Questions and Comments Answered to Date (Received to planzone@greenburghny.com and by mail)

**Process – Related Questions/Comments**

1. **Question:** In what format will residents who ask questions or make comments be responded to and when.

   **Response:** Comments/Questions received by the CPSC will be discussed at regularly scheduled CPSC meetings. Responses will be generated and posted on the Comprehensive Plan Website [www.greenburghcomprehensiveplan.com](http://www.greenburghcomprehensiveplan.com).

2. **Question:** Can question and answer (Q and A) documents prepared by the Town contain a blog/comment space for residents to ask follow-up questions or make follow-up comments?

   **Response:** The Plan website will have each comment/question grouped by category to allow for ease of follow-up. Additional questions and comments can be sent to planzone@greenburghny.com.

3. **Question:** What is a charrette?

   **Response:** A charrette is a group of focused planning sessions where residents, business owners, designers and others collaborate on a vision for development.

4. **Question:** What is a GEIS?

   **Response:** A Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) is a required document of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) which looks at project or plan impacts and potential mitigations. It is prepared as a separate and complementary document and will be completed prior to adoption of the final Plan.

5. **Question:** Can approval of the Plan be subject to a referendum?

   **Response:** New York State Town Law does not authorize the approval of Comprehensive Plans via a referendum – direct vote of Town residents.

6. **Question:** Can a timeline of the Plan process be generated and made available.

   **Response:** Section 1.10 – Public Review Process of the DRAFT Plan (Page 1-10) assigns a general timeframe of the Plan process. The Plan’s website [www.greenburghcomprehensiveplan.com](http://www.greenburghcomprehensiveplan.com) will have periodic updates including Plan process dates.

7. **Question:** Is there a way to provide a summary of the recommendations?

   **Response:** The Plan intentionally does not include an executive summary. Each chapter of the Plan is deemed to have uniform importance, and is intended to have overlapping/interconnected policies.
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8. Comment: The CPSC should strive to make sure there is community buy in of the plan.

Response: The CPSC strives for community buy in. The two outreach meetings to date have been very helpful in terms of better understanding the quality of life perspectives of residents. The comments received will result in a modified draft with a goal of obtaining full support from the community.

In addition to the April 29, 2014 and May 10, 2014 CPSC outreach meetings, the CPSC will hold additional meetings on Thursday, May 22nd at 7:30pm, Monday, June 2nd at 7:30pm and Thursday, June 12th at 7:30 pm. The Town Hall Auditorium was selected so that the meetings could be televised on cable access TV and rebroadcast. The meetings are also streamed on the Town’s website. Hard copies of the Plan are available at the Greenburgh Public Library, Town Hall and the Theodore D. Young Community Center.

9. Comment/Question: Past experience indicates that the views of some residents are ignored. As an example, residents do not appear to support the development of a more intense private recreational component on Dobbs Ferry Road, in the vicinity of Frank’s Nursery; however, it appears that the Town Board is leaning towards facilitating more intense private recreational development at this location. What are the implications of this perceived disconnect, in regards to the Comprehensive Plan.

Response: Section 1.1 – Comprehensive Plan Introduction (Page 1-1) states, “...once adopted, all policies and municipal laws, including local zoning regulations, must be consistent with the plan.” An adopted Plan, based on a community derived vision for the future is a strong document that will guide land use decisions going forward. The CPSC encourages broad and continued community input into the development of the Plan through to its adoption. It is important that the public continues to participate.

10. Comment: In terms of process, there is a concern that the Town Board can have views related to the Plan that are inconsistent with public input that will be received throughout the Plan’s review process. The concern is that components of the Plan can be modified towards the very final stages of the Plan adoption process.

Response: See previous response above. All modifications to the draft Plan, regardless of the stage of adoption process that they are made, are subject to the SEQR process. The Plan, when adopted, must be consistent with the GEIS findings made in support of the Plan.

11. Comment/Question: The Plan is too comprehensive, may be difficult to implement. Similarly noted were the seemingly large number of policies and related action items. Can the policies be prioritized?

Response: Chapter 13.0 Implementation and Monitoring, directs the reader as to How the Plan will be implemented, Who will implement it, and When it will be implemented. The Plan, once adopted, will be a guide for residents, elected officials, land-use board appointees, Town employees and others to utilize.
12. **Question**: Do all of the CPSC members support each aspect of the Plan? Are there minority opinions?

**Response**: The CPSC to date voted to release the draft Plan for public comment. It is not realistic to expect nine (9) diverse members of a committee to unanimously support each and every element of a 400+ page document. As a result of the comments received from the public at the four outreach meetings and subsequent CPSC public hearing, changes to the Plan will be made and sent to the Town Board.

13. **Question**: What community indicators (noted in Chapter 4.0 - Health and Well-Being) has the Town used to date and will community indicators be used going forward?

**Response**: In connection with the Plan’s formulation, Community Indicators (Section 4.6, Page 4-6) were used. Section 1.4.1 Comprehensive Plan Input Survey (Page 1-4) references the survey, which is contained in its entirety as Appendix A of the Plan. A summary of the visioning meetings is provided in Appendix B. The CPSC met with school districts and the business community (Appendix C) as well, to solicit input. Going forward, community indicators are recommended to be used. Policy 4.1.1.1 (Page 4-9) states, “Utilize community indicators as a way of gauging the successful implementation of quality of life policies.”

The charrettes for each planning area will be used as community indicators. Residents attending the charrettes will have a forum to state the aspects of their respective neighborhood that are favorable or lacking. Each of the planning areas or nodes are not necessarily intended to include a residential component. If at the charrette, it is deemed that a residential component does not enhance the respective planning area, the findings of the charrette would be reflective of this. In such an instance, an alternate combination of uses such as commercial and retail may be more appropriate.

Chapter 13.0 – Implementation and Monitoring, contains policies that will result in Town staff generated annual reports. Such reports will cover policy implementation and contain correlations to quality of life.

14. **Comment**: There is no New York State requirement to have a Comprehensive Plan. This whole process is not necessary. Zoning map and zoning text amendments occur without the need for a Plan. Regional entities (Westchester County, New York State, neighboring municipalities) do not have to comply with the Town’s comprehensive Plan, further devaluing the need for a Plan.

