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<td>International Business Machines Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICLEI</td>
<td>Local Governments for Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IECC</td>
<td>International Energy Conservation Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAs</td>
<td>Inter-Municipal Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Institute of Transportation Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kWh</td>
<td>Kilowatt Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED</td>
<td>Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED-ND</td>
<td>LEED-Neighborhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPZ</td>
<td>Low Pressure Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWCF</td>
<td>Land and Water Conservation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD</td>
<td>Million Gallons per Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHRSP</td>
<td>Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO</td>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>Needs Assessment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHLA</td>
<td>New Homes Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREL</td>
<td>National Renewable Energy Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>National Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPA</td>
<td>National Recreation and Park Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂O</td>
<td>Nitrous Oxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYMTC</td>
<td>New York Metropolitan Transportation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDEC</td>
<td>New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
<td>New York State Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
<td>New York State Energy Research and Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSTA</td>
<td>New York State Thruway Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Property Assessed Clean Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;2.5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Particulate Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Planned Unit Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Photovoltaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;DCN</td>
<td>Research and Development Cluster North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;DCS</td>
<td>Research and Development Cluster South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDC</td>
<td>Regional Economic Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHRS</td>
<td>Reconnaissance-level Historic Resource Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMO</td>
<td>State Emergency Management Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQR</td>
<td>State Environmental Quality Review Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDYCC</td>
<td>Theodore D. Young Community Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFSD</td>
<td>Union Free School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGBC</td>
<td>United States Green Building Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWNR</td>
<td>United Water New Rochelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCWD-3</td>
<td>Westchester County Water District No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCDOH</td>
<td>Westchester County Department of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan

1.1 Comprehensive Plan Introduction

A comprehensive plan is a strategic and visionary document that describes a community’s desired future for a period of approximately 20 years. It is based on community-derived values and guides decision-making and actions affecting the enhancement, growth and physical development of the community. A comprehensive plan is a policy document that does not, in and of itself, have the force of law. However, once adopted, all policies and municipal laws, including local zoning regulations, must be consistent with the plan. Following a community’s adoption of a comprehensive plan, it is expected that subsequent plan review and updates will occur every five years. A comprehensive plan:

- documents existing conditions;
- presents a long-term vision and describes goals and objectives to achieve the vision;
- guides decision-making towards the achievement of community goals;
- directs discussion and decisions about land use and development;
- fosters coordination among governmental agencies for planning and implementation of capital projects;
- supports the protection of public health and safety and promotes general welfare; and
- helps a community prepare for change, future challenges and growth.

1.2 Legislative Authority

The unincorporated Greenburgh Comprehensive Plan (herein referred to as, “the Plan”) has been prepared pursuant to New York State (NYS) Town Law §272-a which specifies that the Town Board is responsible for preparing and adopting the Plan. Since Town Law also permits the Town Board to delegate the responsibility of preparing the Plan to a special board established for that express purpose, the Town Board appointed the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee (CPSC) to guide the preparation of the Plan.

In accordance with recommendations in New York State Town Law § 272-a, the following items are addressed in the Plan:

- General guiding principles upon which proposals for the immediate and long-range enhancement, growth and development of the Town can be based;
- Existing and proposed location and intensity of land uses;
- Historic and cultural resources, natural resources and sensitive environmental areas;
- Existing and proposed recreation facilities and parkland;
- Population, demographic and socio-economic trends and future projections;

Unincorporated Greenburgh is the portion of the Town of Greenburgh that is outside the six incorporated villages: Ardsley, Dobbs Ferry, Elmsford, Hastings-on-Hudson, Irvington, Tarrytown.
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- Transportation facilities;
- Existing and proposed public and private utilities and infrastructure;
- Existing and proposed cultural facilities, historic sites, health facilities and facilities for emergency services;
- Existing housing resources and future housing needs, affordable housing;
- The present and potential future general location of commercial and industrial facilities;
- Policies and strategies to conserve resources and direct development patterns for improving the local economy in coordination with other Plan topics;
- Proposed measures and instruments to implement the goals and objectives of the Plan;
- Existing plans of other public agencies; and
- Regional needs and the official plans of other government units and agencies within the region.

Greenburgh Town Hall - 177 Hillside Avenue

The Plan has been referred to several local and regional municipal organizations for comments. Locally, it was referred to the Town’s Planning Board for review and recommendation before action by the Town Board. Regionally, the Plan was referred to the Westchester County Planning Board for review and recommendation as required by Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law.(1) Other municipal organizations to which the Plan was referred include:

- New York State Departments of Transportation and Environmental Conservation
- Cities of White Plains and Yonkers
- Villages of Ardsley, Dobbs Ferry, Elmsford, Hastings-on-Hudson, Irvington and Tarrytown
- Towns of Mount Pleasant and North Castle, Village/Town of Scarsdale
The Plan has also been referred to several local and regional planning organizations.

- Westchester Municipal Planning Federation
- Business Council of Westchester County
- Westchester County Association
- Mid-Hudson Regional Economic Development Council
- New York Planning Federation
- New York State River Valley Greenway
- Regional Plan Association
- Scenic Hudson
- River Keeper

### 1.3 Unincorporated Greenburgh 2016 Comprehensive Plan

In 2007, the Town Board appointed the CPSC, which consisted of representatives from the Town Board (Councilman Francis Sheehan, CPSC Chairperson), Planning Board (Chairperson Frances McLaughlin, CPSC Vice Chairperson; Vice Chairperson Walter Simon), Zoning Board of Appeals (the late Chairperson Steven Belasco), Historic and Landmark Preservation Board (the late Chairperson Eda Burne, current Chairperson Madelon O’Shea), Conservation Advisory Council (Chairperson Theresa Mae Tori), Department of Community Development and Conservation (then Commissioner Thomas Madden, AICP), and Community Liaison (Ella Preiser). Lou Klein, commercial realtor, was appointed to the CPSC on August 29, 2012. Since November 2012, the CPSC was assisted by Community Liaison, Viola Taliaferrow, appointed as a Planning Board member alternate in 2014. Commissioner of Community Development and Conservation Garrett Duquesne, AICP, served as lead author of the document, and was appointed to the CPSC on October 6, 2015.

After an extensive request for proposal process, in December 2007, the Town Board hired a team of consultants led by Ferrandino & Associates Inc. (Public Outreach & Visioning, initial Plan formulation); Dvirka and Bartilucci, Consulting Engineers (Public Utilities & Infrastructure); Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. (Transportation); Fairweather Consulting (Economic Development) and Steven Tilly, Architect (Green Design/Public Facilities).

The process of developing the Plan included:

- public involvement to identify values and elicit stakeholder input in the development of a consensus vision for future growth;
- surveys of relevant background studies/plans, literature and historic records;
- documentation of existing conditions and trends;
- technical analyses of needs;
- identification of issues, opportunities and constraints; and
- articulation of a unified long-range “vision” and formulation of strategies to achieve goals and objectives.
Chapter 1.0 Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan

1.4 Community Participation and Input into the Plan

Community participation and input into the Plan was carried out through a Town-wide survey, local area visioning sessions with residents of unincorporated Greenburgh, and meetings with other stakeholders that included representatives of school districts, local realtors, and members of the business community. The community vision and related goals, objectives and policies of the Plan are the result of this public outreach and participatory process. This input was formulated into a set of Guiding Principles adopted by the Town Board in 2009 (discussed in Section 1.5).

1.4.1 Comprehensive Plan Input Survey

As part of the public input process, a survey was conducted over a five-month period. During the spring and summer of 2008, the survey was distributed in print through the Town of Greenburgh Guide to Programs, Activities and Services, mailed to all residents and neighborhood representatives and made available electronically on the Town’s Web site. Surveys were also available at Town Hall, the Greenburgh Library, Anthony F. Veteran Park and the Theodore D. Young Community Center and were handed out during the local area visioning meetings. A copy of the survey and a summary of responses is provided in the Plan’s Appendix A.

1.4.2 Local Area Visioning

The CPSC divided unincorporated Greenburgh into eight geographic areas for the purposes of local area visioning. A Town-wide kick-off meeting was held and followed by interactive visioning meetings within each geographic area, shown on Figure 1.1. Prior to each area meeting, Town staff, CPSC members and the Consultant Team toured the neighborhoods with community liaisons. These field visits provided first-hand insights from area residents and civic leaders as to the local challenges and opportunities facing their neighborhoods.

Visioning activities were conducted at each area meeting to help participants express their observations and wishes related to their neighborhoods and the Town. These goal-setting exercises served as starting points for identifying strengths and weaknesses in assessing the needs of areas and in establishing priorities and action plans. Residents highlighted positive aspects of their neighborhoods that they wanted retained, as well as aspects that should be addressed. A summary of the visioning meetings is provided in Appendix B.

1.4.3 Central Park Avenue & Commercial Corridor Visioning

The CPSC and the Consultant Team hosted two focus groups on March 19, 2009, in Greenburgh Town Hall, to better understand various aspects of Central Park Avenue and the Town’s two other key commercial corridors (Rt. 119 – Tarrytown-White Plains Road and Rt. 9A – Saw Mill River Road). Participants in the first focus group were members of the real estate profession involved with commercial properties in unincorporated Greenburgh. Participants in the second session included property owners, merchants and developers. Information gathered from these meetings helped to identify strengths and weaknesses of the major commercial corridors in unincorporated Greenburgh and served as a basis for the Central Park Avenue Market Positioning Analysis, which became part of this Plan. A summary of the meetings (Appendix C) and the Central Park Avenue Market Positioning Analysis are provided in Appendix D.
Figure 1.1: Visioning Areas

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Produced by: Town of Greenburgh, Sarah Pawlczak
Date Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced, August 2015
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1.4.4 School District Outreach

All nine school districts serving unincorporated Greenburgh residents were invited to a meeting held on November 13, 2008, at which the framework of the Plan was explained. The Consultant Team received input about school operations from the Edgemont School District, Greenburgh Central School District, and Pocantico Hills Central School District. The Edgemont School District and Pocantico Hills Central School District provided the CPSC with budget information, contact information and their five-year improvement plans.

In 2014, Town staff held individual meetings with the nine school district superintendents and/or school representatives and presented an overview of the draft Plan. Section 8.13 Outreach to students at Ardsley High School (Education), Appendices F, G, H, I and J provide school-related information.

1.5 Guiding Principles

On December 15, 2009, the Town of Greenburgh Town Board adopted Guiding Principles to assist the CPSC’s review of the formulation of the Plan. The Guiding Principles are based on the community participation and input and consist of four inter-related categories: Quality of Life, Transportation and Infrastructure, Development, and Process. The inter-relatedness of these Guiding Principles is carried over into the philosophy of the Plan as each chapter supports a common vision. Table 1.1 lists the titles of the chapters of the Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Number</th>
<th>Chapter Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Our Town of Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Community Well-Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Historic Resources and Cultural Assets and Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Environmental Resources and Related Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Public Infrastructure and Essential Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Transportation, Mobility and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Demographics and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Land Use and Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Implementation and Monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 lists the adopted Guiding Principles of the Plan (with the exception of the one noted addition) and identifies the chapters of the Plan that focus on the respective principle. Section 3.3 (Planning for Sustainability) further describes how the chapter-to-chapter connections are made in the Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guiding Principle</th>
<th>Highlighted in Plan (Chapters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Foster a distinctive and attractive Town comprised of strong neighborhoods.</td>
<td>3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 7.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage a Town that is affordable for all.</td>
<td>4.0, 10.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve and enhance the character of the Town including open space, trails,</td>
<td>6.0, 7.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natural beauty, scenic qualities, critical environmental areas and historic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>properties, landmarks and districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to build a sense of community through cultural and recreational</td>
<td>4.0, 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow for a variety of housing types that meet the needs of all income levels</td>
<td>10.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and demographic groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain a high level of public services in a cost effective manner.</td>
<td>8.0, 11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Provide a safe, efficient and accessible transportation system that meets the</td>
<td>3.0, 8.0, 8.0, 9.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mobility needs of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage connected neighborhoods that promote walking and bicycling.</td>
<td>3.0, 7.0, 9.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide and maintain adequate utilities to meet community needs</td>
<td>8.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan for short and long term infrastructure needs.</td>
<td>3.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Support and revitalize existing commerce and industry in the Town</td>
<td>9.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attract new businesses to enhance revenue generation and job creation by</td>
<td>10.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encouraging economic growth and a creative mix of uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote efficient, sustainable, and innovative “green” building and site design.</td>
<td>3.0, 6.0, 8.0, 9.0, 10.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support development that complements and preserves the character of existing</td>
<td>7.0, 10.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential neighborhoods. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Encourage a clear, fair and efficient development approval process.</td>
<td>12.0, 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to encourage community and stakeholder collaboration in planning and</td>
<td>3.0, 12.0, 13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to work with our planning partners (neighboring communities,</td>
<td>3.0, 7.0, 8.0, 9.0, 11.0, 12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westchester County, NYMTC, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* CPSC recommendation added with the adoption of the Plan.
1.6 Document Review and Comment

A number of meetings between the CPSC and the Consultant Team were held toward the beginning of the Plan formulation process. Throughout the remainder of the process, the CPSC and Town staff held three-hour meetings on most Fridays. The primary purpose of these meetings was to review and discuss the information and data culled from the visioning sessions, surveys, and other stakeholder input and to ensure consistency with the Guiding Principles of the Plan. The CPSC and Town staff also formulated and reviewed drafts of the Plan. The time and effort donated from each former and current CPSC member was invaluable. The Plan is a direct result of their effort.
1.7 Organization of the Plan

The Plan’s organization provides clear linkages between goals, objectives and policies. It articulates a strong vision with land-use policies consistent with the Guiding Principles. The Guiding Principles are the road map for each goal, objective and policy. Significant effort has gone into integrating sustainability and connectivity with land-use planning and other considerations in the Plan. Figure 1.2 provides an overview of how the Plan is structured.

**Figure 1.2: Plan Organization & Process**

- **Unincorporated Greenburgh Vision**
- **Guiding Principles**
- **Chapters 3.0 through 12.0 of the Plan**
- **Plan Adoption**

**Amendments to the Code of the Town of Greenburgh, Zoning Map, and Town Policies**

Comprehensive Plan Introduction, Historical and Regional Perspective of unincorporated Greenburgh, and Community priorities influencing land use and policy direction. Chapters 1.0 and 2.0

Each Chapter contains goals, objectives and policies.

A broad statement that describes a desired outcome towards which all efforts should be directed.

The range of desired outcomes that must be realized to achieve the overarching goal.

A general or detailed course of action focused on specific issues that seeks to guide implementation.

Prior to adoption, numerous public outreach/commenting meetings and SEQR review, described in Section 1.10, will take place.

Following Adoption of the Plan, subsequent steps to be taken.
1.8 How the Plan will be Utilized

The Comprehensive Plan serves as a basis for land-use regulations, infrastructure development, and public and private investment. The Town shall reference the Plan for all rezoning's, amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, infrastructure projects and proposals from private and governmental agencies. A copy of this Plan was provided to county and state agencies to assist with their plans and projects in the Town of Greenburgh.

1.9 Interactive Use of This Plan (Web-based use of Plan)

For legal purposes, the official version of the Plan is the signed hard copy version that is kept in the Town Clerk’s Office. A copy will be available at the Greenburgh Town Library. An interactive version of the Plan is available on the Town’s Web site (www.greenburghny.com). The internet version is provided for the convenience of the public. The Web-based version contains hyperlinks to figures, maps and exhibits. This version includes links to the many initiatives that are underway to implement the Plan’s goals, objectives and policies.

1.10 Review Process of the Plan

The local area visioning process that contributed to many of the concepts and policies of the draft version of the Plan took place in 2008. The draft Plan has evolved over a period of seven years. A concerted effort will continue to ensure that all residents, civic associations, business owners and other interested entities have numerous opportunities to further comment on this draft Plan.

An important feature of the review process is the manner in which the Plan will evolve from the initial draft to the version ultimately adopted by the Town Board. During 2014, five CPSC outreach meetings took place. Comments received from residents, business owners or other interested parties at the CPSC outreach meetings and via phone and email were documented by Town staff and were followed with a response from the CPSC. On Tuesday, April 28, 2015, the CPSC held a public hearing as part of two sessions (1:00pm-4:00pm & 7:00pm-10:00pm). This public hearing was continued on October 1, 2015, at which time, the hearing was closed, with an extended period made available to receive written comments.

The wide range of public comments received contributed to the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan delivered by the CPSC to the Town Board.

Review process:

- **Town Board Receipt of Plan and the Referral Process.** The CPSC’s final draft (dated 12/4/15) was referred by the Town Board to the Planning Board and other local and regional municipal organizations.

- **Planning Board Recommendation.** On April 6, 2016, the Planning Board made a positive recommendation to the Town Board, with respect to the draft Plan, and forwarded several individual recommendations.

- **Town Board Public Hearing.** The Town Board’s public hearing was held on June 22, 2016, July 12, 2016 and August 4, 2016.
• **Environmental Review Process.** The environmental review process consists of the preparation of SEQRA documentation. All SEQRA documentation was reviewed by Ferrandino & Associates, Inc.

• **Final version issued.** Following a review of all comments received and addressed by Town staff, the final version of the Plan, dated September 20, 2016, was issued.

### 1.11 The Plan’s Adoption Process

A comprehensive plan, and any amendment thereto, is subject to the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) under Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law and its implementing regulations. State law requires that municipalities consider the potential environmental impacts of their actions and propose alternatives or mitigation to remedy significant potential adverse impacts. The potential environmental impacts of the Plan were evaluated as part of an expanded Environmental Assessment Form (EAF). All future non-Type II actions (including zoning map and zoning Text amendments, and land use Board project reviews) will continue to be subject to subsequent SEQRA environmental review.

To ensure full opportunity for citizen participation several neighborhood outreach meetings were held. In addition, public hearings were separately held by the CPSC on April 28, 2015 and October 1, 2015, and by the Town Board on June 22, 2016, July 12, 2016 and August 4, 2016 on the draft Plan. Written comments were accepted from the date of the Plan’s release as a draft through the close of the written record (September 19, 2016) that followed the date of the last public hearing (August 4, 2016).

The unincorporated Greenburgh 2016 Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the Town of Greenburgh Town Board on September 28, 2016.

---

**List of Sources**

(1) General Municipal Law Section 239-m
CHAPTER 2.0 Our Town of Greenburgh

2.1 Historic Overview of the Town

Greenburgh's recorded history* began more than 400 years ago when Henry Hudson traveled up the river that now bears his name. During these travels, he encountered the Weckquasgeek Indians who occupied the area now known as the Town of Greenburgh. The Weckquasgeek Indians were known for using the bark of native trees to fashion canoes, lodge coverings and unique water-tight kettles. “Weckquasgeek” is said to mean "the place of the bark kettle." In 1955, the Town of Greenburgh adopted a bark kettle as a symbol for its official seal as a historic reminder of the first settlers of the area.

Following Hudson's 1609 voyage, the Dutch claimed sovereignty and started to settle the area. Land was purchased from the Indians and small colonies were established. In 1664, when the Dutch surrendered sovereignty to Great Britain, the English began to develop boundaries of existing towns and provide basic organization of town government. Frederick Philipse, who had emigrated from Holland, swore loyalty to the British king and began acquiring large tracts of land. In 1693, the Philipse family received a charter from the English crown establishing the Manor of Philipsburg, approximately 200 square miles. The Manor’s western border was the Hudson River providing a route for shipping its goods. The Hudson River continued as an important route of commerce leading to the development of Greenburgh’s historic “River Towns.”

The name Greenburgh possibly was derived from Dutch words that described the vast expanses of "green" or "grain" farming areas of the Manor. For almost 100 years before the American Revolution, inhabitants referred to their settlement as "Greenburgh" and elected various officials to represent their interests on the Manor.

During the seven years of the American Revolution, Greenburgh inhabitants were at the mercy of both the English and Continental Armies; farms and homes were destroyed and possessions carried away. The beginning of the end of the war occurred in Greenburgh when General George Washington and French General Comte de Rochambeau were headquartered less than a mile apart in the Hartsdale area with their armies encamped nearby. The six-week Philipsburg Encampment of the American and French armies preceded the historic march of the Franco-American armies to the decisive battle of the American Revolution in Yorktown, Virginia. Following the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, the manor belonging to Frederick Philipse III was deemed a Loyalist estate and confiscated. The land was broken into parcels and tenant farmers were given preference in purchasing it.

On March 7, 1788, the State of New York Legislature officially chartered Greenburgh as one of 21 towns to provide basic services to thinly populated areas in the state. Based on the first census of the U.S. - 1790, State of New York, Bureau of the Census, the Town-wide population was 947 whites, 10 other and 167 slaves. Since Saw Mill River Road and White Plains-Tarrytown Road were two of the earliest Greenburgh roadways, their intersection in what is now Elmsford became an important focus of town government. With the advent of the New York and Harlem Railroad (1846), which extended along Greenburg's eastern boundary to White Plains, and the Hudson River

* Historical information obtained from Greenburgh: A Glimpse of Our Past, which can be found at the Greenburgh Library.
Railroad (1849), which extended along Greenburg’s western boundary to Peekskill, Greenburgh experienced a land boom. Speculators bought up farmland lots which were sold at auction in New York City, and population pockets developed in the vicinity of the railroad stations. The land boom continued in the 1870s when the New York City and the Northern Railroad lines (which became the Putnam Division of the New York Central Railroad) built a rail extension to Brewster through the heart of Greenburgh. Figure 2.1 depicts the Town of Greenburgh in 1868, prior to the incorporation of any villages.

As settled communities increased in size, the state Legislature approved their incorporation into villages, granting self government charters through village institutions between 1870 and 1910. During this period the Town of Greenburgh government gradually declined in importance since only the remaining rural unincorporated areas, needing relatively few public services, were left to be governed directly by the town administration. Unincorporated Greenburgh is the portion of the Town of Greenburgh that is outside the six incorporated villages: Ardsley, Dobbs Ferry, Elmsford, Hastings-on-Hudson, Irvington and Tarrytown. In 1900, out of the total Town population of approximately 15,000, only 2,500 people lived in the unincorporated area.

With the completion of the Bronx River and the Saw Mill River Parkways in the 1920s and 1930s and the New York State Thruway and Tappan Zee Bridge in the 1950s, Greenburgh became a heavily populated suburb of New York City. By 1960, the Town-wide population was more than five times greater than it was in 1900. While the population of the villages grew immensely in these 60 years, the unincorporated area population grew at an even greater rate (thirteen-fold).\(^{(2)}\)
Figure 2.1 Map of the Town of Greenburgh - 1868

Today, the Town of Greenburgh, including its six villages, is Westchester County's largest town in population and second largest municipality in population. Unincorporated Greenburgh is a busy commercial, industrial and residential community with many parks, open space areas and institutions.

The following are some of the people, places and events having roots in unincorporated Greenburgh and its villages:

- Saint Andrew's Golf Club - America's oldest golf club (1888)
- Boss Tweed - NYC politician, contributor to the development of Central Park Avenue
- Cab Calloway - musician
- Cyrus Field - the Atlantic Telegraph Company, laid the first telegraph cable across the Atlantic Ocean
- Earliest parkways in the United States - Bronx River and Saw Mill River
- Evangeline Booth - The Salvation Army founder
- Felix Warburg - banker, former summer home is now the Greenburgh Central School Campus
- Gordon Parks - photographer, musician
- Hartsdale Canine Cemetery
- Henry Gaisman - invented a type of safety razor, Former estate is now Hart's Brook Park and Preserve
- John Hartford - A&P Supermarket Founder, Former Hartford estate is now the Westchester Community College Campus
- Madame C.J. Walker - first African American self-made female millionaire
- Mark Zuckerberg - co-founder of Facebook
- Madison Square Garden training facility New York Rangers, Knicks and Liberty
- Roy Campanella - professional baseball player
- Tom Carvel - developer of the soft ice-cream industry, first Carvel store was located on Central Park Avenue
- Walter Winchell - reporter/radio
- Washington Irving - author, The Legend of Sleepy Hollow

Some individuals are considered "permanent" residents of unincorporated Greenburgh since they "reside" in historic Ferncliff Cemetery on Secor Road, including:

- “Aaliyah” Dana Haughton - singer
- Ed Sullivan - newspaper, TV personality
- Joan Crawford - actress
- Judy Garland - actress
- Malcolm X - human rights activist
2.2 Geography

The Town of Greenburgh is located in the south central portion of Westchester County in New York State and includes 31 square miles of land between the Hudson River on the west and the Bronx River on the east. It contains five (5) major highways and parkways (I-87, I-287, the Bronx River, Sprain Brook and Saw Mill River parkways), and three major commercial corridors (Central Park Avenue - Rt. 100, White Plains-Tarrytown Road - Rt. 119 and Saw Mill River Road - Rt. 9A).

Greenburgh is bound on the north by the Town of Mount Pleasant and on the south by the City of Yonkers. East of the Bronx River are the Town of North Castle, the City of White Plains and the Town/Village of Scarsdale. There are six incorporated villages within the Town: Ardsley, Dobbs Ferry, Elmsford, Hastings-on-Hudson, Irvington and Tarrytown.

The unincorporated area of the Town of Greenburgh, hereinafter referred to as “unincorporated Greenburgh,” is the subject of this Plan. Unincorporated Greenburgh occupies approximately 18 square miles and includes numerous neighborhoods. Unincorporated Greenburgh is served by a Police Department, Department of Public Works, three combination (career and volunteer) fire districts, seven fire protection districts and nine independent public school districts.

2.3 Regional Planning Context

Inter-municipal transportation planning is primarily conducted through the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC). Transportation, Mobility and Access (Chapter 9.0) lists other important regional transportation-based planning initiatives and organizations.

Inter-municipal land-use planning is coordinated through the Westchester County Department of Planning. Economic Development (Chapter 11.0) and Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0) list other important regional land use-based planning initiatives and organizations.

2.3.1. Transportation Partners

Urbanized areas with a population over 50,000 in the United States must have a designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in order to qualify for federal transportation funding. NYMTC is the MPO for New York City, Long Island and the lower Hudson Valley; its geographic boundaries are depicted on Figure 2.2. Its members consist of the New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT), the New York State Thruway Authority (NYSTA), the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, the City of New York and five suburban counties in New York State including Westchester County. NYMTC provides a planning forum based on consensus that addresses transportation-related issues, develops regional plans and makes decisions on the use of federal transportation funds. NYMTC is responsible for creating a Regional Transportation Plan, a Unified Planning Work Program for current planning activities and the Transportation Improvement Program which establishes funding priorities on a project-by-project basis.
The Guiding Principles that form the backbone of the Plan closely follow NYMTC’s regional transportation priorities which focus on five key areas: increased mobility, reduced congestion, improved air quality, enhanced economic vitality and improved quality of life. The plans, recommendations and decisions advanced by NYMTC play an important role in unincorporated Greenburgh’s development, transportation infrastructure and transit service.

2.3.2. Westchester County

The Town of Greenburgh is one of 45 municipalities in Westchester County. The County Planning Department and its Planning Board work within this multi-jurisdictional environment by promoting intergovernmental cooperation and urging the participation of municipalities in regional planning efforts. Unincorporated Greenburgh, like all municipalities in Westchester, refers certain planning and zoning applications and proposals to the County Planning Board for review and recommendation pursuant to provisions of the Westchester County Code and NYS General Municipal Law. Regional planning at the county level promotes consideration of the impact of land-use decisions across municipal borders as well as their general relationship to surrounding development and appropriate density. Goals, objectives and policies in the Plan specifically note the importance of inter-municipal planning. “Special Planning Areas” are introduced in Section 12.8.
2.3.2.1 Patterns for Westchester: The Land and the People (1995)

Patterns for Westchester: The Land and the People is a statement of land use and development policies and strategies adopted by the County Planning Board. Patterns advocates sustainable development of “downtowns” or “centers,” the preservation of open space and natural resources, and the redevelopment of corridors into better functioning and more sustainable areas. It promotes transportation alternatives, creation and protection of a range of affordability in housing stock, and regional collaboration.[(4)  

Specific recommendations in Patterns relevant to unincorporated Greenburgh include: (1) the promotion of mixed-use development and design enhancement in existing corridors such as Central Park Avenue - Rt. 100, White Plains-Tarrytown Road - Rt. 119 and Saw Mill River Road - Rt. 9A; (2) the enhancement of transit opportunities; and (3) amenities promoting pedestrian activity. Public input from the visioning sessions of the Plan was consistent with many of the recommendations of Patterns.

