

**CHAPPAQUA HAMLET FORM BASED CODE  
DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENT**

**1/14/20  
Revised 2/25/20**

***Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement Revised Based  
on Comments through February 21, 2020***

Name of Proposed Action: Chappaqua Hamlet Rezoning

Location: Chappaqua Hamlet  
Town of New Castle, Westchester County, NY

SEQRA Classification: Type 1

Lead Agency: Town of New Castle Town Board  
200 South Greeley Avenue  
Chappaqua, NY 10514

Contact: Sabrina Charney Hull, AICP, Director of Planning  
(914) 238-4723

Date Submitted: January 14, 2020  
Date of Public Scoping Session: January 28, 2020  
Comments Due: February 21, 2020  
Date Adopted: \_\_\_\_\_

DRAFT SCOPING DOCUMENT  
**Chappaqua Hamlet Rezoning**  
**DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

INTRODUCTION

A Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) will be prepared in accordance with the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617.9, to assess the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed Chappaqua Hamlet Form-Based Code legislation. The study area is located in the southwest corner of the Town of New Castle, Westchester County, New York. The area to be rezoned spans approximately 72 acres along Greeley Ave and King Street including the areas currently zoned in this Hamlet B-R (Retail Business), B-RP (Retail Business and Parking), B-D (Designed Business), and I-P (Planned Industrial Zoning).

PROJECT SCOPING

This Scoping Document contains the items described in 6 N.Y.C.R.R. Part 617.8(F) (1) through (6), and identifies the existing conditions, the potentially significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Action, and the potential mitigation measures for any adverse impacts that will be addressed in the DGEIS.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The New Castle Town Board, (the “Applicant”) proposes an amendment to the New Castle Zoning Code to rezone the Chappaqua Hamlet business districts with the creation of a “Form-Based District” which is described as an implementation task of “A Framework for the Future of New Castle”, 2017 (the “Comprehensive Plan”). Prior to adopting the 2017 Comprehensive Plan, an extensive public engagement process was carried out in the Town of New Castle. Public opinions regarding the future of the Chappaqua Hamlet and the Town of New Castle were used in drafting of the Town’s Comprehensive Plan. The rezoning of the Chappaqua Hamlet has taken the goals of the Public Engagement report and the Comprehensive Plan into account when developing the substance of the draft Form-Based Code.

The objective of the Form-Based District is to rezone the study area such that the Hamlet’s existing character is preserved while mixed-use development is promoted to ~~meet the changing needs~~ increase the socioeconomic vitality of the community. The Chappaqua Hamlet’s business districts in the study area will be replaced by an entirely new zoning district that will primarily regulate the form of development with greater flexibility in regard to the use of properties. The

change from a conventional zoning code to a form-based zoning code in the Chappaqua Hamlet business districts is essential to stimulate the for socioeconomic vitality of the community for guiding new growth and future economic development in a manner that is consistent with community planning goals.

### REQUIRED APPROVALS

The only approval required for the changes to the Town Code will be the adoption of the proposed Form-Based District by the New Castle Town Board.

### DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FORMAT

The Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) will discuss relevant and material facts information and evaluate the reasonable alternatives to the Proposed Action identified in this Scoping Document. It will be clearly and concisely written in plain language that can be easily read and understood by the public. Highly Technical technical material will be summarized and, if it must be included in its entirety, will be referenced in the DGEIS and included as an appendix. All relevant correspondence from the Lead Agency and interested agencies will be included in an appendix to the DGEIS.

The DGEIS will be written in the third person without use of the terms I, we, and our. As appropriate, narrative discussions will be accompanied by illustrative tables and graphics. Graphics will clearly identify the study area. Each potential impact category will be the subject of a separate section describing existing conditions, anticipated impacts, and proposed mitigation.

The full DGEIS will be made available to the Lead Agency in both hard copy and electronic formats. The electronic format will be in Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) file. When the DGEIS is accepted for public review by the Lead Agency, sufficient hard copies will be provided to allow placement of a copy at the Chappaqua library and New Castle Town Hall for public review during normal business hours. In addition, the full DGEIS will be posted on the internet for public review, as required by law.