**Response**: The New York State Department of State (http://www.dos.ny.gov/) technical guide, “Zoning and the Comprehensive Plan,” revised 2009, states: “New York’s zoning enabling statutes (the state statutes which give cities, towns and villages the power to enact local zoning laws) all require that zoning laws be adopted in accordance with a comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan should provide the backbone for the local zoning law.”

Town Law Article 16 (Zoning and Planning) Section 261 empowers the Town Board “to regulate and restrict the height, number of stories and size of buildings, and other structures, the percentage of lot that may be occupied, the size of yards, courts, and other open spaces, the density of population, and the location and use of buildings, structures and land for
trade, industry, residence or other purposes; provided that such regulations shall apply to
and affect only such part of a town as is outside the limits of any incorporated village or
city…” The Town Board is not required to regulate land use but it is empowered to do so.
Similarly, the Town is not required to have a Comprehensive Plan but, if it adopts zoning
regulations, must do so in accordance with a comprehensive plan, pursuant to Town Law
Section 263, which states: “Such regulations shall be made in accordance with a
comprehensive plan and designed to lessen congestion in the streets; to secure safety from
fire, flood, panic and other dangers; to promote health and general welfare; …” [Emphasis
added]

Town Law Section 272-a(b) states: “Among the most important powers and duties granted by
the legislature to a town government is the authority and responsibility to undertake town
comprehensive planning and to regulate land use for the purpose of protecting the public
health, safety and general welfare of its citizens.”

Town Law Section 272(c) states: The development and enactment by the town government
of a town comprehensive plan which can be readily identified, and is available for use by the
public, is in the best interest of the people of each town.”

In accordance with the above, the Town Board authorized a Comprehensive Plan be
prepared.

15. Comment: The CPSC public hearing scheduled for Thursday, June 12, 2014 should be postponed.

Response: The comment will be taken into consideration leading up to the June 12, 2014
meeting. The CPSC looks forward to continued comments.

16. Comment: The intentions of the Plan should be identified up front/as soon as possible, before
June 12, 2014 (the scheduled date of the CPSC public hearing).

Response: The intentions of the Plan are to maintain and enhance our residents’ quality of
life, promote community character and support a strong and diverse tax base.

Sustainability – Related Questions/Comments

1. Comment: Page 3-14 contains a photograph which identifies the Westhab building as LEED
Certifiable; however, my understanding is that the building was never certified through the U.S.
Green Building Council.

Response: The caption in the Plan identifying the building as certifiable is correct. The
building contains “green” elements which make it LEED™ “certifiable,” benefitting the site
and the community. “Certification” by an applicant is voluntary.
2. **Comment:** A better approach to Chapter 3.0 (Sustainability) may be to note that there is an understanding of the benefits of limiting greenhouse gases as opposed to the seemingly overly-specific references of greenhouse gas projections that are in the chapter.

   **Response:** Chapter 3.0 notes the benefits of limiting greenhouse gases, while providing background data. It builds on the Town of Greenburgh’s draft Climate Action Plan and the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, both of which supply baseline data and benchmark goals. In addition, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation’s new environmental assessment form has evolved into a metric-based document, in terms of project impacts in connection with air quality.

3. **Comment:** LEED Certified Buildings alone do not lead to successful occupancy of office buildings.

   **Response:** Agreed.

4. **Comment:** The design of the library does not make sense from an energy design perspective.

   **Response:** The design of the library preceded the release of the Plan.

5. **Question:** The night sky portion of the Plan (Section 6.7 – Night Sky and Light Pollution, Page 6-24) should include discussion of buildings and structures, to address sports bubbles.

   **Response:** Buildings, structures and signage are all components that can impact the quality of night sky. The Plan will be reviewed to reflect each of these components as needed.

### Flooding/Hazard Mitigation – Related Questions/Comments

1. **Comment:** The Plan should have a greater emphasis on flooding mitigation, particularly in the Fulton Park and Parkway Gardens portion of unincorporated Greenburgh.

   **Response:** Stormwater run-off (Page 8-16) and flooding (Page 8-20) are major components of Chapter 8.0 Public Infrastructure. Section 8.4.4 – Stormwater Best Management Practices (Page 8-22) contains several mechanisms that Town staff and Town of Greenburgh land use boards can require applicants to use in land use development projects. As an MS-4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) Community (Page 8-17 thru 8-19), unincorporated Greenburgh is required to address water quantity and water quality.

2. **Question:** What are the impacts of infill subdivision with respect to stormwater runoff concerns?

   **Response:** While impervious surface coverage in the Town may increase with each new development project, the Town’s current stormwater management law (Chapter 248 of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh) provides a mechanism for regulatory stormwater oversight and mitigations. In addition, the best management practices cited in the previous response, are used, and will continue to be required by the Planning Board (the Town’s land use board that approves subdivision applications).
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3. **Question:** How does the Plan address security and safety concerns, particularly in the instances where new development is advocated? Will there be sufficient police and fire coverage? Will new development add to the emergency response time of the Town in a way that exacerbates problems incurred during major catastrophes such as hurricanes and major flooding?

   **Response:** The Plan’s GEIS as well as any project-specific SEQRA process will address impacts including the potential demand for additional community services (police and fire). In addition, Section 4.7 Design and Planning for Security and Safety (Page 4-7) is an important component of the Plan and directly responds to several aspects of the question.

4. **Question:** Are the potential impacts from events like Sandy accounted for in the Plan? Will changes need to be made from major storm events, in terms of the Town budget? Should a sub-group or sub-committee be formed to focus on hazard mitigation? The Plan only contains one reference (Page 8-32) to this topic. It incorporates by reference, the Town’s Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan, adopted two years before Sandy. Should the building code require backup generators in medical facilities and gas stations? Would shrubbery and tree control improve street visibility and reduce hazards of falling tree limbs? Should new development require underground power lines? How can the Comprehensive Plan be considered until hazard mitigation is given more attention.

   **Response:** The Town has an adopted Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan that undergoes periodic review. The Comprehensive Plan complements the Town’s Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan. Town staff and first responders will continue to learn from major catastrophes.

5. **Question:** Do we have emergency equipment for taller buildings?