2.3.2.2 Westchester 2025

Westchester 2025 - Context for County and Municipal Planning and Policies to Guide County Planning was adopted by the County Planning Board on May 6, 2008, and amended January 5, 2010. Westchester 2025 is meant to guide county decisions that may impact or shape land use as well as to provide guidance to Westchester’s 45 municipalities for use in their own comprehensive plans. This document replaces the policies but not the strategies that are set forth in Patterns and is the first product of a larger long-range planning program that has the title Westchester 2025.

The County’s Web site: http:westchester2025.westchestergov.com provides demographic information, mapping, archival and new photographs and other relevant data that can serve as tools for municipal planning. The County Planning Board intends to produce a new county-wide Vision Plan to replace the Patterns map. This Vision Plan will be based on County planners working closely with municipal officials to produce 43 local vision plans that can then be combined. A component of the Vision Plan’s development is the calculation of build-out scenarios under local zoning. Section 12.6 (Land Use Groupings) of this Plan contains unincorporated Greenburgh’s buildout potential.

Westchester 2025’s 15 adopted policies,⁵ in summary, are to:

- channel development to centers;
- enhance transportation corridors;
- ensure interconnected open space;
- nurture economic climate;
- preserve natural resources;
- support development and preservation of permanently affordable housing;
- support transportation alternatives;
- provide recreational opportunities to serve residents;
- protect historical and cultural resources;
- maintain utility infrastructure;
- support vital facilities;
- engage in regional initiatives;

A build out analysis is used to understand the development potential of land area by taking into account a community’s vacant and underdeveloped land, existing land use regulations, environmental constraints, conservation areas and rights-of-way.
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- define and protect community character;
- promote sustainable technology; and
- track and respond to trends

2.4 Local Planning Context

Municipal governments in New York State have been granted home rule powers enabling them to provide individual services within their jurisdictions. Although each municipality regulates land within its own borders, adjacent municipalities share common resources such as open space and roadways. Development impacts also are shared by adjacent municipalities. The Town of Greenburgh’s Planning Board has Inter-municipal Agreements (IMAs) with the Villages of Tarrytown and Ardsley that allow a member of one municipality to participate as a non-voting member in the development approval process of the adjacent municipality for proposals that impact both communities. The process allows for greater inter-municipal participation than simply referring an application as is required under General Municipal Law.

Each of the municipalities adjacent to unincorporated Greenburgh has planning initiatives in varying stages as discussed in Sections 2.4.1 through 2.4.11. The location of unincorporated Greenburgh in relation to adjacent municipalities is shown on Figure 2.3.

2.4.1 Village of Ardsley - Downtown Planning Analysis (2008)

The Village of Ardsley is bordered by unincorporated Greenburgh on its north, east and south sides. In November 2008, Ardsley accepted a consultant’s report on a downtown planning analysis. The analysis cited four issues within the downtown: traffic congestion from the Rt. 9A (Saw Mill River Road) and Ashford Avenue intersection; a shortage of parking availability in the business area; a limited community center; and long range planning impediments. In order to address these issues, three proposals were recommended: (1) expand the existing community center by building an addition in the rear; (2) adapt the Westchester Garage (762 Saw Mill River Road) to accommodate a community center; and (3) build a mixed use parking structure at 18 Center Street (currently a parking lot), with a community center on the top level. Traffic circulation improvements to the Village’s downtown are planned as mitigation of the Ridge Hill Development in the City of Yonkers.

2.4.2 Village of Dobbs Ferry – Dobbs Ferry Vision Plan (2010)

The Village of Dobbs Ferry, which borders a relatively small portion of unincorporated Greenburgh to the west, completed its Vision Plan in September 2010. The plan identifies 21 distinct neighborhoods in Dobbs Ferry and describes features, opportunities, concerns and recommendations. Two neighborhoods in Dobbs Ferry, Chauncey Park and Parkway, border unincorporated Greenburgh.

The Chauncey Park neighborhood, located in the vicinity of Lawrence Street, is intended to have an intensification of commercial and residential uses on a comparatively large scale. The plan recommends a multi-storied parking garage in the area of the existing parking lots adjacent to Lawrence Street. The garage could serve the neighboring Ardsley and unincorporated Greenburgh communities.
Figure 2.3: Town of Greenburgh
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The Parkway neighborhood is located along the Saw Mill River Parkway. A small portion of this neighborhood borders unincorporated Greenburgh. The Village’s Vision Plan recommends changes at the intersection of Lawrence Street and the Saw Mill River Parkway to improve traffic patterns and to maintain an acceptable level of service.

A project approved in the Village of Dobbs Ferry, known as “Rivertowns Square,” will consist of a 138-room hotel, residential and commercial mixed-uses. Section 12.10.2 (Research and Development Cluster South) of the Plan notes the proximity of the Rivertowns Square project to a planning initiative in unincorporated Greenburgh.

The Dobbs Ferry plan includes a number of other recommendations that could have an impact on unincorporated Greenburgh. The recommendations include the redesign and reconstruction of the Ashford Avenue Bridge; a substantial redesign of on and off ramps to the Saw Mill River Parkway; and additional ramp connections to both the New York State Thruway and the Saw Mill River Parkway.

**2.4.3 The Village of Elmsford – Comprehensive Development Plan (1995); Comprehensive Plan Update under development**

The Village of Elmsford is entirely surrounded by unincorporated Greenburgh, bordering the neighborhoods of North Elmsford, East Irvington, Mayfair-Knollwood and Fairview. Elmsford adopted a Comprehensive Plan in 1995 and is currently updating its plan. Both New York State Rt. 9A (Saw Mill River Road) and Rt. 119 (White Plains-Tarrytown Road) extend through Elmsford and unincorporated Greenburgh to form continuous corridors. With the exception of the intersection of Rt. 119 and Rt. 9A in Elmsford and the office park section of Rt. 119 in unincorporated Greenburgh, the corridors in each municipality have similar traits.

With respect to long term planning initiatives, the prospect of a Tappan Zee Bridge replacement and the related transportation corridor investment, which may include a BRT option along Rt. 119 or I-287, presents redevelopment opportunities for both Elmsford and unincorporated Greenburgh. As part of the Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287 Corridor Project, transit oriented development (TOD) workshops were held in the Village of Elmsford, Village of Tarrytown and unincorporated Greenburgh. Elmsford’s Village Center was selected as an area with redevelopment potential for a TOD. Sections 12.8.2. (Greenburgh/Elmsford Rt. 9A Planning Area) and 12.8.3 (Rt. 119/ Knollwood Road Planning Area) of the Plan are two Coordinated Planning Areas that could benefit from intermunicipal planning.

**2.4.4 Village of Hastings-on-Hudson – Comprehensive Plan (2011)**

The Village of Hastings-on-Hudson, which borders the Jackson Avenue – Donald Park neighborhoods, adopted its Comprehensive Plan on July 19, 2011. It identifies challenges such as the anticipated redevelopment of a contaminated waterfront area, the potential development of long-held large tracts of land whose landscape defines the Village’s corridors, rising housing prices, and the continued escalation of property taxes due in part to the loss of tax ratable waterfront industry. It aims to foster economic development, to promote environmental sustainability, and to protect and enhance community character. The Village’s Comprehensive Plan contains recommendations for increased communication and cooperation between Hastings-on
- Hudson and adjacent neighbors to address and solve issues of shared importance. An objective of the Village’s plan is to improve bridge connections for cars, bicyclists and pedestrians, particularly along Ravensdale Road near Rt. 9A (Saw Mill River Road).

2.4.5 Village of Irvington – Comprehensive Plan (2003)

The Village of Irvington completed its Comprehensive Plan in 2003. Of relevance to unincorporated Greenburgh, the Plan defines its portion of East Sunnyside Lane/Taxter Road as a connector that accommodates 5,000 to 9,999 daily vehicle trips. It does not contain recommendations for East Sunnyside Lane/Taxter Road, as operating conditions for vehicles are good and the number of accidents on the road is minimal.

2.4.6 Town of Mount Pleasant

The Town of Mount Pleasant, which borders Landmark at Eastview, the Mack-Cali Industrial Park, and the Greenburgh neighborhoods of Knollwood Manor and Mayfair Knollwood, and Westchester Meadows and Edgebrook Cooperatives, does not have an adopted Comprehensive Plan. The Town’s residential area consists of single-family homes, apartments and estates. Mount Pleasant also contains several large office parks, which are home to major firms such as New York Life Insurance Company, International Business Machines Corp. (I.B.M.), PepsiCo, Inc. and Fuji Photo Film U.S.A., Inc. Westchester County’s Valhalla Campus at Grasslands, located just north of unincorporated Greenburgh on Rt. 100C, is home to the Westchester Medical Center and Westchester Medical College as well as a variety of county-run facilities such as the jail and prison, public safety training center and Bee-Line bus garage. The New York City Department of Environmental Protection constructed a UV Water Treatment Facility in Mount Pleasant that connects to the Delaware Aqueduct in unincorporated Greenburgh via underground utilities under Rt. 100C (Grasslands Road). The BioMed Realty Trust facilities at Landmark at Eastview are located within both unincorporated Greenburgh and Mount Pleasant and are separated by Old Saw Mill River Road.

Section 12.11.1 (Research and Development Cluster North) of the Plan notes the coordinated planning potential between the Town of Mount Pleasant and the Town of Greenburgh in promoting an enhanced research and development cluster on both sides of the border. Approximately 300,000 additional square feet of new laboratory and research space was completed in the Town of Mount Pleasant, with a future buildout potential of approximately 170,000 additional sq. ft.

2.4.7 Town of North Castle - Comprehensive Plan (1996)

The Town of North Castle, which borders a small portion of unincorporated Greenburgh to the northeast of the Bronx River, last updated its Comprehensive Plan in 1996. The adjacent North Castle area located along Virginia Road is known as North White Plains. The area is zoned “Industrial A District,” which permits warehousing, manufacturing and extractive operations, although some of the land has been converted to office/warehouse and/or retail use. Major uses in this area are Peckham Concrete and Metro North’s North White Plains yard/support facility. In addition, the area adjacent to unincorporated Greenburgh contains several Revolutionary War historical sites such as Washington's Headquarters and the Miller Hill battle site. Approximately 80 acres of this 85 acre site are developed.
2.4.8 Town/Village of Scarsdale – Comprehensive Plan (1994)/ Update of the Village Center Component of its Comprehensive Plan (2010)

The Town/Village of Scarsdale, which borders the unincorporated Greenburgh neighborhoods of Edgemont and Hartsdale, completed its Comprehensive Plan in 1994. Two thoroughfares, Fenimore and Popham Roads (which become East Hartsdale Avenue and Ardsley Road in Greenburgh), link Scarsdale with unincorporated Greenburgh. Residents from each municipality utilize train stations and commercial districts in the neighboring community on a daily basis. The Scarsdale train station area is characterized as a Village Center. The nearby Edgemont neighborhood consists of single family residences. Similarly, in unincorporated Greenburgh, the Hartsdale train station within the Hartsdale Center District is used by residents of the single family residential areas known as Greenacres and Fox Meadow in Scarsdale.

Scarsdale adopted an update (2010) of the Village Center Component of its Comprehensive Plan. The plan provides recommendations for future development on three key sites, encourages development that is context sensitive and recommends permitting increased density in exchange for certain public amenities and for residential uses.

2.4.9 Village of Tarrytown – Comprehensive Plan (2007)

The Village of Tarrytown, which borders the East Irvington and Glenville neighborhoods, completed its Comprehensive Plan in 2007. The plan recommends support of commercial, office and residential development along Rt. 119 (White Plains-Tarrytown Road). The plan also recommends developing a Master Plan or strategy for the protection of the Tarrytown Lakes.

Tarrytown also participated in the Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287 Corridor Project and identified areas with redevelopment potential for a TOD. A potential node at the intersection of Rt. 9 (Broadway) and Rt. 119 (White Plains-Tarrytown Road) was identified. This node could work in concert with stops along Rt. 119 in unincorporated Greenburgh, the Village of Elmsford, the City of White Plains and points east. Section 12.8.1. (Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park Mixed-Use District) of the Plan identifies a Coordinated Planning Area with the Village of Tarrytown, which builds on this concept.

A property known as the “Greystone parcel” is located in both unincorporated Greenburgh and Tarrytown. A 55-acre portion of the Greystone parcel, located in unincorporated Greenburgh, is adjacent to the Taxter Ridge Park Preserve. Access to the parcel in unincorporated Greenburgh, which is approved to contain 12 one-family residences and 23 acres of open space, will be from a gated entrance in connection with an eight-lot subdivision in the Village of Tarrytown. Further inter-municipal coordination is important to ensure that trail access to this new open space and the open space of the Taxter Ridge Park Preserve is connected and enhanced. An additional trail access point and parking lot is expected to be approved along Taxter Road in unincorporated Greenburgh.

The City of White Plains, which borders the Fulton Park and Fairview neighborhoods to the east, and the College Corners neighborhood to the southeast, updated its 1997 Comprehensive Plan in 2006. White Plains is a regional center and destination for business, government and transportation. The City of White Plains is the Westchester County seat.

According to White Plains’ plan, “the vision for the future form of White Plains is one of a suburban city with a vibrant and healthy Core Area that combines places to work, live and shop in a well-designed urban setting; high-quality residential neighborhoods of diverse character and densities; aesthetically appealing corridors, some characterized by an open space quality and others by commercial vitality; and major properties developed to complement the surrounding neighborhoods and preserve significant environmental and open space resources.” Its recommendations call for balancing, maintaining and strengthening the City’s economic sectors through selective support of additional commercial development and support for more limited residential development. It emphasizes that the Core Area should remain the commercial and retail hub of Westchester County, while also containing vibrant residential areas. Downtown residential development has become, and will continue to be, a major economic tool for the City to create a truly livable, “walkable” urban environment with a 24/7 character which supports the other major economic generators - office and retail. Over the last decade, the dramatic growth of the downtown core and surrounding areas has helped to shape and advance the goals and objectives of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. (6)

Rt. 119 (Tarrytown Road) and Rt. 100 (Central Park Avenue) both enter unincorporated Greenburgh from White Plains. The intersection of these corridors is adjacent to multi-modal transit options including the White Plains Train Station, numerous Westchester County Bus routes, biking trails and pedestrian amenities. Westchester County, through NYMTC, is exploring an initiative to create a BRT route along Central Park Avenue from White Plains to New York City. This initiative would require inter-municipal coordination and common objectives. Section 12.8.5. (Greenburgh Gateway Planning Area) of the Plan is an identified Coordinated Planning Area with the City of White Plains which builds on these concepts.

2.4.11 City of Yonkers – Comprehensive Plan (1997)

The City of Yonkers is located to the south of unincorporated Greenburgh and borders the Donald Park neighborhood and several Edgemont neighborhoods. Yonkers completed its Comprehensive Plan in 1997 and adopted the plan in 2000 (the previous master plan was adopted in 1968 and various area or development plans were adopted between 1968 and 2010). Rt. 100 (Central Park Avenue) is the principal north/south commercial corridor linking unincorporated Greenburgh with Yonkers.

A 1.2 million-square-foot mixed-use project known as Westchester Ridge Hill in Yonkers is located within close proximity to the Donald Park and Edgemont neighborhoods. Planned mitigation includes roadway improvements in the Town of Greenburgh and Village of Ardsley, partially funded by the Ridge Hill developer. The reconstruction of the intersection at Jackson Avenue and Sprain Road in unincorporated Greenburgh is planned. The widening of Rt. 9A in the Village of
Ardsley, north of the intersection of Rt. 9A and Ashford Avenue was completed in 2016. From a regional perspective, the Ridge Hill development is expected to remain a major retail destination and provide increased competition for the portion of the Central Park Avenue corridor within unincorporated Greenburgh.

There are planned expansion (commercial and hotel) projects at the Cross County Shopping Center which will also provide increased competition for the portion of the Central Park Avenue corridor within unincorporated Greenburgh.

Other development proposals and developable land in Yonkers in the vicinity of unincorporated Greenburgh, include those at the Austin Avenue site, which contains Stew Leonard’s, Costco and Home Depot. The site contains portions of land that was once a landfill that is being capped. A project consisting of a total of 225,000 sq. ft. of commercial space (Target) is approved at the site. Safe vehicular circulation in this portion of the City of Yonkers and the Town of Greenburgh will be an important contribution to the viability of these developments.

Continued coordinated planning efforts and assistance from Westchester County and the City of Yonkers will be necessary as these projects will continue to produce significant traffic volumes in the Town of Greenburgh.

List of Sources

(1) A History of Greenville/Edgemont - Edgemont History Committee
(3) http://www.nymtc.org/
(4) http://planning.westchestergov.com/publications
(5) http://westchester2025.westchestergov.com/
(6) City of White Plains write-up, received, November 14, 2013.
CHAPTER 3.0 Sustainability

3.1 Relationship to our Guiding Principles

Sustainability, which includes sustainable development, is the ongoing effort to enhance well-being and improve environmental, economic and social resources. It results when human and economic activity occurs with a minimal depletion of nonrenewable resources, minimal release of pollution including greenhouse gases (GHGs) and minimal impact to ecosystems.

Sustainability occurs on several levels. The Guiding Principles and policies of this Plan position unincorporated Greenburgh as a sustainable place in the Mid-Hudson region. Specific policies of this Plan are intended to facilitate the utilization of “green” construction practice and green site design in development projects. Green construction practice and site design are the building blocks of sustainability. They refer to a structure and process that is environmentally responsible and resource efficient throughout a building’s life-cycle, from siting to design, construction, operation, maintenance, renovation, and demolition.(1)

This Chapter follows with a discussion on the connections between sustainability and economic development, transportation, infrastructure, land use, green building, alternative energy and ongoing climate action plan efforts. It is intended to follow the format of and align with the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan (MHRSP). The MHRSP, a plan for the seven counties located immediately north of New York City, was funded as part of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority’s (NYSERDA) Cleaner Greener Cities program. It focuses on sustainability in five areas: (1) Land Use, Livable Communities and Transportation; (2) Energy; (3) Materials Management; (4) Agriculture and Open Space; and (5) Water.

3.2 Sustainability and the Interconnected Policies of the Plan

Land use and neighborhood design patterns have a significant effect on the environment in each location. Facilitating additional employment options closer to our residents can reduce automobile trips and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Mixed-use development along “complete streets” encourages walking, bicycling, and public transportation for daily errands and commuting. Environmentally responsible construction and infrastructure can reduce greenhouse gas emissions by decreasing energy consumption. Green buildings and infrastructure also lessen impacts on water resources, improve air quality, and minimize natural resource consumption.

Sustainable development encourages housing of various types and price ranges. This type of development respects historic resources and the existing community fabric, preserves open space, and encourages access to parks. Public spaces that encourage physical activity are beneficial for public health. These building blocks of sustainability fall within a “smart growth” strategy and are addressed throughout the Plan.
3.2.1 Smart Growth Strategy

Sustainable development is implemented with smart growth strategies that aim to maintain and create great neighborhoods and communities by:

- fostering distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place;
- preserving open space, natural beauty and critical environmental areas;
- encouraging community stakeholder collaboration in development decisions;
- making development decisions predictable, fair and cost effective;
- providing a variety of transportation choices;
- mixing land uses;
- creating a range of housing opportunities and choices;
- creating walkable neighborhoods; and
- taking advantage of compact/green building design.

The Guiding Principles of the Plan are closely aligned with the policies listed above. Few of these policies make specific reference to “green development,” which tends to be narrowly connected with specific practices such as the use of solar panels or green roofs. The smart growth strategies and the Guiding Principles of the Plan are often land use based and highlight the numerous direct and indirect ways that the quality of life for residents and businesses can be enhanced in a comprehensive, sustainable way.

3.3 Planning for Sustainability

Planning for sustainability on a local level should be carried out in the context of established best practices and consideration of other regional plans.

3.3.1 Local/Regional Sustainability Connections

Generally, regional land use planning is facilitated by Westchester County, largely through its ongoing *Westchester 2025* plan. Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0) contains a specific focus on inter-municipal planning coordination. Accordingly, several areas in unincorporated Greenburgh are listed as “Coordinated Planning Areas,” on Figure 12.16, which are areas where inter-municipal planning is necessary to carry out a future land-use strategy. These regional land-use based policies are consistent with *Westchester 2025* policies.

Regional transportation planning is coordinated through Westchester County and various state agencies. Strengthening the use and efficiency of our transportation assets with a focus on alternative modes of transit is discussed in Transportation, Mobility and Access (Chapter 9.0) and Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0).

The Mid-Hudson Regional Economic Development Council’s - REDC Plan contains strategies for a seven-county consortium with a focus on facilitating inter-municipal and non-competing economic development collaboration. Planning for economic development within this regional context is a major component of Economic Development (Chapter 11.0). Economic Development also contains specific local policies to enhance the range of employment opportunities for our residents.
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### 3.3.2 Sustainable Development Best Practices/Policy History

Many sustainable development best practices have been implemented either informally or as adopted policy. Table 3.1 lists adopted sustainable development policies.

This Plan integrates land use, transportation, economic, infrastructure, housing and other disciplines with traditional environmental policies and forms a comprehensive sustainability plan. The legislation listed in Table 3.1 has been carried out without the benefit of an implemented long range comprehensive plan.

---

#### Table 3.1: Adopted Sustainable Development Policies in Unincorporated Greenburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Law/Policy</th>
<th>Year Adopted</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation District Overlay</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Allows flexibility in residential site design to maximize the preservation of environmental features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Star*</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Required one or two-family dwellings or multifamily dwellings of three stories or less to meet the requirements for a New York Energy Star® -labeled home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steep Slopes</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Requires development proposals with regulated steep slope areas (15%+ slopes) to incorporate appropriate mitigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland/Watercourse</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Requires development proposals with disturbance to, or within 100 ft. of, a wetland/watercourse to incorporate appropriate mitigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Requires that projects with 500 sq. ft. or more of proposed disturbance are subject to a separate stormwater permit process to regulate water quality and quantity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building (LEED)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Requires that documentation listing green building features be provided for new commercial construction proposals over 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Energy Conservation Requirements</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Requires that applicants make home energy conservation improvements for one or two-family dwellings or multiple single-family dwellings (townhouse) of three stories or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Makes financing available to commercial property owners to fund improvements that lower energy consumption. The cost is paid as part of that owner’s property tax bill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Energy Star was superseded by the 2012 Greenburgh Home Energy Conservation Requirements.*
3.4 Greenhouse Effect and Climate Change

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) such as carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}), methane (CH\textsubscript{4}), nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O) and fluorocarbons naturally blanket the Earth and keep it warmer than it would be without these gases in our atmosphere, a process referred to as the “Greenhouse Effect.” \(^{(2)}\)

Long-term change in the earth’s climate, especially a change due to an increase in the average atmospheric temperature, is often referred to as climate change. Climate change has been quantified in terms of heating degree days (HDD) and cooling degree days (CDD). Heating and cooling degree days are a standardized way of measuring the day’s temperature by relating it to the energy demands of air conditioning and heating. HDD and CDD between two 30 year time periods (1971 to 2000 and 1961 to 1990) show that CDD have increased markedly during these time periods while HDD have declined.\(^{(3)}\) Consistent with the MHRSP, NYSERDA reports that between 1970 and 2007, the number of HDD declined by 46.3 days per decade. \(^{(4)}\)

Due to the life-cycle and ongoing emission of GHGs in the atmosphere, climate change will continue to be felt for many years and likely will increase in its impact. Recent experience with Tropical Storm Irene (2011) and Superstorm Sandy (2012) underscore the tremendous economic, environmental and social impacts that can be caused by severe weather events, which are predicted to increase in frequency and severity as a result of climate change. In the Mid-Hudson Region, models show that climate change may have a number of different effects, from increasing property damage to reducing water quality. Each of these effects stems from either a primary or secondary climate impact. Primary climate impacts are those directly associated with radiative forcing due to GHG emissions, such as sea level rise, changes in precipitation, and changes in temperature. Secondary impacts include flooding, drought, and heat waves. \(^{(5)}\)
3.4.1 Climate Change Policy History

The importance of climate change and its associated impacts have consistently been recognized in unincorporated Greenburgh. In 2006, the Town became a signatory to the U.S. Mayor’s Climate Protection Agreement, committing to achieve GHG reduction targets established as part of the Kyoto Protocol. To date, 1,060 municipalities from all 50 states have signed the agreement.

In 2008, the Town of Greenburgh joined the Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI), an international association of local governments and national and regional local government organizations. At least 1,200 cities, towns and counties worldwide have joined ICLEI and committed to climate protection and sustainability, including 500 member municipalities in the U.S. ICLEI assists local governments through international performance-based programs by providing technical consulting, training, and information services. (6)

In 2008, Greenburgh formed a Climate Action Task Force. In 2009, a Climate Action Plan (CAP) was prepared by the Task Force that addressed GHG reductions, reviewed operations and cost-saving measures, and noted future grant opportunities and the potential for green collar jobs.

In 2009, the Town Board adopted the “Climate Smart Community Pledge,” which is promoted by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC). This pledge acknowledges the effects of climate change and builds on the policies of the CAP.

3.4.2 Climate Action Plan

The task force followed ICLEI’s Five Milestone Methodology in the formulation of the CAP: (1) conduct a baseline emissions inventory and forecast; (2) adopt an emissions reduction target for the forecast year; (3) develop a Local Climate Action Plan; (4) implement policies and take measurements; and (5) monitor and verify results.

Utilizing software tools provided by ICLEI, the task force completed a Year 2008 baseline GHG emission inventory for all electricity and all natural gas consumption for stationary municipal assets (buildings, pumps, recreation facilities, streetlights, traffic signals, etc.) in unincorporated Greenburgh and gasoline and diesel fuel usage for the Town’s vehicle fleet (cars, trucks, buses, ambulances, sanitation vehicles, and construction equipment). “No action” forecasts through the Year 2020 were established that provide a benchmark for monitoring progress.

Building on the calculated baseline data completed in connection with the CAP, the Town, as part of the Climate Smart Community Pledge, adopted goals of reducing its GHG emissions 15 percent below 2008 levels by the end of 2015, and a 20 percent reduction in total GHG emissions by the end of 2020. These benchmarks can be implemented with long-range goals to reduce GHG emissions by 80 percent by the Year 2050. The baseline data has been supplemented with work done through the MHRSP.
The CAP notes that a community component of the GHG inventory was not completed; however, the MHRSP contains many of the community-based emission inventory statistics on a county/regional basis that are lacking in the CAP. Although these relevant statistics are often Westchester County-based, some of the data and resultant policy recommendations have been extrapolated for unincorporated Greenburgh.

With respect to the comprehensive list of smart growth strategies in Section 3.2.1, and the Guiding Principles of this Plan which are discussed in Chapter 1.0 (Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan), the CAP tends to focus on specific green practices for municipal implementation. The CAP contains many excellent recommendations but should be revisited following adoption of the Plan to incorporate the Plan’s sustainable land-use policies in its forecasts.

### 3.4.3 Baseline Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The baseline GHG emissions listed in Table 3.2 for unincorporated Greenburgh were established as part of the MHRSP. These emissions are broken down by sector and separated as stationary and non-stationary sectors. Mobile energy or those from the transportation sector produced the most GHG emissions in unincorporated Greenburgh. The calculation includes occupied housing unit data, journey to work mode preferences and regional transportation trips through unincorporated Greenburgh. For reference purposes and for a better understanding of our municipal GHG emissions in comparison to Westchester County’s, it should be noted that unincorporated Greenburgh contains approximately 4.5 percent of Westchester County’s population and comprises approximately 3.9 percent of Westchester’s land area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Mobile Energy</th>
<th>Solid Waste</th>
<th>Wastewater Treatment</th>
<th>Industrial Processes</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Energy Supply</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.G.</td>
<td>122,254</td>
<td>135,268</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>199,080</td>
<td>2,487</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>15,910</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>19,152</td>
<td>510,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of U.G. Total</th>
<th>23.9%</th>
<th>26.5%</th>
<th>2.4%</th>
<th>38.9%</th>
<th>0.5%</th>
<th>0.8%</th>
<th>3.1%</th>
<th>0.02%</th>
<th>3.8%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.G. Percentage of Westchester Total</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTCO₂E = Million Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide; U.G = Unincorporated Greenburgh

Source: Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, Final - June 2013
Transportation-related energy consumption produces the Mid-Hudson Region’s largest percentage of GHG emissions as shown in Figure 3.1. The second largest source of emissions is residential energy use, which includes fuels used directly for space and water heating as well as the indirect emissions resulting from the use of electricity. Solid waste management, wastewater treatment, and industrial activities produce most of the remaining GHG emissions.
Table 3.3 lists transportation-related GHG emissions. Approximately 84 percent of these emissions result from on-road transportation (cars, trucks, buses, motorcycles) in the Mid-Hudson Region. In Westchester County, the percentage of emissions from on-road transportation (78.2) is less than that of the Mid-Hudson Region’s (84.1). The percentage of air and marine emissions is greater for Westchester County. Unincorporated Greenburgh contributes approximately 5.6 percent of Westchester County’s on-road transportation emissions.

