The purpose of Section V is to compare the Proposed Action to reasonable alternatives that are consistent with the Applicant’s objectives and capabilities. In the discussion that follows, six alternatives are analyzed with regard to the same types of potential environmental impacts assessed in Subsections IV, VI, VII, VIII and IX of this DEIS for the Proposed Action.

Conceptual site plans for each alternative have been prepared. The site plans for each alternative are located at the end of this section and labeled as Figure Nos. V-2 through V-6. A site plan illustrating the proposed Project has been included for reference as Figure No. V-1

The alternatives are as follows (See Table No. V-1: Alternative Programs):

- **Alternative A**: “No Build” (No Action);
- **Alternative B**: Proposed Project with vacant Armory building and removal of the Annex building;
- **Alternative C**: Existing zoning alternatives:
  - C-1: Development of the City Yard parcel and Armory parcel as an assembled single project site;
  - C-2: Separate development of the Armory parcel and City Yard parcel;
- **Alternative D**: Proposed Project with Armory building and preservation of the Annex building (i.e., the current Good Profit proposal based on its site plan dated July 20, 2012 preserving the Armory Annex building which includes use of Mancuso Marina and Nelstad properties for public parking and Huntington Place for access to Armory parcel):
  - D-1: Development of the proposed Project and the Good Profit site plan with minor modifications to Armory Place design for improved on-site traffic circulation.; and
  - D-2: The D-1 Alternative without minor modifications to Armory Place design.

The proposed Project would utilize the City Yard DPW parcel for the mixed use residential and commercial building and the waterfront esplanade, and a portion of the Armory parcel for shared driveway access, the waterfront esplanade and public parking for the waterfront. Two of the alternatives described above include the redevelopment of the Armory site. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council selected “Good Profit,” the sponsor of a proposed local food marketplace with restaurants. In November, the Council approved a six-month, non-binding “letter of agreement” between the City and Good Profit, which has not yet been signed, pursuant to which Good Profit and the City will explore the redevelopment of the Armory buildings. Upon the expiration of the six-month time period, Good Profit is required to submit a detailed site plan, analysis of public costs and benefits and a detailed financing program to the City. The development program and site plan for the Armory has not been finalized at this time. Although the Good Profit development program and site plan for the Armory buildings and parcel are not yet finalized or approved by the City, the current proposal includes the City-owned Mancuso Marina parcel and the privately-owned Nelstad parcel for parking and access to the Armory. To illustrate how the Project can be coordinated with the potential future development of the Armory, Alternative D shows the proposed Project (without public parking on the Armory parcel) and the current Good Profit proposal, based on Good Profit’s July 20, 2012 site plan. In the Good Profit proposal, the public parking for the waterfront proposed by the Applicant on the Armory parcel would be relocated to
the Mancuso Marina and/or Nelstad parcels. It is noted that even though it is incorporated into those alternatives, the proposal would nevertheless require its own separate environmental analysis under the State Environmental Quality Review Act. A copy of the July 20, 2012 Good Profit site plan is located in Appendix 13 for reference.

The expected impacts of each alternative are discussed below and summarized and compared to those of the Proposed Action.

A. **NO BUILD (NO ACTION) ALTERNATIVE**

Under the “No-Build” alternative, the Project Site would remain in its existing condition, with single-story DPW office and storage buildings, garages, sand/salt storage, recycling storage and surface parking for employee and City vehicles. The Armory buildings would remain in their current condition. Armory Place would not be constructed and the Echo Bay waterfront would remain deteriorated and lack public access.

**Land Use, Zoning, and Planning Consistency**

Under this alternative, the DPW site would continue to be an underutilized waterfront property, blocking both physical and visual access to Echo Bay. Without the proposed Project, the Project Site would remain in its current condition, owned by the City of New Rochelle. It is probable the DPW site would continue to be used as the City Yard operated by the Department of Public Works. The Armory parcel would remain in its current condition until, and if, the City Council selects a developer for the redevelopment of the Armory buildings.

Additionally, without the proposed Project, the land use characteristics of the parcels would be unchanged. The current use of the City Yard parcel and the vacant Armory building are not consistent with the permitted principal uses or special permit uses in the Planned Waterfront Development District (PWD-5 and PWD-3). The current use of the DPW and Armory parcels is not consistent with the City’s long standing redevelopment vision for the Echo Bay area as outlined in the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan. The continued use of the DPW parcel as the City Yard does not advance the goals and objectives in the City’s Comprehensive Plan, City Harbor Management Plan or LWRP related to the Echo Bay area, as well as other general City-wide objectives. Additionally, without the proposed Project, no public land use amenities such as the proposed Echo Bay Walk esplanade, seating areas, public parking and boat access would be provided.