### CONTENTS OF THE DGEIS

**Cover Sheet** listing title of project, location, identification as a DGEIS, Lead Agency (with a contact name and a phone number), preparer, and relevant dates (i.e., date of submission, and spaces for dates of DGEIS acceptance, public hearing, final date for comments). A list of preparers will include the firm name, contact name, address, and phone number for all consultants who contributed to the document.

**Table of Contents** including list of primary DGEIS sections and subsections, tables, exhibits, drawings, appendices, with page numbers listed for each.

## **I Executive Summary**

The Executive Summary will include a brief summary description of the Proposed Action and a listing of all potential significant adverse environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures. A summary will provide a list of the approvals and permits required, and of the alternatives to the Proposed Action that are evaluated in the DGEIS. The Executive Summary will only include information that is found elsewhere in the main body of the DGEIS.

## **II Description of Proposed Action**

### **A. Site Location and Characterization**

1. Description of Chappaqua Hamlet location in the context of Town of New Castle
2. Narrative and map describing study area, with existing zoning identified
3. Primary vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns (state, county and local roads)
4. Open Space, Natural Areas and Historic Features in the Hamlet
5. Discussion of land ownership-Public vs. Private
6. Discussion of lot sizes within the study area

### **B. Proposed Action**

1. Proposed Form-Based Zoning
  - a. Applicability- specifically "50% of assessed value"
  - a-b. Regulating Plan and Regulations
    - c. Development standards
      - i. Massing
      - ii. Describe first floor height commercial and residential
    - b-d. Architecture standards
    - e. Definitions
    - f. Proposed development review and approval process
      - i. Comparison of existing process and proposed process
        - a. Public Involvement
2. Build Out Scenario
  - a. Description of assumptions resulting in the Buildout Scenario
    - i. Include exploration of alternative assumptions; eliminate all alternatives which overwhelm existing infrastructure (e.g. traffic, parking, roadway capacity, schools) before proceeding.

ii. Alternative regarding socioeconomic vitality if a public attraction is introduced into the community (Destination)

iii. Discussion of adjustment in lot size/combining lots

a-b. Residential – Buildout Scenario

c. Commercial/Retail – Buildout Scenario

i. 100% (maximum) commercial development

ii. Realistic Expectation

d. Residential/Commercial/Retail-Buildout Scenario without Town-Owned land

b-e. Vehicular, pedestrian circulation, ~~and~~ parking in Buildout Scenario

3. Open space, natural areas and historic features relative to the Buildout Scenario

4. Utilities in the Hamlet

a. Sanitary Sewer

b. Water Supply

c. Stormwater Management

d. Electric/Natural Gas Services

e. Telecommunication Services

**C. Project Purpose, Needs, and Benefits**

1. Project Purpose and Objectives

a. Community goals as identified through the Comprehensive Plan Process

b. Encourage and enhance vitality of the hamlet with a mix of uses to enhance the viability of the Hamlet, improved economic development, sustained environmental benefits, enhanced walkability, and protection of historic and desired architectural character

2. Need for the Proposed Action/Project History

a. Project History - Comprehensive Plan Update

b. Form-Based Code working group

c. Summary of Market Scan Report

3. Costs/Benefits to the Town and the general public from implementation of the Proposed Action (Ensure consideration of impacts to DPW, Fire Protection, and the like are included).

