

VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION

Several alternatives have been evaluated and compared with the Proposed Action. The studied alternatives are detailed below:

Alternative A. No Action: An alternative that consists of no major development taking place on the Site with the exception of a ferry terminal;

Alternative B. Alternative Public Access Design: An alternative considering an increase in the width of the public park area to a minimum of 80 feet, increased parking at the boat ramp, and renovation of the Leatherworks building for a public use (e.g., kayak rental/boathouse). This alternative also analyzes an alternative location for the Anglers Club, with use of that site for public purposes, as mentioned above. This alternative also includes consideration of the relocation of Garvies Point Road along the edge of the Preserve, and any potential replacement of lost space by enlarging the Preserve in the east.

Alternative C. Alternative East Side Configuration: An alternative replacing the office component with residential use, identifying an alternative location for the retail component, and integrating workforce units into block(s) west of Dickson Street.

Alternative D. Reduced Height: A mixed-use development similar in size (square feet) and scope (same mix of land uses) to the Proposed Action, but with structures reduced to a maximum of 10-stories; and

Alternative E. Maximum Build-Out Under Existing Zoning: An alternative demonstrating maximum allowable density pursuant to the MW-3 District under a Planned Unit Development District.

A. No Action

The No Action Alternative consists of a no-build development scenario for the project area, which assumes that the existing conditions within the project area would continue to remain as they currently are (that is, if no major development at all occurred in the project area). Under the No Action alternative, the project site would not be redeveloped and it is anticipated that the property would remain in its current, largely vacant, blighted, and deteriorated condition.

No major development would take place on the project area by the project's 2016 build year, with the exception of the construction of a new ferry terminal with supporting infrastructure and other planned developments in the surrounding area, accompanied with background growth for the region. Such planned developments are proposed under separate actions that would already be in place by the 2016 build year.

Soils and Topography

Due to the previously developed nature of the site, the majority of the property in the study area has been substantially excavated, filled and altered. As described in the impact chapter, many of the soils have limited ability to accommodate development, including buildings, parking areas, and roads. Under the No-Action Alternative, as there would be no development, existing topographical and soil features of the project site would not be altered or disturbed (with the exception of any separately planned but geographically adjacent project, such as the Glen Cove Creek Ferry project, scheduled to occur regardless of whether or not the project is built.)

Subsurface Environmental Conditions

Certain soil remediation activities of contaminated properties within the project area have already occurred, and will continue in accordance with approved State and Federal plans, regardless of whether or not the project moves forward. See **Section III.B, *Subsurface Environmental Conditions***. All funding efforts to date have been based upon the redevelopment of the property as part of an overall economic development effort. Therefore, under the No-Action alternative, it is reasonable to assume that further clean up efforts associated with the redevelopment of the property would be jeopardized.

Water Resources

As there would be no development, this alternative would not include any disturbance to wetlands. Conditions related to water resources such as the floodplain, surface water quality, and stormwater runoff would remain the same as currently, except for changes resulting from the ferry terminal development. No structural or non-structural improvements would be made, and existing surface and stormwater conditions would continue, with discharges directly into the creek and to Hempstead Harbor. Stormwater would not be controlled to minimize the transport of sediments, nutrients, metals, organic chemicals, bacteria and other contaminants from within the area to surface and ground water and, as a result, water quality would continue to deteriorate.

Ecology

Under the No-Action Alternative, it is anticipated that existing ecological conditions would remain as they are within the project area, with the exception of the construction of a new ferry terminal with supporting parking areas and infrastructure. Other planned developments in the area surrounding the project site would occur as would the expected background growth for the City of Glen Cove. The open fields, shallow ponds, and small stands of hardwood trees on the site would continue to provide habitat for migratory and residential songbirds. Without periodic mowing, it is expected that these open fields would gradually become colonized by woody trees and shrubs. Accordingly, the songbirds that utilize the project site would be expected to shift from birds that inhabit open fields, edge habitats, and grasslands to those that prefer shrubby habitats and young, open forests.

Under the No-Action Alternative, the potential adverse impacts to migratory and resident birds associated with the proposed action would not be realized including the potential for collision-related mortality of songbirds, potential disruption of the use of Garvies Point Preserve and Hempstead Harbor as stop-over locations during migration due to increased light pollution, and potential degradation of breeding habitat in Garvies Point Preserve due to increased light pollution, noise pollution, and increased abundance of predators (such as cats, raccoons, and rats).

The potential impacts to water quality and finfish and invertebrate habitat provided by Glen Cove Creek and Hempstead Harbor resulting from the incremental increase of operation and maintenance of recreational boats (i.e., the discharge of gasoline and diesel fuels, petroleum products, cleaning chemicals; increased noise associated with recreational boat traffic; littering) would be avoided. Pollution and noise associated with operation of a commercial ferry operation would occur and would add to the marine impacts resulting from the operation of the Jude Thaddeus Glen Cove Marina and Brewer's Yacht Yard. The potential adverse impacts of the ferry operation under the No Action alternative would be minimized through compliance with NYSDEC SPDES regulations regarding the operation of marinas. Under the No-Action Alternative, the short-term increases in turbidity resulting from the disturbance associated with the construction of the large-boat marina and installation of pilings would be avoided.

Under the No-Action Alternative, the area of impervious surfaces at the project site would be considerably less than under the proposed action. Accordingly, precipitation received by the project site would infiltrate into the site's soils and either recharge into groundwater or flow into Glen Cove Creek or Hempstead Harbor. By contrast, under the proposed action, a large proportion of the precipitation received by the project site will be collected into the site's stormwater control system and treated before discharge, with precipitation waters only reaching Glen Cove Creek during precipitation events greater than 2" in magnitude.

Some stormwater would be generated under the No-Action Alternative as a result of the parking areas and roof surfaces of the proposed ferry terminal, although the volume is expected to be considerably less than the under proposed action. The stormwater generated at the ferry terminal under the No-Action Alternative is likely to contain various pollutants (i.e., petroleum products, automotive chemicals, and heavy metals) and road sediments. However, the stormwater pollution prevention measures required by the NYSDEC under the SPEDES regulations would serve to minimize the discharge of these pollutants into Glen Cove Creek during precipitation events of less than 2" in magnitude.

Under the No-Action Alternative, the existing tidal wetlands adjacent to the subject property would not be impacted and these wetlands would continue to provide habitat for shorebirds, waterfowl, finfish, and invertebrates. Accordingly, the short-term, construction-related disturbances associated with the proposed action would not be realized. However, it is likely that invasive *Phragmites australis* would continue to increase in abundance at the expense of native *Spartina alterniflora* under the No-Action

Alternative. Lastly, the long-term impacts of the proposed action to tidal wetlands associated with the increased human activity at the project site would be avoided under the No-Action Alternative and the project site would continue to provide habitat for shorebird and waterfowl species that are intolerant of human activity and disturbance.