**Land, Water and Ecological Resources**

Without the Project, site conditions would remain essentially in their current conditions. If measures are not taken to secure the shoreline, it is probable that tidal erosion will persist. Many of the current coastal stabilization measures have undergone significant deterioration and are no longer effective. Current industrial uses on the City Yard may continue to degrade water quality, contributing to the decrease of coastal vegetation and existing wildlife. Additionally, the stormwater system on the City Yard parcel would remain in its current condition, with no improvements to the treatment of stormwater.
Utilities
Without the proposed Project, the City of New Rochelle Department of Public Works Yard would remain and both water supply connections and water use demands would be similar to the present day conditions.

Visual Resources
Under this alternative, the DPW and Armory sites would continue to block visual access to Echo Bay from the surrounding area. It is expected that most of the Main Street commercial corridor will remain in its current state and use for the foreseeable future. Streetscape improvements and the waterfront esplanade improvements would not occur under this alternative. One significant change, which is currently underway, is the infrastructure upgrades to the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a part of a 2008 Consent Order between Westchester County and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC), the New Rochelle Wastewater Treatment Plant is required to meet certain standards by 2014. The WWTP will increase in height with the infrastructure upgrades, with the Solids Handling Building designed to be approximately 48 feet tall above ground surface and the BNR Building designed to be approximately 81 feet above ground surface. These buildings, particularly the BNR Building, will be taller than the current WWTP buildings and will be visible from the surrounding areas, including the Project Site. However, a dense, mostly deciduous, mature vegetated buffer exists along the north, south, and western sides of the WWTP property which provides dense screening of the Treatment Plant buildings during the late Spring, Summer, and early Fall months.

Transportation
The “No Build” condition analyzes future traffic operating conditions without the development of the Project. Future conditions were projected for the Year 2016. The Existing Traffic Volumes were conservatively increased by a compounded 2% annual background growth rate for four years (total of 8.2% increase) as described below based upon discussions with representatives of the City of New Rochelle.

All intersections would generally operate at an overall acceptable Level of Service. Some delays will be experienced by vehicles turning left from eastbound Echo Avenue to northbound Main Street and thus, additional green time is recommended for this advanced phase.
Table No. V-2
Peak AM Hour Existing and No-Build Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS (Delay)</th>
<th>No-Build LOS (Delay)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
<td>D 36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>B 13.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B 11.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B 18.2</td>
<td>B 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>B 13.7</td>
<td>B 14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. V-3
Peak PM Hour Existing and No-Build Levels of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing LOS (Delay)</th>
<th>No-Build LOS (Delay)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Echo Avenue</td>
<td>C 28.0</td>
<td>C 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; Stephenson Boulevard</td>
<td>B 15.6</td>
<td>B 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street &amp; LeFevres Lane</td>
<td>B 12.0</td>
<td>B 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot Street &amp; Echo Avenue/River Street</td>
<td>B 17.5</td>
<td>B 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Street &amp; Radisson Plaza</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
<td>D 37.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noise**
Without the Project, the sources of noise would be substantially similar to the existing condition. Background levels would remain the same, but traffic noise could show a slight increase due to growth in traffic volume.

**Air Quality**
Without the Project, there would be no change in existing uses and therefore no change to air quality.
Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts
Without the addition of the proposed Project, the demographic characteristics of the City of New Rochelle are expected generally to change only slightly, with several exceptions. The population of the City looks to continue its trend of aging, with an increase in the number of persons age 65 and older. In addition, income levels are projected to continue rising. However, with projected background population growth of only 622 people by 2016, demographic conditions in the City will likely remain very similar to current conditions, albeit with a somewhat wealthier population.

For the immediate areas around the Project Site, however, demographic characteristics are likely to change during the next few years. By 2016, both Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 are projected to lose 9.4% of their respective populations, and over 10% of their resident family households. In addition, the over 12% projected decreases in residents age 0 to 19 in both Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 will help hasten the aging of the underlying local population. Despite these changes, Census Tract 59.02 and Block Group 1 will experience similar levels of growth in median household income and per capita income as the City as a whole. These increases will help generate additional disposable income dollars that can be spent at local businesses.

Without the Project, the Project Site would continue not to generate tax revenue for both the City of New Rochelle and Westchester County. Assuming no private development on the Project Site, no taxes would continue to be collected for the foreseeable future. With no new development on the site, it is assumed that any municipal costs associated with the Project Site will remain negligible.

Community Facilities and Services
Without the Project, the Fire Department indicated that future demand for fire and emergency services should be fairly stable, with current volume only experiencing slight increases. The Police Department did not provide specific information related to future conditions, but based upon telecommunications with the Department, it is expected that police services would also be stable with current volume.

Historic and Archaeological Resources
Without the Project, impacts to the existing Armory parcel and City Yard parcel would be limited to those associated with continued current uses of the City Yard parcel and Armory parcel.

Hazardous Materials
Without the Project, the City Yard and Armory parcels would likely remain in their current conditions. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessments of the City Yard and Armory parcels, there are a number of existing conditions, both within and adjacent to the Site, that present current and future potential risks for contamination. If no action is taken, these conditions will persist.