   **Response:** Yes. Westchester County emergency response and the respective fire districts and fire protection districts that serve unincorporated Greenburgh have adequate equipment to respond to emergencies at existing buildings. The Plan does not advocate for buildings of a specific height. As part of the GEIS process for the Plan, fire officials serving fire districts and fire protection districts in unincorporated Greenburgh will be consulted to ensure the continued adequacy of emergency equipment.

6. **Comment:** Police presence is not spread uniformly throughout unincorporated Greenburgh.

   **Response:** For the purposes of policing, unincorporated Greenburgh is divided into sectors and the police force is deployed as needed into each sector.

7. **Question:** Can the police force handle the impacts of new development?

   **Response:** All new development projects will be evaluated through the SEQRA process. As part of the GEIS process for the Plan, the Town of Greenburgh Police Chief and Traffic Safety Control Officer will be consulted to ensure public safety-related issues are addressed.
Environmental/Tree – Related Questions/Comments

1. **Question:** Is the Town ordinance regarding trees—their care and removal—a part of the comprehensive plan or is that a separate issue?

   **Response:** Section 6.3.4 - The Code of the Town of Greenburgh (Chapter 260) regulates trees in unincorporated Greenburgh. The draft Plan contains several policy recommendations regarding tree coverage (Goal 6.2, Page 6-25). Proposed amendments to Chapter 260 are anticipated to be presented to the Town Board after adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. Trees and Canopy Coverage (Page 6-11) discusses various aspects of tree care and removal.

2. **Comment/Question:** The current tree ordinance (and its provision allowing neighboring property owners to appeal the issuance of a tree removal permit) makes living on an acre of land a burden and hindrance. Will my neighbors have the right to object and prevent me from removing a tree even if a permit has been granted?

   **Response:** Any proposed amendment(s) to the tree ordinance will have an associated public hearing process, which will present Town residents with an opportunity to voice their concerns related to the tree ordinance.

3. **Question:** Please explain “canopy coverage” usage in the plan?

   **Response:** Canopy coverage is a metric based approach to shade tree adequacy which is the basis for its use in the Plan. Canopy coverage standards is a concept that will be considered as part of any amendment to the tree ordinance. Policy 6.2.1.2 states, “Consider the use of tree canopy standards in connection with tree replacements.” Canopy coverage standards are not a current component of the existing tree ordinance.

4. **Question:** At what circumference size and how far from the ground will a permit be required to remove a tree? If a tree is removed, will consideration be given to the number of trees remaining on the property or will the owner be made to plant a tree in its place and have the type of replacement determined by someone other than the property owner?

   **Response:** These details will be looked into further as part of any proposed amendments to Chapter 260 (Trees). Any proposed Town Code amendment will have a public hearing associated with it.

5. **Question:** From what I read, I believe all properties in the Town will be treated equitably and the restrictions placed on properties over one acre will be dropped. Is that correct?

   **Response:** Policy 6.2.1.3 (Page 6-25) states, “Amend Chapter 260 (Trees) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh to address properties of less than one acre.” Properties over one acre are currently subject to the existing tree law. It is not anticipated that any tree law related amendment will remove regulation of properties greater than one acre.
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6. **Comment:** There are existing and former uses within the Central Park Avenue and Route 119 corridors that may have contributed environmental contamination. There should be a study of these sites to see the extent that they need to be remediated.

   **Response:** Phase I Environmental Site Analyses deemed necessary will be required in connection with redevelopment projects.

**Economic – Related Questions/Comments**

1. **Comment/Question:** During Town staff’s introduction of the Plan, there was a reference to 60% of residents with college degrees. A connection was made that Plan policies are intended to take advantage of the high percentage of graduate degrees of the residents. A request for further explanation of this aspect of the Plan was made.

   **Response:** The research and development/biotech industry commonly seek to locate in regions with high concentrations of universities and highly educated residents. Unincorporated Greenburgh has these two advantages: the prevalence of the Mid-Hudson Region’s high concentration of colleges and universities and approximately 60 percent of residents having a bachelor’s degree or higher (Table 11.7 – Educational Attainment; Page 11-9). As part of developing the northern and southern biotech clusters (Section 12.11 – Research and Development Clusters, Pages 12-68 thru 12-72) and supporting the existing commercial businesses, Greenburgh is well positioned to support and allow for expansion of existing companies and new companies looking to relocate.

2. **Comment/Question:** Tax certioraris appear to be a prevalent problem in the Town. What is the anticipated impact of the Plan on tax certioraris?

   **Response:** Specific tax-related impacts associated with implementation of the Plan will be a component of the Plan’s GEIS. Separate from the Plan, the Town-wide reassessment that will take place over the next two years is anticipated to reduce issues related to tax certioraris.

3. **Comment:** The taxes experienced in the Town are too high.

   **Response:** The implementation of numerous components of the Plan should increase rateables. An example of the potential for increased rateables is the northern and southern biotech cluster (Section 12.11 – Research and Development Clusters, Pages 12-68 thru 12-72) planning areas.

4. **Comment/Question:** A comment made during the presentation noted an example of a recent college graduate obtaining employment of approximately $50,000 a year who likely could not afford to buy a residence in the Town. Many or a majority of households contain two wage earners. A request for clarification on the example was made.

   **Response:** Section 11.6.3 – Residential & Demographic Market Dynamics (Page 11-21) contains discussion regarding the types of housing young professionals seek.
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5. Comment: Online sales have accelerated exponentially and have caused downsizing and store closings in small-to-mid box categories.

Response: Agreed. As stated in the Plan on Page 11-26, “Although increased consumer purchases are made through the use of the internet, local attractive, inviting and safe places to shop and socialize remain a viable component of the community.”

6. Comment: Residential growth that brings younger people with spendable income is good for business and that is sorely needed.

Response: Agreed.

7. Comment: The Plan does not address taxes, the WestHELP property or the $5,000,000 settlement from the Fortress Bible project.

Response: The Plan addresses taxes by facilitating the potential for fiscally responsible development. The Plan is a twenty-year plan for the future.

8. Question: How would implementation of the Plan impact Fire Department, School, Town and County taxes?

Response: Fiscally responsible development entails assessing the impacts to related taxing entities to ensure that there is a positive tax revenue benefit for the school district, the fire district and the town. An analysis will be done for each taxing district as part of the Plan’s GEIS and subsequent individual project reviews.