Table 3.3: Transportation GHG Emissions (in MTCO₂E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>On-Road</th>
<th>On-Road POT</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Air POT</th>
<th>Marine</th>
<th>Marine POT</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Rail POT</th>
<th>Off-Road</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh</td>
<td>199,080</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>3,529,093</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>241,184</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>384,669</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7,184</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>352,960</td>
<td>4,515,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Region</td>
<td>10,252,920</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>281,235</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>680,987</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>127,831</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>834,313</td>
<td>12,177,277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POT = Percentage of Total; NA = Not Available

Source: Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, Final - June 2013

Table 3.4 lists GHG emissions from energy supply activities. The percentage of totals are similar for Westchester County and the Mid-Hudson Region with respect to natural gas transmission (regional) and delivery (local) emissions. As a percentage of the energy supply activities GHG emissions total, Westchester County (345,886) contributes 41 percent of the Mid-Hudson Region’s (836,500). Unincorporated Greenburgh contributes approximately 5.5 percent of Westchester County’s GHG emissions from energy supply activities.

Bringing energy sources closer to the use is one sustainable practice that is a component of this Plan. Section 3.6 (Alternative Energy) includes policies to promote solar and geothermal energy on site in unincorporated Greenburgh. Coupled with “green building” energy conservation measures, these policies will minimize our total municipal GHG emissions.

Table 3.4: Emissions from Energy Supply Activities (MTCO₂E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Electricity T &amp; D Emissions</th>
<th>Electricity POT</th>
<th>Natural Gas T &amp; D Emissions</th>
<th>Natural Gas POT</th>
<th>Utility SF₆ Emissions</th>
<th>Utility POT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>92,929</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>233,031</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>19,925</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>345,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Region</td>
<td>218,315</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>565,374</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>52,811</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>836,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POT = Percentage of Total; T & D = Transmission and Delivery; SF₆ = Sulfur hexafluoride; NA = Not Available

Source: Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, Final - June 2013

Emission data recorded as Not Available in the Tables are expected to be updated as part of the CAP or in subsequent updates of the Plan.
3.4.4 Energy Consumption

Nationwide, petroleum, natural gas and coal are the leading source of energy consumption, as indicated in Table 3.5. In 2011, these three fossil fuel sources represented a total of approximately 82 percent.

**Table 3.5: U.S. Total Energy Consumption by Source (2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewables</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97.3 Quads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://css.snre.umich.edu/css_doc/CSS03-12.pdf

A quad is a unit of energy equal to 1015 (a short-scale quadrillion) BTU, or 1.055 x 1018 joules.

Transportation (including on road, off road, rail, air, marine sectors) is the single largest user of energy in the Region, as depicted in Table 3.6. The dominant fuel source in transportation is petroleum. The Mid-Hudson Region contained 12 percent of the state’s population in 2010, but accounted for only 9.6 percent (360 trillion Btu) of the annual energy consumption (3,728 trillion Btu). Westchester County has a higher population density than the Mid-Hudson Region and consumes less energy per capita across all the major consumption sectors.

**Table 3.6: Net Energy Consumption (MMBtu) by County and Sector (2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Residential Fuel</th>
<th>Commercial Fuel</th>
<th>Industrial Fuel</th>
<th>Transportation Fuel</th>
<th>Total MMBtu</th>
<th>MMBtu per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>35,443,876</td>
<td>20,828,408</td>
<td>6,696,102</td>
<td>65,914,196</td>
<td>128,882,582</td>
<td>134.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Region</td>
<td>90,691,653</td>
<td>65,330,331</td>
<td>25,389,466</td>
<td>178,789,925</td>
<td>360,201,375</td>
<td>157.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester POT</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Region POT</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POT = Percentage of Total

Source: Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, Final - June 2013

*Con Edison transmission lines in Unincorporated Greenburgh*
Table 3.7 lists energy usage by household. Natural gas, along with fuel oil/kerosene, are the largest sources of energy use by household in both Westchester County and the Mid-Hudson Region.

### Table 3.7: Energy Use by Household (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Occupied Households</th>
<th>Fuel Oil/Kerosene</th>
<th>Natural Gas</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Bottled Tank or LP Gas</th>
<th>Wood, other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>344,475</td>
<td>153,556</td>
<td>153,495</td>
<td>28,318</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>4,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Region</td>
<td>809,150</td>
<td>338,350</td>
<td>342,131</td>
<td>80,158</td>
<td>25,659</td>
<td>22,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, Final - June 2013

3.4.5 Climate Adaption Strategies

Responses to climate change have evolved from focusing on mitigating or reducing the amount of GHGs released into the atmosphere to including adaptation measures in an effort to both minimize the impacts and prepare for unavoidable future changes. Climate adaption strategies should supplement the planning associated with bridge, roadway, capital project and other public and private infrastructure improvements. In Westchester, temperatures are anticipated to rise 1.5 to 3.0 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) by the 2020s, 3.0 to 5.5°F by the 2050s and 4.0 to 8.0°F by the 2080s. Precipitation is anticipated to increase 0 to 5 percent by the 2020s, 0 to 5 percent by the 2050s and 0 to 10 percent by the 2080s. Sea level rises, the potential for increased frequencies and intensity of storms, and the repercussions of not planning for these events are causes for action. Allowing for flexible responses to changing climate conditions is important. Flexible adaptation consists of implementing actions or infrastructure that stakeholders can adjust or shift over time in response to new climate science and evidence from ongoing monitoring, as well as implementing shifts in policies and strategies to better respond to emerging climate threats and opportunities. NYSERDA’s Climate Adaptation Guidebook for New York State recommends an eight step process:

- Identify current and future climate hazards
- Inventory vulnerabilities and opportunities
- Prioritize vulnerabilities
- Identify and categorize adaptation strategies
- Evaluate and prioritize adaptation strategies
- Link strategies to capital and rehabilitation cycles
- Create an adaptation plan
- Monitor and reassess

3.4.6. Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan.

On October 12, 2011 the Town of Greenburgh adopted a Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan, which notes that exposure to natural hazards can increase the risk to life, property, environment and the economy. It provides and prioritizes potential pre- and post-disaster mitigation of identified hazards. The document, which contains information and plans for the Town of...
Greenburgh and its six Villages, is intended to be updated every five years. Regarding unincorporated Greenburgh’s portion of the Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan, any update should factor in the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, and reference applicable best management practices.

3.5 Green Buildings

Construction that incorporates green building practices is an important component of sustainable development. It has the potential to transform the way sites and buildings are designed, constructed, and operated. The green building field is growing rapidly. New and more cost effective technologies and products are continually being introduced into the marketplace. Green buildings lower operating costs, increase asset value, reduce waste sent to landfills, conserve energy and water, are healthier and safer for occupants, and reduce harmful greenhouse gas emissions.

The construction and operation of buildings use more than three quarters (76 percent) of the electricity produced in the U.S. and emit almost half (48 percent) of its greenhouse gases. About 85 percent of greenhouse gas emissions are carbon dioxide, of which 35 percent are attributed to buildings. The location of the buildings which house and employ our growing population, the extent of energy conserving measures utilized, and the distance our growing population must travel for employment and other needs are connected to carbon dioxide emissions.

3.5.1 Residential Development

For the average consumer, residential energy use can be reduced by at least 20-30 percent through weatherization and envelope improvements, upgrading and maintaining heating, cooling and ventilation systems, replacing old appliances, introducing smart metering and controls, and by changing occupant behavior. The Mid-Hudson Region’s households spend $2.18 billion on utilities per year for non-transportation related energy. Installing common energy upgrades (e.g. air sealing and insulation) on a wide scale sufficient to achieve five percent regional reductions would save $109 million annually within the residential sector. Even greater efficiencies are possible with new construction or major renovation projects. Table 3.8 lists household energy costs and savings projections for Westchester County and the Mid-Hudson Region.

In 2002, Greenburgh was the first Town in the state to pass a law requiring that new residential construction be built to Energy Star standards. This requirement evolved into the current and comparable “Greenburgh Home Energy Conservation Requirements.”

Solar panels on a house in Unincorporated Green-
Newly constructed one and two-family dwellings, and multi-family buildings of three stories or less, in unincorporated Greenburgh must comply with Greenburgh Home Energy Conservation Requirements. These local requirements include several methods of making a home more energy efficient than required by the state energy code. Efficient measures include more effective insulation, higher performance windows, more efficient heating and cooling equipment, a tighter building envelope to reduce air infiltration, and the use of various energy efficient products.

Table 3.8: Household Energy Costs and Savings Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Utility Costs (All households)</th>
<th>Total Potential Savings (All households)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>$1,021,131,000</td>
<td>$51,056,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Region</td>
<td>$2,376,252,000</td>
<td>$118,812,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Household Utility Costs per Year</th>
<th>Annual Savings with Small-Scale Energy Upgrades</th>
<th>Annual Savings with Large-Scale Energy Upgrades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>50.0% or Greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, Final - June 2013

Residential construction meeting the Town’s Home Energy Conservation Requirements - Avalon II Town Houses
3.5.2 Commercial and Office Development

In the commercial/office sector, the Mid-Hudson Region’s businesses spend $2.37 billion on utilities per year. For larger commercial and institutional entities, annual energy bills can run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars (or more). A modest five percent energy savings through common efficiency measures (lighting, controls, etc.) would yield $118 million per annum in savings that can be reinvested locally. Green buildings are attracting attention from a growing number of buyers and tenants who prefer lower operating costs and healthier indoor environments. Table 3.9 depicts the benefits of green buildings.

On average, an initial investment of two percent in green building design results in lifecycle savings of 20 percent of the total construction costs, more than 10 times the initial investment. Sales prices for energy efficient buildings are as much as 10 percent higher per square foot than conventional buildings. A 2008 CoStar Group study found that green buildings outperform their non-green peers in key areas such as occupancy, sale price and rental rates.\(^9\) LEED buildings command rent premiums of $11.33 per square foot higher than conventional buildings and boast 4.1 percent higher occupancy, according to the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating Costs</th>
<th>Building Value</th>
<th>Return on Investment</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Construction</strong></td>
<td>13.6% Reduction</td>
<td>Rise 10.9%</td>
<td>Improves 9.9%</td>
<td>Rises 6.4%</td>
<td>Rises 6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Building Projects</strong></td>
<td>8.5% Reduction</td>
<td>Rise 6.8%</td>
<td>Improves 2.5%</td>
<td>Rises 1%</td>
<td>Rises 19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan, Final - June 2013
In 2009, the Town of Greenburgh Town Board adopted a local “Green Building” Law requiring commercial and multifamily buildings in unincorporated Greenburgh to incorporate green building measures in new construction. The local “Green Building” Law requires applicants to submit a “Green Building Project Checklist” and related narrative describing the green construction features of a proposed building based on U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system. The law helps start the discussion about using green building techniques and measures with developers during the early stages of development planning. It is important to note that the law does not mandate registration and certification of the development by USGBC as part of the approval process.

LEED-Neighborhood Development (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) is a rating system that complements and expands on the U.S. Green Building Council’s individual building focus and helps plan for unified neighborhood development in a sustainable manner.

3.5.3 Industrial Development

Industrial facilities and related businesses tend to be major energy users and have a critical need for a reliable energy supply. As these industries are targeted for growth in unincorporated Greenburgh, care should be taken to ensure that energy efficiency is given priority in designing or retrofitting facilities. The Local LEED Law is also a part of the new or retrofitted industrial development process.

3.5.4 Green Buildings and Sustainable Development Toolbox

There are numerous green building construction practices, many of which have been utilized in buildings throughout unincorporated Greenburgh. The locations of these places are shown on Figure 3.2. The U.S. Green Building Council (http://www.usgbc.org) details these practices, some of which are listed in Table 3.10.

With respect to development on individual buildings and individual sites, several Chapters of the Plan contain additional sustainable development strategies. Chapter 8.0 (Public Infrastructure and Ancillary Services) contains extensive detail on stormwater management best practices and recycling initiatives.
(Environmental Resources and Related Systems) addresses steep slope, tree and canopy coverage, wetland/watercourse and flood plain preservation. Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities) notes the importance of open space and lists several open space preservation policies. Current undeveloped landscapes absorb 15 percent of carbon dioxide emissions.

The green infrastructure and sustainable practice highlights listed in Table 3.10 are typically connected to one building or one project site. Chapter 12.0 (Land Use and Zoning) combines green building and sustainable development concepts.

3.5.5. International Codes and Policies

The existing regulations in unincorporated Greenburgh set standards for new houses (Greenburgh Home Energy Conservation Requirements) and commercial buildings (Local LEED Law). Together with the New York State Energy Code and the advances in the building industry, these provisions should facilitate a new generation of environmentally friendly buildings.

There are other codes that complement local green building policies. The International Energy Conservation Code (IECC) is tied to Federal law through the Energy Policy Act of 1992. It is the only energy code that serves as a basis for federal tax credits for energy-efficient homes, energy efficiency standards for federal residential buildings.

*Drop curbs to allow stormwater infiltration - Stop & Shop Rt. 119*

*Porous Pavers at BioMed Realty - Old Saw Mill River Road*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Green Infrastructure/Sustainable Design Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Biomed Realty (Landmark @ Eastview)</td>
<td>Pervious Asphalt within Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NYCDEP (Grasslands Road)</td>
<td>Wetlands Restoration Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Westchester Community College</td>
<td>Gateway Bldg. (1st County-owned LEED Gold Bldg.), Solar Hot Water Heater on Gym (5 Mbtu), 6 KW Photovoltaic System (Tech Bldg. Roof), Rain Garden (Native Plant Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Residence (8 Oxridge Road)</td>
<td>Geothermal Heating &amp; Cooling System, Photovoltaic System (60% of Energy Consumption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sam’s Club (333 N. Saw Mill River Road)</td>
<td>Rain Garden within Commercial Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flooring Liquidators (267 N. Saw Mill River Road)</td>
<td>Green Roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Courtyard Marriott (Benedict Avenue)</td>
<td>Secondary Access (Grasscrete Pavers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stop &amp; Shop (600 White Plains Road)</td>
<td>Landscaped Island Bio filters within Commercial Parking Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Valimar (Hillside Avenue)</td>
<td>Secondary Access (Grasscrete Pavers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Greenburgh Town Hall (177 Hillside Avenue)</td>
<td>Photovoltaic Cells, Rain garden, Pervious Asphalt Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TDYCC (32 Manhattan Avenue)</td>
<td>Solar Hot Water Heater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Greenburgh Library (300 Tarrytown Road)</td>
<td>Geothermal Heating &amp; Cooling System, Adaptive Building Reuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ray Catena (543 Tarrytown Road)</td>
<td>LED Site Lighting, 95% Direct Daylight Line of Sight Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Westhab (22 Tarrytown Road)</td>
<td>Green Roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Downing Drive Subdivision</td>
<td>Secondary Access (Grasscrete Pavers), Neighborhood Sidewalk Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Banzai Restaurant (95 Central Park Avenue South)</td>
<td>Green Roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pea Pod (46 Central Park Avenue South)</td>
<td>Green Roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Greenburgh Nature Center (99 Dromore Road)</td>
<td>Rain Gardens, Demonstration Green Roof, Planned Pervious Asphalt Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Residence (230 Glendale Road)</td>
<td>Insulated Concrete Forms (Basement), Floor Radiant Heating, Geothermal Heating &amp; Cooling System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Gelsprain Subdivision (Ardsley Road)*</td>
<td>Secondary Access (Grasscrete Pavers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.2: Green Infrastructure Highlights
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Implementation of the 2009 IECC will produce approximately a 15 percent gain in residential energy efficiency compared to the 2006 edition, according to the Department of Energy. As a result, homes and buildings built in accordance with the 2009 IECC, including schools and hospitals, will consume less energy and help the environment by reducing emissions associated with operations. If adopted by New York State, it will raise the state standards even higher.

The International Code Council, the same parent, umbrella organization that coordinates the preparation of the Energy Code, is preparing the International Green Construction Code to provide guidance for municipalities. It can be adopted as part of each state’s building code and is intended to incorporate workable state of the art guidance for green construction into the existing code enforcement process. Building inspectors would receive training in this new code just as they do when fire safety or egress requirements are changed; enforcement would be local with the support of the state.

3.5.6. Green Building Incentives

The need for green building incentives, particularly financial ones, are diminishing due to the increasing cost effectiveness of green construction practices and long term cost savings. At present, numerous voluntary energy efficiency programs exist in the Mid-Hudson Region. Many are sponsored by State agencies or by utilities. Successful energy efficiency programs typically combine readily available financing with compelling business terms and strong outreach and engagement. Making our residents aware of these programs is one policy that can generate support, interest, and participation in existing energy efficiency resources.

In the Mid-Hudson Region, current participation in existing NYSERDA programs for the residential and commercial/industrial sectors is modest, with some signs of recent increases. Homeowner participation in residential energy efficiency programs has begun to climb, in part due to the Green Jobs, Green New York (GJGNY) program, which provides free or low cost energy assessments. Communities, such as Greenburgh, that have launched the Energize New York program, in which outreach to homeowners is coupled with the state’s GJGNY assessment incentives and low interest finance options, have experienced a significant increase in the number of homes upgraded.

For the commercial, institutional and industrial sector, NYSERDA reports relatively steady participation in the Existing Facilities Program, New Construction Program, and Industrial & Process Efficiency Program. Under these NYSERDA programs, about 300 different projects were completed annually in the Mid-Hudson Region, for a total of 75 million kWh savings in 2010 and 2011.
Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) Financing is a program in which a municipality administers, or partners with a company to administer, funds (municipal bonds) for energy efficiency improvements. The program is a mechanism that allows property owners to pay the cost of the efficiency improvements in their property tax bill over 20 years, at a competitive rate of interest. Since 2010, the PACE program has limited its use to commercial properties as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac refuse to back residential mortgages with PACE liens on them. At this time, the Town has established a program that will allow an Energy Improvement Corporation (“EIC”), a local development corporation, acting on behalf of the Town of Greenburgh, to make funds available to qualified property owners in order to finance improvements that will lower energy consumption. Until the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac dispute is resolved, implementation of this program is anticipated to be for commercial use only.

3.6 Alternative Energy

Most primary sources used today are unsustainable. About 82 percent of the nation’s energy comes from fossil fuels, eight percent is derived from nuclear, and nine percent comes from renewable sources. Given the environmental impacts associated with the current fuel mix — global climate change, acid rain, freshwater usage, hazardous air pollution, and radioactive waste — renewable energy has great potential to meet the demand for power with a much smaller environmental footprint. Wind power and solar energy are fast growing renewable sources, but contribute small percentages of total energy used in the U.S.

Unincorporated Greenburgh can become a leader in the Mid-Hudson Region by conserving electricity at the residential, commercial and municipal levels and promoting alternative and renewable energy sources. Table 3.11 lists U.S. renewable energy consumption percentages by source in 2011. Section 8.5.1 (Resource Recovery) details a strategy associated with the potential for an indoor resource recovery/biomass facility.

### Table 3.11: U.S. Total Renewable Energy Consumption by Source (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomass</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroelectric</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.1 Quads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://css.snre.umich.edu/css_doc/CSS03-12.pdf](http://css.snre.umich.edu/css_doc/CSS03-12.pdf)

The Town of Greenburgh is investigating the potential of building and using an anaerobic digester at Anthony Veteran Park in order to generate bio-gas that could be used for cooking meals as part of the nutrition program.

Biomass is a renewable energy source derived from organic wastes that can be used as fuel.
3.6.1 Solar Energy

Solar Photovoltaic (PV) systems and thermal technology are now mature and extremely flexible, allowing solar energy to be converted for use on site at the residential, commercial, and utility scale. The maximum generation of power from PV typically coincides with warm weather peak electrical demand. Therefore, an additional benefit of PV is its potential for “peak shaving.” Peak shaving refers to the process of reducing the amount of energy purchased from the utility company during peak hours when the charges are highest. (13)

Solar applications, including solar hot water heating, building heating, passive solar and solar daylighting also have significant potential. For example, current mature technologies for domestic hot water could supply 60-70 percent of the hot water requirements of typical households in the Mid-Hudson Region. Microgrid solar power is another potential solar application. A microgrid is a localized electricity generation, storage and transmission network, connected to a traditional centralized grid that can also operate independently if necessary. (14) Grid-connected PV systems supply excess power beyond consumption by the connected load to the utility grid. This type of system is applicable for residential and commercial sites.

Solar energy accounted for two percent of the total nine percent of renewable energy that was produced in the U.S. in 2011. Solar costs are declining rapidly. The cost of PV modules, currently the single largest part of system cost, fell 74 percent in the last 20 years and dropped 30 percent from just 3 years ago. A 439 sq. ft. solar cell system can produce 6,355 kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity per year. An average American home uses approximately 9,000 kWh per year. It is anticipated that the number of PV cells needed to produce 6,355 kWh of electricity per year will drop substantially as efficiency improves, resulting in a smaller form factor. (14)

New York State’s solar resource dwarfs other energy resources, finite and renewable. According to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, rooftop PV potential alone in NY has the technical potential of 25 gigawatts (GW) in capacity and 28,420 GW hours (GWh) in generation potential. Extrapolating from this, the Mid-Hudson region’s potential capacity exceeds 3,000 MW from rooftop PV systems alone. (15) New York’s installed solar energy output increased substantially from 2007 to 2011, as depicted in
Table 3.12. Cumulative MW installed by 2011 in NY was 124 MW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Prior to 2007</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total Cumulative MW installed by 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://solaroutreach.org/resource/solat-permitting-workshop-westchester-ny/#.UZUfkbWkrkc

Solar energy growth in Westchester County also increased substantially from 1998 to 2011, as depicted in Table 3.13. This trend is expected to continue with forecasts suggesting that the power generation of PV installations may triple by 2015. Cumulative MW installed by 2011 in Westchester County was 3.75 MW. It is important that the appropriate Town departments are able to efficiently process the heavy volume of applications that are expected to be submitted over the next decade.

Table 3.13: Westchester Solar Energy Growth (1998 - 2011) in kW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://solaroutreach.org/resource/solat-permitting-workshop-westchester-ny/#.UZUfkbWkrkc

Examples of numerous ways to make a building more efficient - Source: http://energizeny.org/
3.6.2 Alternative Vehicle Technology

As noted in Section 3.4.4, transportation fuel is the largest net energy consumed in Westchester County and the Mid-Hudson Region, comprising approximately 50 percent of all sources. In 2010, fueling stations in the Mid-Hudson Region sold nearly 820 million gallons of gasoline with an average vehicle consuming approximately 480 gallons per year. This figure is lower than the national average which was 530 gallons for light duty vehicles in 2010.\(^{16}\) There is enormous potential to facilitate greater use of alternative vehicle technology. Alternative vehicle technology relies on the use of more resource efficient vehicles and their related energy sources.

Batteries are expected to continue to be a major enabling technology in transportation supporting plug-in hybrids and fuel cell vehicles. As the price of batteries and hybrid powertrains continue to drop, consumers will more likely buy hybrid electric vehicles for the added value of fuel economy and lower emissions. It is anticipated that in the future consumers will require more electric and plug-in functionality. The electricity source for plug-in hybrid and battery electric vehicles is expected to become “greener” and renewable.

Electric Car/Hybrid Plug Stations - Source: http://www.chargepoint.com

Private companies, fuel suppliers, vehicle manufacturers, local state and federal government agencies, and other organizations are best suited to cooperatively implement alternative transportation solutions. Several incremental steps can be taken in unincorporated Greenburgh to support alternative vehicle technology. Requiring a small percentage of vehicle battery charging stations at appropriate locations would provide functional benefits and reinforce the sustainability image of the Town. The identification of funding and financial opportunities; development of information resources to educate transportation decision-makers about the benefits of using alternative fuels; advanced vehicles and other measures that reduce petroleum consumption; and potential incorporation of alternative vehicle technology into municipal operations are steps to be considered.
3.6.3 Geothermal

Geothermal energy can be tapped almost anywhere with heat pumps that extract heat from the soil or air. Ground source geothermal heat pumps (GHPs) utilize year-round cool temperatures near the earth’s surface for highly efficient heating and cooling. Increasingly, geothermal power is utilized on individual sites.

Although the purchase and installation cost of a residential geothermal heat pumps system is often higher than that of other heating and cooling systems, properly sized and installed GHPs deliver more energy per unit consumed than conventional systems. Depending on factors such as climate, soil conditions, the system features chosen, and available financing and incentives, an initial investment can be expected to be recouped in two to ten years through lower utility bills.

Greenburgh Nature Center “Green Roof” Demonstration project
3.6.4 Energy Improvement Districts

Energy improvement districts are a group of local stakeholders, such as residents, businesses and institutions, that create a shared system for local energy generation and distribution. The districts contain a framework for how they will collectively own and manage the infrastructure needed. This framework can be used as a way to implement locally produced renewable energy. Each district could incorporate one or more of the following resources and strategies: renewable generation, energy efficiency, demand response, energy storage, electric vehicle charging, or collective energy purchase.

List of Sources

(1) http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/education/carbon_toolkit/basics.html
(2) Greenburgh Climate Action Report 2009
(3) http://hudsonvalleyregionalcouncil.org/mid-hudson-regional-sustainability-plan/
(4) http://hudsonvalleyregionalcouncil.org/mid-hudson-regional-sustainability-plan/
(5) NYSERDA, 2011. Responding to Climate Change in New York State: The ClimAID Integrated Assessment for Effective Climate Change Adaptation in New York State
(6) http://hudsonvalleyregionalcouncil.org/mid-hudson-regional-sustainability-plan/
(7) http://hudsonvalleyregionalcouncil.org/mid-hudson-regional-sustainability-plan/
(10) http://www.iclesafe.org
(11) http://www.eia.gov/energy_in_brief/article_major_energy_sources_and_users.cfm
(13) http://hudsonvalleyregionalcouncil.org/mid-hudson-regional-sustainability-plan/
(16) www.epa.gov/fueleconomy/fetrends/1975-2012
3.7 Sustainability Goals, Objectives and Policies

GOAL 3.1: Lessen contributions that exacerbate the greenhouse effect.

OBJECTIVE 3.1.1: Facilitate a reduction of greenhouse gases of 20 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050.

POLICY 3.1.1.1: Update of the Climate Action Plan, with the aid of grants if available, to be consistent with the land use and transportation policies of this Plan.

POLICY 3.1.1.2: Reestablish and/or clarify baseline greenhouse gas emission levels to more accurately monitor emission reduction efforts.

POLICY 3.1.1.3: Continue to monitor the emissions associated with municipal energy consumption.

POLICY 3.1.1.4: Continue to monitor the benefits of green municipal installations such as photovoltaic systems.

POLICY 3.1.1.5: Supplement existing baseline emissions associated with community-based emission inventory statistics where currently lacking.

POLICY 3.1.1.6: Require new structured parking facilities and new commercial/office buildings to contain a percentage of parking spaces for electric plug-in or other comparable technologies for alternative-fuel vehicles.

POLICY 3.1.1.7: Encourage existing parking facilities and lots to contain a percentage of parking spaces for electric plug-in or other comparable technologies for alternative-fuel vehicles.

GOAL 3.2: Increase sustainability on a regional level, through local planning initiatives.

OBJECTIVE 3.2.1: Plan with adjacent municipalities, Westchester County, transportation agencies and other regional planning partners, consistent with the identified coordinated planning areas.

POLICY 3.2.1.1: Pursue economic development initiatives that are consistent with the Mid-Hudson Regional Economic Development Council Plan.

POLICY 3.2.1.2: Pursue sustainable development initiatives that are consistent with the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan.

POLICY 3.2.1.3: Balance social, economic and ecological benefits on an intermunicipal and regional level.

POLICY 3.2.1.4: For coordinated inter-municipal and regional planning initiatives consistent with the Plan, apply for regional funding sources such as those available through NYSERDA’s Cleaner, Greener Communities Program.
POLICY 3.2.1.5: Monitor potential New York State adoption of the International Energy Conservation Code and/or the International Green Construction Code, and if applicable, adopt consistent local provisions.

GOAL 3.3: Facilitate compact building design with a strong sense of place and access to a variety of transportation choices.