Construction Impacts
This alternative would not include any demolition or new construction. Therefore, there would be no potential for short-term impacts on noise, air quality or traffic related to construction activity.
B. PROPOSED PROJECT WITH ARMORY BUILDING AND REMOVAL OF THE ANNEX BUILDING

This Alternative assumes that the proposed Project will be developed. Figure No. V-3, shows how the Project can be enhanced with the removal of the Annex building.

In this Alternative, all aspects of the Applicant’s development program and site plan remain the same as the proposed Project, with the exception of the removal of the Annex portion of the Armory, the Armory Place boulevard design, and the provision of public parking along Armory Place. Because the development program and site plan are almost identical to the proposed Project, the analyses for each impact area are the same for this Alternative, with the exception of three impact areas: Visual Resources, Historic and Archaeological Resources, Transportation and Construction Impacts.

Visual Resources
This Alternative is substantially similar to the proposed Project in terms of retention of the majority of buildings on the Armory parcel. The primary difference in this Alternative is the removal of the Annex portion of the Armory. In this Alternative, the Armory Annex would be removed which would allow a wider boulevard driveway and a greater viewshed from Main Street across the site to Echo Bay and the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade. In this Alternative, the Annex would be removed and Armory Place would be enlarged from approximately 70 feet wide in the proposed Project to 120 feet wide in this Alternative. Figure Nos. V-3A, V-3B and V-3C illustrate the visual photo simulation of the viewshed from Main Street.

These figures illustrate the entrance into the project for Alternative B. In this alternative design, the separation between the proposed mixed-use building and the Armory would be widened to approximately 120 feet. This widened separation between buildings would allow for the entrance drive to include a landscaped median, additional plantings that flank both sides of the drive, and grading adjustments that would not require the use of retaining walls along the drive. Removal of the Annex would provide less obstruction of the views to the waterfront area.

Historic and Archaeological Resources
As described above, in order to accommodate a wider entrance drive and viewshed at Armory Place, this Alternative includes the removal of the Annex building and the shed located behind the Annex on the Armory parcel. Since the Armory annex is located in a distinct structure attached to the left side of the entrance tower, in significant disrepair and not listed on the National Register of Historic Places, removal of the annex block would not have significant adverse impacts on historic resources.

Transportation and Parking
This Alternative is substantially similar to the proposed Project in terms of traffic generation and level of service. The primary difference in this Alternative is the design of Armory Place. Under this Alternative, Armory Place would be located slightly south, allowing for a longer southbound left turn lane along Main Street and more vehicle storage in this lane. The design of the intersection of Main Street and Armory Place would be slightly modified, as illustrated on Figure No. V-3. Levels of Service for this Alternative are contained in Table No. V-1 and Appendix 8.
Construction Impacts
This Alternative is substantially similar to the proposed Project in terms of construction impacts. The primary difference in this Alternative is that the demolition of the Annex portion of the Armory building would occur at the same time as the demolition of the DPW buildings. Materials removed from the Annex would be removed at the same time and in the same manner as those removed from the DPW site. The demolition of the Annex building does not substantively change the construction schedule or construction phasing snapshots. Figure Nos. V-3C – 3L illustrate the snapshots of construction for Alternative B. Depending on the condition of the wall separating the Annex from the entry tower, a temporary wall may be installed immediately following demolition, with the final façade improvement completed in Phase 3.

With the Annex currently vacant, it is not expected the demolition of the Annex building at the same time as the DPW buildings would have substantively different short term construction-related impacts as the proposed Project. Since the Amory buildings are owned by the City and not listed on the National Register of Historic Places, there is no special approval process for removal of the deteriorated portions of the Amory that include the annex and metal storage shed.

C. EXISTING ZONING ALTERNATIVES

The Project Site consists of two parcels totaling approximately 9.4 acres. The City Yard parcel (6.5 acres) and the Armory parcel (2.9 acres) are both owned by the City, and are located in the Planned Waterfront Development–5 Story District (PWD-5 District). At the time of the adoption of the Scoping Document in May 2012, the future of the Armory parcel was uncertain. Therefore, the Scoping Document included the evaluation of the maximum build-out of the Project Site both as an assembled single parcel and as two individual parcels under current zoning regulations. However, since the adoption of the Scoping Document, the City has determined that the majority of the Armory parcel and the Armory building will be redeveloped separately from the Project and solicited re-development proposals for the Armory building. At its September 19, 2012 meeting, the City Council selected “Good Profit,” the sponsor of a proposed local food marketplace with restaurants. In November, the Council approved a six-month, non-binding “letter of agreement” between the City and Good Profit, which has not yet been signed, pursuant to which Good Profit and the City will explore the redevelopment of the Armory buildings. However, “Armory Place” and the waterfront esplanade on the Armory parcel (including public walkway and kayak dock) would still be developed as part of the proposed Project.