9. Comment: There is an asymmetric tax structure for one-family residences and multi-family residences, which has implications for the school districts.

Response: The tax structure is defined by New York State. Any proposed development would have to take this tax structure into account.

10. Question: How does the Plan interplay with the Town’s scheduled assessment revaluation?

Response: They are not related.

11. Comment: The Plan should not take a one size fits all approach to development in the Town, but rather explore development that has contributed to the stability of rateables and replicate it in ways that make sense to promote economic vitality in all the communities in the Town.

Response: Agreed. The Plan does not advocate for a one size fits all approach to development.

12. Comment: Implementation of the nodes will adversely impact residential property values.

Response: Implementation of the nodes is expected to positively impact residential property values.
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School Impact – Related Questions/Comments

1. **Comment:** The Plan does not appear to address impacts to school districts.

   **Response:** Impacts to school districts are an important component of any comprehensive plan. Section 1.11 - The Plan’s Adoption Process (Page 1-11), notes that a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS), “prepared as a separate and complementary document, will be completed prior to adoption of the final Plan.” Although the development densities of each of the planning areas cannot be determined until a project-specific SEQRA process (based on the charrette findings and subsequent zoning enabling legislation), the GEIS associated with the Plan will look at several hypothetical alternatives including a “no change/existing zoning alternative.” This no change/existing zoning alternative will be the comparative basis for a range of other alternatives that include a spectrum of hypothetical densities. In addition, the GEIS will address the impact of existing zoning districts that currently permit multi-family residences, such as the CA District.

2. **Question:** What is the extent of rateables expected to be generated, particularly in Edgemont, with implementation of the Plan. Will these rateables off-set the anticipated additional capital/operating cost to be incurred by the Edgemont School District with additional students entering into the District?

   **Response:** Each of the planning areas is intended to contain a commercial component which generates significant tax rateables, particularly when compared with the revenue generated in an existing scenario. Complementary residential development, if deemed appropriate during the charrette process, could also generate tax revenue. The planned mixed-use areas have the potential to contain a residential component where appropriate, but are not intended to have only a residential building. The financial analysis done in connection with the GEIS for the Plan will look at the cumulative tax generations from each aspect of a mixed-use development.

3. **Comment:** It appears that the Plan aims to disproportionately maximize rateables in the Edgemont School District. Increased tax rateables strategies should be evenly spread throughout the Town.

   **Response:** Figures 12.16 and 12.21 depict nine (9) planning areas or nodes. In addition, there are two (2) Research and Development Cluster Nodes, for a total of eleven (11) planning areas or nodes. Two (2) of these eleven (11) planning areas are fully located within the Edgemont School District and one (1) is partially located within the Edgemont School District. The Plan’s recommendations were based on uniform standards and are not specific to any school district.

   It has been brought to the attention of the CPSC that the size of the planning areas on Figure 12.16 give an impression that large swaths of Central Park Avenue (specifically when viewing the Mt. Joy/Henry Street – Traditional Hamlet District & Ardsley Road/Central Park Avenue District Center areas) are intended to be redeveloped. Although not lot specific, the CPSC will closely revisit each of the planning areas and modify their depiction on Figure 12.16 as deemed appropriate.
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4. **Question:** How many students per unit are anticipated as part of any new neighborhood node development? How would those projections compare with the existing ratios of students per unit, particularly in multifamily residential developments?

   **Response:** The CPSC encourages the use of local data, which provides a breakdown of existing students per unit in various types of dwellings (single-family homes, multi-family residences). As part of the Plan’s GEIS process, statistical data will be compiled which looks at existing ratios of students per multi-family dwelling in unincorporated Greenburgh, to the extent that such data is provided by the school districts.

   Additionally, the Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research “Residential Demographic Multipliers – Estimates of Occupants of New Housing (Residents, School-Age Children, Public School-Age Children by Housing Type, Housing Size, and Housing Price),” is a New York State specific guide that is routinely used in evaluating various impacts associated with development projects with a residential component. This guide will be utilized in connection with the ongoing review of the Plan unless local data is available.

5. **Comment/Question:** The Greenburgh Central School District is in the process of exploring a consolidation of its building infrastructure onto the Woodlands High School campus. How does the Town’s draft Plan factor into such an endeavor?

   **Response:** Implementation of the Plan would in no way inhibit consolidation of the Greenburgh Central School District should the school district decide to do so.

6. **Comment:** The success experienced within the Edgemont School District and traits of land-use/properties within the Edgemont School District (multifamily/one-family residence ratio 1/3 to 2/3; the school district itself; the Greenville Fire District) should serve as a model for planning the remainder of unincorporated Greenburgh - which is not currently a component of the Plan.

   **Response:** Each school district has a unique mix of residential housing and commercial development.

7. **Comment:** What type of rateables can the Town bring in to help out the school districts?

   **Response:** The Plan contains policies to facilitate various forms of economic development (commercial, industrial, office, research and development, residential, mixed-use). The Plan assigns importance to the retention and enhancement of existing businesses as well as facilitating a successful environment for new businesses.

8. **Question:** Did you consult with the various school districts during the formulation of the plan? If so, who did you work with and what were their responses?

   **Response:** The CPSC consulted with school districts as part of the draft Plan’s formulation, see Section 1.4.4 School District Outreach (Page 1-6). Additional outreach to the school districts is planned.
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9. **Question:** Given that this plan predicates increases in the development of apartments that are carried at lower tax rates than private single family residences, are you willing to incorporate using the Homestead Act (after revaluation) to balance the tax burden?

   **Response:** The revaluation process and Comprehensive Plan are not interconnected. The use of the Homestead Act is at the discretion of the Town Board at the completion of the tax revaluation process.

10. **Comment:** The Plan does not contain a school district map for land in unincorporated Greenburgh.

    **Response:** A map and information on the school districts will be added to the Plan.

11. **Question:** The Fairview Fire District contains approximately 50% tax exempt properties.

    **Response:** A relatively high percentage of the assessable value of property in Fairview is tax exempt. Numerous policies, including three (3) planning areas/nodes in the Fairview area, seek to promote private investment and rateables in the fire district.

12. **Comment:** The student population projections for multi-family buildings that have been developed in Edgemont have been less than the actual numbers of students entering the school district.