**D. Involved/Interested Agencies and Required Approvals**

1. Provide the Lead Agency’s contact information and describe approval process

2. Provide a listing of all Interested Agencies/parties who will receive the DGEIS for comment

**III Existing Environmental Conditions, Anticipated Impacts and Mitigation**

**A. Land Use**

1. Existing Conditions

a. Describe existing land uses within the study area, including recent streetscape and infrastructure improvements as well as development projects under construction.

i. Include proportion of residential and commercial uses within the study area.

ii. Include identification of pervious, impervious and green space areas within the study area.

b. Describe the surrounding area (within the “Capture Zone” or 200XX? Feet depending on adjacent neighborhood, and those properties 200 feet, immediately adjacent to boundary)

b-c. Relevant Planning Studies

i. “A Framework for the Future of New Castle” 2017

ii. New Castle Recreation Plan

iii. Other applicable plans (e.g., past traffic studies)

2. Anticipated Impacts

a. Potential impacts (pros and cons) of the Proposed Action in relation to existing land uses and immediately-surrounding land uses

i. Include anticipated proportion of residential and commercial uses within the study area.

ii. Include anticipated change in pervious, impervious and green space areas.

b. Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and other relevant documents

c. Consistency and /or compatibility of the proposed Town Zoning Code and Map with other Town Plans

d. Anticipated costs

3. Mitigation Measures

**B. Zoning**

1. Existing Conditions

a. Describe existing zoning and permitted uses in the study area

b. Surrounding area (within the “Capture Zone” or XX? Feet depending on adjacent neighborhood and those properties immediately adjacent to boundary immediately adjacent within 200 feet)

2. Potential Impacts of Rezoning and Build-out

a. Describe zoning districts that will be replaced

- b. Describe differences between existing zoning ordinance and Form-Based Code
  - c. Describe current review procedures for development in the Hamlet
  - d. Integration into the Town Code (Subdivision Chapter 113; Affordable Housing, Section 60-220; natural resources such as steep slopes, wetlands, wetland buffers, tree removal and stormwater management)
3. Mitigation
- a. Identify mitigation measures to address adverse zoning impacts ~~Procedures to expedite implementation of Proposed Code~~

**C. Visual Resources and Community Character**

- 1. Existing Conditions
  - a. Describe the character of the study area and immediately surrounding neighborhoods
  - b. Document existing views in the study area from public roadways (by use of photographs and diagrams)
    - i. South Greeley Avenue
    - ii. North Greeley Avenue
    - iii. King Street
    - iv. Saw Mill Parkway
    - v. Bedford Road
    - vi. View from 149 King Street westward towards South Greeley and the Rite Aid parking lot
    - vii. Train station including memorial park
    - viii. Quaker Street Bridge
    - ix. Railroad Platform (Coming in and out of town)
    - x. Looking from the top of the hills looking into the Hamlet.
    - xi. View from west side of South Greeley Ave. looking towards Bell Middle School as you enter the hamlet from the bridge.
  - c. Describe existing structural height ceiling in the study area
    - i. Lower King Street
    - ii. ~~Chappaqua~~ Chappaqua Station (Conifer)  
~~Quaker Street Bridge~~
    - iii. 91 Bedford Road
    - iv. King Street
    - v. Top of Quaker Street Bridge

vi. west side of South Greeley Ave. (Citibank Plaza) looking towards Bell Middle School

d. Describe existing rooftop design, visibility and concealment of HVAC and other technical equipment

e. Identify ridgelines

## 2. Anticipated Impacts

a. Views to the study area relative to the Buildout Scenario from surrounding roadways and parks, including building heights, build to line, appearance of streetscape and pedestrian zone. Illustrate with sketches, photo-simulations, or cross sections, as appropriate.

i. Include impacts to ridgelines

ii. Impact of roof-scapes (eg., solar panels, green roofs)

iii. Roof structural elements such as elevator and stair penthouses

b. Describe proposed public open space and landscape elements as part of Form-Based Code

i. Recreational Space requirements

c. Describe architectural character requirements of Form-Based Code

d. Describe proposed structural height in the study area

i. Lower King Street

ii. South Greeley Avenue

iii. Allen Place

iv. Washington Avenue

v. View from bridge looking at Citibank Plaza (west side of S. Greeley) towards Bell Middle School.

e. Describe impacts to rooftop designs in regard to HVAC and other technical equipment (e.g., visual interruption, concealment)

## 3. Mitigation

a. Proposed regulating plan, architectural character, styles and materials

b. Proposed landscaping and buffering

c. Proposed building form and height, public spaces, enhanced pedestrian circulation