The Applicant has prepared an analysis of the redevelopment of the City Yard parcel under current PWD-5 District zoning regulations. However, evaluating the maximum development of the Armory parcel as an assemblage with the City Yard parcel is no longer a feasible alternative given the City’s decision to pursue separate redevelopment of the majority of the parcel.

C-1. DEVELOPMENT OF AN ASSEMBLED SINGLE PROJECT SITE

As noted above, the development of an assembled single project site is not feasible given the City’s decision to pursue separate redevelopment of a majority of the Armory parcel.
C-2. Development of Individual Parcels Included in the Proposed Project Site

Figure No. V-1 illustrates a site plan for the City Yard parcel that complies with all current PWD-5 District zoning regulations. The Armory parcel does not meet the minimum lot size requirement for a parcel in the PWD-5 District, so development of that parcel is likely already maximized with the existing Armory buildings. This Alternative assumes the existing Armory Drill Hall building, Annex and shed building to the east of the Annex would remain. Armory Place would not be constructed and the public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade would be eliminated. The Echo Bay waterfront esplanade and walk would end at the City Yard property line.

This Alternative provides for a mixed-use building located along East Main Street. The building includes 22,360 square feet of retail facing East Main Street, with three floors of residential apartments above the retail. The residential apartments include 81 dwelling units. Retail and residential amenity space is located above a partially below-ground parking structure with 212 parking spaces and a loading area. Access for both the retail and residential uses would be from the existing driveway across from Stephenson Boulevard.

Land Use, Zoning, and Planning Consistency

Table No. V-4, Zoning Compliant Alternative identifies the specific zoning compliance for this Alternative. This Alternative complies with all zoning requirements for the PWD-5 District, including dimensional requirements, standards for medium density residential uses and standards for planned waterfront development, as well as parking requirements. The maximum development of the site is restricted primarily by the required minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 3,500 square feet as outlined in Section 331-67.B of the City Zoning Ordinance, which yields 81 dwelling units.

This Alternative, while consistent with the regulations outlined in the City’s Zoning Code, is not consistent with the City’s long standing redevelopment vision for the Echo Bay area as outlined in the Main/Echo Urban Renewal Plan, and redevelopment goals and objectives in the City’s Comprehensive Plan, City Harbor Management Plan or LWRP related to the Echo Bay area. The URP and other City planning documents identified objectives such as increased density, opening of views and physical access to Echo Bay, and increased tax generation. This Alternative would provide reduced public land use amenities (Echo Bay esplanade, seating areas, public parking and boat access) as compared to the proposed Project.

Land, Water and Ecological Resources

This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of land disturbance and ecological resources. The demolition of the DPW buildings would occur in the same manner as the proposed Project and the new mixed-use building would be built in a smaller configuration. The area between the building and the esplanade would be grassed lawn with landscape. This Alternative would provide the same public land use amenities as the Project including the proposed Echo Bay esplanade, seating areas, public parking and boat access.
This Alternative would also include the same shoreline improvements and stormwater management improvements as the proposed Project.

**Utilities**
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the types of utilities required and water supply connections, but the water use demands and sanitary demands would be less than the proposed Project due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the Proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). The water use demands would be approximately 20,000 gallons per day (gpd) as compared to approximately 54,000 gpd in the Project, and the sanitary demands would be approximately 18,000 gpd as compared to approximately 49,000 gpd in the Project. Because the building would be smaller and located primarily along East Main Street, the sanitary sewer lines would not require as much relocation as the proposed Project. Required stormwater management improvements would also be less as the impervious area would be smaller than the proposed Project.

**Visual Resources**
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the views from the areas to the north, including Lispenard Avenue, Stephenson Boulevard, and Pratt Street intersections with East Main Street. The building along East Main Street for this Alternative would be four stories and 50 feet in height like the proposed Project. Views of the site from Five Islands Park, Sutton Manor and Echo Bay would be different in this Alternative from the proposed Project in that the building would not extend as far south towards the bay. Views from the building to the bay and the WWTP in this Alternative would be more distant than those from the proposed Project since the building would end approximately 130 feet from the edge of East Main Street.

**Transportation**
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the proposed access driveway locations at Stephenson Boulevard and Armory Place, but the traffic generation for the residential portion of this Alternative would be substantially less than the proposed Project due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). The retail traffic generation would be substantially similar to the proposed Project. The trip generation is illustrated in Table No. V-1. Because this Alternative would include the Armory Place site entrance drive to public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade, the recommendation of a new traffic signal at Armory Place would be included as part of this redevelopment alternative. Since no significant adverse traffic impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this alternative since the traffic generation would be less than the proposed Project.