Although the No-Action Alternative would have no additional adverse impacts to the environment, there would be no beneficial impacts either. For example, under the No-Action Alternative, the ecological benefits associated with the net creation of approximately 12,000 square feet of new tidal wetlands and the restoration of approximately 0.7 acres of beach under the proposed action would not be realized. This additional wetland and beach area would serve to provide additional habitat for shorebirds and waterfowl and provide other wetland-related benefits including nutrient-cleansing, sediment-trapping, and absorption of flood waters. The proposed action also incorporates viewing platforms and signage to educate the public about the wetland environment, which would not be realized under the No-Action Alternative.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

Under this alternative, the project site would remain essentially in its current condition. Former industrial sites would remain undeveloped and vacant industrial buildings would remain in their current conditions. Many of the buildings and lots suffer from deterioration and blighted conditions. Without redevelopment, the buildings and lots would continue to deteriorate, and public access to the waterfront would not be enhanced.

The City would, however, move forward with development of the ferry terminal. A July 2007, *Draft Glen Cove Ferry Terminal and Boat Basin Design Report/Environmental Assessment* indicated that the preferred alternative for the ferry terminal location (and parking) is a central location along Glen Cove Creek, designed independent of future development, with the ferry on the west side of the site.¹

The preferred ferry terminal location would impact the Angler's Club, which is located on property owned by the City. The ferry terminal project would require use of approximately 2,700 square feet of the area currently used by the Angler's Club. A portion of the terminal building would impact an upland storage area and Angler's Club marine operations would be affected by ferry operations. Reconfiguration of the Angler's Club would be required if the preferred ferry terminal alternative were constructed.²

The No-Action Alternative would retain its existing MW-3 District designation. No zoning amendments are anticipated to occur under the No-Action Alternative development scenario.

¹ *Draft Glen Cove Ferry Terminal and Boat Basin Design Report/Environmental Assessment*. Urbitran Associates, Inc., July 2007.

² *Ibid.*

The No-Action Alternative would not introduce any land uses that are significantly different from the existing conditions, other than those separately planned projects for the area. As such, the No-Action Alternative would not introduce any changes or improvements to the area that would increase or decrease the degree of conformity to local adopted public policies, such as the draft Glen Cove Master Plan, *Third Amended Urban Renewal Plan for the Garvies Point URA*, the LISCMP, the *Harbor Management Plan for Hempstead Harbor*, or the *Long Island Sound Study*, as well as the GCCRP (which was never formally adopted).

The No-Action Alternative would not introduce any provisions to eliminate blight, and those substandard conditions that impede the proper development of the area would remain. As such, the City's waterfront would not be revitalized and redeveloped with water-dependent, water-enhanced or other related commercial and public open-space recreational uses, which were important components of the GCCRP. Blighted properties within the project area would not be redeveloped, an objective of the *Urban Renewal Plan* and the LISCMP, nor would new connections with Downtown Glen Cove be introduced.

The No-Action Alternative would not advance the general goals outlined in *Harbor Management Plan for Hempstead Harbor*, such as the components of the project that would redevelop dilapidated bulkheads and vacant, blighted and underutilized land with new residential, commercial, water-related, water-dependent and other related uses, and further protect existing natural resources.

The No-Action Alternative would not advance the land use goals supported by the \$121 million (amount expended or committed) in furtherance of the clean-up efforts for the Glen Cove Creek area.

Transportation

Under this alternative, no new residential, office, hospitality or retail development would occur. Trip generation from the site would remain the same, although volumes on the local network would be expected to increase due to increases in traffic generated by the ferry operation. The site would not provide increased resident and employee populations that could support and encourage ferry use.

Air Quality

Any air quality impacts would be the result of the ferry terminal and boat basin construction and operations. Since there would be no other changes or new activity, there would be no other changes to air quality.

Noise

Short term noise impacts may result during construction of the ferry terminal and boat basin and on-going noise impacts resulting from ferry operations would be anticipated. Since there

would be no other changes or new activity, there would be no other change in the amount of noise generation.

Community Facilities

The ferry operations would require fire, police and harbor patrol services. Since there would be no change in population, there would be no anticipated increase in the level of other community facility use (e.g., library, day care, parks and recreation, hospitals and schools). There would also be no additional population or increase in tax revenues to further support community facilities through increased patronage and expansion of the pool of potential volunteers in the City.

Similarly, existing solid waste service levels would not be substantially altered, as the majority of the project area would remain vacant. The separately planned Glen Cove Ferry project and terminal building would have the potential to increase solid waste service levels over existing conditions. The facility, however, is expected to contain a minimal amount of floor area, and users (mostly commuters) of the facility would not be expected to remain on site for long periods of time. As such, it is anticipated that the facility would not introduce any significant additional levels to solid waste services, over existing conditions, as compared to the City's overall capacity and generation.

Utilities

Since there would be no new activity on the site, there would be no change in utility demand. While the separate but geographically related Glen Cove Ferry project and terminal building would introduce additional levels of water usage, gas, electric and telecommunications usage and increase sanitary disposal service levels over existing conditions, the facility is expected to contain a minimal floor area, and users (mostly commuters) of the facility are not expected to remain on site for long periods of time. As such, it is anticipated that the facility would not introduce any significant additional levels to water, gas, electric and telecommunications usage or sanitary disposal services.

As stated in *Section III.J Utilities*, according to the Glen Cove Director of Public Works, the City currently has sufficient well capacity to meet maximum day demand in the event that one major well goes out of service. However, since the City is just meeting this requirement; there is no excess well capacity for future growth, or to meet the demand if the recently closed large industrial uses were reactivated with similar operations. The Director of Public Works has indicated that, with the increased water demand resulting from the various proposed developments in the City, there will not be sufficient well capacity to meet future maximum demand in the event that one major well is out of service. If a water supply system does not have sufficient well capacity to allow for the loss of a major well pump, it may need to consider imposing water use restrictions or, if possible, obtain water from a neighboring supplier if a well is lost during the summer peak pumping period. The City has begun to study improving its water infrastructure to accommodate the increased water demand resulting from future growth in the City.

The existing need to improve the water distribution system to meet peak demand should the City experience a key well site failure is anticipated to be further magnified under the No-Action Alternative, as additional background growth continues in the City.

Water supply and distribution improvement options may include that the City either rehabilitate an existing well site, or install an additional well at either an existing well site or at a new location. According to the Director of Public Works, the City is considering several options to address the water system capacity issues, including adding a second well at the Kelly Street well site and improving conveyance systems in various locations within the City. The Carney Street well site and Duck Pond well site, which were originally considered as potential sites for a new well, will likely be considered non-viable options due to potential environmental / contamination issues. The City is in the initial planning stages of their water system improvements study and has indicated a willingness to work with the Applicant in the City's evaluation of viable options for a water system improvements plan that will address the City's current and future water needs.

