

A stormwater management plan is proposed for the site as shown on Map #80. The project will not increase peak flow levels above pre-development levels. Additional water quality features are proposed to meet NYSDEC requirements for GP-02-01. GP-02-01 will require preparation of full erosion control plans and limits construction activity to 5 acres at a time (unless waived by NYSDEC). This requirement will minimize the area disturbed at one time, but may increase the construction time depending on weather. Phasing of the project is shown on Map #95 which is sheet 2 of the Site Plans.

Based on the sewer connection procedure and GP-02-01, it is expected that construction will take approximately 3 years. At this time, the following sequence is expected:

1. Construct town road loop and storm drainage.
2. Begin southern loop and construct units 1-6, 15-20, 101-138 (50 units).
3. Complete southern loop and construct units 7-14, 21-60 (48 units).
4. Construct northern loop and construct units 61-100 (40 Units).

The project will conform to the requirements of the Town of Monroe Zoning and Subdivision Regulations and all outside agency requirements.

Alternative #3 Public Need for the Project

As stated in the DEIS, it is the applicant's belief that there is a public need for expanded housing type in the Town of Monroe. The proposed townhouses and age-restricted units will increase the diversity of housing types available. The three LI zoned lots are also proposed to increase employment opportunities and generate additional tax revenue. Alternative # 3 provides the opportunity to improve circulation in the area through road improvements on County Route 105 and the Larkin Drive Extension in accordance with regional plans.

Alternative #3 - Benefits of the Alternative #3 Plan

The benefits of the proposed project are:

- 1) Increased diversity in housing stock.
- 2) Creation of additional age restricted units which provide units targeted to an aging population.
- 3) Additional tax revenue will be generated above the cost of services expected to be used at the project.
- 4) The commercial properties will generate tax revenue and provide new employment opportunities.

- 5) Construction of the Larkin Drive Extension will reduce the number of future curb cuts on CR105 and promote better regional accessibility consistent with the goals of the Southeast Orange County Land Use Study.
- 6) The extension of a water main to this project may allow future users to connect. This future connection may increase additional commercial growth and address potable water supply issues of the existing residential homes in the vicinity of the site.
- 7) Elimination of the southern access drive will reduce on-site impervious surface; will eliminate the need for removal of trees and grading in this area and will reduce the need for retaining walls. In addition, trees within the former proposed disturbance area along and affecting Route 105 will be retained and will screen views of the project from Old Country Road.

Alternative #3 - Comparison with DEIS Plan

Alternative #3 proposes 138 units, an increase of 26 units from the DEIS Plan.

As shown on Map #65, Alternative #3 varies from the DEIS Plan. The location of the proposed project has been reconfigured due to the location of ACOE wetlands. This reconfiguration resulted in relocating the detention basins and a focusing of units at the center of the site. This movement results in reduced disturbance around the edges of the site but requires the removal of trees at the center of the site. This change modifies the view from Route 17 as shown on Map #87. From this view, Alternative #3 is more visible than in the DEIS. Additional planting has been added throughout the site to provide shade trees in this area.

The northern access road has been aligned with Durant Drive and the southern drive has been removed. The removal of the secondary access drive eliminates disturbance in this area as well as the removal of several retaining walls in this area which were a concern of the Planning Board. The detention basins shown in the DEIS have been combined to a single basin on the southern side of the site. Like the SEIS plan, the units have been oriented along the contours. In addition to Map #65, Table 1 shows a comparison of the plans.

To mitigate the increased area of disturbance and impervious surface, the storm drainage system has been redesigned to provide for greater storage capacity to cause no increase in peak runoff. In addition, the project grading has been redesigned to substantially reduce the proposed retaining walls. The retaining walls shown in Alternative #3 are limited to those within the complex. No retaining walls are associated with proposed road construction.

Alternative #3 - Comparison with SEIS Plan

As shown on Map #66, Alternative #3 increases the number of units from 112 to 138. The units have been reconfigured from 21 buildings to 28 buildings. The buildings have been reduced from mostly 6 unit buildings to mostly 4 unit buildings. This change will reduce the length of the buildings and provide for opportunities to reduce the perceived scale of the buildings within the site.