## D. Natural Resources

### 1. Geology and Soils

a. Existing Conditions

i. Describe existing soils (using existing available sources), including hydric soils and urban fill





- ii. Describe regulated activities and permits that would be required for those activities, if any (compliance with Chapter 137, “Wetlands” and Chapter 135 “Watercourses” of the Town Code)

c. Mitigation

i. Avoidance

ii. Minimization

iii. Mitigation

**E. Infrastructure and Utilities**

1. Stormwater

a. Existing conditions

- i. Describe existing drainage patterns
- ii. Provide current mapping of 100-year and 500-year flood in study area
- iii. Describe study area constraints relative to drainage
- iv. Map existing infrastructure (particularly up King Street)

b. Anticipated impacts in relation to Buildout in general terms:

- i. Stormwater quantity
- ii. Stormwater quality
- iii. Floodplains (compliance with Chapter 70, “Flood Damage Prevention” of the Town Code)

c. Mitigation

- i. Describe threshold issues related to drainage limitations in the study area, if any

2. Water Supply

a. Existing Conditions

- i. Identify and describe the existing water supply and distribution system in the study area using data from recent Town infrastructure upgrades

b. Anticipated impacts

- i. Impact on existing water supply in relation to Buildout based on recent infrastructure upgrades

c. Mitigation

- i. Describe threshold issues related to water supply limitations in the study area, if any

3. Sanitary Sewer/Wastewater

a. Existing Conditions

- i. Identify and describe existing sanitary sewage system in the study area and in the immediate area based on recent infrastructure upgrade reports

b. Anticipated Impacts

- i. Impacts to sanitary sewage system in relation to the Buildout scenario based on infrastructure upgrade reports

ii. Wastewater generation for commercial and residential uses based on Buildout scenario

- iii. Discussion of impacts on Yonkers Wastewater Treatment Plant (Millwood)
  - a. identification of mitigations (including sewer lateral inspections) to offset project increase in sewer flows (reduction of I & I at 3:1 for market rate housing and 1:1 for AFFH housing).

c. Mitigation

- i. Describe threshold issues related to sanitary wastewater disposal limitations in the study area, if any

4. Energy Use/Natural Gas/Fossil Fuels

a. Existing Conditions

- i. Identify and describe the existing energy systems available in the study area.
- ii. Energy Savings related to New Castle Green Building Code

b. Anticipated Impacts

- i. Impacts to existing energy system (will natural gas connections be available)
- ii. Impacts of fossil fuel use (exhaust) i.e. air pollution
- iii. 5G/ Telecommunications needs for increased density
- iv. Energy Savings related to implementation of Stretch Energy Code or other “green building” technologies (investigate cost/benefit)

c. Mitigation (note consideration of the use of passive house technologies/increase green building standards to off-set energy impacts)

- i. Avoidance
- ii. Minimization
- iii. Mitigation

**F. Transportation, Pedestrian Circulation and Parking**

1. Existing Conditions

- a. Describe road system in study area and surroundings
- b. Describe alternative transportation systems- bus/train/bicycle circulation, service and ridership
- c. Describe existing parking requirements/parking ratios
- d. Describe existing ITE Trip Generation
- ~~a-e.~~ Describe existing speed limits in the study area
- ~~b-f.~~ Document Existing and Planned (91 Bedford and Conifer development) Traffic Volumes for the Weekday Peak PM Hour (based on a review of NYSDOT Automatic Traffic recorder data) at the following intersections:
  - i. Washington Avenue and Old Pinesbridge Road
  - ii. Washington Avenue and South Greeley Avenue
  - iii. Woodburn Avenue and South Greeley Avenue
  - iv. Quaker Street/Route 120 and Greeley Avenue

- v. Quaker Road/Hunts Place/Douglas Road/Mill River Road
- vi. King Street and Greeley Avenue
- vii. King Street/Route 120 and Senter Street
- viii. King Street/Route 120 and Maple Avenue
- ix. King Street and Bedford Road
- ~~x. South Bedford Road/King St~~ King Street/Route 120 and Highland Avenue
- xi. King Street/Route 120 and Castle Road
- xii. King Street/Route 120 and Orchard Lane
- xiii. King Street/Route 120 and Prospect
- xiv. South Bedford Road/King St

