architectural assessment of these structures that are slated for demolition. In particular, the former stable building at Lot 13, with attractive decorative ironwork, appears to have become an annex to the Teutonia Hall building at some point in time, and this connection needs to be explored.

Response 3.7-10: *As per the Phase IA study prepared by Cityscape contained in the DEIS, the aforementioned structures are not considered to have historic potential. Cityscape's findings have been transmitted to the New York State Historic Preservation Office for comment and the agency has concurred (refer to Appendix F of the FEIS).*

Comment 3.7-11 (Letter 11, February 25, 2011, Diedre Rylander, Member-at-large, YCSD):

Page 18 of the same section indicates: In conjunction with the information gathered from the historic sources, the Sanborn maps provided that basis for an archaeological assessment of each of the lots on each of the blocks within the Redevelopment project area. The approach taken was to identify each of the lots within the blocks. Based on the historic research and this assessment, a determination was made concerning the potential of any lot to contain intact historic archaeological resources. This information is presented in the report in tabular form. The report's findings indicate that the historic archaeological potential of the majority of the parcels within the Redevelopment project area is moderate on those lots that have rear yard areas. Please provide the report and table specified.

Response 3.7-11: *Table A is included as Appendix F of this FEIS.*

Comment 3.7-12 (Letter 11, February 25, 2011, Diedre Rylander, Member-at-large, YCSD):

Also, the following recommendation is made: Based on the material presented above, it is the recommendation that a Phase IB survey plan be developed that will specifically identify the areas requiring archaeological investigation. These would be the rear yards of lots that have been undisturbed, and have the potential to contain a privy or cistern feature. Please provide evidence that a Phase 1B survey has been or will be conducted prior to any demolition or site disturbance. This should be a condition of any approvals granted for the project.

Response 3.7-12: *Comment noted. The Applicant will conduct Phase IB testing at the two residential properties located on the west side of Buena Vista Avenue prior to demolition or site disturbance as the buildings are presently occupied with tenants and the activities would be disruptive to them. This requirements will be included in the Findings Statement, and can be made a condition of special use and/or site plan approval.*

Comment 3.7-13 (Letter 11, February 25, 2011, Diedre Rylander, Member-at-large, YCSD):

Trolley Barn: Since this is a National Register site, has the NY SHPO been consulted regarding the proposed alteration to the building to connect it with the proposed skyscraper? It appears that alteration to the exterior wall of the Trolley Barn would be necessary in order to connect it to the new building. In addition, the potential construction impact, as well as permanent visual impact, to the trolley barn of the proposed new skyscraper should be submitted for review to SHPO for comments and guidance in order to mitigate the potential negative impact on the Trolley Barn.

Response 3.7-13: *The State Historic Preservation Office has issued written comments - the comments are included in Appendix B and E of the FEIS.*

Comment 3.7-14 (Letter 12, February 25, 2011, Nell Twining, Member, Yonkers LPB):

Doubling the Allowable Density Creates a Tall and Bulky Building That Overpowers the Small Scale of Adjacent Trolley Barn, Teutonia Hall and other Historic Resources. The proposed tower would be massively out of scale with: The Trolley Barn, which is on the National Registry of Historic Places, and eligible to be a Yonkers Historic Landmark; Teutonia Hall which is considered to be locally Landmark eligible; the three small historic houses across Buena Vista Avenue, where the applicant proposes to undertake some exterior restoration.

Response 3.7-14: *The proposed project will result in the demolition of Teutonia Hall. The Applicant proposes rehabilitation of the three multifamily buildings on the east side of Buena Vista Avenue. Although the proposed project will be constructed at a different scale than the surrounding buildings, it will improve the overall community character for this portion of the Riverview urban renewal area. It is also consistent with the scale of buildings that dominate the viewshed as one travels down Nepperhan Avenue onto Prospect Street, including the buildings that are located near the streets' intersection with Riverdale Avenue. Lastly, it is consistent with the scale of buildings approved west of the project site along the waterfront.*

Comment 3.7-15 (Letter 13, February 14, 2011, Harjit S. Jassal, Member, Yonkers LPB):

If front facade of the Teutonia Hall gets landmarked than you have a structure that was felt worth preserving and has been designated as a landmarked facade. The Developer in their presentation has presented that the front of the Teutonia Hall is an important element of the building from the historical point of view therefore it should be Land Marked. The developer is also stating that he is planning to demolish the Land Marked front of Teutonia Hall after getting it landmarked and reconstruct a replica of that would look like the "Land Marked" Teutonia Hall facade with the materials salvaged of the "Land Marked Structure". In my opinion, the newly constructed replica of Teutonia Hall Front is not going to be worth anything because it will not have the antique value, feel and look.

Response 3.7-15: *The City Council will determine whether the facade should be landmarked in light of the Applicant's proposal to demolish the overall structure, upon recommendation of the Landmark Preservation Board (LPB). The applicant continues to work with the LPB particularly concerning the Façade of Teutonia Hall and anticipates that the City Council will include the obligation in the CDP. The applicant has submitted demolition permits with the Building Department to take down the building and reassemble the facade and has copied the LPB in order to comply with Executive Order regarding demolition of structures over 75 years old. Whether the building is landmarked or not, the PUR application proposes to integrate the facade into the garage structure. The antique value, feel and look of the facade will be preserved by reusing the bricks, cornices, frieze, and other elements of the facade. The mortar can be treated to "age" the appearance of the structure.*

Comment 3.7-16 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): The Phase IA report recommends that a Phase IB survey plan be developed. This Phase IB should be undertaken in the area and on lots recommended and its results reported as part of the FEIS.

Response 3.7-16: *The Applicant will prepare the Phase IB study prior to any site disturbance or demolition of structures. This requirement will be set forth in the Findings Statement.*

Comment 3.7-17 (Letter 15, January 24, 2011, Syrette Dym, AICP, VHB - City Planning Consultant): The status of consideration of the site by the Yonkers Landmarks Preservation Board should be reported in the FEIS and any anticipated action by the Board and its potential impacts on the proposed project development should be identified.

Response 3.7-17: *An application has not been submitted to the Landmarks Preservation Board. The Landmarks Preservation Board has received a copy of the DEIS for its consideration. The applicant has submitted demolition permits with the Building Department to take down the building and reassemble the facade and has copied the LPB in order to comply with Executive Order regarding demolition of structures over 75 years old. Comments have not been received from the LPB regarding the proposed project. It would be speculative to opine on any anticipated action of the LPB. The SEQRA process must be concluded before any agency may take action. This DEIS has examined the impacts associated with the demolition of Teutonia Hall and the LPB and City Council will consider the information in its determinations. The applicant has been working with the LPB to relocate the facade in a historically sensitive manner and anticipates that the City Council will include that as a condition in the CDP.*