Economics

Property taxes revenues would remain the same as under existing conditions, representing substantial underutilization and lost potential. (Increased tax revenues would only occur if tax rates were increased.) There would be no increase in employment opportunities. There would be no increase in the pool of potential patrons for nearby downtown businesses, no additional business activity on the site, and no additional sales tax generation. Therefore, although no direct adverse impacts would be created, the No-Action Alternative would not result in any major positive economic impacts, such as the potential for generating a net annual fiscal benefit, accounting for the estimated cost to provide services for the project, of up to approximately \$4.7 million for the City and \$10.6 million for the School District, as outlined in **Section III.K, Economics**.

Demographics

No new residential construction would occur in the project area. Therefore, under this scenario, the projected beneficial effects of redeveloping the project area would not occur, and the area would primarily continue to remain unpopulated and blighted. As such, the demographics of the project area and the City of Glen Cove would not be altered, as new residents or housing units would not be introduced to the area under the No-Action Alternative.

Aesthetics

Without redevelopment of the area, no major aesthetic improvements would occur. The majority of the project area would remain vacant land with blighted conditions, with the Garvies Point Preserve visible in the background. The aesthetic and visual quality of the project area would remain poor, with vacant land, abandoned and dilapidated buildings, and scattered debris in the area.

Cultural Resources

With no redevelopment and associated ground disturbance, no cultural resource impacts would be anticipated.

Construction Impacts

This alternative would not include any demolition or new construction, other than that required for the proposed ferry terminal. There would be limited potential for short-term impacts on noise, air quality, and traffic circulation related to the ferry terminal construction, as well as limited potential for the expansion of job opportunities during the construction period.

B. Alternative Public Access Design

This alternative assumes a redevelopment of the site that maintains the project's mixed-use character, density, and general configuration, but with potential modifications to the waterfront open space area. The primary items required for consideration by the scope include: an increase in the width of the public park to a minimum of 80 feet; increased parking at the boat ramp; renovation and incorporation of the Leatherworks building as a public use; and an alternative location for the Anglers Club.

The proposed action includes a waterfront open space area that exceeds 80 feet in width along almost the entire length of the Creek. As indicated on **Exhibits II-14 and II-15** in the Project Description, the exceptions to this are a "pinch point" in front of Block B and a portion of Block A, where the width is reduced to approximately 60 feet, and the area in front of Block J, which provides approximately 73 feet in width.

Increasing the width in front of Blocks A and B could be achieved by realigning the western portion of Garvies Point Road further north. However, this would necessitate alienation of public parkland, an increase in building height due to reduced footprint, or a decrease of open space and the creation of more massive buildings. Before parkland alienation can occur, the New York State Legislature must vote on a bill requesting such an action. Typically, a municipality would prepare a draft of a proposed New York State Legislative bill requesting permission to alienate parkland and ask that the bill be introduced in the appropriate committees of the State Assembly and State Senate. Upon receipt of a home rule resolution from the municipality requesting passage of the bill, the State Legislature would take up the issue and vote on the bill. If the bill is passed, the municipality would then be empowered to alienate parkland. In this case, as Garvies Point Preserve is a County park, Nassau County would have to make the request to the State Legislature. There is no mandated timeframe associated with these steps, and alienation of parkland can often take years to complete.

In addition to these considerations, as detailed below, the intrusion into the Preserve would exacerbate forest "edge" impacts. Although the physical area lost could be replaced with a comparable quantity of land from the project site near the east end of the Preserve, as noted below, this land includes areas that have been disturbed and would not replace buffer benefits and habitat quality along Garvies Point Road. In addition, as a practical matter, the open space proposed as part of the project behind the workforce housing on Dickson Street, while not technically under the same ownership, would in effect function as an extension of the Preserve. This alternative, would, therefore ultimately reduce the overall functional area of the Preserve when compared to the proposed action.

The suggested expansion of trailer parking at the boat ramp would suffer from similar problems, as it would also require further intrusion north of Garvies Point Road resulting in additional impervious surfaces, or an increase in building height due to reduced

building footprints, or a decrease in the amount of open space and the creation of more massive buildings.

Expansion of the waterfront open space in front of Block I could be accommodated by reducing the width of the Transient Marina. This would reduce the number of potential slips and, therefore, the potential for water-related recreation. In the Applicant's opinion, the seven foot difference in width between the proposed action and the suggested 80 foot minimum is immaterial, and the perceived quality and "openness" of the space would more likely be affected by the programming and design elements.

As a result of these considerations, it is the Applicant's opinion that the configuration of the proposed action would result in fewer adverse impacts and therefore be preferable to the suggested expansion of the few narrowest portions of the waterfront open space to 80 feet.

The Angler's Club is a membership club occupying City-owned land along the Glen Cove Creek. The club plans several public events each year and is considered a public benefit. In order to maintain this use, as part of the proposed Action, the Applicant has proposed relocating the facility east towards Dickson Street, away from the ferry terminal (for safety reasons) and into a park area. In the event that the City does not wish to continue this use, the contemplated relocation site could instead be converted to open space, which would expand the area of publicly-accessible waterfront. Alternatively, a similar small structure could be erected to serve as a storage area for bicycles or a boathouse/storage area for hand-launch craft that would be available to accommodate visitors to the site. Such a facility could be operated as a rental concession by a private operator or be managed as volunteer community boathouse if an appropriate educational or recreational organization is willing and able to operate such a facility.

The former Leatherworks or "Lounge" building was also suggested in the scope as a potential location for a public recreation use such as a kayak rental or boathouse. The Leatherworks building is located in an area proposed as open space in the proposed action. The building is substantially deteriorated, which would affect the feasibility of remediating, restoring, and converting it for public use. Inclusion of the building would not affect the project's mix of uses or development program and, therefore, would not result in any significant changes in the identified environmental impacts compared to the proposed action. If such a use were to prove viable, it would only require modification of the open space design. However, the building was inspected by a structural engineer in February 2009. The findings are detailed in the Robert Silman Associates *Structural Existing Conditions Report*) located in the Appendix, which indicates that the building is in poor condition and that the structural deficiencies generally impair the functionality of the building. In addition, the buildings current floor elevation sits below the FEMA floodplain, rendering it uninhabitable.

The project architecture is, however, designed to reflect the area's industrial past. The redeveloper will continue to explore ways to incorporate design elements of the Lounge Building into the project.