**Noise**
With this Alternative, the anticipated traffic generation would be less than with the proposed Project since there would be 204 fewer residential units. The commercial square footage would be slightly less than the proposed Project. Therefore, noise levels would be expected to be somewhat lower. Since no significant adverse noise impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.
**Air Quality**
Like noise, the anticipated traffic generation would be less than with the proposed Project since there would be 204 fewer residential units. As a result, the potential generation of air pollutants from mobile source emissions would be reduced. Since no significant air quality impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.

**Socioeconomic and Fiscal Impacts**
This Alternative would add significantly less residential population and public school children than the Proposed Project. This Alternative would add fewer total residents and public school children to the City’s population due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). Additionally, this Alternative would have 8 affordable housing units as compared to the 29 affordable units in the proposed Project. Using the same percentages of studios, one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments planned for the proposed Project (25%, 48% and 27%, respectively), this Alternative would have 20 studio apartments, 39 one-bedroom apartments and 22 two-bedroom apartments. Using the same population and public school multipliers from Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research used to analyze the proposed Project, the total population for this Alternative would be 149 (as compared to 524 in the proposed Project) and total public school population would be 7 (as compared to 22 in the proposed Project).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Type</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Rent Level</th>
<th>Population Multiplier</th>
<th>Public School Student Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Public School Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,525</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$1,750</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2,350</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, "Residential Demographic Multipliers," June 2006; compiled by MMI.

This Alternative would have less impact on the City’s demographic profile, fewer public school children, fewer jobs created during construction, and would generate less tax revenue from the residential portion of the development, approximately $730,000 less than the Project with no PILOT and approximately $307,000 less than the Project with a PILOT\(^1\).

**Community Facilities and Services**
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the addition of residential dwelling units and retail space and would require the same types of community facilities and

---

\(^1\) Milone and MacBroom estimated the decreased tax revenue associated with 81 residential units as compared to the proposed 285 units by pro-rating the construction costs for the residential component of the project in proportion to the reduction in the number of residential units.
services (police, fire, emergency services, public school education and open space) as the proposed Project, but would require fewer services due to the reduced number of residential units (from 285 in the proposed Project to 81 in this Alternative). As noted above, the total residential population and public school children for this Alternative would be much less than the proposed Project at 149 and 7, respectively. Since no significant adverse impacts related to community facilities and services have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.

**Historic and Archaeological Resources**
This Alternative is similar to the proposed Project in terms of the proposed demolition of the City Yard buildings and construction of a new mixed-use commercial and residential building. Like the proposed Project, this Alternative also includes the retention of the Armory Annex building. Like the proposed Project, the metal shed would be removed for the creation of Armory Place and the public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade. Since no significant adverse historic and archaeological impacts have been identified with the proposed Project, none would be anticipated from this Alternative.

**Hazardous Materials**
According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessments of the City Yard and Armory parcels, there are a number of existing conditions, both within and adjacent to the parcels, that present current and future potential risks for contamination. Remediation would be required under this Alternative as it would be under the proposed Project.

**Construction Impacts**
This Alternative would likely generate short-term noise and air quality impacts typically associated with construction activity, and similar to those of the proposed Project. Since the scale of development would be less than the proposed Project, the extent of construction would be less as well.


The Applicant is aware that the City is currently considering proposals for redevelopment of the Armory building, including a proposal by “Good Profit”, that include retention of the Annex building. The Applicant has met with representatives of Good Profit to explore how the Project can be coordinated with the potential future development of the Armory. Alternative D shows the proposed Project (without public parking on the Armory parcel) and the current Good Profit proposal, based on Good Profit’s July 20, 2012 site plan. However, the Good Profit development program is not yet certain, and the site plan for that proposal has not yet been finalized. Good
Profit has indicated its desire to retain the Amory Annex building. Retention of the Annex building would not impact the Applicant’s proposed Project. This Alternative shows how the proposed Project can be developed with the current Good Profit site plan, dated July 20, 2012.

**Summary of The Good Profit Proposal for the City of New Rochelle Armory (July 20, 2012)**

At this time, according to its proposal, Good Profit proposes multi-use programming, centered on a local food marketplace. This indoor open market would include both vendors and restaurants that prepare, serve and sell locally raised and harvested food. The market would occupy the ground floor of the former drill hall. A mezzanine and terrace would contain a wine and oyster bar with both indoor and outdoor seating. In addition, the basement would serve as a storage facility, a depot for collection and distribution of produce and meat from farms throughout the region, and as a space devoted to food preparation.

Good Profit proposes to retain the Annex, which would have some military uses as well as house an active transportation-related use. The first floor would include space for veterans’ services, the second floor would house the American Legion, and the basement would house a program to salvage and repair broken bicycles in an effort to support the success of the multimodal transportation system.