The site orientation is changed as well. By using the Larkin Drive Extension as the main 2-way access, most traffic will move north to Larkin Drive, thereby reducing the flow at Durant Drive. This is further reinforced by the elimination of the southern access drive.

The area of disturbance of Alternative #3 has increased slightly (from 25± acres to 26.2± acres) but this is mostly due to regrading requested by the Town to reduce the need for retaining walls. At Route 17, more roof lines will be visible as shown on Map #87. Additional planting at the center of the site will reduce this impact. In Alternative #3, the detention basin has been redesigned to meet the requirements of the project and NYSDEC. In addition to Map #66, Table 1 provides a comparison of the three plans.

Table 1

Comparison of DEIS / SEIS / Alt #3 Plans

	DEIS	SEIS	ALT #3*
# of Units	112	112	138
# of Age Restricted Units	32	36	42
Length of Town Road	2,075 LF	2,075 LF	1,015 LF
Curb Cuts from Route 105	2	2	1
Length of Retaining Walls	1,520 LF	1,910 LF	2,090 LF
Green Space Dedication to Town	0 ac	0 ac	20.71± ac
Area of Disturbance	22 ± ac	25± ac	26.3± ac
Impervious Surface	10.5± ac	10.5± ac	12.57± ac
Earthwork	100,000± cy excess	125,000± cy excess	125,000± cy excess
Undisturbed Green Space	39.58± ac	38± ac	34.57± ac
Water / Sewage Usage	47,800 gpd	47,800 gpd	58,200 gpd
Traffic Generated Peak	133	133	152
Main Entrance	Opposite Durant Dr.	Opposite Durant Dr.	Larkin Drive Extension
# of Buildings	21	21	28
# of 6 Unit Buildings	14	14	12
Wetland Buffer Disturbance	2.54± ac	2.05± ac **	2.02 ± ac

*Does not include Larkin Drive Extension

** Includes construction of drive to edge of Oliveri lands.

Alternative #3 - Geology

As noted in the DEIS, the project will require the design and implementation of grading and erosion control plans to ensure protection of slopes and soils during construction. These plans have been prepared and are included at a reduced scale as Maps #98-101 (grading and drainage) and Maps #106-109 (erosion control). The proposed project will be constructed in phases to minimize the area disturbed at any one time in accordance with NYSDEC requirements. All slopes greater than 3:1 will be covered in erosion control netting and seeded in accordance with the Planting Plans. Wherever possible, creation of steep slopes will be minimized. The project buildings have been redesigned to fit the existing contours reducing the need for long cut or fill slopes. All recommendations and mitigation measures identified in the DEIS would be applicable for Alternative #3.

Alternative #3 - Water Resources

As noted in the DEIS, Alternative #3 will require a source of potable water. As noted in the DEIS and SEIS, several alternates, as discussed on page ES-10, are being considered, these are:

1. Connection to Village of Harriman water main in Larkin Drive.
2. Connection to Village of Monroe water main at Spring & King Streets.
3. Creation of District in Town of Monroe. A Water District would be created to operate the water distribution system and develop a water supply for the project area.
4. Connection to the Mimar Transportation Corporation established to serve Harriman Business Park (HBP) and which uses wells in HBP to provide water to those uses in the district.

Alternative #3 will require approximately 58,200 gpd. This is based on:

$$\begin{array}{r} 138 \text{ units} \times 400 \text{ gpd} = 55,200 \text{ gpd} \\ 3,000 \text{ gpd for LI lots} = \underline{3,000 \text{ gpd}} \\ \hline 58,200 \text{ gpd} \end{array}$$

The stormwater system has been completely redesigned for Alternative #3. The majority of townhouse portion of the site is directed to a basin which discharges to the on-site stream. Pipes connecting the on-site wetlands are provided as well as a discharge pipe for the detention basin. This redesign significantly reduces the disturbance at the southern end of the site. The elimination of the road significantly reduces the grading in this area and a significant amount of trees will remain which will

minimize views of the project from the south. A complete updated Drainage Report for Alternative #3 is included in Volume 3.