OBJECTIVE 3.3.1: Achieve LEED-Neighborhood Development status for applicable mixed-use planning initiatives detailed in Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0).

POLICY 3.3.1.1: Incorporate LEED-ND into the design process of applicable projects.

POLICY 3.3.1.2: Invite representatives from the green building industry to assist developers in the design process.

GOAL 3.4: Support initiatives that promote and encourage green building practices in new and retrofit construction projects for residential, commercial and industrial development.

OBJECTIVE 3.4.1: Support initiatives that increase the percentage of building stock that utilizes solar, geothermal and other sustainable energy sources.

POLICY 3.4.1.1: Support the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing program, Energy Improvement Corporations (EIC), and/or other innovative green improvement financing options.

POLICY 3.4.1.2: Monitor the availability of technical assistance and grant/funding opportunities through agencies such as NYSERDA.

POLICY 3.4.1.3: Encourage Town staff and volunteer boards to attend seminars involving existing and emerging green technologies associated with sustainable development.

OBJECTIVE 3.4.2: Support initiatives in an effort to reduce the Town Hall building’s energy use by fifty percent.

POLICY 3.4.2.1: Seek funding sources for a comprehensive, dedicated analysis of Town Hall, including an air leakage analysis.

POLICY 3.4.2.2: Include elements such as motors, pumps, insulation levels, lighting, computer and other “plug loads,” and HVAC control systems in a Town Hall energy audit and analysis.
GOAL 3.5: Incorporate sustainable development and smart growth strategies consistent with the Guiding Principles of the Plan.

OBJECTIVE 3.5.1: Utilize the interconnected policies of the Plan in a manner that balances social, ecological and economic benefits.

POLICY 3.5.1.1: Support public health policies consistent with those established in Chapter 4.0 (Community Well-Being).

POLICY 3.5.1.2: Support policies consistent with those established in Chapter 5.0 (Historic Resources and Cultural Assets and Programs).

POLICY 3.5.1.3: Support transportation policies consistent with those established in Chapter 6.0 (Transportation, Mobility and Access).

POLICY 3.5.1.4: Support park, trail and open space policies consistent with those established in Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities).

POLICY 3.5.1.5: Support infrastructure best management practices consistent with those established in Chapter 8.0 (Public Infrastructure and Ancillary Services).

POLICY 3.5.1.6: Support transportation policies consistent with those established in Chapter 9.0 (Transportation, Mobility and Access).

POLICY 3.5.1.7: Support housing policies consistent with those established in Chapter 10.0 (Demographics and Housing).

POLICY 3.5.1.8: Support economic growth policies consistent with those established in Chapter 11.0 (Economic Development).

POLICY 3.5.1.9: Support land use policies consistent with those established in Chapter 12.0 (Land Use and Zoning).

GOAL 3.6: Continue to engage the public, assess the risk and vulnerability associated with the impacts of natural hazards.

OBJECTIVE 3.6.1: Implement mitigation strategies consistent with Town’s Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan.

POLICY 3.6.1.1: Provide an update of the Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan, with the aid of grants if available, no less than every five years.

POLICY 3.6.1.2: Incorporate applicable best management practices and policies of the Town’ Comprehensive Plan into the Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan updates.

POLICY 3.6.1.3: Continue to use the adopted and approved portions of the Plan to guide pre- and post-disaster mitigation of the hazards identified.
CHAPTER 4.0 Community Well-Being

4.1 Relationship to our Guiding Principles

Community well-being refers to the many factors that contribute to a high quality of life for individuals and the community as a whole. The concept is more comprehensive than a standard of living metric which focuses predominantly on income. This Plan recognizes that the true "wealth" of our community can be found in the rich mosaic formed from all the different lifestyles, cultures, ages, abilities, incomes and needs of unincorporated Greenburgh residents. A broad range of policies is necessary to continually enhance community well-being for this diverse group.

Chief among the Guiding Principles of this Plan, formed with public input, is enhancing the quality of life of unincorporated Greenburgh residents. The Town provides a number of core services that enhance quality of life but also relies on a network of community service providers to supplement filling the needs of residents. Programs and services offered by organizations addressing childcare and youth development, health care, and special housing for some seniors and persons with disabilities are important to community well-being.

This Plan recognizes that communities evolve and needs change. This Chapter examines existing factors and suggests new policies. The Chapter also emphasizes the need for continued public participation in land use and other decisions to enhance community well-being.

4.2 Quality of Life

As the resources that contribute to a high quality of life are social, cultural, education/schools, environmental and economic, Sustainability (Chapter 3.0), which embodies several smart growth principles, supports the links among quality of life factors. Policies listed throughout the Plan reinforce that economic growth and development in appropriate areas can enhance our quality of life. However, quality of life components such as clean air, green space, and cultural fabric should be treated comparably to other components such as the need for economic growth and planned development.

When assessing quality of life, an important focus in the Plan is quality, as opposed to a focus on quantitative or prescriptive measurements. As an example, with respect to parks, the focus is not on the number of parks, but on the location, accessibility and function of our parks. Similarly, the planning initiatives of Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0) are not intended to simply reduce the percentage of vacancies in the Town, but are also intended to facilitate the creation of vibrant, walkable, inviting places for residents and visitors to work, reside and enjoy.
Table 4.1 lists quality of life categories followed by a column noting conventional assessment methods. These conventional assessments are important and utilized throughout the Plan; however, the third column in the Table presents a more holistic method that is also used in assessing quality of life issues in this Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Conventional Focus of a Municipality</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh Plan and Policy Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources and Cultural Assets</td>
<td>Quantifying Historic Resources and Cultural Assets</td>
<td>Incorporating art, cultural and historic resources into the land use planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Volume of Employment Opportunities / Tax Revenue Generated</td>
<td>Meaningful employment opportunities Region of economic development coordination Economic diversity Ratables which support quality of life services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Safe and Adequate Housing Stock</td>
<td>Diverse housing options Housing that supports local businesses Proximity to employment options Proximity to walking, biking, transit Attractive neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Quantifying Land Use Patterns/ Separation of Land Uses</td>
<td>Access to employment, education, recreation, entertainment, retail, services Patterns that promote walking, biking, access to transit Neighborhood centers containing local businesses that serve daily needs of nearby residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Trails, Open Space</td>
<td>Number of parks, trails, open space</td>
<td>Ecological benefits of open space Pedestrian and bicycle access to parks and trails system Connectivity of parks, trails and open space Function of parks (range of active and passive opportunities for residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Safety</td>
<td>Enforcing Existing Codes</td>
<td>Hazard Mitigation/Preparedness Walkability/Pedestrian Amenities Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Infrastructure</td>
<td>Safe and Adequate Infrastructure</td>
<td>Best Management Practices Green Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation</td>
<td>Conducting Public Hearings Required by Code, Ensuring Proper Legal Noticing</td>
<td>Collaborative public contributions to land use planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>Complete Streets (public right-of-ways for all users) Multi-mode transportation options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Healthy and Active Communities

“Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” Factors that contribute to a healthy community include: the level of social capital; housing choices; air and water quality; access to nutrition and medical care; and parks, trails and active recreational opportunities. Municipal land use policies can have a number of impacts on health and safety.

- Air quality and respiratory health
- Water quality/quantity and storm water run-off patterns and flooding
- Buildings, streets, open space and infrastructure that promote or discourage physical activity and/or vehicular travel
- An increase/decrease in the number of pedestrian and vehicular injuries and deaths
- The walkability of a community
- Housing choices for a variety of needs
- Conveniently located services

Active communities are those places with a variety of facilities and environments available to help spur physical activity. Factors such as the presence or absence of sidewalks, heavy traffic, hills, street lights and enjoyable scenery, as well as safe places to exercise and frequent observations of others exercising can affect how active a community becomes. To continue to establish unincorporated Greenburgh as an active community, Transportation, Mobility and Access (Chapter 9.0) contains goals, objectives and policies to increase the number of people who walk and bike to daily activities; minimize car dependency; facilitate safe and attractive places to exercise; and reduce traffic injuries.

Social Capital refers to the institutions, relationships and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society’s social interactions.

Managed healthcare agencies providing medical, rehabilitation and other services allow seniors, the chronically ill and disabled individuals to remain safely in their homes.

4.4 Health and Human Services

Access to health and human services contributes to a high quality of life. Locally, residents of unincorporated Greenburgh have access to social services and programs such as the Health and Wellness Series, general senior services (operated by Parks and Recreation and Community Resources Departments), the Senior Nutrition Program (Department of Parks and Recreation) and children’s services at the Lois Bronz Children’s Center (building owned by the Town of Greenburgh, operated privately).
Chapter 4.0 Community Well-Being

Table 4.2 lists the major health care facilities in unincorporated Greenburgh and the major facilities located within five miles of the Town. These locations are shown on Figure 4.1. In addition, there is convenient access to outstanding hospitals in New York City, some of which have branches in Westchester County. Car ownership, ride sharing, transit access, and distance are correlated to overall ease of use of health care facilities and are factors to consider when permitting the placement of new health facilities or expanding bus and other transit lines.

The Plan identifies an aging population as one of several groups needing special considerations, particularly regarding mobility and health care. Transportation, Mobility and Access (Chapter 9.0) and Demographics and Housing (Chapter 10.0) contain goals, objectives and policies related to health and human services necessary to support a population aging in place, as well as other groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blythdale Children’s Hospital</td>
<td>95 Bradhurst Ave., (P.O. Valhalla)</td>
<td>Town of Mount Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Rehabilitation Hospital</td>
<td>785 Mamaroneck Ave. (P.O. White Plains)</td>
<td>City of White Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Health Center</td>
<td>295 Knollwood Road (P.O. White Plains)</td>
<td>Town of Greenburgh *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Hospital Home of Westchester</td>
<td>61 Grasslands Road (P.O. Valhalla)</td>
<td>Town of Greenburgh *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Sloane-Kettering Cancer Center</td>
<td>777 N. Broadway (P.O. Sleepy Hollow)</td>
<td>Village of Sleepy Hollow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montefiore Medical Center</td>
<td>495 Central Park Avenue (P.O. Scarsdale)</td>
<td>Town of Greenburgh *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps Memorial Hospital Center</td>
<td>701 N. Broadway (P.O. Sleepy Hollow)</td>
<td>Village of Sleepy Hollow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprain Brook Manor Rehab</td>
<td>77 Jackson Avenue (P.O. Scarsdale)</td>
<td>Town of Greenburgh *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s Riverside Hospital</td>
<td>128 Ashford Avenue (P.O. Dobbs Ferry)</td>
<td>Village of Dobbs Ferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester Medical Center</td>
<td>Wood Avenue (P.O. Valhalla)</td>
<td>Town of Mount Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Plains Hospital</td>
<td>41 E. Post Road (P.O. White Plains)</td>
<td>City of White Plains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unincorporated Greenburgh

Aging in place refers to the services, housing and infrastructure which allow one to remain in a community throughout one’s lifetime.

Greenburgh Health Center - 295 Knollwood Road
Figure 4.1: Major Health Care Facilities
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4.5 Resident Involvement and Participation

Residents can play an important role in strengthening social, environmental and economic characteristics of the Town by participating in the planning process. Efforts will be made to approach future planning processes in a way that supports an active citizenry, balances the protection of environmental assets and grows the economy.

Bringing residents together can foster a sense of belonging to the community and encourage strong interest in outcomes. Table 4.1 notes that collaborative public participation in land use planning is important to the Plan.

4.6 Community Indicators

Past trends, current conditions and future directions are used to rate community well-being. Community indicators are measurements that provide a means of monitoring and evaluating whether a community’s direction is improving, declining or stagnant. Public participation is necessary in establishing these measurements.

The community survey carried out in connection with the preparation of the Plan and the visioning sessions noted in Section 1.4.2 (Local Area Visioning) and Section 1.4.3 (Central Park Avenue and Commercial Corridor Visioning) resulted in community indicators. These indicators were utilized in the formulation of the Guiding Principles of the Plan. Each goal, objective and policy of the Plan is intended to enhance the well-being of our community.

Community indicators will be used following the Plan’s adoption and will influence future Plan updates.
4.7 Design and Planning for Security and Safety

Community well-being is enhanced when the places in which we live, work and play are inviting, engaging and safe. Safe places can be facilitated through the participation of all stakeholders to minimize security-related risks while not sacrificing the unique and historic character of unincorporated Greenburgh.

This process is carried out in several ways. Hazard mitigation and related preparedness plans focusing on responses to natural events such as severe storms are one element. Access to local land use, building, development data and technical resources are crucial to prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation activities. GIS and GPS related technologies were successfully used by Town staff and first responders to decrease response times and increase efficiency in storm events such as Tropical Storm Irene (2011) and Superstorm Sandy (2012). GIS systems were utilized to report road closures and identify the locations of downed trees.

The site planning process associated with new development is another mechanism to enhance safety. Vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns, parking facility design, and amenities such as landscaping, lighting, sidewalks and sight distances are considerations that are the focus of Transportation, Mobility and Access (Chapter 9.0) and Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0). Appropriate design can and should protect the public in a manner that preserves the integrity of our buildings, public spaces, and communities, while demonstrating the values of an open and accessible society.

The Plan supports policies and standards such as Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) and SafeScape. CPTED places a major emphasis on the design of the physical environment to address issues of public safety. It relies on three primary principles: 1) natural access control, 2) natural surveillance, and 3) territoriality. SafeScape is an approach to designing communities whose focus is on creating a safe community by influencing the physical environment. This approach also enables a sense of community through the design process. In addition to design, our well-trained and effective Police Department engenders the support and confidence of Greenburgh residents.
4.8 Regional Contributions to Quality of Life

Numerous regional services and amenities enhance the lives of unincorporated Greenburgh residents. Access to various cultural venues, numerous parks and open space areas, historic resources, multi-modal transportation options and economic opportunities is the result of our central location in Westchester County and proximity to the New York metropolitan region. In less than one hour, residents can travel from unincorporated Greenburgh to a museum in New York City, a beach on the Long Island Sound or an aquarium in Connecticut. Residents are not far from a kayak trip on the Hudson River and are within close range to the New Jersey Shore.

Regional planning is a major component of the Plan. To reinforce the connections between regional land-use planning and quality of life, Section 12.8 (Special Planning Areas) notes several Coordinated Planning Areas. The planning and development of these areas will support regional transportation improvements, increase employment opportunities, increase walkability and sense of place; and enhance the quality of life in unincorporated Greenburgh and neighboring municipalities.

Example of a Coordinated Planning Area

List of Sources

(1) http://www.who.int/about/definition/
4.9 Community Well-Being Goals, Objectives & Policies

GOAL 4.1: Maintain and enhance well-being and quality of life for all community members.

OBJECTIVE 4.1.1: Enhance well-being through a balance between social, economic and environmental factors.

POLICY 4.1.1.1: Utilize community indicators as a way of gauging the successful implementation of quality of life policies.

POLICY 4.1.1.2: Support and enhance the arts, cultural and heritage sectors as vital components of our community.

POLICY 4.1.1.3: Continue to provide and enhance parks and facilities that encourage physical activity.

POLICY 4.1.1.4: Work collaboratively with adjacent municipalities and other regional agencies (and school districts, when applicable) to ensure that planning initiatives enhance quality of life.

POLICY 4.1.1.5: Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design and SafeScape principles in land-use decision-making processes and in parks and other public spaces.

POLICY 4.1.1.6: Continue to actively solicit community involvement.
Chapter 5.0 Historic Resources and Cultural Assets and Programs

5.1 Relationship to our Guiding Principles

Historic resources and cultural assets and programs contribute to making unincorporated Greenburgh a distinctive and attractive community in which to live and to work. Many neighborhoods, businesses, public buildings and parks reflect our unique past. Cultural and historic resources also support economic development through tourism and employment opportunities. This chapter follows with strategies related to historic preservation and policies to enhance and celebrate our cultural resources.

5.2 Historic Resources

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s historic resources, including buildings, structures, barns, walls, trees and farm lanes have been recognized on the federal, state, county and local levels. The preservation and the maintenance of our historic resources is carried out through the oversight and work of the Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board (H&LPB), by the owners or operators of individual sites, and through the regulation of historic sites and adjacent development. The H&LPB is one of a handful of historic boards with Certified Local Government (CLG) status. An historic preservation board, with CLG status receives professional guidance and support and is eligible for grants from the New York State Historic Preservation Office.

5.2.1 Federal (National), State and County Historic Properties

Federal and State historic recognition is evidenced by the individual listings of properties on the National Register of Historic Places and the State Registry of Historic Places. Twelve separate properties in unincorporated Greenburgh are listed on the Westchester County, New York State, and/or Federal Historic lists. One of these listings, John A. Hartford House, is also listed as a National Historic Landmark. Being listed on the National Register puts no extra restrictions on individual properties. In this regard, regulation is carried out at the local level. However, there is a notice, review, and consultation process for federal and/or state agency sponsored, licensed, or assisted projects on or near properties determined eligible for or on the Historic Register. Owners of depreciable, certified historic properties may take a 20 percent federal income tax credit for the costs of substantial rehabilitation as provided for under the Tax Reform Act of 1986. Municipal and not-for-profit owners of listed historic properties may apply for matching state historic preservation grants.(1)
Table 5.1 lists qualifying criteria of the National Register of Historic Places and that of the Town of Greenburgh.

### Table 5.1: National Register of Historic Places & Town of Greenburgh Criteria

- Relationship to a historic event or theme significant in American history, such as settlement, agriculture or the Revolutionary War
- Association with an individual who made a significant contribution to the history of the local community, state or nation
- Distinction as an example of a type, period or method of construction
- Archaeological potential to provide information about an important aspect of pre-history or history
- A property must be at least fifty years old to establish a suitable context for the evaluation of significance (unless otherwise demonstrated)
- The property must retain sufficient physical integrity from its period of significance to be authentic

*Source: Reconnaissance-level Historic Resource Survey

Unincorporated Greenburgh receives additional historic recognition for being part of the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, created in 1996. The Hudson River Valley is one of 49 National Heritage Areas designated by the National Park Service and is recognized for the Hudson River’s early settlement patterns, importance as a trade and transportation route and its association with the Revolutionary War. Section 5.2.4 further discusses events associated with unincorporated Greenburgh’s history that are also important in the Hudson River Valley’s heritage.

*Pine Tree Corners (5 Old Knollwood Road) - Built in 1685, attributed to Fredrick Philipse*
Table 5.2 lists federal, state, county and locally designated historic places, all of which achieved this recognition by meeting the qualifying criteria of the National Register of Historic Places. Many of these historic places achieved local historic recognition in September of 2012, a process described in Section 5.2.2. Figure 5.1 depicts the locations of these places and sites.

The Hartsdale Pet Cemetery, established in 1896, is the oldest operating pet cemetery in the United States.

Hartsdale Pet Cemetery

Evangeline Booth House/St. Andrew’s Church
Table 5.2: Federal, State, County and Local Historic Listings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Location</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>National Register</th>
<th>State Register</th>
<th>Westchester County Inventory</th>
<th>Local (unincorporated Greenburgh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Residence of Gordon Parks</td>
<td>15 Adams Place (Parkway Gardens)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5/23/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Bronx River Parkway Reservation</td>
<td>Bronx River Parkway Reservation</td>
<td>1/11/91</td>
<td>10/30/90</td>
<td>10/30/90</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Leo Friedlander Home and Studio</td>
<td>825 West Hartsdale Road, P.O. Hartsdale</td>
<td>3/28/73</td>
<td>6/23/82</td>
<td>1/5/88</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Pine Tree Corners - White Plains</td>
<td>5 Old Knollwood Road, P.O. White Plains</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2/19/93</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Church of St. Joseph of Arimathea</td>
<td>2172 Saw Mill River Road, P.O. Elmsford</td>
<td>1/11/02</td>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>11/27/01</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Romer-Van Tassel House</td>
<td>2121 Saw Mill River Road, P.O. Elmsford</td>
<td>12/12/94</td>
<td>10/14/94</td>
<td>3/6/91</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>East Irvington School</td>
<td>East Irvington School</td>
<td>10/6/86</td>
<td>9/2/83</td>
<td>1/5/88</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Odell House</td>
<td>425 Ridge Road, P.O. Hartsdale</td>
<td>3/28/73</td>
<td>6/23/80</td>
<td>1/5/88</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Hartsdale Pet Cemetery</td>
<td>Central Park Avenue North, P.O. Hartsdale</td>
<td>8/17/12</td>
<td>1/5/11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>Evangeline Booth House/St. Andrew’s Church</td>
<td>101 North Central Park Avenue, P.O. Hartsdale</td>
<td>2/22/11</td>
<td>1/5/11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7/08/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>Hartsdale Railroad Station</td>
<td>East Hartsdale Avenue, P.O. Hartsdale</td>
<td>1/14/11</td>
<td>5/23/11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>Spanish American War Monument to the 71st Infantry Regiment at Mount Hope Cemetery</td>
<td>Jackson Avenue/Saw Mill River Road, P.O. Hastings</td>
<td>1/14/11</td>
<td>11/18/10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Also listed as a National Historic Landmark
Figure 5.1: Historic Resources/Art Facilities
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5.2.2 Historic and Landmark Preservation Board

The H&LPB, whose mission statement is "preserve the history of Greenburgh through landmarking, pictures, and the written word," was created in 2003. Table 5.3 lists some of the H&LPB's duties. The H&LPB's goals are to protect, enhance, perpetuate and facilitate the use of those districts, sites, buildings, structures, barns, walls, trees, objects that are illustrative of the growth and development of unincorporated Greenburgh, New York State and the country.

Table 5.3: Selected Duties of the Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board

- Prepare reports for and recommendations to the Town Board on nomination or rescission of areas, buildings, structures, sites or objects as landmarks or historic districts
- Maintain and revise public listings of historic sites, buildings, structures, objects or districts and data about them
- Establish procedures for identification and nomination of historic districts and of buildings, structures, sites and objects as landmarks
- Formulate design guidelines for landmarks and historic districts to be approved and adopted by the Town Board.
- Formulate recommendations concerning the establishment of an appropriate system of markers for selected historic and/or architecturally significant buildings, structures, sites, objects or districts
- Encourage and promote education about historic landmarks and districts
- Provide advice and guidance to property owners, and any and all government agencies, about historic buildings, structures, sites or objects and on issues of preservation relating to their properties
- Work in cooperation with the Planning Board, Town staff and other state, county and local historic preservation agencies toward the goal of promoting and preserving the Town's rich cultural heritage

Source: Chapter 235 - Historic Districts and Landmarks, Code of the Town of Greenburgh

Once specific criteria have been met, the H&LPB is authorized to recommend to the Town Board that structures, including buildings, walls, etc., be locally designated as historic. Upon gaining local designation, the landmark or district can be referred to the county, state and federal registers for regional historic designation. Alternatively, a landmark or district that is currently designated on the State and Federal Registers can be assigned local historic designation by the Town Board. The Town Board, at the recommendation of the H&LPB, has designated several landmark buildings, structures and sites. These sites have also been recognized on the State and National Registers. To date, the H&LPB has not recommended to the Town Board, the designation of any historic district (further discussed in Section 5.2.4). Areas which might meet the historic district criteria are identified in the Reconnaissance-level Historic Resource Survey, discussed in Section 5.2.3.
5.2.3 Reconnaissance-level Historic Resource Survey (2006)


The RHRS identifies properties that have historic value, presents detailed architectural information on these properties and provides recommendations for new local historic designations. A total of 63 individual properties have been identified in the RHRS as potentially worthy of local landmark status: 37 domestic structures, six Country Clubs, eight commercial buildings, eight schools, three churches and one pet cemetery. Eleven potential local historic districts based on the integrity and cohesiveness of the resources located within them are noted. The survey, compiled from driving every street in unincorporated Greenburgh, is meant to remain a work in progress. As additional information is obtained, it will be added into the body of the survey.

5.2.4 Historic Districts

A historic district is a contiguous collection of properties that exhibit special historic value and represent one or more periods or styles of art or architecture typical of past eras. An area of houses might be noteworthy for the people who first settled there, e.g., the railroad workers or the Kensico Dam builders, and thus be eligible as an historic district. The potential landmarks and historic districts identified in the RHRS possess similar qualities needed to obtain state and federal historic designation. Regulation of historic districts can include architectural review and/or demolition-related discretion. The RHRS notes that public understanding of the benefits of preserving and enhancing resources within a potential distinct are the primary means of gaining support.

As noted in the RHRS, the Cotswold Tudor homes have been identified as worthy of being in an historic district.
5.2.5 The Washington Rochambeau Trail

The Washington Rochambeau Trail is a National Historic Trail that begins in Newport, Rhode Island and ends in Yorktown, Virginia. One building of historic significance along the route, the Odell House (Ridge Road), was built in 1732 and served as headquarters for French General Comte de Rochambeau. Although the trail passes within unincorporated Greenburgh, the Washington Rochambeau Trail has not been formalized through existing mapping or local historic designation status. A combination of local historic designation and informational trail markers along the route of the trail in unincorporated Greenburgh would strengthen our involvement in the preservation of the Hudson River Valley’s heritage.

5.2.6 Role of Land Use Boards

The Town Board and Planning Board exercise a regulatory role that involves oversight of impacts to historic resources in unincorporated Greenburgh. These Boards evaluate development impacts to sites near the historic resource, inquire whether historic artifacts are located on-site, and utilize archeological consultants to assist in the understanding of a site’s historic value, when appropriate. This process is typically carried out in conjunction with a SEQR review and also involves a referral to the H&LPB for recommendation, particularly on properties older than 50 years.

5.2.7 Office of Town Historian

Historic resources in unincorporated Greenburgh are further cultivated through the work of the Town’s Historian. The Town’s Historian provides support to Town residents, staff, land-use boards and committees, through published reports, historic documentation and general guidance with respect to matters related to history in and around Greenburgh.
5.3 Cultural Assets and Programs

The Arts and Culture Committee (ACC), the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Department of Community Resources and the Greenburgh Public Library offer numerous cultural programs in facilities throughout unincorporated Greenburgh. Private organizations also contribute cultural assets and programs.

5.3.1 The Arts and Culture Committee

The ACC was established in 1956 as a volunteer group and now operates through the Town of Greenburgh. It serves to: (1) stimulate creative and critical thinking about the arts and their value; (2) preserve, continue and enrich multi-cultural artistic and intellectual traditions; and (3) make access to the arts and ideas available to the general public. These objectives are carried out through the ACC’s coordination and exhibition of paintings, drawings and photographs by area artists. The artwork is exhibited in several galleries located in municipal buildings throughout unincorporated Greenburgh.

Greenburgh Town Hall houses two art galleries, “The Madeleine Gutman Art Gallery” on the first floor, and the “Town Hall Showcase” on the second floor. The Multipurpose Center at Anthony Veteran Park also has gallery space. The Theodore D. Young Community Center (TDYCC) houses a Children's Art Gallery. At these locations, area artists are able to exhibit original work of any size, in any two-dimensional medium, for two month periods. The artists are permitted to sell pieces from their exhibits. Although preference is given to residents of unincorporated Greenburgh, all artists are welcome. One of the larger annual shows is "Matters of the HeART," an exhibit in which artists over the age of 55 share their love of art with the public.

The ACC also conducts poetry readings, workshops, talks and art receptions at various locations and holds an annual poetry competition for adults, students and juveniles, with winners' and finalists' poems published in an anthology, Let the Poets Speak. The “Kids Short Story Connection” is a spring and fall series of creative writing workshops for 9 to 18 year-olds which results in the publication of an annual anthology, "Short Stories by Me." In addition, The Poetry Caravan is a network of more than 36 local poets who voluntarily take their poetry into Westchester venues such as senior centers, assisted living facilities, nursing homes, shelters, jails, etc. These poets read from their original works and conduct poetry writing workshops.

The ACC cooperates with Town agencies, public and private not-for-profit organizations, and other institutions in projects of mutual interest and public service. It also serves as a resource consultant upon the request of individuals and organizations. The ACC received the Westchester Arts Council’s Millennium Award for Community Arts Education and has long been recognized throughout Westchester County as a leader in free arts and culture programming which enlightens and entertains.
5.3.2 The Department of Parks and Recreation

The Department of Parks and Recreation offers cultural programs and a gallery at the Anthony F. Veterans Multipurpose Center. The Department of Parks and Recreation also sponsors events jointly with the Department of Community Resources, discussed in Section 5.3.4. Chapter 4.0 (Community Well-Being) and Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities) contain descriptions of additional services offered by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

5.3.3 The Greenburgh Public Library

The Greenburgh Public Library has been located at 300 Tarrytown Road since 1969. In early 2007, the Library underwent a two year renovation and expansion project, which resulted in a doubling of the building size and increased the services offered. The Greenburgh Public Library is the fifth largest member of the Westchester Library System. In addition to housing over 186,000 items, including books, periodicals, DVDs, videos, CDs and audio books, the library hosts numerous educational and cultural events. These events include, but are not limited to, artist receptions, musical performances, ethnic heritage celebrations and poetry readings. The Library contains the Howard and Ruth Jacobs Family Gallery which displays art work.