Ecology

Under the Public Access Alternative, the potential beneficial and adverse environmental impacts to the terrestrial habitats of Blocks B and C and the estuarine and wetland habitats of Glen Cove Creek and Hempstead Harbor are expected to be equivalent to those under the proposed action. The Public Access Alternative is similar to the proposed action in terms of the acreage of proposed impervious surfaces and commercial and residential building space, the proposed waterfront and marina developments, and the proposed tidal wetland and beach restoration (although depending on the approach taken, it could result in an increase in impervious surfaces.) Accordingly, the potential adverse impacts of the Alternative Public Access Design Alternative to vegetation communities, songbirds and shorebirds, threatened/endangered plant species, tidal wetlands, essential fish habitat, and the water quality of Glen Cove Creek and Hempstead Harbor are similar to those described in **Section III.D**.

As with the proposed action, the Public Access Alternative would include mitigation measures to reduce the magnitude of potential impacts including construction of stormwater collection systems to accommodate 2" precipitation events, implementation of erosion and sediment control measures during construction, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for the proposed marina facilities, and architectural and landscaping measures to reduce the potential for light pollution and collision-related bird mortality.

In addition, the Public Access Alternative would also provide the environmental benefits associated with the increased wetland area attained through the creation of approximately 0.5 acres of tidal wetlands at the low sill bulkhead and 0.7 acres of restored beach.

The relocation of Garvies Point Road into the Garvies Point Preserve would result in adverse environmental impacts associated with the clearing of the existing hardwood forest, creation of additional edge habitat, and the potential for erosion and sediment transport during construction. Relocation of the road into the Preserve by a maximum of 50-80' would result in the destruction of ~0.9-1.6 acres of hardwood forest and the associated loss of wildlife habitat. In addition, the relocation would result in the creation of a new forest edge and degradation of the habitat quality afforded by the adjacent forest including potential changes in forest microclimate, the spread of invasive plants into the adjacent forest, and increased abundance of predators (i.e. cats, raccoons, rats, etc) and invasive competitors (i.e. European starlings and house sparrows). Therefore, relocation of Garvies Point Road has the potential to increase the penetration of these edge effects into the Preserve. Studies have found that changes in microclimate in forests (i.e. ambient light, air and soil temperatures, wind speed, relative humidity, etc.) occur up to 240' from the forest edge (Gehlhausen et al. 2000). This increase in potential for increased edge effects along the northern border of Garvies Point Road is only expected to result in a minor adverse environmental impact as the adjacent woodland is currently highly impacted by the edge effects created by the presence of Garvies Point Road. In addition, clearing and grading associated with the construction of the new road surface has the potential to result in erosion and the transport of sediments and the generation of stormwater and pollutants.

Under the Public Access Alternative, the Preserve would be enlarged in the east in order to compensate for the loss of Preserve land located adjacent to Garvies Point Road. The 5.6 acres of land that may be targeted for inclusion in the Preserve is located to the west of Dickson Street and to the south of Janet Lane and contains a mix of hardwood woodlands, cleared and disturbed soils, and commercial/industrial properties. It is possible that the inclusion of this property into the Preserve could adequately offset the adverse impacts related to the loss of wildlife habitat associated with the relocation of the road, particularly if the areas of cleared and disturbed soils were restored into native grassland or woodland habitats. However, the Dickson Street property is not located directly between the developments associated with the proposed action and Garvies Point Preserve. Accordingly, this property would not be able to adequately replace the buffer benefits provided by the woodlands located to the north of Garvies Point Road and would be unable to compensate for the degradation of habitat quality in the Preserve due to increased light and noise levels, altered microclimate, and spread of invasive plants.

Other Impacts

Since this alternative maintains the same mix of uses and density as the proposed action, there would not be any change in impacts driven by the quantity and type of development, such as utility demand, traffic generation, noise generation, air quality, socioeconomic impacts, and community facilities demand.

C. Alternative East Side Configuration

This alternative assumes a redevelopment of the site with a mixed-use project similar to the proposed action, but with the replacement of the office component with residential use, and consideration of alternative locations for the workforce units and the retail component.

The Proposed Action proposes a 50,000 square foot office building on Block D. If the same floor area and footprint were to be maintained, assuming an average of 2,000 gross square feet per unit, this alternative could produce approximately 25 residential units on Block D. As 25 units would have a dramatically lower parking requirement than 50,000 square feet of office (50 vs. 250 spaces), some of the structured parking could be eliminated. This would result in a slightly shorter building. It would also somewhat dilute the project's mixed-use character, which is intended to help foster a vibrant waterfront, with activity during all times of the day.

The 86 workforce units in Blocks F and G could technically be incorporated into one of the condominium buildings. This would not alter the site plan or overall development footprint, as a corresponding number of market-rate units would be "swapped" out of Block A or B and relocated into Blocks F and G. However, the workforce housing is anticipated to be managed and administered by a housing advocacy group such as the Long Island Housing Partnership. The Partnership has initially indicated that it would prefer the workforce housing units to be organized as an independent area in order to facilitate efficient administration and management of the units. This arrangement would also allow for additional cost savings for households occupying the workforce units, as the common charges will be limited to those costs directly attributable to the maintenance of their buildings and grounds (i.e., households would not be assessed with higher common charges necessary for the maintenance of the substantial waterfront open spaces.)

The proposed action includes approximately 20,000 square feet of retail space in Block J at the east end of the site. Again, it would be physically possible to incorporate this relatively limited quantity of retail into the podiums of the building blocks located further west. However, in the Applicant's opinion, this would produce less desirable land use relationships. First, dispersing the retail further west would diminish the land use connection to the downtown by removing cafe activity, window shopping, people watching and special event opportunities from the area closest to downtown, which would provide vibrancy and pedestrian interest and help draw visitors to the waterfront. Dispersing the retail would also weaken the attraction to visitors arriving from the Transient Marina. The proposed action provides a visual connection and easy pedestrian access to a retail cluster for visiting boaters. Without this proximity and clustered retail, the marina may not provide as inviting a destination and boating experience. Relocating the retail into the Blocks on the west side would also reduce the conveniently available parking to support the retail uses, as access to the structured parking, which provides

residential and hotel parking, would be limited. This may present a concern for retailers, who often demand readily accessible surface parking.

As described above, relocation of either the workforce housing or the retail space would not change the overall development program or footprint. Besides the management and land use considerations already described, these changes would not result in any change in impacts driven by the quantity and type of development, such as utility demand, traffic generation, noise generation, air quality, socioeconomic impact and community facilities demand. Therefore, the primary differences in impacts related to this alternative would stem from the change from office to residential, which are explored below.

Economics and Community Services

This alternative would increase the number of condominium units by approximately 4.2% compared to the proposed project. Assuming a proportionate increase in anticipated property tax revenue, this would result in an increase in property tax revenue of approximately \$174,177 for the City and \$392,503 for the Glen Cove School District. However, the removal of the office would result in a decrease of approximately \$206,906 for the City and \$461,911 for the School District.