An addition on the north side of the Armory building would be constructed to create an exhibition hall along the exterior street façade. The capacity would be approximately 100 seats. The site has been designed to have three points of entry. These access points would include a drop-off path along the front of the building, subterranean parking accessible via a curb-cut along the east side of the current access drive, and Huntington Drive to the west. The subterranean parking access would be achieved through a widening of the current access drive and would be preceded by angled parking spaces on both sides of the current access from Main Street, just beyond the point of entry. Huntington Drive would be converted from private to public access, and would provide access to the rear of the building. The City’s traffic consultant has indicated that Huntington Place would provide secondary access to the Armory site for all vehicles, including truck, service and emergency vehicles. Although the proposed site design includes 191 parking spaces, the City Zoning Ordinance requires 210 spaces and the proposal indicates this deficit would be mitigated through shared parking of uses whose peak demand operate at different hours.

The Good Profit proposal contemplates the use of the former Mancuso Marina parcel (Block 84, Lot 110) owned by the City of New Rochelle, and the former Nelstad Concrete Company parcel (Block 84, Lot 120) which is in private ownership. The Nelstad parcel is approximately 0.97 acres and the Mancuso Marina parcel is approximately 0.66 acres for a total of 1.63 acres. Based upon Good Profits’ proposal, the two parcels would be utilized primarily for parking, walkways and open space. Future development of both parcels would be subject to separate State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) review.
D-1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE GOOD PROFIT SITE PLAN WITH MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO ARMORY PLACE DESIGN FOR IMPROVED ON-SITE TRAFFIC CIRCULATION

This Alternative assumes that the Project and Good Profit proposal will both be developed. Figure No. V-5, shows how the Project can be developed and the Annex preserved and reused as part of the Good Profit development. However, the following two minor modifications would be required (shown in blue on Figure No. V-5 as modified edge of pavement):

1) Provide access to the parking structure within the Project building from Armory Place (just east of the Annex building); and
2) Remove angled parking along Armory Place due to the potential conflict of cars entering Armory Place from Main Street and the proposed drop off zone, the narrow drive aisle, and the potential for cars to queue while waiting for angled spaces to become available.
3) The City’s traffic consultant has also indicated that Huntington Place would provide secondary access to the Armory site for all vehicles.

In this Alternative, all aspects of the Applicant’s development program and site plan remain the same as the proposed Project, with the exception of the Armory Place access drive location, Armory Place boulevard design and the provision of public parking along Armory Place. Because the development program and site plan are almost identical to the proposed Project, the analyses for each impact area are the same for this Alternative, with the exception of two impact areas: Transportation and Parking and Utilities.

Transportation and Parking

This Alternative includes the cumulative traffic generation from the Good Profit proposal, using the limited information available from the July 20, 2012 site plan. Although the Good Profit proposal did not include a traffic generation analysis, it did include a preliminary development program. The potential Trip Generation for Good Profit is illustrated in Table No. V-1 and in Appendix 8. Therefore, this Alternative would have greater traffic impacts than just the proposed Project due to the Good Profit development program of a market hall, restaurants and various supporting uses. Because this Alternative would include the Armory Place entrance drive to the public parking for the Echo Bay waterfront esplanade, the new traffic signal at Armory Place is recommended as part of this redevelopment alternative, similar to the proposed Project. Traffic impacts have been identified with the Proposed Project and the addition of the Good Profit Armory redevelopment. The mitigation proposed with the two projects would be similar to for the Proposed Project except as described below. The Levels of Service with the two projects are contained in Table No. V-1 and Appendix 8.

As part of the Good Profit site plan, the public parking located at the end of Armory Place for the waterfront esplanade has been eliminated. The Good Profit site plan does include approximately 23 at-grade parking spaces, though it is unclear whether those spaces are for public waterfront access. Seven at-grade parking spaces are shown on the proposed Project’s site plan just north of the resident lobby drop-off area. Due to the realignment of Armory
Place for this Alternative and the removal of the median, angled parking along Armory Place does not appear to be optimal so the overall site plan for this Alternative has been adjusted to illustrate a more efficient circulation layout between the Armory and the proposed Project. All required retail and residential parking for the proposed Project is accommodated within the building structure. With the modified Armory Place parking and circulation layout, approximately 16 at-grade parking spaces are shown for waterfront esplanade public parking.

Utilities
The water and sanitary demand from the Good Profit proposal is based on the limited information available from the July 20, 2012 site plan. The potential water and sanitary demand for Good Profit is illustrated in Table No. V-1, and would be 59,768 gallons per day for sanitary and 65,745 gallons per day for water. The sanitary demand would be approximately 10,400 gallons per day more and the water demand would be approximately 11,500 gallons per day more than the Project. Therefore, this Alternative would have greater impacts to water and sanitary demand than just the proposed Project.

D-2. The D-1 Alternative without minor modifications to Armory Place Design
This Alternative incorporates the Good Profit site plan exactly as illustrated in the July 20, 2012 proposal to the City Council without the minor site plan modifications described above in Alternative D-1 with the site plan for the proposed Project. Figure No. V-6, illustrates that the Good Profit site plan works with the proposed Project. However, without any modification to Armory Place, the layout and circulation of at-grade parking and driveway circulation are not optimal.