    **Response:** The CPSC is requesting additional data from each of the school districts.

13. **Comment:** The nodes will negatively impact the character of Edgemont.

    **Response:** Properly planned through a charrette process, neighborhood specific nodes will complement the local area for which they are designed and located.

**Land-Use – Related Questions/Comments**

1. **Comment:** The Urban Renewal District contains antiquated/outdated and overly restrictive zoning provisions which hinder the successful redevelopment of commercial properties on Tarrytown Road (NYS Rt. 119). A rezoning of this portion of the Town that would allow for similar commercial uses as those which exist on nearby/comparable parcels of land on Tarrytown Road would be good for the Town.

    **Response:** The Plan seeks to address the comment by removing the antiquated Urban Renewal District zoning. Section 12.6.37 (Urban Renewal - Existing), Section 12.6.38 (Urban Renewal Build-out Under Existing Zoning) and Section 12.6.39 (Urban Renewal – Future Land use) on Pages 12-41 thru 12-44. Figure 12.15.2 (Future Land Use – Urban Renewal) on Page 12-44 depicts future land use designations that will result in zoning map (likely new zoning districts) and related zoning text changes associated with properties currently zoned Urban Renewal. These changes are intended to facilitate appropriate land uses in the primarily commercial-used parcels along Tarrytown Road (Rt. 119) and in the residential-use parcels in the remainder of the Urban Renewal District.
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In addition, Appendix E contains recommended zoning map changes for 28 individual parcels that are currently zoned in the Urban Renewal District.

2. **Comment:** *It appears that the Plan would promote urbanization or urbanized sprawl.*

**Response:** Figure 12.16 (Page 12-47) and Figure 12.21 (Page 12-60) depict nine (9) unique areas within unincorporated Greenburgh that have the potential to support some form of mixed-use development. Each of these nine (9) areas contains a general vision-based narrative. The first such write-up begins on Page 12-48 (Section 12.8.1 Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park District). The yellow polygons that depict each of the nine (9) planning areas are not lot specific and portray a generalized area. It has been brought to the attention of the CPSC that the size of the polygons give an impression that large swaths of Central Park Avenue (specifically when viewing the Mt. Joy/Henry Street – Traditional Hamlet District & Ardsley Road/Central Park Avenue District Center areas) are intended to be redeveloped. The CPSC will revisit each of the planning areas and modify their depiction on Figure 12.16 as deemed appropriate.

The nine (9) planning areas and any subsequent redevelopment done in accordance with the adopted Plan, would take place only at these limited nodes. Future applications proposing comparable mixed-use development elsewhere in unincorporated Greenburgh would be deemed inconsistent with the Plan and not feasible. In this sense, the Plan does not promote “urbanized sprawl.”

The second sentence on Page 12-57, under the heading of Section 12.8.6 Mt. Joy/Henry St. Traditional Hamlet District, reinforces the limited locations that the planning areas are envisioned: “Similar development is not intended to stretch along the expanse of Central Park Avenue. If density were increased along...”

Following subsequent adoption of the Plan, the Plan provides for a unique multi-step process involving residents from the start in a charrette process. (Page 12-46: “A charrette is a group of focused planning sessions where residents, business owners, designers and others collaborate on a vision for development.”). Included in the charrette process, and likely at the forefront, residents will articulate density-related design components such as building heights, architectural schemes, etc., that would exhibit conformance in terms of neighborhood character. A series of findings from each charrette will be formulated by Town staff and will inform any subsequent site/neighborhood-specific legislation.

Each of the planning areas or nodes are not necessarily intended to include a residential component. If at the charrette, it is deemed that a residential component does not enhance the respective planning area, the findings of the charrette would be reflective of this. In such an instance, an alternate combination of uses such as commercial and retail may be more appropriate.
3. **Comment:** It appears that implementation of the Plan would transform Central Park Avenue into a version of Queens Boulevard in New York City.

**Response:** Implementation of the Plan has the potential to transform limited portions of Central Park Avenue that could be part of the planning areas, through significant private investment. Residents can contribute to the design process to direct investment in the respective area that enhances and complements the neighborhood and community.

In the portions of Central Park Avenue that are not part of the planning areas, implementation of the Plan could result in traffic calming measures, signalization improvements, a modest reduction in off-street parking requirements or the elimination/consolidation of a curb cut. Such right-of-way and site changes would likely not transform Central Park Avenue but may facilitate incremental changes that foster more meaningful/enhanced greenspaces, safer vehicular movements and enhanced quality of life.

4. **Question:** How many stories are the buildings of any new neighborhood node development anticipated to be?

**Response:** Similar to the previous two responses above, the appropriate number of stories that could be a component of a particular mixed-use planning area would be determined as part of the charrette process, which would highlight the unique neighborhood/community attributes. Unique findings will inform any subsequent zoning enabling legislation, including building height. Section 12.12 - Collaborative Zoning Process (Page 12-73) notes the rationale for not pre-determining building heights, desired architectural forms or other design aspects. Predetermining such aspects would preclude meaningful participation through the charrette process.

5. **Comment/Question:** There is discussion in the Plan that the buildings of any new neighborhood node development would have zero lot line setbacks, particularly along frontages of street rights-of-way. Is that a uniform requirement, would there be any greenspace?

**Response:** The charrette process presents the opportunity for residents to contribute to findings that will drive any subsequent development. If front yard zero line setbacks are not deemed appropriate/advantageous for neighborhood redevelopment, the findings would reflect this design element.

Each planning area contains an associated narrative with varying degrees of specificity. Some of the planning areas, based on factors such as existing street networks and topography, may be appropriate for traditional street frontages including storefronts built to a sidewalk. Such development exists within the general planning areas identified on Figure 12.16 – Future Land Use Overlay. Examples include: (1) the south side of Tarrytown Road (Rt. 119) between Fair Street and Hillside Avenue; (2) the northeast corner of the intersection of Central Park Avenue and East Hartsdale Avenue; (3) both sides of East Hartsdale Avenue between Rockledge Road and Aqueduct Road; (4) Central Park Avenue South from Mt. Joy Avenue to Curry Chevrolet. In some instances, the charrette process may produce findings that encourage comparable development with no front yard setbacks. Here, the vision may be small storefronts with new sidewalks, benches and street trees/landscaping. The inclusion of pocket parks also could be explored though the charrette process. In these limited instances
maintaining the standard existing CA District front yard setback of 40 or 80 feet would likely preclude any meaningful redevelopment where it may be logical to have buildings with little or no front yard setback. Form-based zoning is a concept introduced in the Plan (see Pages 12-46 thru 12-48) as an alternative to standard Euclidean zoning and can be used in instances where building alignments are evident.