The net impact of this alternative would be a slight reduction in property tax generation of approximately \$32,729 for the City and \$69,408 for the School District. The 25 unit increase would result in a minimal increase of approximately two public school children. This could potentially increase the cost to the School District by approximately \$26,720. However, this alternative would continue to provide a significant fiscal surplus for the School District of approximately \$11 million annually. No significant change in the level of other municipal service or community service demand would be expected from the change in use of a comparable amount of floor area from office to residential.

**Table VI-1
Potential Additional Public School Child Generation**

Type of Unit	Number of Units	Public Schoolchildren per Household	Estimated Number of New Pupils
Multifamily 2-br	25	0.05	2

Source: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, Residential Demographic Multipliers.

Traffic, Air Quality and Noise

Under this alternative, the office component would be eliminated and replaced by 25 additional residential units. During the weekday AM and PM peak hours, the office space would be expected to generate approximately 70 trips, while 25 additional residential units would generate only between 10 and 15 additional trips peak hour trips. On Saturdays, the office space would be expected to generate 19 peak hour trips while the additional residential units would generate approximately 11 trips. Therefore, from a traffic and trip generation standpoint, the net impact of such an alternative scenario would be less than the Full Build-Out scenario analyzed in detail in **Section IV** of this document.

Since anticipated traffic generation would be lower with this alternative than the proposed project, noise and air pollutants from mobile source emissions would be reduced. This alternative would result in the loss of the potential shared parking opportunities afforded by the off-street spaces that could be available for use by the public during office off-hours.

Utilities

This alternative would eliminate water and wastewater flows from the office component, which total approximately 50,000 gpd ($50,000 \text{ sf} \times 0.15 \text{ gpd} = 7,500 \text{ gpd}$). The increased residential component would increase flows by approximately 11,875 gpd ($25 \text{ d.u.} \times 475 \text{ gpd/unit} = 11,875 \text{ gpd}$). The net result would be an increase of approximately 4,375 gpd (or less than 1%) compared to the proposed action.

Other Impacts

As described above, relocation of either the workforce housing or the retail space would not change the overall development program or footprint. Besides the management and land use considerations already described, these changes would not result in any change in impacts driven by the quantity and type of development, such as utility demand, traffic generation, noise generation, air quality, socioeconomic impact and community facilities demand.

D. Reduced Height

The Reduced Height Alternative contemplates a mixed-use development with the same square footage and mix of uses as the Proposed Action, but with the maximum building height reduced to 10 stories. This alternative would affect Blocks A through C on the west side of the project site. Reducing the height of these blocks from 10 and 12 story buildings to all 10 story buildings, while maintaining a similar floor area, requires an alternative building massing and configuration with fewer setbacks and more uniform floor plates. The resulting massing on these blocks would therefore be more uniform and bulky. In these blocks, the midrise buildings have a single setback on the 9th floor as compared to up to three setbacks in the Proposed Action for each of these buildings. No changes would be contemplated for the remaining blocks to the east, which are already below the 10 stories. (See **Exhibit VI-1**)

Soils and Topography

Since this alternative would have essentially the same development footprint, potential impacts to soils and topography would be the same as for the proposed project.

Subsurface Environmental Conditions

Since this alternative would have essentially the same development footprint and same mix of uses, potential impacts related to subsurface environmental conditions would be the same as for the proposed project.

Water Resources

Since this alternative involves the same development program and footprint, potential impacts to water resources would be generally the same as for the proposed project.

Ecology

The minor reduction in building heights for Blocks A through C would result in a slight reduction in the magnitude of the potential adverse environmental impacts and it is expected that this slight reduction in impact magnitude would be insignificant.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

Under this alternative, the project would continue to include the same combination of residential, office, entertainment, hospitality, retail/restaurant and marine open space/recreation uses. The base footprints of the buildings would remain the same, however, the upper private open space areas would be reduced.

The project would comply with the lot area, density, minimum number of permitted uses, workforce housing, and open space requirements. Under this alternative, the height of the

proposed structures would be reduced to 10 stories. This height reduction would result in a “wall” of uniform buildings that would not promote the objectives to be considered under the MW-3 PUD zoning, including creation of view corridors from public streets and open spaces to the creek, harbor and preserve, and the creation of varied vistas when viewed from the south side of the creek.

This action would therefore not advance the following public policies as fully as the Proposed Action:

- LISCMP Policy 9: Provide public visual access from public lands to coastal lands and waters or open space at all sites where physically practical.
- Hempstead Harbor Management Plan Goal 5: Protect and enhance Hempstead Harbor’s natural environment and open space resources, including surface water quality, wetlands, coastal fish and wildlife habitats, upland natural areas, and important viewsheds.
- Long Island Sound Study Policy 5.a: Preserve and enhance public access and view corridors to coastal waters.

Transportation

Since the development program remains the same, anticipated trip generation and potential impacts on the transportation network would be the same as for the proposed project.

Air Quality

Since there would be no change in trip generation or development components, potential impacts to air quality would be the same as for the proposed project.

Noise

Since there would be no change in trip generation or development components, potential impacts to noise would be the same as for the proposed project.

Community Facilities

While the buildings would be reduced in height, the overall square footage and number of units would not change. Therefore, the increased demand for community services would be similar to that of the proposed action. The Reduced Height Alternative would, however, reduce the roof top open space areas, reducing the total private open space and recreation available to residents.

Utilities

Since this alternative contemplates the same development program, potential impacts on utilities would be the same as for the proposed project.

Economics

Since this alternative contemplates the same development program, property tax revenues and job creation would remain the same as for the proposed project.

Demographics

The reduced height buildings would contain the same number of residential units, hotel suites and office area, etc. as the proposed development and would result in the same estimated population increases, including residents, workforce and school children.

Aesthetics

The reduction in height from 10 and 12 story buildings to all 10 story buildings results in an alternative building massing and configuration that will have fewer setbacks and more uniform floor plates. The resulting massing on these two blocks would be more uniform and bulky. In these blocks, the midrise buildings have a single setback on the 9th floor as compared to up to three setbacks in the Proposed Action for each of these buildings.

The overall footprints of the buildings are the same as the Proposed Action. As a result, there are no changes to the view corridors at the ground level. See **Exhibit VI-2**. However, the aesthetic impact on the view corridors will have a peripheral impact because the buildings with fewer setbacks will feel closer to the water's edge, particularly at the midrise levels above the podium, as well as reducing views from south side of creek.

A series of revised shadow studies have also been prepared for this alternative to analyze the impact of the reduced height. The shadow analysis for the Reduced Height Alternative is similar to the Proposed Action, with a slight reduction in the length of shadow cast. However, the impacts on the neighboring parcels and Garvies Point Preserve are similar to the Proposed Action. See **Exhibits VI-4 to VI-9**.