The potential environmental impacts associated with this Alternative are identical to Alternative D-1 described above, with the exception that all the at-grade parking proposed for the Armory redevelopment is as illustrated on the Good Profit site plan. Impacts with this Alternative are primarily related to the close proximity of the Armory Place driveway to the northeast corner of the Annex building and the circulation and layout of Armory Place as proposed by the Good Profit site plan:

- Potential queuing of cars along East Main Street turning right into the site, in the proposed Armory drop-off area north of the building, and along the east façade of the Annex building while waiting for angled parking spaces.
- Potential conflicts of cars entering and exiting the Project parking structure from the Armory Place entrance with cars queuing for angled parking spaces along Armory Place.
- Potential circulation conflicts with cars attempting to park in the lot adjacent to the Good Profit aquaponics pavilion with inadequate turn-around at the end of Armory Place.
### TABLE NO. V1
ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM COMPARISON TABLE

**ECHO BAY CENTER - NEW ROCHELLE, NEW YORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternatives</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>D-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project + Modified Good Profit Armory Annex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternate Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project + Vacant Armory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision of Redevelopment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Action + Vacant Armory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision of Redevelopment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Action + Vacant Armory + Vacant Armory Annex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision of Redevelopment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Action + Vacant Armory + Vacant Armory Annex + Mancuso Marina Parcel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision of Redevelopment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Zoning Amendments</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance with Planning Documents</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Disruption: Proposed Project (Acres)</strong></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Waterfront Open Space (Acres)</strong></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6 + Good Profit</td>
<td>1.6 + Good Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater Management Measures</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewshed from Main Street at Armory Plaza</strong></td>
<td>70' wide</td>
<td>120' wide</td>
<td>70' wide</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70' wide</td>
<td>70' wide</td>
<td>70' wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Population (in Build Year 2016)</strong></td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public School Children</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM COMPARISON TABLE

## ECHO BAY CENTER - NEW ROCHELLE, NEW YORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C-1</th>
<th>Alternative C-2</th>
<th>Alternative D-1</th>
<th>Alternative D-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Design - Proposed Project + Vacant Armory + Remove Armory Annex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Compliant - Project Site as Single Parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Compliant - Project Site as Individual Parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project + Modified Good Profit Armory and Annex Site Plan + Nelstad Parcel + Mancuso Marina Parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Municipal Services
- Calculated Sanitary Demand (gpd)
  - Proposed Project: 49,344
  - Alternative: 4,870
  - Alternative: 49,344
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 18,564
  - Alternative: 59,768
  - Alternative: 59,768

- Calculated Water Demand (gpd)
  - Proposed Project: 54,278
  - Alternative: 5,357
  - Alternative: 54,278
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 20,099
  - Alternative: 65,745
  - Alternative: 65,745

### Traffic Generation (vph)
- Peak AM Hour Inbound
  - Proposed Project: 44
  - Alternative: 12
  - Alternative: 44
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 24
  - Alternative: 65
  - Alternative: 65

- Peak AM Hour Outbound
  - Proposed Project: 124
  - Alternative: 23
  - Alternative: 124
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 43
  - Alternative: 32
  - Alternative: 32

- Peak PM Hour Inbound
  - Proposed Project: 149
  - Alternative: 0
  - Alternative: 149
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 105
  - Alternative: 223
  - Alternative: 223

- Peak PM Hour Outbound
  - Proposed Project: 92
  - Alternative: 0
  - Alternative: 58
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 89
  - Alternative: 141
  - Alternative: 141

### Traffic Level of Service (Peak AM Hour)
- Main St. & Echo Ave.
  - Proposed Project: C (29.6)
  - Alternative: D (26.1)
  - Alternative: C (29.6)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: C (29.6)
  - Alternative: C (29.6)

- Main St. & Stephenson Blvd.
  - Proposed Project: B (11.2)
  - Alternative: B (11.4)
  - Alternative: B (11.2)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (11.2)
  - Alternative: B (11.2)

- Main St. & Liberty Ln.
  - Proposed Project: B (12.2)
  - Alternative: B (12.2)
  - Alternative: B (12.2)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (12.2)
  - Alternative: B (12.2)

- Huguenot St. & Echo Ave/River St.
  - Proposed Project: C (20.0)
  - Alternative: B (18.8)
  - Alternative: B (20.0)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: C (20.0)
  - Alternative: C (20.0)

- River St. & Radisson Plaza
  - Proposed Project: B (14.8)
  - Alternative: B (14.5)
  - Alternative: B (14.8)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (14.8)
  - Alternative: B (14.8)

- Main St. & Armory Place
  - Proposed Project: B (10.2)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: B (10.2)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (10.2)
  - Alternative: B (10.2)