The Plan recognizes the importance of greenspace, particularly in the existing Central Park Avenue, Saw Mill River Road (Rt. 9A) and Tarrytown-White Plains Road corridors. The last paragraph on Page 11-27 notes, “Several major shopping centers in unincorporated Greenburgh contain beautiful landscaped buffers or green spaces between the roadway and shopping center and are a positive defining attribute of portions of the commercial corridors. Buildings constructed at the street line would not enhance these centers.” This portion of the Plan highlights that traditional street front stores built to the sidewalk are only envisioned if deemed appropriate as part of the charrette public participation process, in the general/limited planning areas identified on Figure 12.16 – Future Land Use Overlay.

6. **Comment:** The Plan does not propose to make one-family residential neighborhoods more dense. This is a positive aspect of the Plan.

   **Response:** The Plan responded to community input to protect existing neighborhoods.

7. **Question:** Does the Planning Consultant who assisted the CPSC with the Plan have experience with neighborhood node development, consistent with the vision for development in the Plan?

   **Response:** Yes. The planning consultants who assisted the CPSC with the Plan have been involved in numerous technical and analytical planning projects throughout the tri-state region.

8. **Question:** Are there examples or case studies of neighborhood node development consistent with those advocated for in the Plan. How successful are these nodes?

   **Response:** The closest example of neighborhood scale development that could be comparable/applicable to one or some of the planning areas envisioned as part of the Plan is development in the Village of Scarsdale that includes attractive mixed-use buildings with façade and other interesting architectural components, and incorporates underground parking. The Village of Scarsdale contains mixed-use development within close proximity to transit options, shopping and within walking distance of single-family neighborhoods. This type of development successfully contributes to the Village of Scarsdale community and provides many of the benefits that are featured throughout the Plan.

9. **Question:** Why was the term hamlet used, it does not seem appropriate?

   **Response:** The comprehensive plan uses the term “hamlet” to refer to areas within unincorporated Greenburgh that are easily recognizable by residents, through the use of local landmarks. The use of this term is especially important because unincorporated Greenburgh does not have a traditional downtown area or Central Business District. Some portions of the Town have commercial areas servicing pockets of surrounding neighborhoods.
10. **Comment**: The Plan does not support the development of a more intense private recreational component on Dobbs Ferry Road, in the vicinity of Frank’s Nursery. This was noted to be a positive aspect of the Plan.

**Response**: Comment noted.

11. **Comment**: Please review the cemetery designations on Figure 12.3.2 to ensure that all designated cemetery lands are incorporated into this map and any other applicable maps.

**Response**: All cemetery designations will be reviewed for accuracy.

12. **Comment**: The Lifestyle Center references in 2010 Central Park Avenue Market positioning Study have not been borne out by the mixed results of their performance. For every Beverly Hills Grove there are many W. Palm City places. The successful Ridge Hill takes care of that niche for much of our market. The downplay of vehicular based shopping is not consistent with the market on Central Ave.

**Response**: The Plan focuses on the traits of experience based retail that are most applicable to unincorporated Greenburgh. Page 11-26 notes that, “components associated with experience-based retail include safe and inviting pedestrian circulation, outdoor seating in connection with restaurants, seating for general public use within retail locations, higher quality architecture and enhanced landscaping.”

13. **Comment**: Consolidation of lots and opening cross easements is an excellent idea if it can be implemented.

**Response**: Agreed.

14. **Comment**: Four Corners is a major intersection and not a hamlet.

**Response**: Four Corners is a major intersection and can be seen as the gateway to the Hartsdale Train Station District, and as a planning area, is specifically discussed in Section 12.8.4 – Four Corners District Center. The intersection will always remain a major intersection. However, implementation of features such as underground utility lines, attractive mixed-use buildings and better walking connections across the intersection and up West Hartsdale Avenue would create a more pedestrian-friendly environment in the Town.

15. **Comment**: The Plan will not influence affordable housing.

**Response**: The Code of the Town of Greenburgh currently mandates that 10% of the units in new multifamily residential projects either be affordable or workforce housing. Policy 10.2.2.2 (Page 10-26) states: “Include a ten percent affordable housing set-aside in any new zoning district permitting multi-family housing.”
16. **Comment:** Regarding Figure 12.7.2 Future Land-Use (Office-Commercial), can there be a better explanation of the intended future land-uses in these areas are office, retail, multi-family and/or assisted living.

**Response:** The existing zoning districts with parcels identified as general office-commercial are the CA (Central Park Mixed-Use Impact District), CB (Close Business), DS (Designed Shopping), HC (Hartsdale Center), IB (Intermediate Business), LOB (Limited Office), OB (Office Building) and OB-1 (Office Building) and UR (Urban Renewal). Regarding the intended future use of the parcels identified as office-commercial on Figure 12.7.2 Future Land-Use, Section 12.6.12 (Page 12-24) notes that there are few zoning change recommendations associated with these districts. To the extent that the areas are shown within a node/planning area, future land uses are intended to be explored through a neighborhood-specific charrette process. For areas outside the general planning areas, Section 12.7 – General Mixed-Use Strategies (Page 12-45) contains policies which can facilitate site improvements such as increased landscaping, better site-to-site integration, and a design oriented to pedestrians and site users. Lastly, there are recommended changes in land use associated with the general office-commercial areas of the existing UR District. Those are explained in Section 12.6.39 – Urban Renewal, Future Land Use and are described in response 1 on Page 12 of this report.

17. **Comment:** Does the Plan consider reconfiguring the existing shopping centers?

**Response:** Some of the planning areas contain existing shopping centers which could be planned to be reconfigured through the charrette process. Implementation of the Plan has the potential to transform these shopping centers in limited portions of commercial corridors through significant private investment. In these locations, residents can contribute to the design process to direct investment that enhances and complements the neighborhood and community.