INSERT EXHIBIT VI – 1

Alternative D Plan

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-2
View Study Site**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-3
View Study SeaCliff**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI.-4
Alternative D
SHADOW STUDIES
March 21 10 am**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-5
Alternative D
SHADOW STUDIES
March 21 4pm**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-6
Alternative D
SHADOW STUDIES
June 21 10 am**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-7
Alternative D
SHADOW STUDIES
June 21, 4pm**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-8_____
Alternative D
SHADOW STUDIES
December 21, 10 am**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-9
Alternative D
SHADOW STUDIES
December 21, 4pm**

Cultural Resources

Since this alternative would have the same development footprint, potential impacts to historical or archaeological resources would be the same as for the proposed project.

Construction Impacts

Since this alternative would have the same development footprint and program, potential construction impacts would be generally the same as for the proposed project.

E. Maximum Build-Out Under Existing Zoning

The Maximum Build-Out Alternative contemplates a scenario that applies the maximum residential density permissible in the MW-3 District (20 units per acre). This would result in a project containing 1,120 residential dwelling units, in addition to the hospitality, retail/restaurant, marine, and office use components of the proposed action. See **Exhibit VI-10**. The table below provides a summary of the development program accommodated by Alternative E plan.

Table VI-2
Alternative E Program

Parcel	Condo	Townhouse	Hotel	Rental	Workforce	Retail/Rest.	Office	Parking
West	613	52	250			5,000 sf		2,375
East	103	12		228	112	20,300 sf	50,000sf	1,280
Total	716	64	250	228	112	25,300 sf	50,000 sf	3,655

On the western residential parcels (Block A-B), the building massing and configuration would be expanded to accommodate additional units and parking. The building footprint of Block A would be expanded to the west and east, eliminating the park along the western edge and the park between Blocks A and B. The building footprint of Block B would be expanded to the west and east and the park between Block B and C would be eliminated. This expansion would increase the on-site parking capacity to accommodate the additional residential units. The residential units in these two blocks would increase from 500 units to 665 units. The buildings would have fewer setbacks and would typically have a 12 and 14 story midrise component perpendicular to the creek connected by a 10 story building parallel to Garvies Point Road. In order to maintain the same quantity of open space as the proposed action, the alternative would be to maintain the proposed action footprint and increase the number of stories and the height of buildings.

On the eastern residential parcels, Block I would increase its podium height to three stories from two, and the midrise component from six and seven stories to eight and 10 stories to accommodate 21 additional units. On Block J, 26 additional workforce housing units would be added to the site of the surface parking lot adjacent to the commercial use. On Blocks E and H, 48 additional rental units would be added.

Soils and Topography

While this alternative would result in some adjustment of the building footprints in Blocks A, B and J, the overall limit of disturbance would not change, and therefore the potential impacts to soils and topography would be generally the same as for the proposed project. The reduction in the pocket parks would increase the quantity of impervious surfaces on-site.

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-10
Alternative E Plan**

Subsurface Environmental Conditions

Since this alternative would have essentially the same area of disturbance and includes the same proposed uses, potential impacts related to subsurface environmental conditions would be the same as for the proposed project.

Water Resources

While this alternative would result in some adjustment of the building footprints in Blocks A, B and J, the overall limit of disturbance would not change, and therefore the potential impacts to wetlands would be generally the same as for the proposed project. Similarly, this alternative would require installation of a comparable stormwater management system.

Ecology

Under the Maximum Build-Out Alternative, the potential environmental impacts to vegetation communities, songbirds and shorebirds, threatened/endangered plant species, tidal wetlands, essential fish habitat, and the water quality of Glen Cove Creek and Hempstead Harbor would be similar in nature, but greater in magnitude, to those described for the proposed action in **Section III.D**.

For example, due to the increased impervious surfaces and increased recreational boat activity, it is expected that the potential adverse environmental impacts associated with stormwater generation and discharge to Glen Cove Creek and the potential discharge of pollutants, sediments, and fertilizers would be greater under the Maximum Build-Out Alternative.

All construction-related impacts, such as increased turbidity, noise, and erosion and sediment transport, described in **Section III.D** would occur under the Maximum Build-Out Alternative, although the magnitude of these impacts would be greater than with the proposed action. The Maximum Build-Out Alternative, similar to all alternatives except the No-Action Alternative, would result in the elimination of the availability of the existing open fields and shallow ponds for resident and migratory songbirds.

Similar to the proposed action, environmental mitigation measures would be employed to reduce the potential adverse environmental impacts associated with the Maximum Build-Out Alternative. Under the Maximum Build-Out Alternative, the environmental benefits associated with the proposed restoration of tidal wetlands and Garvies Point Beach would be realized.

Land Use

The Maximum Build-Out Alternative would include the same type of land uses as the proposed action, located in generally the same areas. Therefore, no changes in land use relationships would be expected. As with the proposed action, this alternative would eliminate blighting conditions on the project site and provide opportunities for the public

to reconnect to the waterfront. The building footprint adjustments necessary to accommodate the increased density would eliminate the pocket parks located between Blocks A, B and C, resulting in a minor reduction in the amount of open space in comparison to the proposed action. This alternative would require the same amount of property acquisition. The redevelopment of the site as a mixed-use, transit-oriented neighborhood would advance the various planning goals identified in related public policy documents. However, the increased bulk of the buildings would reduce some of the view corridors through the site provided by the proposed action.

Table VI-3 provides an analysis of the Maximum Build-Out Alternative to the MW-3 regulations using the PUD criteria.