- ~~e.g.~~ Capacity Analysis (Level of Service) for each of the above intersections (SYNCHRO Analysis)
- h. Describe existing character of streets in the Hamlet and pedestrian circulation patterns, including recent streetscape improvements (traffic light)
  - i. Include existing safety concerns such as blind curve on King Street/Route 120 between Maple Avenue and Orchard Lane
- ~~d.i.~~ Evaluate ticket(speeding) and accident data for the study area over the past three years with data from Town of New Castle police and other available sources
- ~~e.i.~~ Provide inventory of ~~overall~~ current parking areas in the study area, including:
  - i. on-street public parking
  - ii. off-street parking (public and private)
  - iii. existing parking districts
  - iv. existing commuter parking and permits
  - v. describe parking restrictions, public/private parking
- k. Conduct a parking survey of all parking in the study area on a Monday or a Tuesday between 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. (additional effort required as a result of inclusion of partial parking waiver for existing properties in the Form-Based Code). \*Note: Why are these times being used? Should use M-F and Saturday Peak times for parking.
  - i. Include investigation of parking data collected by the Town Clerk and the Parking permit reports.
- l. Summarize existing Parking District
  - i. Boundary
  - ii. Agreements
  - iii. Maintenance
  - ~~vi.~~ iv. Parking space allocation

## 2. Anticipated Impacts

- a. "No Build" Traffic Volumes/Capacity Analysis - to include background traffic growth and other proposed projects in the area, if any (to be provided by the Town)

- b. Potential Trip Generation – Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, or other sources, estimate the net increase in weekday PM peak-hour traffic volumes resulting from a reasonable maximum Build Out under the new Code)
  - c. Analyze the “Build” peak-hour traffic volumes using Synchro 10 to evaluate future traffic volumes with the contemplated Form-Based Code.
  - d. Identify the changes in delay and changes in levels of service (LOS) (or other relevant metrics) projected to occur that could be considered a significant impact
  - e. Describe other potential impacts to character of surrounding streets
  - f. Evaluate intersection sight distances at the access drives in accordance with NYSDOT standards
  - g. Calculate the additional on-street parking that would occur from the Build Out scenario under the new Code and compare to the available spaces documented by the survey of existing conditions (additional effort required as a result of inclusion of partial parking waiver for existing properties in the Form-Based Code).
  - h. Describe application of parking agreements and allocated spaces contained within.
  - i. Discussion of revised parking ratios, assumptions of changes.
  - j. Discuss construction and impacts on traffic circulation especially during commuting hours.
  - k. Discuss parking demand of full buildout.
  - l. Discuss the impact on alternative transportation systems (MetroNorth, BeeLine)
3. Mitigation
- a. Propose mitigation measures at study area intersections as needed to accommodate projected traffic increases. This may include traffic controls at site entrances if warranted.
  - b. Describe parking initiatives and solutions, including off-site parking and a parking structure, as part of a “parking toolbox” and describe how those measures could address parking related to new and existing development in the Hamlet
  - c. Describe a requirement to maintain parking on-site (as an alternative)
  - d. Describe impacts-including costs of future parking needs

## G. Cultural Resources

- 1. Existing Conditions
  - a. Based on data from New Castle Historical Society and other publicly available sources, provide existing conditions information on historical and archeological sites in the Hamlet, including but not limited to:
    - i. Horace Greeley House
    - ii. Chappaqua Railroad Station and Memorial Park
    - iii. Church of Saint Mary the Virgin

- iv. Robert Bell Middle School
  - v. Chappaqua firehouse on Senter St. (What is the historical value of this?)
  - vi. Greeley Woods
2. Anticipated Impacts
    - a. Describe potential direct and indirect impacts to historic buildings, structures and cultural landscapes in the study area
    - b. Describe potential direct impacts to archaeological sites in study area
  3. Mitigation
    - a. Describe threshold issues related to cultural resources in the study area, if any, related to the adoption of the Form-Based Code.