The library, a significant public asset, is located at a prominent intersection, making it easily accessible from all points of Greenburgh. Increasing pedestrian safety in the vicinity of the library would enhance this Town resource.

5.3.4 The Theodore D. Young Community Center

The TDYCC is operated by the Department of Community Resources and seeks to improve the quality of life for residents by providing a variety of educational, cultural, recreational and social activities. Programs provided at the TDYCC include instructional art classes in dance, drawing and creative writing, recitals, cultural observances, and family oriented events. These programs are available to unincorporated Greenburgh children through seniors and to non-residents as space permits. The TDYCC houses a Children's Art Gallery.

Elementary Acting Class & Creative Drum Class run through the Department of Community Resources
5.3.5 Outdoor Art and Sculpture Displays

Outdoor art complements the attractiveness and identity of a community. Public and private displays of outdoor art add to the character of a community by calling attention to its heritage, milestones or events. The ACC serves as a conduit for local residents who donate art or who would like art displayed outdoors for public appreciation. In that capacity, the ACC has worked to secure and facilitate placement of significant outdoor art on the grounds of various municipal buildings and parks such as the Greenburgh Library, Town Hall, Hart’s Brook Park and Preserve, and Richard Presser Park. The Hartsdale Train station and Disanti Plaza also contain public art. Many private businesses also display outdoor art and sculptures.

One of the largest displays of outdoor art in unincorporated Greenburgh is the People's 9/11 Memorial Wall at Richard Presser Park. The wall was originally composed of 1,800 mosaic tiles designed by local school children and residents throughout the county. The tiles were created in workshops sponsored by ArtsWestchester. Although the wall began to deteriorate from weather exposure and started to lose tiles in 2008, a total of 1,711 tiles were salvaged by the Town of Greenburgh’s Department of Parks and Recreation. With generous support from local business and community groups, a team of 41 volunteers conducted an intensive restoration project to save the memorial. The monument was restored and rededicated in 2011. A piece of steel from the World Trade Center is part of the monument.
Outdoor art has been incorporated, where appropriate, as part of development projects before land use boards. A sculpture will be placed within a landscaped island in a cul-de-sac at a subdivision along Downing Drive West. In other instances, applicants have donated art or historic features to the Town. As part of a subdivision on Fort Hill Road, with a recommendation from the H&LPB, a hitching post was donated and placed at Hart’s Brook Park and Preserve.

5.3.6 Private Facilities and Programs

There are a number of private organizations, businesses and non-profit institutions which contribute cultural resources. Residents also have excellent access to museums, theatres, galleries and other cultural institutions in the New York Metropolitan area. Within unincorporated Greenburgh, the Westchester Broadway Theatre located at 1 Broadway Plaza, (P.O.) Elmsford, is the longest running year-round Equity theatre in New York State. Westchester Broadway Theatre has a 41-year history of nearly 200 main-stage productions, and over 900 special events and concerts. The Academic Arts Building on the campus of Westchester Community College, located at 75 Grasslands Road, (P.O.) Valhalla, contains a performance space offering plays, musicals, concerts and a film series. The Academic Arts Building also contains a fine arts gallery. Bow Tie Cinema 100 on Knollwood Road commonly screens independent movies. Section 5.4 (Economic Development through the Arts) highlights the benefits associated with revenue and employment generated from arts and cultural facilities.

Currently, museums, art galleries and other cultural centers are principal permitted uses in the Limited Office Building (LOB) and in the Central Avenue Mixed-Use Impact (CA) Districts. Figure 5.1 shows the locations of some public and private art facilities in unincorporated Greenburgh, which are also listed in Table 5.4.

Westchester Broadway Theatre
Table 5.4: Cultural Facilities in unincorporated Greenburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location (Address)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Westchester Broadway Theatre</td>
<td>1 Broadway Plaza, P.O. Elmsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Academic Arts Building</td>
<td>Westchester Community College (75 Grasslands Road, P.O. Valhalla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>The Madeleine Gutman Art Gallery</td>
<td>1st Floor Greenburgh Town Hall (177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Town Hall Showcase</td>
<td>2nd Floor Greenburgh Town Hall (177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Children’s Art Gallery</td>
<td>Theodore D. Young Community Center (32 Manhattan Avenue, P.O. White Plains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Howard and Ruth Jacobs Family Gallery</td>
<td>The Greenburgh Library (300 Tarrytown Road, P.O. White Plains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>The People's 9/11 Memorial Wall</td>
<td>Richard Presser Park (Central Park Avenue North, P.O. Hartsdale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Hart’s Brook Park and Preserve</td>
<td>Ridge Road, P.O. Hartsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Multipurpose Center Gallery</td>
<td>Anthony Veteran Park (11 Olympic Lane, P.O. Ardsley)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Live music events/entertainment facilitate social interaction and also provide economic benefits. These uses are regulated as cabarets in accordance with the Code of the Town of Greenburgh. Cabaret permits are granted through the Town Clerk’s Office for single events while cabaret permits of longer duration are granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The focus of regulating cabaret uses is to ensure that events are run safely and at appropriate times. One potential modification to the process could be to change or waive requirements for small scale events.
5.3.7 Cultural Community Events

Examples of cultural events which take place within unincorporated Greenburgh are listed in Table 5.5. Throughout the Town there are also numerous block parties and civic association events that take place during the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location (Address)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate Greenburgh</td>
<td>Anthony F. Veteran Park (Olympic Lane, P.O. Ardsley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerts</td>
<td>Hartsdale Train Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Day Events</td>
<td>Greenburgh Nature Center (Dromore Road, P.O. Scarsdale) and various other locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Concerts</td>
<td>Yosemite Park (Yosemite Avenue, P.O. White Plains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day Parade</td>
<td>Hartsdale (East Hartsdale Avenue, P.O. Hartsdale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Residents Reception/</td>
<td>Town Hall (177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers Reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spooktober Fest</td>
<td>Hart’s Brook Park &amp; Preserve (Ridge Road, P.O. Hartsdale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Painting</td>
<td>Hartsdale Business District (East Hartsdale Avenue, P.O. Hartsdale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County Irish-</td>
<td>Ridge Road Park (Ridge Road, P.O. Hartsdale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Heritage Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Economic Development through the Arts

Arts-centric businesses play an important role in building and sustaining cultural vibrancy and economic diversity. They are comprised of businesses that range from galleries, museums, symphonies, and theaters to film, architecture, and advertising companies. As of January 2011, Westchester County is home to 3,332 arts-related businesses that employ 13,572 people. These businesses employ a creative workforce, spend money locally, generate government revenue, and are a cornerstone of tourism and economic development. The creative industries account for 5.44 percent of the 61,214 total businesses located in Westchester County and 3.05 percent of the 444,866 workers employed in Westchester. Table 5.6 shows art audience spending in Westchester County in the years 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2010.\(^{(2)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Audiences Spending</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29,182,162</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>$47,856,16</td>
<td>$59,594,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


List of Sources

\(^{(1)}\)http://www.nysparks.com/shop/national-register/

5.5 Historic Resources and Cultural Assets Goals, Objectives and Policies

GOAL 5.1: Maintain, Preserve and Enhance Historic Resources.

OBJECTIVE 5.1.1 Promote the use and preservation of landmarked buildings, structures, sites and objects.

POLICY 5.1.1.1: Support the H&LPB in carrying out duties noted in Section 5.2.2.

POLICY 5.1.1.2: Conduct further research and analysis of existing conditions to determine the authenticity of historic buildings.

POLICY 5.1.1.3: Encourage any public schools (K-12) interested in teaching or researching the evolution and growth of unincorporated Greenburgh.

POLICY 5.1.1.4: Encourage colleges and universities to undertake research and field work projects related to unincorporated Greenburgh’s history.

POLICY 5.1.1.5: Identify certain historic property types or themes to help focus the ongoing documentation and preservation efforts.

POLICY 5.1.1.6: Use the Reconnaissance-level Historic Resource Survey list and its updates of significant resources to plan for local designations and National Register nominations.

POLICY 5.1.1.7: Continue to supplement the RHRS with new data as it is collected.

POLICY 5.1.1.8: Educate the public about the range of property types and how their architectural characteristics can be maintained.

POLICY 5.1.1.9: Designate applicable historic Town-owned properties as landmarks and work with HLPB to institute preservation plans for them.

POLICY 5.1.1.10: Continue to factor in historic and architectural context in new project development review processes.

POLICY 5.1.1.11: Continue to document the local history associated with the Washington Rochambeau trail in order to formalize the trail in unincorporated Greenburgh through a series of identification markers and through local historic designation.

POLICY 5.1.1.12: Identify gateway areas in non-residential districts, where redevelopment incorporating complementary architectural schemes can enhance adjacent residential areas.
POLICY 5.1.1.13: Explore the potential of establishing 501(c)3 status for the H&LPB, for the purpose of enhancing grant and funding capabilities.

GOAL 5.2: Utilize Arts and Cultural Assets, including Organizations, Festivals and Events as Resources to Promote Education, Diversity, and Economic Development.

OBJECTIVE 5.2.1 Encourage the establishment, development, continued growth and health of publicly and privately funded facilities and programs which enhance cultural and artistic development.

POLICY 5.2.1.1: Use arts and culture as a way to increase understanding and communication among people of diverse backgrounds.

POLICY 5.2.1.2: Continue to support efforts to facilitate arts and culture in public spaces and public parks, including art events, musical performances, etc.

POLICY 5.2.1.3: Create special permit criteria or other approval processes for galleries, museums, and other cultural centers in appropriate districts.

POLICY 5.2.1.4: Compile and annually review and update a master list of arts and cultural organizations in unincorporated Greenburgh.

POLICY 5.2.1.5: Encourage individual, corporate, and foundation donations to public art projects and programs.

POLICY 5.2.1.6: Explore the feasibility of instituting a “First Friday” monthly series of events that includes gallery openings and mini-performances in designated areas on a rotating basis.

POLICY 5.2.1.7: Develop guidelines for donating art and artifacts to the Town of Greenburgh.

POLICY 5.2.1.8: Consider a cabaret permit waiver or modified process for small-scale music/entertainment oriented events.
Chapter 6.0 Environmental Resources and Related Systems

6.1 Relationship to our Guiding Principles

Environmental resources in unincorporated Greenburgh include wooded areas, wetlands and watercourses, steep slopes, soils, rock outcroppings and open space. These resources support a variety of wildlife and vegetation; provide ecological benefits, recreational opportunities and open space; and add to the character and livability of the Town. On large publicly and privately owned parcels, environmental resources are more clearly separated from developed areas. Across unincorporated Greenburgh’s roughly 18 square miles, close interactions between developed areas and environmental resources exist. Preservation and enhancement strategies for natural areas are discussed throughout this chapter.

6.2 Environmental Resource Systems

Climate, temperature, precipitation and winds affect unincorporated Greenburgh’s variety of wetlands, watercourses, vegetation and wildlife.

6.2.1 Climate

Unincorporated Greenburgh has a humid-continental climate typified by large seasonal temperature differences, with warm to hot (and often humid) summers, and cold (sometimes severely cold) winters. The region’s climate is influenced by masses of cold-dry air from the northern interior of the continent and warm-humid air from the south and southwest. The combination of these air masses creates the principal temperate continental characteristics of the climate. This area’s climate is also affected by proximity to the Atlantic Ocean. The Atlantic Multi-decadal Oscillation, a 70-year-long warming and cooling cycle in the Atlantic Ocean, also influences local weather patterns.

6.2.2 Temperature

The impact of the Atlantic Ocean helps to moderate temperatures in the area and reduce seasonal temperature extremes. Summer temperatures are somewhat cooler than inland areas at similar latitudes. In the summer months, the average high temperature is 83°F, but it is not uncommon for the temperature to reach 90°F. Recorded highs have been in excess of 100°F. On average, July is the warmest month and January is the coolest month of the year. Winter temperatures average 30°F, which are milder than those of inland areas of similar latitudes. Low temperatures in January and February average 21°F, with the lowest recorded temperature being -10°F. Despite the noted averages, it appears that recently there has been an unpredictable variety of patterns with respect to temperature, precipitation and wind.

Many developed areas throughout unincorporated Greenburgh contain vegetation and landscaping that complement our open space.

Specific climate response strategies are discussed in Section 3.4 (Greenhouse Effect and Climate Change) and in the Town of Greenburgh Climate Action Plan. Upon adoption by the Town Board, the Climate Action Plan will be incorporated as an appendix to this Plan.
6.2.3 Precipitation

Two different air masses, cold-dry and warm-humid, in combination with jet stream movement, provide the region with an abundant and fairly uniform supply of annual precipitation. Average annual precipitation is approximately 45 inches. March is typically the wettest month of the year. Storm systems that move off the coast in the mid-Atlantic region occasionally stall, influencing weather in the region for several days. Between the months of October and April, the air masses also influence the formation of Nor’easters, which bring substantial amounts of precipitation and high winds.

In the summer, precipitation is associated with the passage of fronts and convective showers, while hurricanes and tropical storms during this time of year can dump more than seven inches of precipitation on the area. In August 2011, Tropical Storm Irene caused intense rainfall and flooding. Localized heavy rainfall from squall lines and intense thunderstorms are also common. Most precipitation in the winter months is produced by low pressure systems that form to the south and intensify as they move northeastward. Snowfall varies from year to year, with an average annual snowfall of 25-40 inches. Nor’easter winter storms can produce heavy ice and snow.
6.2.4 Wind

The Department of Energy's Wind Program and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) publish a wind resource map for the State of New York. This resource map shows average wind speed estimates measured at 164 feet above the ground. Wind speeds in the area are varied because terrain obstacles such as topographic features, vegetation and buildings slow the wind speed. Wind speeds typically range from 0 to 14.1 miles per hour and are generally mild, averaging eight miles per hour, but gusts in excess of 60 miles per hour can occur. Winds commonly reach 40 miles per hour during storm events. Since 1950, there have been eight known tornadoes that have touched down or entered Westchester County. In 2006, the largest and strongest tornado (F2 category) to hit travelled from Tarrytown to Greenwich, Connecticut. In October, 2012, Superstorm Sandy produced very damaging winds causing downed trees on almost every street, dozens of closed roadways, and extensive power outages which took more than one week to fully restore. These types of events highlight the importance of having an all hazards mitigation plan, such as the one the Town Board adopted on October 12, 2011.

6.3 Geology, Topography, Soils and Trees

6.3.1 Geology

According to the United States Geological Service (USGS), unincorporated Greenburgh is located on the Manhattan Prong in the “Highlands Province” area of New York State Geology. This area consists of metamorphic Fordham Gneiss and igneous rocks of the Late Precambrian and Early Paleozoic age. The Manhattan Prong is a smaller belt of ancient rock that extends from upland portions of southwestern Connecticut through Westchester County to the Bronx and Manhattan and includes segments of Brooklyn and Staten Island.
On August 23, 2011, the remnants of a 5.8 magnitude earthquake that occurred in Virginia were felt in unincorporated Greenburgh.

In unincorporated Greenburgh it is not uncommon to find bedrock close to or at ground level. Depth to bedrock impacts the location, maintenance and development cost of sewers and roads, utility lines, building foundations, stormwater collection systems and landscaping.

Unincorporated Greenburgh is not located on or near a crustal plate boundary where a majority of earthquakes occur but is located in the middle of the North American tectonic plate. When earthquakes occur locally, they are often less intense and felt over a larger area due to the large foundation of bedrock that runs from Virginia to Canada. Unincorporated Greenburgh is located between two associated fault lines, Cameron’s line and the Saint Nicholas thrust.

Cameron’s line and the Saint Nicholas thrust were formed approximately 400 to 450 million years ago, when plates of Africa collided with the plates of North America. Cameron’s line runs from western Connecticut near Ridgefield, enters Westchester County in the northeast, heads into the Bronx along the East River in Manhattan, and continues through New York Bay, Staten Island and into New Jersey. The Saint Nicholas thrust runs up the Hudson River. The area also has smaller fault lines, including the Ardsley fault, and the Dobbs Ferry fault, which runs southeast from Dobbs Ferry into unincorporated Greenburgh.

Small earthquakes have always been experienced locally. On October 19, 1985, an earthquake with a magnitude 4.0 on the Richter scale struck Ardsley. On January 10, 2003, a magnitude 1.2 earthquake occurred near Hastings-on-Hudson. Four days later, on January 14, a magnitude 1.4 earthquake occurred about 1.25 miles southeast of Hastings-on-Hudson.

6.3.2 Topography and Steep Slope Preservation

Topography in unincorporated Greenburgh is characterized by the three north-south valleys created by the Saw Mill River, the Sprain Brook and the Bronx River. These valleys create the gently rolling topography that characterizes the area. Typical land elevations in the Town range from approximately 100 feet to 540 feet above sea level, with an average grade elevation in the range of 275 feet to 300 feet above sea level. The lowest portions of unincorporated Greenburgh are found along the Town’s western (Saw Mill River Valley) and eastern (Bronx River Valley) boundaries. The highest elevations are located in the northeast, as well as the central sections of the Town. Figure 6.1 displays general topographies in unincorporated Greenburgh.

From an aesthetic perspective, varied topography which contains open space and forested hills contributes positively to unincorporated Greenburgh. Steep slope legislation encourages slope preservation. These laws are designed to prevent/minimize: erosion and sedimentation, loss of topsoil, habitat disturbance, water quality degradation, slope failure and flooding. They are further designed to provide stable and safe building sites; to protect the quantity and quality of surface and groundwater resources, important scenic views and vistas; and to preserve prominent land forms of scenic and ecological value, rock outcrops and trees; and areas of vegetation and wildlife habitat.
Figure 6.1: Topography
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In 1979, the Town of Greenburgh enacted a local law which made disturbance of slopes of 20 percent or greater a local “Type I” action under SEQR. In 2003, the Town Board adopted a more comprehensive Steep Slope Ordinance regulating the disturbance of sloped areas in unincorporated Greenburgh. The ordinance categorizes slopes into three categories: (1) steep slopes, or slopes with a topographical gradient equal to or greater than 15 percent but less than 25 percent; (2) very steep slopes, or slopes with a topographical gradient equal to or greater than 25 percent but less than 35 percent; and (3) excessively steep slopes, or slopes with a topographical gradient equal to or greater than 35 percent.

The intent of the law is to minimize impact to steep slopes and to incorporate careful review and regulation of disturbance to soil and vegetation in these areas. It is administered by the Town Engineer and the Planning Board; however, a few inconsistencies warrant modifications to the law.

- The 20 percent SEQR Type I threshold is inconsistent with the Town’s slope categorizations established in 2003
- The law does not incentivize development that takes place largely or wholly on the flat area of a subject site
- There are no exemption provisions for small-scale in kind replacements

In 1993, hilltops at or above 400’ elevation were designated a local Type “I” action; however, the action did not result in an official change in the Code of the Town of Greenburgh. Figure 6.2 displays topographies in unincorporated Greenburgh in excess of 400 feet above sea level.

### 6.3.3 Soils

There are 28 identified varieties of soils in unincorporated Greenburgh. The soil types were identified using the United States Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, where polygons were drawn around the approximate boundaries of unincorporated Greenburgh. Table 6.1 lists the different soil types and indicates that five soil types dominate approximately 68 percent of land area. A general soil map is shown on Figure 6.3, and is based on the Soil Survey of Putnam and Westchester Counties, New York. Soil types are important as they often dictate percolation rates and associated stormwater detention or retention provisions. Certain soil types can also have prohibitive qualities, when development on steep slopes is proposed. The presence of bedrock underlying soils can inhibit the placement of underground stormwater collection systems. Bedrock in the Town is often exposed at grade or as little as a few inches below ground level.
Figure 6.2: Elevations Above 400'
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The five most common soil types in unincorporated Greenburgh are Charlton-Chatfield, Charlton loam, Urban land, Paxton fine sandy loam and Udorthents, and are further described in Table 6.2.

It should be noted that Urban land, listed as a soil type by the NRCS Web Soil Survey, consists of impervious surfaces such as paved parking lots or building footprints. In addition to the Urban land estimate of 1,239 acres (or 10.8 percent of unincorporated Greenburgh) noted in Table 6.1, there exist several Urban land complexes, which contain only a percentage of Urban land. A closer approximation of unincorporated

---

**Table 6.1: Soil Types in Unincorporated Greenburgh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Acreage Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlton-Chatfield</td>
<td>2,892</td>
<td>25.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton loam</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton fine sandy loam</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udorthents</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Paxton</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Charlton-Chatfield</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton loam</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollis-Rock</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvaquents</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge loam</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield-Hollis-Rock</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Charlton</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Woodbridge</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester loam</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Riverhead</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgebury loam</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverhead loam</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynham silt loam</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompton silt loam</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun loam</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckley gravelly loamy sand</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle muck</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Ridgebury</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knickbocker fine sandy loam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palms muck</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pits-gravel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: soils.usda.gov/survey/

The numerous soil types and their respective water percolation rates requires that a variety of stormwater mitigation techniques can be utilized throughout unincorporated Greenburgh.
Greenburgh’s Urban land, which takes into account the Urban land-complexes, is 18.2 percent of total land area, as detailed in Table 6.3. Many suburban communities have more Urban land (upwards of 30 percent), which is a tribute to unincorporated Greenburgh’s parks and open spaces, and other landscaped areas.

### Table 6.2: Selected Unincorporated Greenburgh Soil Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Soil Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlton-Chatfield</td>
<td>Very deep and moderately deep, well drained and somewhat excessively drained, medium textured soils on uplands. The landscape is characterized by hills and rolling upland that have complex topography. Slopes are dominantly 2 to 25 percent but range to as much as 45 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton loam</td>
<td>Very deep, well drained loamy soils formed in till derived from parent materials that are very low in iron sulfides. They are nearly level to very steep soils on till plains and hills. Slope ranges from 0 to 50 percent. Saturated hydraulic conductivity is moderately high or high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land</td>
<td>Encompasses any large area completely covered by impervious surfaces such as asphalt, concrete or rooftop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton fine sandy loam</td>
<td>Very deep, gently sloping, well drained soil on top of upland hills. The soil is in oval and in irregularly shaped areas that range from 6 to 100 acres. Slopes are smooth and slightly convex. Stones 10 to 24 inches in diameter cover 1 to 15 percent of the surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udorthents</td>
<td>Consists of gently sloping to moderately sloping areas where the original soil has been cut away or covered with a loamy fill material. Most of these areas have been graded to a smooth surface with 4 to 10 inches of topsoil. This soil commonly occupies upland areas, but occurs in a variety of landscape positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: soils.usda.gov/survey/

### Table 6.3: Urban land Soil Type in Unincorporated Greenburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent Urban Land</th>
<th>Urban Land Acres</th>
<th>Approximate Urban land Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban land</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Paxton</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Charlton-Chatfield</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Charlton</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Woodbridge</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Riverhead</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban land-Ridgebury</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,471</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: soils.usda.gov/survey/
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6.3.4 Trees and Canopy Coverage

A variety of tree species, including magnificent individual specimens and large stands of trees, are located throughout unincorporated Greenburgh. Trees remove carbon dioxide from the air, abate noise, impede soil erosion, assist in the prevention of flooding, and provide necessary shade and screening. Furthermore, trees act as natural barriers, support habitat for wildlife and provide green space. Aesthetically pleasing, trees also provide vital links to the natural world, soften the hard edges of developed areas, provide continuity in areas undergoing dynamic change, visually connect and define the character of neighborhoods, and enhance property values and the quality of life.

Aesthetic, environmental and economic considerations reflect the critical need to retain and enhance unincorporated Greenburgh’s tree and forest coverage. Chapter 260 (Trees) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh regulates the removal of trees exceeding six inches in diameter measured at a height of four feet from the ground on properties greater than one acre and on all undeveloped properties. Lots consisting of one acre or less, substantially developed with improvements or a structure or structures, are exempt from the Chapter. The ordinance also contains a provision that all property owners applying for subdivision, site plan, special permit, variances or other development approval whose plans would require the removal of any regulated trees must apply to the Town Forestry Officer for a tree removal permit. The permit functions as the tool to require the replacement of trees and other vegetation on a site when trees are cut down and removed due to old age, disease, infestation, storm damage, invasive qualities, construction related activities, and the like. Chapter 280 (Wetlands and Watercourses) and Chapter 285 (Zoning) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh, further regulate the removal and replacement of trees from properties within the Town.

Although overall tree canopy coverage is substantial, the tree population is rapidly aging as many of the trees are within the last quarter of their lifecycle. The next generation of tree cover should incorporate a balance of small, medium and large maturing trees, and a wide range of predominantly native species. The prevalence of diseases and insect infestation found within certain tree species signifies the importance of diversifying our tree stock. Invasive trees, vines and groundcovers that displace native species, reduce plant diversity, alter ecosystem processes, and hybridize with native plants changing their genetic makeup, destroy the habitats that support native animals, insects, and micro-organisms, and create ecosystems which support aggressive, non-native plants, animals and pathogens.

Future contributions to our tree coverage must be carried out: (1) at the local, county, and state level; (2) by utilities operating within unincorporated Greenburgh; (3) by existing residents and businesses; and (4) by those developing land. In November 2010, the Town of Greenburgh Town Forestry Officer completed a draft Tree Technical
Manual, which is a local policy guide of best management practices for the spectrum of tree related protection measures, pruning techniques, removal, replacement and planting guidelines, along with transplanting and maintenance procedures. The manual, which is being revised per comment, is intended to work in concert with an evolving revision to Chapter 260 of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh in order to comprehensively protect and enhance tree resources. Additionally, the Town Forestry Officer completed a draft Parking Lot Tree Shading Maintenance and Guideline Manual, which is a local policy guide of best management practices to encourage successful and sufficient landscaping in and around parking lots and paved areas. This manual is also intended to work in connection with Chapter 260 of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh.

6.4 Water Resources

6.4.1 The Groundwater Cycle and Aquifers

The process by which water is transferred from the sea to atmosphere and to land and back is referred to as the “hydrologic cycle.” The hydrologic cycle returns some water directly to surface waters through stormwater runoff and stream flows. The hydrologic cycle also recharges the groundwater system. Groundwater is found in aquifers, which are geologic formations through which water slowly seeps. Locally, stormwater runoff seeps toward the Long Island Sound and the Hudson River, as underflow. Groundwater replenishes wells, provides flow to streams as it discharges naturally from aquifers into riparian wetlands, streams or other open water bodies. Aquifer recharge comes from precipitation that infiltrates through soils and downward into the aquifers.

The unconfined bedrock aquifers that underlie parts of unincorporated Greenburgh along the Saw Mill River and the Bronx River are shown on Figure 6.4. Groundwater migrates through fractures in the crystalline rock. Wells in bedrock aquifers yield water where they intersect water-bearing fractures. Groundwater seeping into wells is a
Figure 6.4: Aquifers

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Produced by: Town of Greenburgh; Sarah Pawlicki
Data Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced: July 2015

Legend
Aquifer Yield

- 10-100 gal/min
- >100 gal/min

1 inch = 1,355 feet

0 0.5 1 2
Miles
source of drinking water in a few locations, identified and discussed in Section 8.2.6 (Water Supply Groundwater Wells).

6.4.2 Surface Water (Watercourses and Water Bodies)

Major watercourses in unincorporated Greenburgh include the Saw Mill River, Sprain Brook and Bronx River. Minor or tertiary watercourses include the Rumbrook, Manhattan, Hartsdale, Mine, Sheldon and Troublesome brooks. Figure 6.5 shows the locations of major and minor watercourses. There are also ponds, lakes and the Grassy Sprain reservoir, which are known as water bodies. Many of these water bodies are part of wetland areas. The Town controls, protects, preserves and regulates floodplains, watercourses and adjacent buffer areas in order to ensure that development activities do not threaten the natural environment or public safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watercourse</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Watercourse Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saw Mill River</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>A tributary river to the lower Hudson River running north to south through unincorporated Greenburgh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx River</td>
<td>B, C</td>
<td>A tributary river to the East River in the Bronx and runs along the east border of unincorporated Greenburgh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprain Brook</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A tributary to the Bronx River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassy Sprain Reservoir</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A reservoir partially fed by the Sprain Brook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(T) indicates that it may support a trout population.