**Table VI-3
Maximum Build-Out Alternative Compared to the MW-3/PUD Criteria**

Criteria	MW-3 PUD Requirement	Objectives to be Considered	Max. Build-Out Alt.	Complies (✓ = Yes)
Lot Area	25 Contiguous Acres		56±	✓
Number of Permitted Uses in Development	At least four	Yacht clubs and marinas, marina slips, museums & other entertainment, educational or cultural uses, hotel, spa, conference, and catering facilities, business and professional offices, retail uses, marine-dependent uses (e.g. boat docks, piers, ferry terminal), multiple residences and townhouses (PUD), food kiosks, growing, wholesale or retail use of fish, shellfish, and/or produce.	>4	✓
Max. Residential Density	20 units per acre	-Creation of attractive, active, mixed-use community that properly utilizes valuable waterfront resources -Creation of a marketable and sustainable development	20	✓
Workforce Housing	10% of dwelling units	To ensure a variety of housing opportunities	10%	✓
Max. Height	To be established by Planning Board during site plan review	-Balance of building scale and density, maximize publicly accessible open space, landscaping, including landscaped roof terraces -Creation of view corridors from public street and open spaces to the creek, harbor and preserve -Creation of varied vistas when viewed from the should side of the creek -Height of buildings and structures shall not exceed treetop elevation of Garvies Point Preserve ridgeline. -Architectural treatments.	All concepts incorporated	✓
Min. Distance Between Principal Structures	To be determined by Planning Board	To maximize creation of view corridors and open space.		✓
Off-street parking	To be determined by Planning Board	-MW-3 parking requirements -Balance of scale and density with maximization of concealed parking facilities, use of landscaping, architectural treatments, roof gardens and courtyards to conceal or mitigate visual impacts of parking structures and lots		✓
Parking Structure/ Area Location	Not be located within 30 ft of mean high water/bulkhead unless walkway is included, then setback may be reduced/eliminated	Integration of parking facilities into landscape designs and building structures to minimize visual impacts	>30' and walkway included	✓
Open Space	Not less than 25%	Including: square, greens, parks, new or enhanced wetlands and esplanades	Approx 35%/	✓
Pedestrian and Bicycle Access	Connected network	To provide well-designed pedestrian-oriented streetscapes, including sidewalks, street trees, lighting, and appropriate relationship of building façade and entrances.	Trail network and esplanade	✓
Intermodal Transportation System	Required	May include trolleys, jitney, people movers, streetcars to connect the waterfront with downtown	Train station shuttle	✓

June 4, 2009

Alternatives

Criteria	MW-3 PUD Requirement	Objectives to be Considered	Max. Build-Out Alt.	Complies (✓ = Yes)
Interconnected Street System	Where possible	Avoid cul-de-sacs, encourage traffic calming	Streets end at public park, beach/boat launch	✓

Transportation

The increase in residential density would result in an increase in the generation of peak hour traffic compared to the proposed project. The increase in project-generated trips resulting from the additional 260 units in the alternative is summarized in the table below. The increase would be approximately 88 trips in the AM peak hour and 104 in the PM peak hour. These represent increases of approximately 15% and 13% of the proposed project's total trip generation.

**Table VI-4
Alternative E Trip Generation Increase**

Component	Units	AM Peak Trips	PM Peak Trips
Residential/Condominiums	212	66	77
Apartments	48	22	27
Total		88	104

Source: Trip Generation, 7th edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers.

As part of the analysis for this DEIS, an analysis of potential future build-out of the entire 96-acre MW-3 district was also prepared. This analysis examined the impacts from an additional 780 units and 50,000 square feet of commercial space. With the Maximum Buildout under Existing Zoning resulting in the addition of only 260 units, the impacts from this alternative would be substantially less than those of the full Buildout analysis of the additional 40 acres in the MW-3 district, presented in Section IV.

Air Quality

Anticipated traffic generation would be higher with this alternative than with the proposed project, raising the potential for increased generation of air pollutants from mobile source emissions.

Noise

Anticipated traffic generation would be higher with this alternative than with the proposed project, raising the potential for increased vehicular noise.

*Community Facilities*Emergency Services

The increase in population would be expected to generate a minor and proportionate increase in emergency service calls.

Schools

The Maximum Build-Out Alternative would be estimated to generate approximately 198 public school children representing an increase of 47 students over the proposed action (see **Table VI-5** and **Table VI-6** for a detailed analysis). Based on the school average that 12.84 percent of students require special education services, it is estimated that the increased costs to

the School District would be approximately \$2,980,000. Increased tax revenues from the larger project could be used to off-set the impacts of the additional school children.

**Table VI-5
Estimated Public School Children Impact - Maximum Build-Out Alternative**

Unit Types	No. of Units	Mult. Gr. K-2	Est. Public School Children Gr. K-2	Mult. Gr. 3-6	Est. Public School Children Gr. 3-6	Multi. Gr. 7-9	Est. Public School Children Gr. 7-9	Mult. Gr. 10-12	Est. Public School Children Gr. 10-12	Mult. Gr. 9 only	Est. Public School Children Gr. 9 only*
780 Condo Units											
1 Bedroom	195	0.02	4	0.05	10	0	0	0.04	8	0	0
2 Bedroom	390	0	0	0.03	12	0.02	8	0	0	0	0
3 Bedroom	195	0.10	20	0.07	14	0.14	27	0.19	37	0.06	12
Total Condo			24		36		35		45		12
228 Rental Units											
1 Bedroom	80	0.02	2	0.02	2	0.01	1	0.01	1	0.01	1
2 Bedroom	114	0.05	6	0.05	6	0.04	5	0.03	3	0.01	1
3 Bedroom	34	0.14	5	0.20	7	0.12	4	0.17	6	0.06	2
Total Rental			13		14		10		10		4
112 Workforce Units** (Assumes ownership units in clusters of 5+ units, all values)											
1 Bedroom	17	0.05	1	0.07	1	0.01	0	0.02	0	0	0
2 Bedroom	95	0.02	2	0.04	4	0.02	2	0.01	1	0.01	1
Total Workforce			3		5		2		1		1
			40		55		47		56		17
TOTAL	198 Public School Children										<i>*Note: Grade 9 only generation is included in Gr. 7 - 9 data</i>

Source: Residential Demographic Multipliers – Estimates of the Occupants of New Housing, New York-All Public School Children: School-Age Children in Public School, Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, June 2006.

Note: **Assumes Ownership townhomes in clusters of 5+ units, all values used since housing prices have not been established

**Table VI-6
Summary of Estimated School-Age Children Impact Maximum Build Out**

School-Age Generation	Number of Public School Students	Est. Cost/Pupil 2005-06 plus 10%*	Total Cost
General Education	173	\$13,360	\$2,311,280
Special Education ¹	25	\$26,806	\$670,150
TOTAL	198		\$2,981,430.00

* Marginal costs based on New York State School Report Cared Fiscal Accountability Supplement

¹Based on 2005-2006 NYS School Report indicating that 12.84 percent of students need special education services

² Includes residential and office tax revenues

Open Space and Recreation

The Maximum Build-Out Alternative would include less accessible open space than the proposed action. Contiguous open spaces would be provided along the waterfront, however, overall park and open space areas, and interior courtyard areas would be reduced and, in some cases, eliminated. For example, the pocket parks between Blocks A, B and C would be eliminated. The proposed marine uses would remain the same as described in the proposed action.

Hospital

As stated in **Section III.I**, the ULI planning standard of four hospital beds per 1,000 population was used in this impact analysis. The generation of approximately 2,400 residents would require approximately 10 hospital beds to serve the estimated population, an increase of approximately two compared to the proposed action. Estimated unused hospital bed capacity would exceed the estimated increased need.