#### H. Community Facilities and Services

1. Existing Conditions - using available data, provide existing conditions information on the following services as they relate to the Chappaqua Hamlet study area:
  - a. Public Schools (including most recent enrollment projections, and capacities, ~~if available~~ especially regarding Grafflin Elementary and Bell Middle School.)
  - b. Police
  - c. Fire Protection/EMS
  - d. Town Public Works
  - e. Open Space and Recreation
  - f. Electric and Natural Gas Service
  - g. Community Center
  - h. Library
  - i. Town Hall, including workload of the Development Department
2. Anticipated Impacts - based on the Buildout Scenario, provide a discussion of the potential impacts and/or demands to each of these community services and facilities in the study area:
  - a. Public Schools – provide an estimate of additional enrollment in public schools based on the Buildout Scenario, and its relationship to enrollment projections and school capacities
  - b. Police
  - c. Fire Protection/EMS
  - d. Town Public Works
  - e. Open Space and Recreation
    - i. Consideration of Open Space Zoning
    - ii. Consideration of Open Space Contribution in relation to new development
  - f. Electric and Natural Gas Service
  - g. Library
  - h. Town Hall (Development Department workload)
  - i. Future Community Attraction
3. Mitigation

- a. Describe threshold issues related to community services in the study area, including but not limited to: increased tax revenues vs. increased demands to Police, Fire/EMS, Town DPW, expanded or improved recreational facilities, community center, library, Town Hall (increased staffing), schools.

## I. Socioeconomics

1. Existing Conditions – using publicly available information, provide existing conditions estimates for the study area relating to:
  - a. Demographics (School age children)
  - b. Property Tax Generation
  - c. Existing employment
  - d. Commercial vacancies
  - e. Cost of housing including AFFH requirements
2. Anticipated Impacts – based on the Buildout Scenario, provide assumptions and estimates relating to potential changes in the study area to:
  - a. Demographics (school age children)
  - b. Property taxes generated with Buildout Scenario as compared to municipal costs
  - c. Employment opportunities
  - d. Height implication to property values
    - i. Condominiums
    - ii. Single family homes
  - e. Commercial Space desirability (e.g. first floor ceiling height, quantification of updated space)
  - f. School district impacts based on estimated number of new residential units.
  - g. Increase in AFFH units
3. Mitigation
  - a. Describe threshold benefits and costs issues related to socioeconomics in the study area, if any, related to the adoption of the Form-Based Code and Buildout Scenario.
  - b. Assess whether or not to increase AFFH requirements (Economic cost/benefit analysis)

## J. Hazardous Materials

1. Existing Conditions – using publicly available information and the NYSDEC Site Remediation Database, provide existing conditions information for the study area relating to remediation sites. (Dentists, dry cleaners, lead paint, asbestos, gas stations)
2. Anticipated Impacts – based on the Buildout Scenario, describe potential impacts relating to identified hazardous sites in the study area.
3. Mitigation
  - a. Describe threshold issues related to hazardous materials in the study area, if any, related to the adoption of the Form-Based Code.

**K. Air Quality and Noise**

1. Existing Conditions
  - a. Provide a qualitative description of the existing noise environment and primary noise generators in and around the study area (e.g., delivery and loading)
  - b. Identification of noise-sensitive uses and properties in the study area
  - c. Provide a ~~qualitative~~ description of existing air quality data (from publicly available sources) and conduct testing as appropriate.
  - d. Identification of local sources of air pollution in the study area
2. Anticipated Impact
  - a. Provide qualitative description of noise generation in relation to Buildout Scenario (delivery and loading)
  - b. Identify air quality pollutants of concern relative to Buildout Scenario
  - c. Discuss general compliance of Buildout Scenario with applicable air quality standards
  - d. Discuss changes in air circulation and natural /light with height increase throughout study area-
  - e. Discussion of energy limitations (no natural gas) impacts on air quality in the "valley".
  - f. Discuss air/noise impacts from construction
3. Mitigation
  - a. Describe threshold issues related to air quality and noise (including construction) in the study area, if any, related to the adoption of the Form-Based Code.