In the portions of the commercial corridors that are not part of the planning areas, implementation of the Plan could result in the elimination/consolidation of a curb cut, cross-easements, traffic calming, signalization improvements or a modest reduction in off-street parking requirements. Such right-of-way and site changes would likely not transform existing shopping centers but may facilitate incremental changes that foster more meaningful/enhanced greenspaces, safer vehicular movements and enhanced quality of life.

18. **Comment/Question:** The definition of low vs. high water pressure (water pressure zones are discussed in Chapter 8 – Public Infrastructure) is not clear in the Plan. What is the implication to the water pressure zones, when factoring in new development?

**Response:** Additional clarification on this issue will be added to the Plan. Water pressure is a factor to consider as part of any new development. As part of the GEIS in connection with the Plan, mitigation when developing property within a low or high pressure water zone will be indicated where necessary. Low pressure does not necessarily equate to inadequate pressure and conversely, high water pressure can also require certain mitigations. The Town’s Water Department has and will continue to be consulted to better establish any necessary mitigations.
19. **Comment:** The Plan should have a map of the sewer districts.

**Response:** Agreed.

20. **Comment:** The discussion for infrastructure alludes that repairs are only or most feasible when new development projects are constructed.

**Response:** Infrastructure upgrades and repairs occur on a regular basis to the extent that municipal financial resources are allocated. Objective 8.2.3 (Page 8-36) is related to identifying and correcting existing water infrastructure. Objective 8.3.3 (Page 8-36) is related identifying and correcting existing sanitary sewer infrastructure. It is also expected that major privately financed infrastructure improvements would be done in connection with the development of any of the planning areas.

21. **Comment:** New development should maintain the same footprint as existing development so as to not lose greenspace in the Town.

**Response:** The Plan contains numerous policies to facilitate increases in greenspace/pervious surfaces.

22. **Comment:** Figure 12.16 – Future Land-Use Overlay, which lays out the various nodes, includes the Cotswold Park District as well as residential properties on Barford Lane.

**Response:** As noted in previous responses, the areas identified on Figures 12.16 and 12.21 will be revisited to address the impression that large swaths of Central Park Avenue, single-family neighborhoods or other portions of the Town are intended to be redeveloped. The Cotswold Special Park District was intentionally included in the Ardsley Road/Central Park Avenue District Center to highlight that potential development in this area must be consistent with this greenspace which cannot be developed. The Plan will be updated to reflect this concept.

23. **Comment:** What are the plans for redevelopment in the Hartsdale side of Edgemont (Pipeline Road)?

**Response:** The charrette process will shape development or redevelopment potential within any planning area.

**Traffic/Transportation – Related Questions/Comments**

1. **Comment:** There are concerns related to traffic and accidents, particularly on Central Park Avenue (from Four Corners to Ardsley Road), and the traffic that is experienced east/west, particularly around the intersection of Fort Hill Road and Ardsley Road; and the impact that these factors have on quality of life, including air quality concerns.

**Response:** Continued coordination with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) is necessary to ensure existing turn lanes and signalized intersections are designed to facilitate travel efficiency. Goal 9.6 (Page 9-35) states: “Address roadways that experience,
or are expected to experience, congestion.” This goal contains a related objective and policies. Table 9.6 – Crash Data Trends (2009-2012), Page 9-22 contains statistical accident data. Section 9.3.7 – Access Management (Page 9-23) lists many transportation planning tools that can be used to mitigate accidents associated with existing and new development.

Traffic impacts, including the impact on air quality, will be a component of the Plan’s GEIS process. Although the development densities of each of the planning areas cannot be determined until a project-specific SEQRA process (based on the charrette findings and subsequent zoning enabling legislation), the GEIS associated with the Plan will look at several hypothetical alternatives including a “no change/existing zoning alternative.” This no change/existing zoning alternative will be the comparative basis for a range of other alternatives that include a spectrum of hypothetical densities.

2. **Comment:** *Need to include NYSDOT and other government entities as partners in planning out the node areas.*

   **Response:** The Plan contains numerous references related to the importance of planning with various agency partners. The Plan introduces the term “Coordinated Planning Areas” on Page 12-48. Coordinated Planning Areas are also depicted on Figure 12.16 – Future Land Use Overlay. This map and the Coordinated Planning Areas specifically note some of the governmental agencies (often neighboring municipalities) that will partner in the planning process. These partnerships are also established in Chapter 13.0. Table 13.3 (Intermunicipal and Regional Planning Partners) lists 18 potential agency partners.

3. **Comment:** *The Four Corners traffic at Central Ave. & Hartsdale Ave. seems unresolvable. The concept of higher density development on the corner lots seems impractical.*

   **Response:** Continued coordination with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) is necessary to ensure existing turn lanes and signalized intersections are designed to facilitate travel efficiency. In addition, Section 9.3.7 – Access Management (Page 9-23) lists many transportation planning tools such as optimal driveway placement/reduction in curb cuts that can be used to mitigate traffic impacts and enhance vehicular and pedestrian safety.

4. **Question:** The Plan does not appear to address traffic impacts.

   **Response:** Chapter 9.0 (Transportation) addresses numerous issues of traffic concern. In addition, a full traffic study will be a component of the SEQRA process of any subsequent planning area development project, at the specific time such a development may be feasible. It is anticipated that redevelopment of any planning area, consistent with the Plan, would be part of a long range implementation process. The completion of the Tappan Zee Bridge, Rt. 9A bypass or other significant local or regional transportation project will greatly influence such a traffic study.
5. **Comment:** It seems that it would make more sense to install enhanced public transit features such as new covered bus shelters in locations, particularly along Central Park Avenue, in advance of any plans that may facilitate mixed-use or other development advocated for in the draft Plan. The Plan seems to allude that a high percentage of people will use the bus. Bus Rapid Transit along Central Avenue cannot compete with the efficiency of the Metro North Trains.