All waters in New York State have “best use” classifications, described in Table 6.4. NYSDEC classifies all navigational water within its boundaries according to a “best use” scale. The highest level of classification (Class AA or SA) refers to the most pristine, while the lowest classification corresponds in general to the least pristine (Class D or SD) water quality. A description of the classification follows:

- The classification AA or A is assigned to waters used as a source of drinking water;
- Classification B indicates a best usage for swimming and other contact recreation, but not for drinking water;
- Classification C is for waters supporting fisheries and suitable for non-contact activities; and
- The lowest classification and standard is D.
Figure 6.5: Watercourses and Water Bodies*

Legend

- Watercourses
- Named Watercourses
- Water Bodies

*Not representative of every watercourse and water body in unincorporated Greenburgh. Such mapping is an ongoing process carried out in connection with field visits and updated County data.
6.4.3 Surface Water (Wetlands)

Wetlands are found throughout unincorporated Greenburgh and include marshes, swamps, fens and bogs, where three factors are present: (1) routinely moist or wet soil; (2) hydric soils (soils that easily retain water); and (3) water-tolerant vegetation (plants that live in damp soils). Wetlands are differentiated from watercourses such as rivers, brooks and streams, or water bodies such as lakes and reservoirs. Wetlands, however, can be present adjacent to watercourses and water bodies. The size of wetlands can range from a small contiguous low lying area of several sq. ft. to a swamp or bog in excess of 100 acres. An example of a large contiguous wetland is found on the Hackley School Campus, where a 6.3 acre red maple dominated hardwood swamp wetland with intermittent (vernal) pools and upland buffer areas exists.

Wetland buffer areas are those areas adjacent to wetlands that do not exhibit the three factors listed above and are often referred to as upland areas. Wetlands and their associated upland buffer areas perform valuable functions, such as flood control (stormwater storage), wildlife and vegetative habitat, water quality improvement and water supply for groundwater recharge. Wetlands areas can also provide open space, recreation and education opportunities. In unincorporated Greenburgh, an area of 100 ft. beyond the outermost boundary of a wetland is considered a buffer.

The importance of preserving wetlands has been recognized nationally through the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), on a state level by the NYSDEC, and locally by the Town. Under the CWA, the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provide regulatory oversight of wetlands in excess of one acre. The NYSDEC regulates wetlands greater than 12.4 acres. Locally, the Town regulates development within wetlands, watercourses, and their buffer areas pursuant to Chapter 280 (Wetlands and Watercourses) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh. Chapter 280 establishes criteria for delineating wetland and watercourse boundaries, and sets forth allowable, prohibited and regulated activities within those boundaries. The Chapter also sets forth procedures for permits, variances and mitigation requirements.

The Wetlands and Watercourses Law is administered by the Town Wetland Inspector and Planning Board. A few modifications would enhance the efficiency of the process.

- Utilizing public hearing notice procedures that are consistent between various permit/approval processes;
- Providing extension timeframes and processes that are consistent between various permit/approval processes;
- Providing exemption provisions in the law, such as for normal ground maintenance of existing landscaped areas (i.e. lawn mowing), installation of appropriate native landscape plantings (i.e. tree and/or shrub planting), agricultural activities, or emergency activities necessary to protect life, property or natural resources; and
- Providing clear distinctions between Town Wetland Inspector Approvals and Planning Board Approvals.

The importance of upland buffer preservation is amplified due to movement patterns of amphibians and reptiles beyond wetland areas.

There are moderate to low risk flood zone areas (Zone X) and high risk flood zone areas (A, AO and AE) in unincorporated Greenburgh.
6.4.4 Floodplains

Floodplains are relatively low land areas adjacent to water sources that are prone to occasional or periodic flooding. For regulatory purposes a floodplain is composed of two components: (1) the floodway, a stream channel and adjacent overbank area and (2) the flood fringe, the part of the floodplain that is outside of the floodway. Approximately 508 acres in unincorporated Greenburgh are considered floodplain areas. A floodplain is a complex, dynamic system which provides many benefits to natural systems. Floodplains provide storage areas for water, helping slow down floodwater and reducing the severity of flooding. Rich ecosystems, both in quantity and diversity, are supported by floodplains. The wetting of the floodplain soil releases an immediate surge of nutrients. In communities all across the country, certain neighborhoods and developed corridors flood due to their proximity to or by being in a floodplain. In addition, and as discussed more closely in Section 8.4.3 (Flood Prone Areas), past development activity has increased stormwater runoff volume and intensity, resulting in compromised floodplain functions and highlighting the regional aspect of flooding.

The term "100-year flood" is used to describe the estimated probability of a flood event happening in any given year. For example, a 100-year flood is calculated to be the level of flood water expected to be equaled or exceeded once every 100 years on average. This does not mean that only one 100-year flood will occur in a 100 year period. FEMA flood zones in unincorporated Greenburgh are depicted on Figure 6.6.

Protection of unincorporated Greenburgh’s floodplains is a priority for public health and safety. Chapter 220 (Flood Damage Prevention) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh addresses flood damage prevention and regulates development within special flood hazard areas to protect residents from increased flood hazards and to ensure that new development is constructed in a manner that minimizes exposure to

Approximately 7.5 acres of floodplain forest wetlands were created in unincorporated Greenburgh to partially offset the loss of wetlands disturbed to accommodate the UV Water Treatment Plant in the Town of Mount Pleasant.
Figure 6.6: FEMA Flood Zones, Major Flood Clusters, and Wetlands*
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* Not representative of every wetland in unincorporated Greenburgh. Such mapping is an ongoing process carried out in connection with flood visits and updated County data.
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flooding. Chapter 220 establishes procedures for obtaining a floodplain development permit for any construction or development activity undertaken in areas of special flood hazard.

6.5 Wildlife and Vegetation

Wildlife and vegetation patterns are related to soil types, topography, hydrology and geology, and in part are shaped by past and present land uses. Changes in the presence of animal species affect plant community composition and dynamics, and vice versa.

Contiguous tracts of open space areas, watercourses and water bodies provide important habitat for a variety of plant and wildlife species. They provide vital food sources and water for wildlife and help to preserve plant and animal gene pools. These “greenways,” or corridors of open space, serve as migratory routes for wildlife and facilitate plant species migration across the landscape and should be considered in the review of development projects. Figure 7.5 in Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities) depicts open space corridors which include parks, protected open space, cemeteries, schools, institutions and private recreation areas with open space components. Within developed areas of the Town, connections to larger open space corridors often exist and should be planned for in connection with future land use decisions.

Development and other activities reduce the amount of habitat for plants and animals by fragmenting contiguous open space and inadvertently promoting the spread of invasive species. Not all natural areas have equal biological importance. Lost natural habitat can be mitigated by development which incorporates the characteristics of natural habitats. An example of this type of innovation can be seen in the creation and restoration of wetland areas and functions which were part of the NYCDEP mitigation work in unincorporated Greenburgh, south of Grasslands Road, associated with the UV Water Treatment Plant in the Town of Mount Pleasant. Future opportunities to preserve tracts of open space can be realized by clustered subdivisions, or utilizing the Conservation District overlay, two concepts explained in detail in Section 7.6.1 (Open Space Preservation Strategies).

6.5.1 Mammals

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s proximity to the Hudson River and wildlife corridors that connect beyond the Town provide a habitat for a variety of mammals. The New England Wildlife: Habitat, Natural History and Distribution (DeGraaf and Yamasaki, 2001) was reviewed to produce a list of mammals that could potentially utilize the habitats present in unincorporated Greenburgh. The range of woodland habitat supports, among others, raccoons, squirrels, rabbits, fox, coyote, eastern chipmunks, Virginia opossums, striped skunks and white-footed mice.

There is a large well-established white-tailed deer population throughout many portions of unincorporated Greenburgh. White-tailed deer prefer to live along the edges rather than...
in the interior of forests. The urbanization of unincorporated Greenburgh has created a habitat that is favored by deer. Small patches of woods or plantings with expanses of lawns, landscaping and gardens on most properties have created this favorable environment. The abundance of food and the relatively small number of natural predators has led to an increase in the population of deer. The result of the ever-increasing white-tailed deer population has compromised the understory woodland vegetation and increased the number of accidents caused by deer foraging for food near roadways. A lack of saplings and understory trees also has the consequence of facilitating increased amounts of destructive non-native vegetation. Deer are also hosts to the ticks that cause lyme disease.

6.5.2 Amphibians and Reptiles

Unincorporated Greenburgh offers a wide range of natural and manufactured habitats for amphibians and reptiles. Constructed wetlands on the Hackley School campus and on the UV treatment property are two examples of manufactured habitats in unincorporated Greenburgh. A preliminary list of amphibian and reptile species that are known in unincorporated Greenburgh was produced by reviewing the data in Amphibians and Reptiles of Connecticut and Adjacent Regions (Klemens, 1993) along with data gathered for the New York State Amphibian and Reptile Atlas Project (NYSDEC, 1999).

Amphibians require suitable aquatic and terrestrial habitat to support an active population. The spring time is the best time to document amphibian breeding activity through the presence/absence of amphibian egg masses, spermatophores and/or larvae. Where wetlands or wet areas are of substantial size, there is a potential to find northern redback salamander, northern two-lined salamander, spotted salamanders, bullfrogs, green frogs, northern spring peeper frogs, wood frogs and fowler’s toads.

Reptiles also require suitable aquatic and terrestrial habitat to support their population. Reptiles use a wide variety of different habitats, from wetlands to woodlands to fields. Reptiles also exist around developments when food sources and shelter are present. In unincorporated Greenburgh there is a potential to find common garter snakes, eastern garter snakes, northern ring neck snakes, northern brown snakes and northern water snakes. Near wetter areas there is a potential to find common snapping turtles, eastern box turtles, painted turtles and red-eared slider turtles.

6.5.3 Fish

The three major watercourses (Sprain Brook, Saw Mill River, and Bronx River) that run through unincorporated Greenburgh are relatively narrow and shallow. Each river is dominated by runs with interspersed pool sections and some areas of riffles. The river bottoms consist of sand and gravel. Numerous species of fish inhabit the rivers and are relatively tolerant of conditions typically present in a setting that is altered by humans. Unfortunately, the suburban/urban setting helps contribute a considerable amount of debris in and along each waterway.
In 1989, The Saw Mill River Coalition conducted fish sampling at 10 sites on the Saw Mill River from Chappaqua downstream to the mouth at the Hudson River. The report documents 13 species of fish in the non-tidal portion of the river, all of which are common species in southern New York State. A recent sampling of fish along the “Eastview Site” in the northeastern portion of unincorporated Greenburgh included blacknose dace, white sucker, common shiner, bluegill sunfish and largemouth bass.

Since the early 2000s, there has been concerted effort to reestablish the Bronx River as a spawning stream for anadromous fish. These are fish that spend the majority of their lives in marine waters, returning to freshwater systems only to spawn. The population of anadromous fish have been drastically reduced from historic levels due to the poor water quality and stream habitat of the Bronx River. Lehman College sampled sites at the mouth of the river and in tidal reaches to help identify which species are present in the river and approaches to the dams. Fish found in this sample included blacknose dace, bluegill sunfish, fourspine stickleback, tessellated darter, mummichog and smallmouth bass.

6.5.4 Birds

Large areas of open space with varying terrestrial and wetland qualities provide habitat for numerous bird species. Unincorporated Greenburgh consists of forest fragments rather than a large intact block of forest, with northern and southern oriented rivers and parkways serving as primary corridors for migratory birds. A preliminary list of bird species that are known to be breeding in southern Westchester County was produced by reviewing the data in *The Atlas of Breeding Birds in New York State*. The preferred breeding habitats of the birds on this preliminary list was then reviewed and edited to include what birds may potentially be utilizing the habitat types present in unincorporated Greenburgh.

In the Town there are many areas that are conducive to supporting a large variety of different species of birds. Common species that are typical of suburban backyard include the bluebird, blue jay, northern cardinal, gray catbird, black-capped chickadee, brown-headed cowbirds, American crow, mourning dove, rock dove, house finch, northern flicker, American goldfinch, common grackle, rose-breasted grosbeak, red-tailed hawk, blue heron, hummingbird, American kestrel, eastern kingbird, northern mockingbird, white-breasted nuthatch, northern oriole, eastern screech owl, American redstart, American robin, chipping sparrow, house sparrow, European starling, scarlet tanager, wood thrush, tufted titmouse, rufous-sided towhee, wild turkey, red-eyed vireo, black-and-white warbler, yellow warbler, downy woodpecker, hairy woodpecker, pileated woodpecker, red-bellied woodpecker and the eastern wood-pewee.
6.5.5 Wildlife Habitat Refuge

There are no New York State Bird Conservation Areas in Westchester County; however, unincorporated Greenburgh contains significant wildlife habitat refuge for indigenous species and for the hundreds of species of migratory birds that use open space as a resting place during their spring and fall travels. The Town’s open space resources and greenways are detailed in Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities).

The New York State Natural Heritage Program facilitates conservation of the State’s bio-diversity by providing comprehensive information and expertise on rare species and natural ecosystems. This program is a partnership between the NYSDEC and The Nature Conservancy. The information provided by the program helps protect and conserve rare animals, rare plants and natural ecosystems.

With respect to bio-diversity, the Town of Greenburgh (including the incorporated villages) is host to several protected species and ecosystems. The Town is also host to six identified endangered plant species and one threatened plant species. These rare plants are brent sedge, rattlebox, reflexed sedge, salt marsh bulrush, torrey’s mountain-mint, velvety bush-clover and Virginia bunchflower.

6.6 Air Quality

In general, air quality in unincorporated Greenburgh is good and is aided by a large quantity and variety of trees. Air quality is influenced by many factors from the surrounding region, including air pollution from local industries, incinerators (RESCO), buses, planes, trucks, cars and wind-blown dust which can disperse particulates into ambient air. The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for various pollutants. Areas where air quality monitoring shows a violation of the NAAQS are designated “non-attainment.” By law the NYSDEC is required to produce a plan, known as the State Implementation Plan (SIP), that details how sufficient emission reductions, including reductions in the mobile source sector, will be achieved to meet the NAAQS. NAAQS have been established by the EPA for six major air pollutants: sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size (PM₂.₅), and lead (Pb).

Unincorporated Greenburgh is within the EPA designated New York – North New Jersey – Long Island non-attainment area (moderate classification) for the federal 8-hour O₃ NAAQS. Counties included in the non-attainment area are Suffolk, Nassau, Kings, Queens, Richmond, New York, Bronx, Westchester and Rockland, as well as counties in the states of Connecticut and New Jersey. Information from the nearest federal and state monitoring stations at Mt. Ninham, Mamaroneck and White Plains indicates compliance with both federal and state air quality standards for all pollutants except for O₃, which is a regional non-attainment problem.

The 1990 and 2005 amendments to the Clean Air Act are aimed at reducing toxic emissions from mobile, stationary and consumer sources. Westchester County has limited stationary sources of pollution; however, its mobile sources, namely vehicles, place the County on the list of areas of extreme/severe non-attainment of safe O₃.

---

A non-attainment area refers to an area considered to have air quality below National Ambient Air Quality Standards for a particular pollutant, as defined in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970.

Mt. Ninham is located in Carmel, New York (Putnam County).
levels. Employers of over 100 employees have been targeted to establish vehicle trip reduction plans that include promotion of alternate means of travel. To assist in this challenge, the County and the private sector have formed the Westchester Transportation Management Organization.

Locally, air quality can be improved by land-use patterns and zoning policies that support mass transportation options, preserve and enhance open space, promote efficient and innovative green building design, and facilitate alternative modes of transit, such as biking and walking. Such land-use patterns and zoning policies are closely linked to the Guiding Principles contained in this Plan. More direct influences on air quality result from tree preservation, tree planting and forest reclamation. As noted in Section 6.3.4 (Trees and Canopy Coverage), tree planting will be carried out as part of local, state and federal partnerships, and by residents, businesses and utility providers in unincorporated Greenburgh.

There is a three minute anti-idling law in Westchester County.
6.7 Night Sky and Light Pollution

The night sky is an asset that has been compromised by excessive light levels from artificial light sources. Excessive light levels impact local wildlife and human health by altering sleep patterns. The majority of unnecessary light that is directed into the night sky stems from poorly designed street, parking, security and sign lighting. Building design and the placement of new structures on a site are also factors impacting night sky. Efficient use of lighting can preserve the night sky, conserve energy and save money without compromising safety, health and well-being.

Section 240-2 (Illumination) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh is applicable to the night sky. It mandates that lighting shall be the minimum necessary to provide for the security of the property and the safety and welfare of the public. It also states that lighting shall be shielded or directed in such a manner that its direct rays are not cast upon any property other than the lot on which such illumination is situated. Strategies that have been employed include the use of motion sensor lighting and/or timed for a shorter duration of illumination during the night.

A Town-based strategy for enhancing the night sky and reducing light pollution includes the replacement of street lights with LED energy efficient lights. In addition to the environmental benefits of these light replacements, there is expected to be cost savings due to the reduced electrical demands of the new fixtures.

Downcast lighting in unincorporated Greenburgh
6.8 Environmental Resources and Related Systems Goals, Objectives and Policies

**GOAL 6.1:** Minimize Soil Erosion and Development Impacts to Steep Slopes and Hilltops/Ridgelines.

**OBJECTIVE 6.1.1** Minimize steep slope disturbance to better stabilize hillsides and soils and to reduce the need for cut-and-fill and grading.

**POLICY 6.1.1.1:** Amend Chapter 245 (Steep Slopes, Protection of) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh to recognize elevations in excess of 400 ft. as environmental resources with provisions for their protection.

**POLICY 6.1.1.2:** Amend Chapter 245 to further address allowable residential and/or commercial floor area ratio coverage.

**POLICY 6.1.1.3:** Amend Chapter 245 to incentivize development on non-sloped land area.

**GOAL 6.2:** Retain and Enhance Tree Coverage in order to maximize Environmental Benefits.

**OBJECTIVE 6.2.1** Plan for the next generation of tree cover by incorporating a balance of small, medium, and large maturing trees, with a wide range of predominantly native species, while supporting the preservation of existing, healthy, mature trees to the greatest extent practicable.

**POLICY 6.2.1.1:** Continue to implement native trees and species diversity throughout the Town and into new development projects.

**POLICY 6.2.1.2:** Consider the use of CO₂ removal, gallons of water absorption and removal of particulate matter in connection with regulated, non-hazard tree replacements.

**POLICY 6.2.1.3:** Factor in the location of new replacement trees based on potential impacts to downslope properties, where appropriate.

**POLICY 6.2.1.4:** Amend Chapter 260 (Trees) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh to reasonably address properties smaller than one acre.

**POLICY 6.2.1.5:** Support a Town of Greenburgh Tree Technical Manual to complement Chapter 260 and to act as a policy guide for tree related matters.

**POLICY 6.2.1.6:** Conduct a street tree inventory utilizing i-Tree (or comparable program), to provide baseline data for decision-making related to trees and to quantify the dollar value of annual environmental and aesthetic benefits afforded by street trees within the community.
POLICY 6.2.1.7: Educate residents, workers and employees about the various functions which trees provide.

POLICY 6.2.1.8: Educate residents, workers and employees about invasive species by sharing research and organizing vine cutting events and trainings.

POLICY 6.2.1.9: Balance approved development objectives by incorporating phased tree removal takedowns, particularly with respect to subdivisions, where feasible, when there is no immediate intent to build.

GOAL 6.3: Protect Surface Water Quality.

OBJECTIVE 6.3.1 Manage stormwater (quantity and quality) as close to the source as possible and minimize the use of large or regional collection and conveyance.

POLICY 6.3.1.1: Incorporate non-structural stormwater control and natural approaches to new and redevelopment projects.

POLICY 6.3.1.2: Incentivize and/or support the use of pervious pavers/grass-crete and other non-traditional surfaces that allow stormwater percolation, particularly where feasible as part of residential driveways.

GOAL 6.4: Minimize Development Impacts to Wetlands and Watercourses.

OBJECTIVE 6.4.1 Preserve wetland and watercourse ecosystems and habitats as part of an efficient development review process.

POLICY 6.4.1.1: Continue to incorporate best management practices with respect to wetland/watercourse and related buffer areas as part of land-use board review and approval conditions.

POLICY 6.4.1.2: Provide exemption provisions for in kind replacements or minor activities taking place in pre-disturbed areas.

POLICY 6.4.1.3: Provide exemption provisions consistent with those noted in Section 6.4.3.

POLICY 6.4.1.4: Provide a clear process for distinguishing between Town Wetland Inspector and Planning Board approvals.

POLICY 6.4.1.5: Where feasible, support the avoidance of buffer area disturbance in new developments. Where infeasible, continue to ensure appropriate mitigation.
POLICY 6.4.1.6: Amend Chapter 280 (Wetlands and Watercourses) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh to incentivize development outside of wetland and wetland buffer areas.

GOAL 6.5: Minimize Development Impacts to Floodplains.

OBJECTIVE 6.5.1 Preserve floodplain ecosystems and habitats as part of the development review process.

POLICY 6.5.1.1: Integrate bio-retention into parking lot and roadway design.

POLICY 6.5.1.2: Consider amending Chapter 220 (Flood Damage Prevention) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh to incentivize the use of alternative impervious surface coverage when developing a site within a floodplain.

GOAL 6.6: Preserve and Enhance Wildlife and Vegetation Corridors.

OBJECTIVE 6.6.1 Plan for connections of open space and the retention of environmental resources.

POLICY 6.6.1.1: Incorporate alternative ground covers, such as naturalized meadows, rather than the typical turf, where applicable.

POLICY 6.6.1.2: Encourage residential clustered development, where feasible.

POLICY 6.6.1.3: Encourage open space connectivity throughout the land use planning process to provide for wildlife and vegetation continuity.

GOAL 6.7: Reduce Contributing Factors to Ambient Air Quality Degradation.

OBJECTIVE 6.7.1 Plan for land uses that contribute to attaining the $O_3$ and $PM_{2.5}$ NAAQS.

POLICY 6.7.1.1: Plan for alternative and public transit-supportive development to reduce single automobile dependency.

POLICY 6.7.1.2: Coordinate with utility providers, the NYSDOT, and other regional public entities to promote enhanced tree planting measures.

GOAL 6.8: Reduce Contributing Factors to Night Sky Degradation.

OBJECTIVE 6.8.1 Continue to balance light safety, security, and amenity needs.

POLICY 6.8.1.1: Coordinate with the NYSDOT to have any newly installed downcast lighting.
POLICY 6.8.1.2: Encourage the utilization of motion sensor site lighting and/or lighting timed for a shorter duration of illumination.

POLICY 6.8.1.3: Retrofit existing street lights within the Town rights-of-way with LED energy efficient lights.

GOAL 6.9: Utilize consistent local environmental regulation processes.

OBJECTIVE 6.9.1 Provide for an efficient local environmental permitting process.

POLICY 6.9.1.1: Amend the Code of the Town of Greenburgh to have consistent quantifiable parameters for Chapter 200 (Environmental Quality Review), Chapter 245 (Protection of Steep Slopes), Chapter 248 (Stormwater Management), Chapter 270 (Watercourse Protection) and Chapter 280 (Wetlands and Watercourses) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh.

POLICY 6.9.1.2: Apply uniform public hearing notice procedures and extension timeframes with other local environmental permits.

POLICY 6.9.1.3: Amend Chapter 200 (Environmental Quality Review) to be consistent with SEQRA updates.

POLICY 6.9.1.4: Amend the SEQR Type I threshold reference associated with Chapter 245 (Protection of Steep Slopes).
CHAPTER 7.0 Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities

7.1 Relationship to Guiding Principles

Parks, trails, open space and recreational facilities are valuable assets that contribute positively to the quality of life of residents in unincorporated Greenburgh. This Plan recommends preservation and enhancement of these assets.

7.2 Parks, Special Park Districts and Miscellaneous Parcels

Figure 7.1 depicts the location of the approximately 1,261 acres of parkland that exist within unincorporated Greenburgh’s borders. Sections 7.2.1 through 7.2.7 provide information on the ownership, the size, and the recommended classification of these parks based on categories used by the National Recreation and Park Association. Brief descriptions of some of the larger parks are provided.

7.2.1 Unincorporated Greenburgh Parks

The Town of Greenburgh exclusively or jointly owns approximately 632 acres of parkland. Table 7.1 contains an inventory of unincorporated Greenburgh parks and identifies those parks that were purchased jointly with other entities or that received funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). Regardless of ownership, the Town’s Department of Parks and Recreation operates and maintains these parks which range in size from 0.14 acres (Bob Gold Parklet) to approximately 190 acres (Taxter Road Park Preserve). Most of the listed parks provide active and/or passive recreation opportunities; however, eight of the parcels provide no recreational opportunities and are designated as undeveloped (UD) land.

Many of the preserves and parks listed in Table 7.1 have been formally dedicated as parkland; however, it is recommended that a local law be adopted formally designating all of these parcels as parkland.

Park #34 on Figure 7.1 is a small greenspace adjacent to the Hartsdale Train Station. It contains landscaping, a World War I monument, pathway and a bike rack. It is owned by the Hartsdale Public Parking District. Ownership of this space by the Town of Greenburgh would be necessary prior to dedicating this area as Town parkland.

7.2.2 Special Park Districts

Two special park districts (Cotswold and Greenridge) totaling approximately 6.6 acres of land are located in unincorporated Greenburgh. The Cotswold Park District contains O’Gorman Park, a 0.75 acre parcel located on the south side of Ardsley Road at the intersection of Cotswold Way and Old Army Road and the Central Park Avenue buffer/open space, a 5.3 acre stretch of wooded area on the northbound side of Central Park Avenue from Ardsley Road to Clifton Road. The Greenridge Park District contains a 0.60 acre wooded lot located at the intersection of Old Colony Road and Club Way. Residents of each respective park district purchased...
### Table 7.1: Town of Greenburgh Parks Inventory (Unincorporated Greenburgh Parks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Recommended Classification*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glenville Woods Park Preserve**</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pocantico Park (<strong>LWCF</strong>)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Massaro Park (<strong>LWCF</strong>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Travis Hill Park (<strong>LWCF</strong>)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Old Tarrytown Road Park</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>PKLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Washington Avenue Park</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yosemite Park</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sky Meadow Park</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>East Rumbrook Park Annex (F.K.A. the Elmsford Animal Shelter) +</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Taxter Ridge Park Preserve***</td>
<td>190.0</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Taxter Road Park</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>East Irvington Nature Preserve</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>West Rumbrook Park</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parkview Road Park</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>East Rumbrook Park (<strong>LWCF</strong>)</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Stonewall Circle</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Knollwood Rd Park</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Riley Pond</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Richard Presser Park (Webb Field)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Homewood Court</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>PKLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Secor Woods Park</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Secor Road Park</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Anthony F. Veteran Park</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Harts Brook Park and Preserve**** (<strong>LWCF</strong>)</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bob Gold Parklet</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>PKLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>De Santi Plaza</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>PKLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Unnamed Pocket Park Adjacent to Hartsdale Train Station +</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>PKLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Greenburgh Nature Center (<strong>LWCF</strong>)</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Parcel Q +</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Crane Pond</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gelsprain (Farm Lane) Parcel +</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>PKLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Parcel O (borders Boulder Ridge) +</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Donald Park</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>UD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Total 632.5

* Key - PKLT = Parklet, NP = Neighborhood Park, CP = Community Park, UD = Undeveloped
**1/3 or approximately 18.3 acres are leased by the Town from the Open Space Institute, Westchester County has part ownership with the Town, maintenance done by Town
*** 1/3 owned by NY State, 1/3 owned by Westchester County, 1/3 owned by Town, maintenance done by Town
**** 1/2 owned by NY State, 1/4 owned by Westchester County, 1/4 owned by Town, maintenance done by Town
LWCF = Received Federal funding through the Land and Water Conservation Fund
+ Not currently a Town Park
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these land areas and are assessed annually by the Town for the cost of maintenance. O’Gorman Park functions as a parklet and is used by residents of the Cotswold Park District. The special park districts listed in Table 7.2 cannot be added to the Town of Greenburgh Parks inventory because of their private ownership and use by residents of the respective districts.