### Traffic Level of Service (Peak PM Hour)
- Main St. & Echo Ave.
  - Proposed Project: C (29.6)
  - Alternative: C (31.8)
  - Alternative: C (29.6)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: C (30.36)
  - Alternative: C (30.36)

- Main St. & Stephenson Blvd.
  - Proposed Project: B (16.6)
  - Alternative: B (16.7)
  - Alternative: B (16.6)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (16.1)
  - Alternative: B (16.1)

- Main St. & Liberty Ln.
  - Proposed Project: B (12.2)
  - Alternative: B (12.4)
  - Alternative: B (12.2)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (12.5)
  - Alternative: B (12.5)

- Huguenot St. & Echo Ave/River St.
  - Proposed Project: B (18.8)
  - Alternative: B (18.3)
  - Alternative: B (18.8)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (19.3)
  - Alternative: B (19.3)

- River St. & Radisson Plaza
  - Proposed Project: A (9.8)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: A (9.8)
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: Less than P.P.
  - Alternative: B (11.7)
  - Alternative: B (11.7)

### Shared Parking Spaces - For Proposed Project Only
- Commercial ratio * for Proposed Project
  - Proposed Project: 4/1,000 SF
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 4/1,000 SF
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 4/1,000 SF
  - Alternative: 4/1,000 SF

- Residential ratio * for Proposed Project
  - Proposed Project: 1.5/shedding unit
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 1.5/shedding unit
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 1.5/shedding unit
  - Alternative: 1.5/shedding unit

- Public * - Waterfront access - On Armory Parcel
  - Proposed Project: 45 spaces
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 45 spaces
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 0
  - Alternative: +/- 32
  - Alternative: +/- 30

### Shared Parking Spaces - For Proposed Project Only
- Commercial ratio * for Proposed Project
  - Proposed Project: 4/1,000 SF
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 4/1,000 SF
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 4/1,000 SF
  - Alternative: 4/1,000 SF

- Residential ratio * for Proposed Project
  - Proposed Project: 1.5/shedding unit
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 1.5/shedding unit
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 1.5/shedding unit
  - Alternative: 1.5/shedding unit

- Public * - Waterfront access - On Armory Parcel
  - Proposed Project: 45 spaces
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 45 spaces
  - Alternative: N/A
  - Alternative: 0
  - Alternative: +/- 32
  - Alternative: +/- 30

### NOTES:
1. Actual Levels of Service for Alternatives C-2 were not calculated since the only difference is a reduction in residential units from 255 in Project to 81 in this Alternative. The actual Levels of Service for this Alternative would be less than shown in the Project size and trip generation for this Alternative would be less.
2. Traffic generation includes pass-by trips.
3. Includes traffic estimated using the limited information in the July 20, 2012 Good Profit proposal and site plan.
4. Public open space for the waterfront esplanade in Alternative D includes only acreage for the DPW parcel; open space acreage for the Good Profit proposal is unknown at this time.
5. Public parking estimated using the limited information in the July 20, 2012 Good Profit proposal and site plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>All Districts</th>
<th>PWD-5</th>
<th>Proposed Site Plan</th>
<th>Zoning Compliant Alternative Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail / Restaurant Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>22,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331-52 PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Uses allowed by Special Permit by City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maximum FAR for following residential uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75 (max 30 DU/acre)</td>
<td>1.13 (43.8 DU/acre); Amendments req’d</td>
<td>0.35 (12.5 DU/acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Multifamily dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331-67 PWD-5 Planned Waterfront Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Dimensional requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Max. building height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within 300 feet of East Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 stories / 50 feet</td>
<td>4 stories / 50 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond 300 feet of East Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 stories / 30 feet</td>
<td>4 stories / 50 feet</td>
<td>Amendment req’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Max permitted FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- water dependent uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.22; Amendment req’d</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Special Permit residential/non-residential uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.22; Amendment req’d</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.22; Amendment req’d</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Standards for medium density residential use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Min. lot area per DU</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
<td>3,506 sf</td>
<td>Amendment req’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Req’d off-street parking spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 spaces / DU</td>
<td>To comply, with Shared Use approval per §331-126A</td>
<td>To comply, with Shared Use approval per §331-126A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Standards for planned waterfront development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Min. lot size</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 acres</td>
<td>6.52 ac</td>
<td>6.52 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 331 Attachment 2 - Schedule of Dimensional Regulations, Mixed-Use Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PWD-5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-dependent special permit uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.22; Amendment req’d</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.22; Amendment req’d</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 stories/50’ w/300’ of East Main Street; elsewhere 3 stories/30’</td>
<td>4 stories/50’ w/300’ of East Main Street</td>
<td>Amendment req’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious surfaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%, Amendment req’d</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>มะ</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%, Amendment req’d</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>45%, Amendment req’d</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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