Solid Waste

The City's SWMP estimated that, on average, 0.88 tons of waste per capita are generated and 0.60 tons per person are generated annually through commercial operation. Using these multipliers, the estimated 2,400 residents would generate 2,122 tons of waste per year or 5.79 tons per day and the on-site employees would generate 277.20 tons of waste annually, or 0.76 tons of waste per day. This relatively minor increase would still be well within the existing available capacity of the waste transfer station.

At the time the SWMP was completed, the proposed transfer station was expected to operate six days per week and transfer approximately 600 tons per day of municipal solid waste plus yard waste and recyclables. A conversation with DPW staff indicated that the SWMP remains valid in its capacity and use data.³ As stated previously, in 2007 the transfer station collected 118,133.65 tons of residential solid waste and 2,422.53 tons of recyclables, for a total of 120,556.18 tons annually, or an average of 330.29 tons daily. This analysis indicates that unused capacity remains at the municipal transfer station. Similarly to the proposed action, the Maximum Build-Out Alternative would use a private carting service which could contract with the City and use its waste transfer station, or contract to use a waste transfer station outside the City.

Utilities

This alternative would increase the number of residential units, which would result in a corresponding increase in water and sewer flows of approximately (260 units X 475 gpd = 123,500 gpd). As indicated in **Section III.J**, there is sufficient capacity at the wastewater treatment facility to accommodate this increase. As described earlier, there is no excess well capacity for future growth, or to meet the demand if the recently closed large industrial uses were reactivated with similar operations. The Director of Public Works has indicated that, with the increased water demand resulting from the proposed project and various other proposed developments in the City, there will not be sufficient well

³ Telephone interview with staff, City of Glen Cove Public Works, December 2, 2008.

capacity to meet future maximum demand in the event that one major well is out of service. The City has begun to study improving its water infrastructure to accommodate the increased water demand resulting from future growth in the City.

Economics

The Maximum Build-Out Alternative would provide additional property tax revenues to the City, County and School District due to the additional 260 housing units. Estimated revenues and job creation from non-residential components of the Maximum Build-Out Alternative would be the same as the proposed action.

The table below provides an estimate of the anticipated property tax revenue from this alternative, assuming a proportionate change in tax generation for the residential component. Overall, this alternative would increase anticipated property tax generation for the City and the School District by approximately 24% compared to the proposed action.

**Table VI-7
Alternative E Property Tax Generation**

Component	City	County	School District
Office	\$206,906	\$888,498	\$461,911
Hotel	\$962,234	\$411,567	\$2,148,160
Retail	\$90,521	\$38,718	\$202,086
Marina	\$164,821	\$70,497	\$367,959
Rental	\$295,286	\$100,392	\$665,422
Condo	\$5,445,637	\$1,851,416	\$12,271,633
Workforce	\$191,544	\$65,121	\$431,640
Total	\$7,356,949	\$3,426,209	\$16,548,811

Demographics

It is estimated that the Maximum Build-Out alternative would generate a population of approximately 2,400 persons, an increase of 556 compared to the proposed action. This would increase the pool of residents in close proximity to the downtown to support downtown businesses.

**Table VI-8
Estimate New Housing Occupants - Maximum Build-Out Alternative**

Unit Types		Total Persons Multiplier	Est. of Total Persons
780 Condominium Units			
1 Bedroom	195	1.77	345
2 Bedroom	390	1.88	733
3 Bedroom	195	3	585
Sub total			1663
228 Rental Units			
1 Bedroom	80	1.67	134
2 Bedroom	114	2.31	263
3 Bedroom	34	3.81	130
Sub total			526
112 Workforce Units			
1 Bedroom	17	1.86	32
2 Bedroom	95	1.88	179
Sub total			210
TOTAL EST.			2,400

Source: Residential Demographic Multipliers – Estimates of the Occupants of New Housing, New York-All Persons in Unit: Total Persons and Persons by Age, Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, June 2006.

Note: The following assumptions have been made: one-bedroom condominium units will have a value of more than \$269,500; two-bedroom condominium unit will have a value greater than \$329,500; three-bedroom condominium units were based on “all values; one-bedroom rental units will have a rent value of more than \$1,000; two-bedroom rental units will have a rent value of more than \$1,100; three-bedroom rental units will have a rent value of more than \$1,250. Workforce units were assumed to be townhome units clustered in groups of five or more and “all values” multipliers were applied as the potential values had not been calculated. The percent of one-, two- and three-bedroom units was based on the proposed action percentages.

Aesthetics and View Corridors

The added residential density would result in increased height, increased parking podium size and height, and fewer setbacks to accommodate the added residential square footage. The resulting impact would be larger buildings with less open space between buildings, more uniform building massing, and increased height across the property. The 14 story building in Block A approaches close to the ridge of the treeline in the elevation diagram but still below the treetop elevation of the ridge at Garvies Point Preserve. See **Exhibit VI-11**.

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-11
Alternative E Elevation**

Since the overall footprint of the buildings changed in Blocks A and B, and additional buildings were added in Block J, the view corridors in this alternative would be adversely affected compared to the Proposed Action. The view corridors from Garvies Point Road between Blocks A and B, and B and C would be reduced while the view corridor from the esplanade to Hempstead Harbor would be significantly reduced due to the expanded footprint of Block A. In the east, the addition of the workforce housing would eliminate one view corridor from Herb Hill Road to Glen Cove Creek.

A series of revised shadow studies has also been prepared for this alternative to analyze the impact of the additional height and density. The shadow analysis for the Maximum Build-Out Alternative is similar to the Proposed Action in its overall impact, with the exception that the shadow lengths are increased due to the additional height and bulk of the buildings, particularly in Blocks A and B. This impact results in more shadow on Garvies Point Preserve and also additional shadow on the inner courtyards of the proposed buildings themselves. See **Exhibits VI-12 to VI-17**.

Cultural Resources

Since the overall limit of disturbance would not change, the potential impacts to historical or archaeological resources would be essentially the same as for the proposed project.

**INSERT EXHIBIT
Exhibits VI-12_
Alt. E MAXIMUM BUILD OUT
SHADOW STUDY
March 21, 10am**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
Exhibits VI-13
Alt. E MAXIMUM BUILD OUT
SHADOW STUDY
March 21, 4 pm**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
Exhibits VI-14
Alt. E MAXIMUM BUILD OUT
SHADOW STUDY
June 21, 10am**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
Exhibits VI-15
Alt. E MAXIMUM BUILD OUT
SHADOW STUDY
June 21, 4pm**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
Exhibits VI-16
Alt. E MAXIMUM BUILD OUT
SHADOW STUDY
December 21, 10am**

**INSERT EXHIBIT
Exhibits VI-17
Alt. E MAXIMUM BUILD OUT
SHADOW STUDY
December 21, 4pm**

***INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-18
Alternative E View Study***

**INSERT EXHIBIT
VI-19
Alternative E View Study From Sea Cliff**