### 7.2.3 Miscellaneous Parcels

Table 7.3 lists two town-owned vacant and currently undeveloped parcels that are not part of the Park inventory. The Taxter Road Parcel (former Unification Church parcel) is adjacent to the East Irvington Nature Preserve and was acquired in connection with a subdivision. The retention of Town-owned vacant land can be a valuable asset in the process of land transfers with other public agencies. As an example, land needed elsewhere in the Town for road widening or other public uses can be obtained through land transfers of Town-owned vacant land. The advantage of utilizing Town-owned vacant land is that there is no need to abandon/ alienate existing Town parkland in the process of a land transfer.

The Taxter Ridge Parcel is bordered on three sides by the Taxter Ridge Park Preserve and was offered to the Town in connection with the adjacent “Greystone Subdivision.” The complexities of the subdivision and a unique law commonly referred to as the Finneran Law (further discussed in Section 7.8), which is associated with park user rights, effectively precludes the Town’s acceptance of this property and subsequent dedication as a park, although the land will remain as open space in perpetuity.

### Table 7.2: Special Park Districts in unincorporated Greenburgh *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Greenridge Park District</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Buffer - Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Old Colony Road/Club Way Parcel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Cotswold Park District</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Parklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(O’Gorman Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cotswold Park District</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Buffer - Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Central Park Avenue Parcels)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This table only lists acreage for the park-like or buffer/open space parcels within the larger Special Park Districts, which include each residence in the Special Park District.

### Table 7.3: Town of Greenburgh Miscellaneous (Not Part of Parks Inventory)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Recommended Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hillside-Wyndover Parcel (owned by civic association)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Taxter Road Parcel (former Unification Church parcel)</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Taxter Ridge Parcel (Former Greystone parcel)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.4 Selected Local Park Descriptions/Recreational Facilities

Many of our parks contain recreational facilities and amenities such as pools, trails and sports fields. Unincorporated Greenburgh and each of the Town’s six villages have separate recreation services with the exception of special recreation programs for Town residents who have developmental disabilities. Special recreation programs are provided by the Town of Greenburgh Department of Parks and Recreation and are open to all developmentally disabled residents and their families in the Town, including its Villages, through an intermunicipal agreement.

Hart’s Brook Park & Preserve, Glenville Woods Park Preserve and Taxter Ridge Park Preserve are open to residents outside of unincorporated Greenburgh as a result of partial funding, and therefore partial ownership of these parks by Westchester County, and/or New York State and/or the federal government. Parks that have received this funding are open to residents outside of unincorporated Greenburgh. In addition to the parks and facilities descriptions below, Table 7.4 lists each unincorporated Greenburgh Park and its associated features and amenities.

- **Anthony F. Veteran Park** (AFVP) (#30 on Figure 7.1) is a 20.4-acre park and is home to the Department of Parks and Recreation administrative offices and maintenance facilities. The park has 13 tennis courts, six swimming pools (a main pool, one adult/competitive pool, one interactive pool and three day camp pools), play areas and equipment for young children, benches, basketball courts, handball/paddleball courts, public meeting rooms, restrooms, lighted facilities, a food concession, an outdoor concert area and a multipurpose center/patio. The multi-purpose community center, located in the park, has year round recreation and exercise programs targeting individuals, families and seniors. AFVP is the park facility most frequented by unincorporated Greenburgh residents.

In May, 2010, a detailed study was undertaken on how to modernize the Anthony F. Veteran and the Massaro Park pool facilities. Age and use at both these pool facilities have caused deterioration over the years, resulting in increased maintenance expenses and periodic shutdowns. Massaro Park (#5 on Figure 7.1) has two closed swimming pools, one of which is a children’s pool. The study makes recommendations for improvements and provides approximate costs associated with repair and renovations at each facility. Recommendations include renovations or replacement of these facilities in four phases.

The Town is working to ensure code conformance, the health and safety of users, efficient operations, reduction of maintenance costs, and extension of the life expectancy of these facilities.
- **East Irvington Nature Preserve** (#18 on Figure 7.1) is a 31.7-acre preserve located on Taxter Road. Prior to the early 1990s this land was informally used as a passive park and was connected to a larger Town-owned site which currently contains an organic waste transfer facility. The 31.7-acre preserve and pond have been enhanced with features designed by a landscape architect which include nature trails, benches and a viewing platform by the pond.

- **East Rumbrook Park** (#21 on Figure 7.1), a 47.8-acre park originally developed in the 1970’s as an athletic complex and park preserve, was developed over an adaptively reused landfill site. The park includes two lighted tennis courts, four lighted platform tennis courts and a warming hut, a lighted regulation size basketball court (with four additional backboards for half-court games), a lighted junior sized baseball/softball field, a lighted baseball field, a dog park, administrative building, storage and parking. A nature trail, a water retention tank and a pump house are also located on the park grounds. Several recommendations in The *East Rumbrook Master Plan*, prepared in 2002, have been implemented, including improvements to the upper ball fields and basketball courts, parking area, entrance plaza, trail and trailhead.

- **Glenville Woods Park Preserve** (#1 on Figure 7.1) consists of 44.6 acres and was jointly acquired in 2001 by Westchester County, the Town of Greenburgh and the non-profit Open Space Institute. The Open Space Institute owns 18.3 acres of the Preserve, which is now owned by the Town. The *Glenville Woods Park Preserve Master Plan*, prepared in 2003, recommended that the park preserve remain a passive recreational park with walking trails, with the exception of the front part of the Park, that presently has a playground for active recreation.
- **Greenburgh Nature Center** (#36 on Figure 7.1) is a 31.1-acre property purchased by the Town in 1973 with local and Federal funds. Open since 1975, the GNC is operated by Nunataks, Ltd. under a 25 year renewable lease from the Town of Greenburgh. The Greenburgh Nature Center (GNC) has a live animal museum with over 100 specimens, exhibit areas focusing on nature and the environment, outdoor animal exhibits, a greenhouse with botanical exhibits, hiking trails, a pond, gardens and a gift shop. The former 21-room manor house was converted into an environmental education center. The Town’s Department of Public Works maintains the buildings and infrastructure.

- **Hart’s Brook Park and Preserve** (#31 on Figure 7.1) consists of approximately 123 acres and was purchased in 1999 through a cooperative agreement between New York State (50 percent ownership), Westchester County (25 percent ownership) and the Town (25 percent ownership, which included Federal funds). The Preserve has 18 hiking trails totaling more than 2.5 miles and two managed landscaped areas of over ten acres. The larger of the
landscaped areas (9.3 acres) is located near the site entrance and consists of sweeping lawns and garden plantings of specimen trees and shrubs along with a nursery production area. A smaller area is located near a pond. Remnants of the former Gaisman Estate remain, including greenhouses and a small residence, a warming hut, a skating pond and a large barn.

- **Secor Woods Park** (#28 on Figure 7.1) is an 18.7 acre park abutting the Anthony F. Veteran Park facilities. It includes two ball fields, one play area, four picnic groves, one pavilion, three tennis courts (accessed through AFVP), restrooms and parking.

- **Taxter Ridge Park Preserve** (#15 on Figure 7.1) consists of approximately 190 acres and was purchased in 2004 by New York State (33.3 percent ownership), Westchester County (33.3 percent ownership) and the Town (33.3 percent ownership). Taxter Ridge is used for passive recreation. The development of hiking trails is planned. Users currently park their vehicles on neighborhood streets on either the East Irvington or Tarrytown side of Taxter Ridge to access the park. A small off-street parking lot will be constructed on the northwest side of Taxter Road, providing additional access into the park.
Theodore D. Young Community Center (TDYCC) functions under the Town’s Department of Community Resources and provides a variety of educational, cultural, recreational and social activities and services for residents. The Center has several indoor facilities, including a heated pool and sauna, a gymnasium, conference rooms, a fitness center, classrooms, a library, a computer technology room and a performing arts studio. The Center provides programs and services for youth, adults and seniors.

The indoor pool at the TDYCC was the subject of LWCF funding and, therefore, is open to the general public.

- **West Rumbrook Park** (#19 on Figure 7.1) is a 43.9 acre park located near the Village of Elmsford. Facilities at this park include two ball fields, a food concession and press box, storage trailers, and parking. The Elmsford Little League, which manages the park under a multi-year contract with the Town, operates an on-site concession stand and is responsible for the utility costs. A new club house was constructed at the field in 2013.

- **Yosemite Park** (#11 on Figure 7.1) is a 12.0 acre park located north of Rt. 119 (Tarrytown Road) and accessed from Yosemite or Dakota Avenues and the TDYCC. Facilities at this park include an outdoor spray/water park with sprinklers for use during the summer months, a baseball field, a basketball court, two tennis courts, two playgrounds, a large pavilion used for concerts and other events and a quarter-mile walking/jogging path. This park is very heavily utilized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Swimming pools</th>
<th>Tennis Court</th>
<th>Ball Fields</th>
<th>Nature Trails</th>
<th>Play Apparatus</th>
<th>Picnic Area</th>
<th>Cooking Grills</th>
<th>Basketball courts</th>
<th>Hand/Paddleball courts</th>
<th>Turf Playfield</th>
<th>Turf Horseshoe pits</th>
<th>Hand Pits</th>
<th>Outdoor Concert Area</th>
<th>Outdoor Ice Skating</th>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Meeting Rooms</th>
<th>Platform Tennis</th>
<th>Outdoor Tennis</th>
<th>Night Light Facilities</th>
<th>Food Concession</th>
<th>Dog Park</th>
<th>Walking Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenville Woods Park Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocantico Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massaro Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Hill Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Tarrytown Road Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Avenue Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky Meadow Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rumbrook Park Annex (F.K.A. the Elmsford Animal Shelter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxter Ridge Park Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxter Road Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Irvington Nature Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rumbrook Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkview Road Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rumbrook Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonewall Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knollwood Rd Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley Pond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Presser Park (Webb Field)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secor Woods Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secor Road Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony F. Veteran Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart's Brook and Preserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Gold Parklet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Santi Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Pond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelsprain (Farm Lane) Parcel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel O (borders Boulder Ridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed Park Adj. Hartsdale Train St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Parks and Recreation
7.2.5 Westchester County Parks

Figure 7.1 depicts the location of approximately 628 acres of parks and trails in unincorporated Greenburgh that are exclusively owned and operated by Westchester County. Several of these parks, listed in Table 7.5, are part of larger contiguous parcels extending into other municipalities. Additionally, residents of unincorporated Greenburgh also have access to regional county and state parks that are not located within the Town.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Recommended Classification*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buttermilk Ridge County Park/Tarrytown Lakes Park</td>
<td>149.6</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>South County Trailway</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bronx River Parkway Reservation</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ridge Road Park (2)</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sprain Lake Golf Course</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sprain Ridge Park</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County Parks: 1,260.9 acres

* Key - RP = Regional Park
(1) All acreage is for areas in unincorporated Greenburgh. Several of these County Parks extend beyond unincorporated Greenburgh.
(2) Ridge Road Park is located fully within unincorporated Greenburgh.

7.2.6 Park Classifications

This Plan recommends classifying parks as parklets, neighborhood parks, community parks and regional parks, categories utilized by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA). This Plan also recommends that the undeveloped and other properties listed in Table 7.1 be dedicated or rededicated as part of the Town’s parkland inventory based on their existing or potential use as an active or passive recreational amenity. A park classification for the undeveloped properties is not recommended until these lands are developed as an active or passive park.

- **Parklets** provide small-scale recreational needs. Typically, they are within a ¼ mile distance from residential neighborhoods. Parklets offer specialized facilities that serve a limited population or specific group. There is a NRPA Recommendation of 0.25 – 0.50 acres of parklets per 1,000 residents.

- **Neighborhood parks** have a recreational and social component with active and passive recreation. These parks accommodate residents living in immediate surroundings and often contain ball fields with some passive recreational opportunities. There is a NRPA Recommendation of 1.00 – 2.00 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 residents.
- **Community parks** meet community-based recreation needs, preserve unique landscapes and open space, and serve residents throughout a municipality. These parks are intermediate in size, accommodate visitors from larger areas, and can include developed and natural resource amenities. There is a *NRPA Recommendation* of 5.00 – 8.00 acres of community parks per 1,000 residents.

- **Regional parks** provide recreation needs, preserve unique landscapes and open spaces, and serve residents throughout multiple municipalities. There is no *NRPA Recommendation* for regional parks. All Westchester County Parks (Section 7.2.5) are considered regional parks as they provide benefits to all residents of the county.

### 7.2.7 Park Availability

A municipality’s park and recreation facilities can be assessed in a variety of ways. The NRPA recommends a minimum ten acres of public parkland per 1,000 residents, based on the classifications noted in Section 7.2.6. A more commonly utilized metric evaluates whether residents of a community have a park within a five to ten minute walking distance, a distance of approximately ¼ mile. If a park is located within this range, it is then important to evaluate the range of active and passive amenities that the respective park offers.

Table 7.6 lists the recommended type and approximate acreage of parks based on NRPA standards. Unincorporated Greenburgh has a ratio of 29.41 acres of parks per 1,000 residents based on an estimated population (42,863 in 2010) and acreage of parks (approximately 1,261). Parklets, neighborhood parks and community parks are located in many areas; however, most of the parks are open to residents outside of unincorporated Greenburgh. In addition, several school districts have play fields and playground areas used by residents. Some of the land dedicated as parkland is not improved and provides more of an open space function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>NRPA Standard (acres per 1,000 population)</th>
<th>Suggested Acres Required for unincorporated Greenburgh Population (1)</th>
<th>Greenburgh Existing Acres of Parkland</th>
<th>Service Area (miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parklet</td>
<td>0.25 – 0.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>&lt; 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>1.0 – 2.0</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>0.25 - 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>5.0 – 8.0</td>
<td>214.3</td>
<td>558.6</td>
<td>0.5 – 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>628.4</td>
<td>County-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped Parkland</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,260.9 (2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Based solely on NRPA standards
(1) Based on a population of 42,863 (2010 US Census)
(2) Based on total acreage of unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County Parks
The unique topography of unincorporated Greenburgh which includes many hills and valleys, coupled with the prevalence of assorted highway and parkway rights-of-way, can limit the accessibility to neighborhood parks. These factors likely contribute to the larger acreage ratios of community parks within unincorporated Greenburgh, as compared to our ratios of neighborhood parks and parklets. Locally, a challenge, which is a result of varying topography and the need for large expanses of flat land, is providing residents with ample field space for sports.

7.3 Trails

Trails are a valuable community resource. They provide active recreational opportunities and serve as an alternative means of transportation. Walking, bicycling and nature trails are located within unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County Parks. Unincorporated Greenburgh Parks with trails are noted in Section 7.2.4 and Table 7.4.

7.3.1 Existing Westchester County Trail Network

Westchester County has an extensive regional trail system to which all residents of the County have access. Portions of these trails, depicted on Figure 7.2, include the Bronx River Pathway, and the South County Trailway which has a connected spur known as the Tarrytown-Lakes Extension. These trails are utilized by walkers, joggers and bicyclists.

- **The Bronx River Parkway Reservation**, part of the County parks system, was the first linear park in New York State. Opened in 1925, this 807 acre linear park includes the Bronx River Parkway and its bridges and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It extends 13.2 miles in Westchester from the New York City line north to the Kensico Dam Plaza in Valhalla. A portion of the Reservation extends along the eastern boundary of unincorporated Greenburgh. This reservation features ponds, wooden footbridges and hundreds of varieties of native trees and shrubs. The Bronx River Pathway is a place for bicycling, walking, running, and appreciating natural features. Figure 7.2 shows locations where the paved pathway can be accessed by pedestrians and bicyclists.

Linear parks are often converted from former railroad rights-of-way and are longer (and less wide), point-to-point parks.
- **The North/South County Trailway** is a shared-use dedicated path that follows the old Putnam Railroad right of way. The North County Trailway is 22.1 miles long and begins just north of unincorporated Greenburgh’s boundary. The remaining 14.1 miles, known as the South County Trailway, is being developed in sections south of Eastview to the Bronx border. Approximately 37.6 acres of land that comprise the South County Trailway are located in unincorporated Greenburgh. A gap in the South County Trailway exists between the Warehouse Lane section and Route 119 (White Plains Road), where the trail is routed to streets. Westchester County plans to connect this gap.

![View from the South County Trailway](image)

- **The Tarrytown-Kensico Trailway** is an east-west trailway that has both off road and on-road segments linking the Bronx River, the North County and the Old Croton Aqueduct trailways. It utilizes Virginia Road, Route 100C (Grasslands Road), Old Saw Mill River Road and other local roads.
Figure 7.2: Existing Trail Network
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1 inch = 1,311 feet
7.3.2 Potential Trail Network

A concern that parks and open space are not interconnected was expressed during the visioning process for this Plan. Having safe access points with signage to existing trails promotes usage and enhances the system. An enhancement of the existing trail system serving recreational hiking, biking and neighborhood connections could evolve through inter-municipal coordination and public/private partnerships.

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Open Space Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2003, contained a series of recommendations pertaining to future trails and connections with existing parks and open spaces. Four trails were envisioned as a result of the 2003 Plan: (1) Central Greenway Trail with connecting spurs; (2) Northeast Trails; (3) Northwest Trails; and (4) a Western/Escarpment Trail. These four potential trails and the Washington Rochambeau Trail are depicted on Figure 7.3. Implementation would involve ongoing analysis of rights-of-way, safety and funding options. The inclusion of trail routes outside of the boundaries of unincorporated Greenburgh would require inter-municipal coordination.

In addition to these four potential trails, Figure 7.3 also depicts potential trails that are coterminous with the existing two Con Edison right-of-way paths that run north/south throughout unincorporated Greenburgh. Use of these trails would only be feasible with Con Edison approvals, through easements and would only be viable if at some point all or portions of the existing overhead power lines were placed underground. As there may be long term potential for a partnership with Con Edison, public access easements to these rights-of-way areas should be explored.

Since 1999, unincorporated Greenburgh has been designated as a “Hudson River Valley Greenway Community,” of the Hudson River Valley Greenway (HRVG). The HRVG is a state sponsored program created to facilitate the development of a regional strategy for preserving scenic, natural, historic, cultural and recreational resources. Leveraging grants, planning expertise and coordination from the HRVG could further trail formulation efforts conceived as part of the 2003 Plan and supported as part of this Plan.
Figure 7.3: Potential Trail Network
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Chapter 7.0 Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities

7.4 Private Recreational Facilities

The numerous private recreation uses and facilities located throughout unincorporated Greenburgh include six golf clubs, three day camps, two swim/tennis clubs, a golf driving range, an indoor ice skating academy and several fitness centers/health clubs. Zoning regulations should support and continue to provide for a variety of these permitted recreational uses. For example, some non-residential zoning districts, such as the OB Office Building District, may contain land which could be viable to be developed with indoor private recreation space, containing playing fields.

Unincorporated Greenburgh is the home of the MSG Training Facility where the New York Knicks, Rangers and Liberty all practice.

St. Andrew’s Golf Course—America’s Oldest Golf Course

The Madison Square Garden (MSG) Training Facility, which hosts the New York Knicks (NBA), New York Rangers (NHL) and New York Liberty (WNBA) is located in unincorporated Greenburgh. This facility is not open to the public.

Madison Square Garden Training facilities for the New York Liberty, Rangers and Knicks
7.5 New Public Spaces

The potential for new public spaces exists. Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0) highlights several planning initiatives that are intended to contain pocket parks, plazas, courtyards, squares, greens and other publicly accessible open spaces. For example, the Riley Pond Study Area could include the revitalization of Riley Pond as an accessible public amenity with a surrounding walking path.

There is also potential for enhanced public spaces in existing shopping centers. As an example, with the recommended incorporation of less restrictive off-street parking standards (Chapter 9.0, Transportation) in commercially zoned districts, plazas, courtyards and enhanced landscaping can be made part of site plans as less land area is needed for paved parking spaces. The introduction of a courtyard into commercial sites as public space can make a center more pedestrian friendly and increase the viability of the center as a destination.

7.6 Open Space

The term "open space" is generally synonymous with undeveloped land. For the purposes of this Plan, open space includes, but is not limited to, undeveloped privately owned land, undeveloped publicly owned land, undeveloped portions of public institutions (schools), golf courses, cemeteries, day camps, deed restricted portions of private developments, water supply lands, and utility and aqueduct rights-of-way. Open space can range from a small fragmented portion of a parcel to many acres of contiguous undeveloped land. Privately owned undeveloped land and other areas that currently constitute open space that is not dedicated, reserved, or deed restricted to preclude a loss of open space, has the potential to be developed. As land is continually developed, open space acreage is diminished. For this reason only those lands that are precluded from development are quantified or mapped as “protected” open space.

Open space plays an important role socially, environmentally and economically. The conservation of open space areas helps maintain flora and fauna diversity. Naturally vegetated open space absorbs stormwater, minimizes water quality degradation, prevents soil erosion, provides habitat for wildlife, helps cleanse air of pollution and enhances the visual landscape. Open space provides stronger ecological benefits when it is a large contiguous land area; however, open space can also be meaningful in smaller fragmented sections, particularly when providing protection to wetlands or steep slopes.
Figure 7.4 depicts the location of protected open space and public parks on the same map. Of the approximately 1,490 acres of protected open space, approximately 1,261 acres are parkland and another 6.6 acres are located in the Special Park districts. These figures do not include undeveloped land at institutions such as the New York School for the Deaf and the Westchester Community College campus, golf courses and cemeteries which amount to significant acreage. The total acreage of schools and institutions that contain open space components within unincorporated Greenburgh are listed in Table 7.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Approximate Open Space Acreage *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Ardsley Middle School</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Edgemont Junior/Senior High School</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Greenville Elementary School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Highview Elementary School</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Lee F. Jackson Elementary School</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Richard J. Bailey Elementary School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Seely Place Elementary School</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Virginia Road Elementary School</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Westchester Community College</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Woodlands Middle School/High School</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Creative Beginnings Children’s Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Elmwood Country Day School **</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Hackley School</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Maria Regina High School</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Mohawk Day Camp and Country Day School **</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>NY School for the Deaf - Fanwood</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Solomon Schechter High School</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These acres are not included in the protected open space inventory discussed in Section 7.6 because of the potential for subsequent development. The acreage does not exclude land area used for buildings and accessory structures, which likely represents less than 10 percent of the respective lots.

** Mohawk Day Camp & Country Day School and Elmwood Country Day School are listed in both Tables 7.7 and 7.8 as each have camp and school uses. Their respective school and camp open space component acreage is one in the same.

Many private recreation uses are located on lands that contribute valuable recreation and open space resources. The continued use of these sites for private recreation not only conserves scenic and natural assets, but also limits potential adverse impacts (traffic, environmental, etc.) associated with other types of development. The acreage of private recreational sites that contains open space components is listed in Table 7.8.
Chapter 7.0 Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities

Figure 7.5 depicts the location of not only parks and protected open space, but also cemeteries, schools, institutions and private recreation areas with open space components. Contiguous regional open space outside of unincorporated Greenburgh is also shown. Unincorporated Greenburgh is unique in that the amount of open space and park acreage is considerable for a community in such close proximity to New York City.

### 7.6.1 Open Space Preservation Strategies

Several existing planning tools can preserve and enhance open space inventories. Existing tree, wetland/watercourse and steep slope legislation minimizes disturbances to natural features. The Conservation District (CD) Overlay and the Planned Unit Development (PUD) District act as alternatives to conventional subdivisions, by preserving and connecting open space. These and other strategies that have a potential to preserve unincorporated Greenburgh’s natural beauty, scenic qualities, critical environmental areas and open space are discussed below. The preservation of open space can be an important contributor to the successful development or redevelopment of any large lot parcel in the Town, such as a golf course or other private recreation site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Approximate Open Space Acreage *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>Elmwood Country Club</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>Knollwood Country Club</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>Metropolis Country Club</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>Scarsdale Golf Club</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>The Saint Andrew’s Golf Club</td>
<td>170 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>Sunningdale Country Club</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>Camp Hillard</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>Elmwood Country Day School</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>Mohawk Day Camp and Country Day School</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim/Tennis Club</td>
<td>Tarry Crest Swimming and Tennis Club</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim/Tennis Club</td>
<td>Maplewood Swim and Tennis Club</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Range</td>
<td>Westchester Golf Range</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This acreage is not included in the protected open space inventory discussed in Section 7.6 because of the potential for subsequent development. The acreage does not exclude land area used for buildings and accessory structures, which likely represent less than 5 percent of the respective lots.

(1) Does not include the residentially developed portion of Saint Andrew’s
Figure 7.5: Open Space (Protected and Non-designated)
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Several beneficial land use-based open space preservation strategies have been identified as part of this Plan.

- **General Development Patterns**, whether existing or proposed, influence the presence of open space in a community. A majority of the mixed-use planning initiatives identified in Land Use and Zoning (Chapter 12.0) are designed to direct significant private investment into previously developed sites along the three major corridors: Route 119 (White Plains/Tarrytown Road), Route 100 (Central Avenue) and Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road). Redevelopment in these planned areas would result in few, if any trees lost. Development in these locations would not reduce open space and in many cases the addition of pocket parks, plazas or squares would increase the “greenness” within the respective neighborhood. Research and Development Clusters, as well as other planned developments, contain recommended elements such as structured parking and relatively high Floor Area Ratios to promote compact development that would better preserve open space on a site.

- **Cluster Subdivisions** can be used as a means of preserving open space and environmentally sensitive areas. Conventional subdivisions require that single-family homes be situated on lots that meet uniform setbacks from the road and adjacent properties. Cluster subdivisions allow single-family development on smaller lots (with houses closer together) so that the remaining land can be reserved for common open space. Cluster subdivisions maintain the same density of development on a parcel of land as allowed by the underlying zoning district and could be utilized on a site-by-site basis as appropriate. Currently, there is no formal cluster subdivision provision in the Code of the Town of Greenburgh.

- **Conservation District (CD) Overlay Zoning** allows flexibility in setback and other bulk requirement criteria with an objective of maximizing the conservation of natural resources when a parcel is developed. This overlay has been successfully utilized in connection with residential subdivision projects and has directly resulted in fewer trees being removed, and less steep slope and wetland/watercourse disturbance. The CD Overlay is intended for use exclusively on sites that have significant environmental features.
Current CD overlay regulations permit only few setback criteria to be relaxed. In addition, the regulations do not clearly articulate that the total number of developable lots should not exceed the underlying zone. Lastly, use of the CD Overlay is prohibited on county and state roads. Extending the use of the CD Overlay to developable sites without significant environmental features would allow for the preservation of greater amounts of open space.

- **Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning** allows flexible use to create residential developments with alternate dimensional criteria. This type of zoning requires a percentage of open space to be preserved. There are 11 PUDs in unincorporated Greenburgh: Ardsley Green–Faith Lane, Boulder Ridge, Clarewood, Chelsea Parc, Hebrew Home Hospital/Westchester Meadows, St. Andrew’s, Stone Oaks, Valimar, Watch Hill, Winding Ridge, Wyldwood. In each instance the resulting development layout varies greatly from development in the traditional residential zoning districts. Wyldwood and Winding Ridge have retained a significant portion of open space and contain trail systems. Valimar is an example of a PUD Zoning District that has conventional subdivision qualities and an open space component. The future applicability of the PUD is somewhat limited by the number of undeveloped contiguous parcels in excess of 15 acres.

- **Conservation Easements** are commonly used to provide buffers, protect resources with ecological value or preserve open space by restricting development on a portion of a property. These easements are more readily enforceable in perpetuity than merely placing a condition on a subdivision plat. As noted in Section 7.6 and depicted in Figure 7.4, the amount of protected open space does not include significant undeveloped portions of land. As unprotected land is proposed for development, a conservation easement requirement would ensure that a portion of the site remains undeveloped and that the Town’s open space preservation goals are enhanced in conjunction with the development approval process. Conservation easements have been successfully used by land-use boards as part of the SEQRA process and as conditions of approval. The accompanying authorizations should be incorporated into zoning and subdivision laws to strengthen open space preservation.

- **Property Purchase** is an important tool to preserve the Town’s open space. Tools for open space acquisition and preservation of selected parcels can include funding mechanisms, such as bond referenda or annual appropriations in a Capital Improvements Plan. In 2004, the Town of Greenburgh, New York State and Westchester County jointly acquired nearly 200 acres of open space which became the Taxter Ridge Park Preserve. A prioritized list of open space properties can help in obtaining County and State technical assistance and funding support for potential acquisitions.
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7.7 Fund for Reserve for Acquisition and/or Development of Recreation Land

New York State Town Law §274-a(6) and §277-4 authorizes towns to require the reservation of parkland or payment of money-in-lieu thereof before approving a residential subdivision or residential site plan. In 2005, a comprehensive recreation needs assessment provided an updated basis for the requirement of recreation escrow fees associated with new development. The 2005 study concluded that there is a current and anticipated future need for park and recreational opportunities in unincorporated Greenburgh. The recreation escrow fees can be used only for the purpose of acquisition or development of permanent park and recreation facilities, in accordance with an approved recreation development plan. This policy has been instrumental in enhancing parks for existing and new residents.