**Response:** The installation of enhanced public transit features such as new covered bus shelters is not an action that can be funded or constructed by the Town of Greenburgh. Such amenities are improved by an appropriate governing agency such as the Metropolitan Transit Authority (associated with Metro North Trains) or Westchester County (associated with the Bee-Line Bus Service). However, the Town, as part of a public-private partnership, or in conjunction with an approval process associated with new development, can require that public transit amenities be upgraded privately at no cost to the Town. In addition, a combination of factors are anticipated to promote increased public transit usage such as walking connections to bus stops or train stations, the existence of jitneys taking residents to train stations, and complementary land uses. The planned mixed-use areas noted in Chapter 12.0 have been selected at least partially due to their potential to combine enhanced public transit features for existing residents and for occupants of any new mixed-use development.

6. **Comment:** Many intersections in the Town are difficult to cross and not pedestrian friendly.

**Response:** Any redevelopment of the planning areas will include measures that render respective intersections more pedestrian friendly. Section 9.2.1 – Pedestrians (Page 9-2) notes the importance and contributing factors of pedestrian friendly environments.

7. **Comment:** Need sidewalks to be connected from the neighborhoods onto Central Avenue.

**Response:** See previous response, above. Chapter 9.0 advocates for sidewalks along collector roads, NYS rights-of-way and other prioritized areas.

8. **Comment:** Bicycles and walking paths are commendable but utilization realistically faces headwinds considering the aging local population, health problems and harsh weather conditions.

**Response:** The Plan seeks to implement policies that result in safer walking and bicycling conditions. Limitations with regard to potential pedestrian and bicycling networks in unincorporated Greenburgh are noted in Section 9.2.1 Pedestrians (Page 9-2) and Section 9.2.2 Bicycles (Page 9-4), respectively.

9. **Comment:** If the nodes in the Edgemont School District are developed, will there be cut through traffic along Old Army Road?

**Response:** Old Army Road is currently used as a cut through. The installation of traffic calming measures will be explored to discourage the use of the road as a cut-through.
1. **Question:** Is there space capacity for the off-street parking that would be needed to accommodate the neighborhood node developments listed in the Plan?

**Response:** Sufficient off-street parking is an important and necessary component of the neighborhood node developments listed in the Plan. Such off-street parking must be constructed in a way that complements and/or enhances community character. Each planning area is unique (various future parcel sizes/groundwater depth, surrounding neighborhood character). New off-street parking built in connection with new mixed-use development can take a variety of forms (underground parking, parking decks, at-grade parking and combinations thereof). As part of the charrette process, the feasibility of off-street parking alternatives will be explored. In some instances, there may be opportunities for public-private partnerships (see last paragraph, Page 12-66). Such partnerships have the potential to increase the number and/or efficiency of parking for existing residents and businesses. Section 9.6.2 Off-Street Parking (Mixed-Use Development), Page 9-31 has further discussion related to this matter. This section notes that, “In some instances, structured parking facilities may be more appropriate, with parking requirements that factor in public transit options, commuter jitneys and dedicated car sharing opportunities.”

2. **Comment:** Parking seems to be a factor that would preclude the implementation of new neighborhood node development.

**Response:** See previous response, above. As an example, the Four Corners District Center, discussed in Section 12.8.4 (Page 12-54), if implemented, could result in redevelopment on all four corners of the intersection of Central Park Avenue and East/West Hartsdale Avenue. Each of the four corners have varying traits (parcel lot depth, proximity to Hartsdale Public Parking District) which would likely result in varying resultant development (including off-street parking layouts) on each corner.

3. **Question:** What is the expected parking allocation requirement per new residential unit anticipated as part of any new neighborhood node development? How would that requirement compare with existing requirements?

**Response:** Structured parking is an efficient way to address parking demand and facilitate good site design. The expected parking allocation per new residential unit anticipated as part of any new neighborhood node development will be based on factors such as public transit options, commuter jitneys and dedicated car sharing opportunities. The existing Zoning Ordinance off-street parking requirements for multi-family dwellings are a minimum of 1 space for each studio, 1.5 spaces for each 1-bedroom, 2 spaces for each 2-bedroom or larger apartment, plus 10 percent of the total required, for visitor parking.

4. **Comment:** Structured parking, done in a way that is attractive and screened, can facilitate better site design.

**Response:** The second paragraph of Page 12-73 expresses a similar sentiment, “In the targeted locations, appropriate densities can provide for better site design through the
incorporation of structured parking; provide increased economic benefits to area businesses;

5. **Comment:** The concept of the Hartsdale Train Station and Four Corners nodes are good; however, traffic seems to be the major hurdle for redevelopment.

   **Response:** Section 9.3.7 – Access Management (Page 9-23) lists many transportation planning tools such as optimal driveway placement/reduction in curb cuts that can be used to mitigate traffic impacts and enhance vehicular and pedestrian safety.

6. **Comment:** Speed limits and ‘no left turn’ signs are routinely ignored on Fort Hill Road. Traffic calming measures are needed.

   **Response:** This and related comments have been referred to the Police Department.

7. **Comment:** Traffic has increased on Sprain Valley Road in the last several years, with commercial traffic included. Sprain Valley Road lacks a much needed sidewalk.

   **Response:** The Plan advocates for a sidewalk on Sprain Valley Road. See Figure 9.1 – Sidewalk Network (Page 9-3).

8. **Comment:** The intersection of Mendham Avenue and Jackson Avenue is dangerous. Will the recommended Appendix E zoning changes in this area, if implemented, make this intersection worse?

   **Response:** The Appendix E – related zoning changes recommended for Mendham Avenue will not result in any increase in development potential and will not be detrimental to the Mendham Avenue/Jackson Avenue.

9. **Comment:** Large-scale development at Mt. Joy and Henry Street will dump traffic onto surrounding residential streets.

   **Response:** There is no large-scale development anticipated in connection with the Mt. Joy/Henry St. Traditional Hamlet District. The charrette process is intended to allow residents to indicate a scale of development that is in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. Subsequent development is not anticipated to significantly increase local traffic patterns.

10. **Comment:** What will be the impact of the Plan on car and pedestrian traffic around the schools.

    **Response:** In general, the Plan advocates for a more pedestrian friendly community.

11. **Comment:** Existing roads in the vicinity of the nodes cannot be widened.

    **Response:** Various right-of-way improvements are anticipated in connection with any node redevelopment.
12. **Comment:** Even if public transit is used by residents occupying any of the nodes, how will people get to various locations during non-working hours?

**Response:** The Plan seeks to facilitate better transit, walking and biking options for all residents.