**L. Construction**

1. Existing Conditions
  - a. Permitting Process
  - b. Hours of Operation
  - c. Maintenance and Protection of Traffic
  - d. Protection of Infrastructure, including roadways
  - e. Rock Removal
  - f. Erosion and sediment control
  - g. Noise generation
  - h. Air quality
2. Anticipated Impact
  - a. Describe permitting process under revised Code
  - b. Discuss amount of construction anticipated as of right
    - i. Rock Removal
      - a. Noise
      - b. Truck Traffic
    - ii. Number of sites
3. Mitigation
  - a. Discuss means to minimize construction impacts



#### IV Alternatives

Provide a description of each alternative noted below, and its anticipated impacts, at a conceptual level of detail sufficient to permit a comparison with the Proposed Action. Where appropriate, provide graphic materials to enable a comparison with the Proposed Action. Summarize information on each alternative and its impacts in a tabular format.

- A. No Action** ~~(no new development in Hamlet)~~
- B. Buildout under Existing Zoning** – discussion of a Buildout development with existing zoning as mapped (with no moratorium).
- C. Full Buildout of Form-Based Code** – description of a potential Buildout with maximum development ~~on~~in the entire Hamlet, including combined parcels, and use of municipal lands. (Does this address all of the cars?)(Does this include an “attraction”? If not conduct a buildout with an “attraction”)
- D. Full Buildout of Form-Based Code Separating Publicly Owned Land-** description of a potential Buildout with maximum development in the entire Hamlet, including combined parcels, without the use of municipal lands (including parking for all required cars)
- E. Adjusted (Best Fit) Full Buildout of Form-Based Code-**description of an adjusted potential buildout taking into consideration market trends and community character. A distinction should be made regarding development on public vs. private lands.
- F. Full Buildout of Form-Based Code with Height Reduction-** description of a potential buildout with maximum development of the entire hamlet, including combined parcels and use of municipal lands with building elevations restricted to four stories throughout the study area. Specific changes regarding parking and circulation should be included.
- G. Full Buildout of Form-Based Code with Height Reduction-** description of a potential buildout with maximum development of the entire hamlet, including combined parcels and use of municipal lands with building elevations restricted to three stories throughout the study area. Specific changes regarding parking and circulation should be included.
- H. Full Buildout of Form-Based Code with Boundary Change-** description of a potential buildout with maximum development of the entire hamlet, including combined parcels and use of municipal lands with the study area adjustments along King Street (visual, parking, density, stormwater)

#### **VIV Other Required Sections**

- A. Significant Adverse Environmental Impacts That Cannot be Avoided if the Proposed Action is Implemented**
  - 1. Long Term Impacts
  - 2. Short Term Impacts
  
- B. ~~Growth Inducement~~Increased Vitality** – Discuss the potential for the proposed rezoning to stimulate growth-vitality in the Hamlet (as an appropriate location for growth), and how that relates to growth elsewhere in Town as per Comprehensive Plan goals. Describe the potential impacts of such growth and identify any potential for it to add to the direct impacts of the proposed rezoning.
  
- C. Effects on the Use and Conservation of Energy Resources** – Identify and describe the general types, amounts and sources of energy for the project and any measures to be incorporated to reduce energy demands, specifically detail strategies to mitigate contributions to climate change and adapt to the effects of climate change.
  
- D. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources** – Identify any natural resources that would be consumed, converted or made unavailable for future use by the Proposed Action.

**Appendices**

- A) Proposed Zoning Code and Regulating Plan
- B) Buildout Scenario
- C) SEQRA Documentation (EAF Parts 1, 2, 3/Positive Declaration, Adopted Scoping Document)
- D) Project Correspondence
- E) Market Scan Report, July 2019
- F) Traffic Impact Study