Alternative #3 - Terrestrial and Aquatic Ecology

Alternative #3 continues the redesign begun in the SEIS Plan by reducing the large cuts and fill slopes shown on the DEIS Plan. This enables the applicant to preserve more of the existing vegetation up to the beginning of the graded areas. Alternative #3 increases the area of disturbance from 25± acres to 26.3± acres. This disturbance area is focused at the center of the site which will require the removal of the existing woods and replacement with shade trees and ornamental trees. Elimination of the southern access will significantly reduce the fragmentation of the vegetation along the stream corridor as compared to the SEIS plan.

The property includes an existing stream and wetlands which have been reviewed and reflagged by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) as shown on Map #69. The proposed Alternative #3 is shown relative to these wetlands on Maps #69A-73.

Alternative #3 requires the disturbance of 0.08± acres of wetland and 2.02± acres of buffer area. This number is slightly misleading when compared to the DEIS and SEIS. For these plans, the applicant was required to acknowledge the existence of wetlands on the lands of Oliveri to the north. These wetlands increased the buffer area on-site. In addition, the connection to the Larkin Drive extension required the disturbance of a small portion of wetland along the northern property line. Even with this additional wetland disturbance, the project does not exceed the threshold for an ACOE Nationwide Permit. A Wetland Permit from the Town of Monroe will be required for disturbance of the buffer and wetland.

Alternative #3 - Transportation

The increase in number of units will result in increased traffic at the site. However, the construction of the Larkin Drive Extension will streamline traffic in this area. A full updated traffic report for 138 units is provided in Volume 3.

Alternative #3 - Land Use and Zoning

The proposed plan is consistent with the Town of Monroe Zoning Regulations and past discussions held during SEQRA. The project meets all of the bulk requirements of the URM zone as shown in the chart on Map #93. During discussions after the Public Hearing, the Planning Board requested Unit Density Calculations.

Allowed Density - 5 units / acre	
Gross Lot Area (Lot 4 only - 40.16 acres)	1,749,370 SF
Areas with slopes greater than 20%	<u>409,371 SF</u>
	1,345,128 SF (30.76± acres)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Unit Density} &= 138 \text{ units} / 30.76\pm \text{ acres} \\ &= 4.5 \text{ units per acre} \end{aligned}$$

These unit density calculations indicate that Alternative #3 is within the allowed density.

Alternative #3 - Community Services

Using the figures presented in the DEIS, Alternative #3 would generate additional school children as well as generate additional school revenue as noted in the DEIS. The 112 unit plans would generate 76 school age children with 65 children attending public school. This plan generated revenue greater than the cost of educating the children generated by that plan. Alternative #3 will generate a similar fiscal net increase. With 138 units, this project would generate 94 children.

$$138 \times 0.676 \text{ (school age children per unit for 3 bedroom townhouse)}^1 = 94 \text{ school age children}$$

Since 15% of the district school age children attend private school, this actual number of children attending public school would be:

$$94 \times 0.15 = 14 \text{ private school attendees}$$

$$94 - 14 = 80 \text{ Project generated children who will attend public school}$$

These figures do not reduce the school children generation to reflect the 42 age restricted units. The actual number of school children generated will be approximately 2/3 of that indicated.

Based on the DEIS figures of \$8,208.65 (annual cost per child), the cost of educating 80 children would be \$656,692.00. Again, based on the assessed value used in the DEIS of \$75,000 (which is considered low in the SEIS - see Revised DEIS pages in this volume) this project would generate:

$$\begin{aligned} \$75 \text{ (assessed value)} \times \$95.55 \text{ (tax rate)} \times 138 \text{ units} &= \$988,942.50 \\ &\text{Annual Tax Revenue} \end{aligned}$$

This analysis, like the DEIS, indicates that the project will generate enough tax revenue to cover the cost of educating the school age children within the project.

¹ The DEIS used figures from Burchell's "The Fiscal Impact Handbook". Recent post occupancy figures for actual projects in Rockland County indicate a much lower generation rate. Like the DEIS, the larger number is used here.