This Plan recognizes the continued need for new and enhanced recreational facilities, particularly with the continued increase in population that is expected. Based on the 2010 census, there has been an approximate 2.3 percent increase in unincorporated Greenburgh’s population to 42,863, since 2000. The 2015 population estimate was established by the US Census American Community Survey as 45,269. There remains a current and anticipated need for capital improvements to various facilities and properties, including, but not limited to, the Town’s tennis courts, pools and athletic fields.

7.8 Finneran Law

A review of public documents prior to 1982 revealed that for as long as could be determined, the Town of Greenburgh restricted access to its public parks and recreational facilities to unincorporated Greenburgh residents and levied the capital, operating and maintenance costs for these parks on unincorporated Greenburgh taxpayers. Following a legal challenge, court decisions found this method was contrary to a state law which required Town-wide access to and financing of Town parks.

At the request of the Town Board and the mayors of five of the six villages, on July 29, 1982, the New York State Legislature approved special legislation that is commonly called the “Finneran Law.” This legislation legalized the Town’s traditional method of restricting access and directed the manner in which park costs must be allocated. Specifically, the Finneran Law mandates that “all costs...of any public park...shall be raised by the levy of a tax upon the lots and parcels of land within said town located in the area outside of incorporated villages,” and that such parks “shall...be restricted in use to the residents of said town residing in the area of said town outside of incorporated villages,” except those parks that are subject to an exception to allow for compliance with the terms of federal grants.

Attempts to change the Finneran Law were unsuccessful until 2012 when the New York Legislature passed legislation allowing the Town to lease tennis facilities at AFVP to a private company. The goal was to enhance the tennis courts and open them to the general public while not affecting access to and financing of the rest of the park.
7.9 Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Goals, Objectives & Policies

GOAL 7.1: Identify the Level of Park and Recreational Service Needs for Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Residents.

OBJECTIVE 7.1.1: Correlate existing park facilities and new services with demand to provide an efficient network.

POLICY 7.1.1.1: Monitor the use and demand on existing facilities to help determine the need for future facilities.

POLICY 7.1.1.2: Institute a program evaluation process to ensure that programs are properly managed and meet the needs and expectations of program participants and evolve to meet future user needs.

POLICY 7.1.1.3: Encourage continual resident involvement in providing high quality parks and recreation services.

POLICY 7.1.1.4: Continue to provide parks and recreation opportunities for residents regardless of age, socio-economic background or disabilities.

OBJECTIVE 7.1.2: Provide facilities and programs in a cost effective manner.

POLICY 7.1.2.1: Design improvements to bring existing facilities into compliance with Town and State codes and other requirements regulating safety and construction.

POLICY 7.1.2.2: Actively solicit resident comment on user needs and expectations in the acquisition and development of new facilities and the expansion/renovation of existing facilities.

POLICY 7.1.2.3: Utilize user fees and/or public private partnerships where possible to offset program costs.

GOAL 7.2: Continue to Support an Integrated System of Active and Passive Recreational Opportunities within a Network of Parks, Trails and Open Spaces.

OBJECTIVE 7.2.1: Quantify and classify existing parks.

POLICY 7.2.1.1: Maintain an accurate inventory (including location/map, size, shape, orientation, pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular access/parking, and development constraints) of the Town’s parks, trails, recreation facilities and open space.
POLICY 7.2.1.2: Coordinate with the Hartsdale Public Parking District regarding transfer of ownership of the pocket park adjacent to the Hartsdale Train Station.

POLICY 7.2.1.3: Dedicate or rededicate lands listed in Table 7.1 as parks maintained by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

POLICY 7.2.1.4: Establish a formal local park classification (i.e. National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Park, Open Space and Greenways classification system) consistent with Section 7.2.6.

OBJECTIVE 7.2.2: Develop a long term Parks Strategic Master Plan that will provide policy in the provision of Parks and Recreation services, Programs and Facilities.

POLICY 7.2.2.1: Develop a Parks Strategic Master Plan consistent with unincorporated Greenburgh’s Comprehensive Plan.

POLICY 7.2.2.2: Establish input procedures regarding goals, objectives and policies of the Parks Strategic Master Plan.

POLICY 7.2.2.3: Develop a five-year process for periodic review of the Parks Strategic Master Plan involving changing demographics, growth patterns, and user needs as it relates to recreation usage.

POLICY 7.2.2.4: Establish a capital funding mechanism (ten-year plan) for long-term implementation of the Parks Strategic Master Plan.

POLICY 7.2.2.5: Evaluate current recreation facilities and create a standardized list of improvements desired for each type of park.

OBJECTIVE 7.2.3: Promote a cooperative relationship between schools, public, private and commercial recreation providers.

POLICY 7.2.3.1: Coordinate the planning, development, and/or shared usage of open space and park facilities at adjacent school sites where feasible.

POLICY 7.2.3.2: Explore the potential to develop joint programs and use of facilities between the Department of Community Resources and the Department of Parks and Recreation.

POLICY 7.2.3.3: Create partnerships with Westchester County and the Hudson River Valley Greenway to improve trail safety and access, trail user information and linkages between trails.

POLICY 7.2.3.4: Work with the Villages of the Town of Greenburgh to provide reciprocal quality recreational programs for persons who are disabled.
POLICY 7.2.3.5: Where appropriate, require site development to incorporate pocket parks, plazas, courtyards, squares and greens and other publicly accessible open space consistent with this Plan.

POLICY 7.2.3.6: Study the feasibility of amendments to the Finneran Law in a manner that allows Unincorporated Greenburgh to provide enhanced services for its residents.

POLICY 7.2.3.7: Explore amending the OB District to allow indoor private recreation facilities as a special permit use.

OBJECTIVE 7.2.4: Maintain and enhance historical, traditional, cultural and social elements in parks, trails and open spaces.

POLICY 7.2.4.1: Ensure that park and trail improvements integrate/respect the history of Unincorporated Greenburgh, Westchester County and New York State.

POLICY 7.2.4.2: Facilitate the incorporation of public art into the Parks system.

OBJECTIVE 7.2.5: Address the need for enhanced trail and bike path networks.

POLICY 7.2.5.1: Provide a system of recreation facilities that are available to residents through the use of an interconnected system of walkways, bikeways, trails, and safe streets.

POLICY 7.2.5.2: Link pedestrian and bike trails to parks and create east-west trail segments through the Town.

POLICY 7.2.5.3: Support County efforts to link the South County Trailway from the Route 119 corridor to Sam’s Club by acquiring/facilitating trailway easements.

POLICY 7.2.5.4: Undertake a thorough analysis of existing rights-of-way and other potential trail segments to complete a Town-wide trail system consistent with Figure 10.3.

POLICY 7.2.5.5: Require that new development projects consider the design and maintenance of sidewalks, trails and bicycle lanes.

POLICY 7.2.5.6: Explore pedestrian and bike options to create a secondary access to Anthony F. Veteran Park from Secor Road.

POLICY 7.2.5.7: Explore pedestrian and bike options to create a secondary access to Ridge Road Park from Emerson Avenue.
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GOAL 7.3: Preserve and Enhance Parks, Open Space and Environmentally Sensitive Land from Development.

OBJECTIVE 7.3.1: Protect and/or dedicate identified lands as open space and parks.

POLICY 7.3.1.1: Develop a process to prioritize key open space parcels for preservation.

POLICY 7.3.1.2: Create a Public Parkland zoning district to allow for the rezoning of Town, County and State public preserves and parks, consistent with the future land-use plan.

POLICY 7.3.1.3: Revise the Conservation District (CD) Overlay to provide clarity and greater flexibility consistent with Section 7.6.1.

POLICY 7.3.1.4: Support the creation of a cluster subdivision ordinance, or other open space preservation regulations, to preserve open space where appropriate.

POLICY 7.3.1.5: Obtain and/or preserve contiguous open space, consisting of environmentally sensitive areas including fish and wildlife habitat and migratory pathways, ravines, trails, walkways, and recreational bicycle paths that link neighborhoods, connect to parks, and provide regional open space connections consistent with those shown on Figure 7.5.

POLICY 7.3.1.6: Establish language in the zoning and subdivision portions of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh authorizing the use of conservation easements for the purposes of open space preservation.

POLICY 7.3.1.7: Support the use of utility corridors and other rights-of-way as passive recreational areas that could provide linear open space and trails, and seek the co-operation of owners of such lands.

POLICY 7.3.1.8: Explore the feasibility of purchasing future lands for open space/park purposes.

GOAL 7.4: Support Protective Ecological Initiatives within the Town’s Park System.


POLICY 7.4.1.1: Incorporate alternative ground covers such as naturalized meadows rather than the typical turf.
POLICY 7.4.1.2: Undertake a study to investigate the role of the Town, the private sector, and non-profit organizations in providing and maintaining community garden plots.

POLICY 7.4.1.3: Support the removal of invasive species and vines in parks and opens spaces.

OBJECTIVE 7.4.2: Eliminate excessive watering and minimize the use of fertilizers to reduce the impact on the quality and quantity of both ground and surface water resources and to increase soil capacity to infiltrate stormwater and filter pollutants.

POLICY 7.4.2.1: Utilize naturescape approaches that emphasize plantings that support a diversity of bird and other wildlife.

POLICY 7.4.2.2: Identify and enhance prominent natural features and significant landscapes as visual landmarks, integrating the natural features and open spaces as part of community planning and comprehensive developments.
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8.1 Relationship to our Guiding Principles

Adequate and well-maintained infrastructure systems are important to the health and welfare of the residential, commercial and industrial communities in unincorporated Greenburgh. Infrastructure systems include municipal water supply storage and distribution; sanitary waste collection and conveyance; stormwater treatment, storage and transmission; and roads and rights-of-way. Also important are the independently provided telecommunication network and the electric and gas distribution network.

Equally necessary to community health and well-being are municipally provided essential services, including solid waste and recyclable pickup and transference, police protection and emergency medical services, and emergency preparedness. Two specific essential services – fire protection and public education – are provided by independent fire districts and independent school districts.

8.2 Water Supply and Distribution

As noted in Table 8.1, properties in unincorporated Greenburgh obtain water from one of three sources. Approximately 95 percent of properties are connected to the Greenburgh Consolidated Water District No.1 (GCWD-1), a special improvement district administered under the direction of the Commissioner of the Department of Public Works (DPW). SUEZ, formerly known as United Water New Rochelle (UWNR), is a private company and provides water to southern Westchester County and serves approximately five percent of unincorporated Greenburgh properties. A small number of properties (exact number unknown) obtain water from private groundwater wells. Figure 8.1 depicts areas served by GCWD-1 and SUEZ.

Sections 8.2.1 through 8.2.9 provide information about GCWD-1 water supply, infrastructure, distribution and consumption. The flowchart on Figure 8.2 summarizes this information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water District/Supply Source</th>
<th>Service Connections</th>
<th>% of Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Consolidated Water District No. 1</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUEZ</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Water Supply Groundwater Wells</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.1: Water Supply Districts
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Figure 8.2 Unincorporated Greenburgh Water Supply Distribution
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8.2.1 GCWD-1 Supply

GCWD-1 purchases water from the New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). This surface water originates in protected watershed areas in the Catskill Mountains approximately 120 miles northwest of Greenburgh and travels through the Catskill/Delaware system, a series of aqueducts operated by the DEP. The water is of such high quality that it meets the requirements for a Filtration Avoidance waiver from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Under the terms of the Filtration Avoidance Determination, the DEP has constructed the world's largest Ultraviolet Light Disinfection facility for the Catskill/Delaware water system on DEP-owned land in the Town of Mount Pleasant with connections to chambers in unincorporated Greenburgh. The facility is in operation.

8.2.2 GCWD-1 Infrastructure

One hundred percent of the water received from the Delaware Aqueduct is delivered through the Knollwood Road pump station. One hundred percent of the water received from the Catskill Aqueduct is delivered through the Rumbrook Park pump station. The Bryant Avenue and Hartsdale water pump stations, owned by GCWD-1, are currently obsolete and inactive. As noted in Table 8.2, water is stored in six tanks providing 4,000,000 gallons of storage. Figure 8.3 shows the general location of the major water infrastructure. Water Pressure zones are discussed in Section 8.2.5.

Table 8.2: GCWD - 1 Water Supply Storage Tanks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply Storage Tank</th>
<th>Storage Capacity (Gallons)</th>
<th>Water Pressure Zone</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Irvington</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>High North</td>
<td>Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>High North</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>High South</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knollwood</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>High North</td>
<td>Elevated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.3: GCWD-1 Infrastructure and Water Pressure Zones
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Maintenance and upgrades of water infrastructure is important in providing an efficient system. Modernization of the mechanical systems within the pump stations will reduce future electrical operating costs and unscheduled high repair costs. A long-term capital program to begin rehabilitation of all six water tanks was approved in 2013. A recent improvement includes the installation of new end-user meters that read automatically.

### 8.2.3 GCWD-1 Distribution within unincorporated Greenburgh

GCWD-1 serves approximately 40,000 residents and numerous non-residential users through approximately 11,000 service connections. Table 8.3 details the amounts of water purchased, delivered and unaccounted for in the years 2007 through 2012. Unaccounted water is attributed to leakage, water main breaks, emergency use and hydrant test flows by fire districts. In each of the listed years, the amount of unaccounted water fell below the national average (15-20 percent), with the exception of 2009; thus suggesting good system management and the likelihood that excessive system leakage is low. Figure 8.4 shows existing water main line locations throughout portions of unincorporated Greenburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Water Purchased (Millions of Gallons)</th>
<th>Water Delivered (Millions of Gallons)</th>
<th>Water Unaccounted For (Millions of Gallons/%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>381 / 13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>433 / 14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>396 / 15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>2,484</td>
<td>355 / 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>2,289</td>
<td>298 / 11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>297/11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Water Department, Town of Greenburgh

### 8.2.4 GCWD-1 Distribution (out of district)

GCWD-1 sells water on a wholesale basis to several municipalities and Westchester County Water District No. 3 (WCWD-3), either for emergency purposes or as a primary source. The Village of Irvington purchases water wholesale from GCWD-1, as its primary water source. The Village of Tarrytown and the City of Yonkers receive small amounts of water wholesale. The Town of Mount Pleasant has 59 residences that receive water from GCWD-1 at out-of-district rates. Water is sold on an emergency basis to the WCWD-3 and to the Villages of Elmsford and Sleepy Hollow. Table 8.4 lists the number of gallons of water sold wholesale by GCWD-1 for the years 2007 through 2012.

*The total amount of water purchased in 2012 was 2.670 billion gallons. Of that total amount, 395.0 million gallons were sold to other water districts.*
8.2.5 GCWD-1 Water Pressure Zones

GCWD-1 water system operates primarily via gravity and has three separate pressure zones: the High Pressure North Zone (HPNZ), the High Pressure South Zone (HPSZ), and the Low Pressure Zone (LPZ), which are depicted on Figure 8.3 and noted in Table 8.5. Three water supply tanks are located in the HPNZ, two are located in the LPZ and one is located in the HPSZ. The pressure zones are generally correlated to the average level of flow experienced “from the tap” of residences and businesses. Typically, the closer in elevation that a residence or business is to the elevation of the respective storage tank providing service, the lower the pressure will be.

Table 8.4: GCWD - 1 Water Sold Wholesale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Water Delivered (Millions of Gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>480.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>474.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>332.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>442.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>374.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>394.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Water Department, Town of Greenburgh

Table 8.5: GCWD - 1 Water System Pressure Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pressure Zone</th>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Percent of unincorporated Greenburgh Consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Pressure North Zone (HPNZ)</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pressure South Zone (HPSZ)</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Pressure Zone (LPZ)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Water Department, Town of Greenburgh

The presence of a low water pressure zone or a high water pressure zone can impact the design of new development projects. Although being located in a low or high water pressure zone does not usually cause problems, when it does, certain mitigations are necessary. As an example, the construction of a pump station or the installation of an additional water loop connection may be necessary in a low water pressure zone. In a high water pressure zone, the utilization of reducer valves could be necessary.

Pressure is also affected by the number of nearby water users. Coca-Cola Bottling Company is the largest commercial/industrial water consumer with a water use averaging approximately one million gallons per day (MGD). Several issues during peak usage periods when Coca-Cola was drawing more water than the GCWD-1 could supply were solved when a new ten-inch main was looped through the Landmark at Eastview property.
Figure 8.4: Existing Water Line Locations
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8.2.6 Water Supply Groundwater Wells

Town records indicate that some homes are still served by groundwater wells. The exact number is unknown but is estimated to be fewer than 20 residences. There may be locations that are on private wells in the SUEZ water district; however, this information is not maintained by the Town. The Westchester County Department of Health (WCDOH) no longer allows private wells when a public water supply is within 100 feet.

Several of the golf courses in unincorporated Greenburgh utilize on-site wells for irrigation and landscaping purposes. In addition, a majority of the golf courses use on site surface water sources such as lakes for similar purposes, significantly reducing the amount of public water needed for maintenance of these facilities.

8.2.7 GCWD-1 Water Capacity

As noted in Table 8.6, the Knollwood Road and Rumbrook water supply stations have a combined design capacity of 26 MGD. The Town of Greenburgh Comprehensive Water Distribution System Study (1999) presented future water consumption demands based on assumed build out scenarios and growth. The projection was calculated through the years 2005, 2010 and 2020. The population analysis considered planned and proposed land development up to 2005, assumed the build out of vacant land by 2010 (which has not occurred), and the development of all private golf courses by 2020 (now noted as unlikely). The projected daily use in 2020 was 10.02 MGD. A peaking factor of 1.8 was used for calculating maximum day demands. Based on these assumptions, 18 MGD would be the projected maximum demand in 2020. Water modeling analyses are necessary to better understand the level of upgrades and maintenance needed, based on existing and future water demands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pumping Station</th>
<th>% of Distribution</th>
<th>Estimated Capacity (Millions of Gallons per Day)</th>
<th>2020 Projected Maximum Usage (Millions of Gallons per Day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knollwood Road Water Supply Pumping Station</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbrook Water Supply Pumping Station</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Water Department, Town of Greenburgh*

The Knollwood Pumping Station is located at 181 Knollwood Road at the corner of Knollwood Road and Stadium Drive. The site consists of the Pumping Station, which was constructed in the mid-1950s, and a number of service buildings, offices and garages which were constructed in the 1960s. In general, mechanical and electrical components of the Pumping Station have reached the end of their useful lives and need to be replaced in order to maintain the Pumping Station in continuous, reliable operation along with additional rehabilitation of the entire pump station and appurtenances. The rehabilitation of the Knollwood Pump Station and/or the construction of a New Pump Station across the street from the existing Knollwood...
Pump station is needed. As an alternative to rehabilitation to the existing Knollwood Pump station; an opportunity exists to cooperatively construct a New Pump Station across the street from the existing Knollwood Pump station.

This approach could have true sharing of services capabilities and/or will lead to cost savings and operational efficiencies. Critical access areas would be separated and all support facilities such as bathrooms/locker rooms, break room, utility room, etc. could be shared.

### Table 8.7: GCWD - 1 Average Daily Water Consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Daily Consumption (Millions of Gallons)</th>
<th>Average Daily Consumption Per Capita (Gallons)</th>
<th>NYCDEP Allowable Daily Consumption Per Capita (Gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Water Department, Town of Greenburgh*

### 8.2.8 Water Consumption within Unincorporated Greenburgh

Table 8.7 lists the total daily water consumption in 2007 though 2012. The average daily consumption during these years has been approximately 169 gallons per capita. Each month, the NYCDEP sets an amount of allowable consumption. The figures in Table 8.7 have been extrapolated to reflect an average allowable consumption of 132 gallons per capita. Per capita consumption includes all customers (residential, non-residential, and governmental) within GCWD-1. On average, users have consumed approximately 37 gallons of water daily per capita in excess of the NYCDEP allowable amounts each of the six years.

GCWD-1 customers are charged at a higher cost as consumption increases. A three rate category structure was established to encourage conservation and to recover the rate surcharge imposed by NYC whenever GCWD-1 consumption exceeds the allowance quantity. The cost of water consumed is approximately five times the normal rate when the allowance quantity authorized per §24-360 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York is exceeded. As of June 2016, the base rate is $5.69 for each 1,000 gallons used up to 10,999 gallons within a three month period. This rate escalates to $7.14 for consumption up to 50,999 gallons and then to the highest rate of $8.49 for consumption in excess of 51,000 gallons in the three month billing period. Out-of-district customers are charged $11.38 per 1,000 gallons. With future costs almost certain to increase, the need for efficient infrastructure upgrades and water conservation efforts is apparent.
8.2.9 Water Conservation

More than ten billion gallons of water are withdrawn each day from the lakes, rivers, streams, estuaries and groundwaters of New York State for uses that include domestic consumption, industrial use, agricultural and golf course irrigation, mining and thermoelectric power generation.

Public water supply accounts for more than 20 percent of water use. Residential water usage includes outdoor (up to half of total use) and indoor uses, at least 50 percent of which are bathroom-related. Leak detection and repair, outdoor water use reduction, landscaping techniques, water recycling and conservation education are the primary reasons to encourage changing patterns of water conservation. As an example, some estimates indicate that more than 50 percent of landscape watering use goes to waste due to evaporation or runoff caused by overwatering.

Other than maintaining a supply-demand balance, municipalities conserving water can realize the following benefits:

- increased ability to handle emergencies such as drought, mechanical failures or water contamination; and
- cost savings in energy and chemicals from reduced production, treatment and consumption of water; and
- greater efficiency and increased capacity in wastewater treatment facilities

---

Average daily consumption during the years 2007 - 2012 has been approximately 169 gallons of water per person.
8.3 Sanitary Sewer Districts & Infrastructure

8.3.1 Sanitary Sewer Districts

Sanitary sewer districts are special improvement districts established for the purpose of controlling and governing the use of sewer infrastructure within the districts’ borders. Unincorporated Greenburgh contains 40 separate sanitary sewer district areas which are listed in Table 8.8 and shown on Figure 8.5. The sewer districts’ service areas are located within unincorporated Greenburgh, with the exception of a portion of land in the Village of Irvington serviced by a sewer extension in Federally Assisted (F.A.) #17.

Of the 40 existing sewer districts, 19 are F.A. Districts that were constructed under a program offered by the EPA in conjunction with the NYSDEC. In the 1970s and 1980s, the Town used federal grants and funds raised from the sale of bonds to construct the F.A. Districts. Property owners in the individual F.A. districts were assessed for the cost of the bonds. The F.A. Districts are smaller in size than the 21 pre-existing sanitary sewer districts and provide service to fewer customers.

Each district carries sanitary sewage through lines that are tributary to Westchester County trunk sewer mains. The County sewer mains are located in three major sanitary sewer-sheds (North Yonkers, Saw Mill and Bronx Valley) that lead to the Yonkers Joint Wastewater Treatment Plant, operated by Westchester County. The Bronx Valley drainage basin contains the Jackson Avenue and the Grassy Sprain pump stations, owned and operated by Westchester County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.8: Unincorporated Greenburgh Sewer Districts*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Donald Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Edgewold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Fairview Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Hartsdale Lawns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Longview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Park Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) F.A. #1 (Mayfair-Knollwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) F.A. #3 (Deerhill Ln)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) F.A. #4 (Sprain Valley - High Pt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) F.A. #5 (Jean Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) F.A. #6 (Crest Dr - Forest Blvd.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) F.A. #7 (South Ardsley)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) F.A. #8 (Bradley Ave)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Districts labeled “F.A.” indicate a Federally Assisted Sewer District
Figure 8.5: Existing Sanitary Sewer Districts*

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Prepared by: Town of Greenburgh, Sarah Pawlicki
Data Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced: June 2010

* Partially Complete (see Policy 8.3.2.3)
8.3.2 Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s sanitary sewer district infrastructure includes extensive sewer piping, pump stations, and individual low pressure residential pumps, all of which are interconnected with and flow into Westchester County systems. The districts are served by a series of gravity sewers and are augmented by two Town-owned sanitary pump stations. The Drake Lane Pump Station is a small station servicing approximately 12 parcels with an estimated capacity of less than 100 gallons per minute (gpm). The Glenville sanitary pump station is located off Rt. 119 (Tarrytown Road) and serves the Glenville and the Halpern Thruway sewer district areas. Figure 8.6 depicts the locations of sanitary sewer infrastructure and sewer-shed boundaries.

The Town maintains the residential pump systems found on Knollwood, Sprain Valley, Blueberry Hill, Mountain and Rockingchair Roads. Individual low pressure residential pumps serve a small percentage of homes in unincorporated Greenburgh and pump sewage to the main gravity sewer systems. Additional individual low pressure residential pumps are planned at newly approved subdivisions such as the Ardsley Chase and the Chauncey Estates projects. Area topography, subsurface conditions, lot layout and accessibility determine the optimal wastewater conveyance system - gravity sewers, pump systems, or a combination thereof.

The age of sanitary sewer system infrastructure is partially determined by available sewer system records. In general, while there may be older sections throughout various parts of unincorporated Greenburgh, the oldest sewer infrastructure is likely to be found in portions of the Edgemont/Greenville, Hartsdale and Fairview sections. The Edgemont/Greenville area is estimated to have some pipes over 100 years old and the sewer infrastructure generally consists of concrete or clay pipe. Portions of the infrastructure in Hartsdale and Fairview are over 80 years old and generally consist of clay or concrete pipe. Other sewer infrastructure consists of Orangeburg and cast iron piping. The age of sewer infrastructure; however, is not directly correlated to condition. Problem spots occur where there are frequent overflows or backed-up conditions. Sewer piping replacements are done with high-density polyethylene (HDPE) and Polyvinyl chloride (PVC) materials.

The Yonkers Joint Wastewater Treatment Plant provides primary and secondary treatment of wastewater generated from portions of southern and western Westchester County.
Figure 8.6: Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure and Sewer-shed Boundaries

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Produced by: Town of Greenburgh: Sarah Pawlczak
Data Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced: July 2015
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8.3.3 Sewer Infrastructure Capacity

In 2012, estimated daily flow of sanitary sewage was approximately 3.2 million gallons per day (MGD). This number, noted in Table 8.9, is a function of water delivered minus water unaccounted for and water used for non-sanitary, landscaping and industrial purposes. The Yonkers Joint Wastewater Treatment Plant, which received 87.8 MGD in 2012, has a design flow of 92 MGD and a permitted flow of 120 MGD. Overall, the system appears to have excess capacity; however, local sewer capacity bottlenecks are known to exist.

Greywater recycling, where feasible, is one of the most efficient ways to reduce volumes of sanitary sewer flow to regional systems. Typically, 50 to 80 percent of household wastewater is greywater from kitchen/bathroom sinks, dishwashers, washing machines and tubs/showers.

Table 8.9: Unincorporated Greenburgh Sanitary Sewage Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Daily Water Consumption (Millions of Gallons)</th>
<th>Average Estimated Daily Flow of Sanitary Sewage (Millions of Gallons) *</th>
<th>Yonkers Joint Treatment Plant Actual Flow Intake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>82.9 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>105.9 MGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>87.8 MGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes reduction based on average of 14 percent unaccounted water (water that does not reach tap) and 40 percent outdoor use (pools, watering lawn/landscaping, etc.).

8.3.4 Areas Outside Sewer Districts

Figure 8.7 shows existing sewer line locations throughout portions of unincorporated Greenburgh. Residences without hookups to sewer lines rely on septic systems for sanitary sewage disposal.

The following residential areas have several contiguous lots with residences that utilize septic systems, although a number of other individual parcels located throughout unincorporated Greenburgh are also without sewers.

- Barnaby Ln., Crosshill Rd., Harmony Ln., Hawthorne Way, Old Farm Ln., Paret Ln., Topland Rd.;
- Dunnings Drive;
- Hevelyn Rd., Mayfair Rd.;
- Heather Ln.;
- Taylor Road (west of Sprainbrook Parkway);
- Winding Road Farm

A properly maintained septic tank in a location with proper site conditions can function without negative environmental impacts; however, problems can potentially arise from a neglected or failing installation. Facilitating sewer easements as part of development...
Figure 8.7: Existing Sewer Line Locations

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Produced by: Town of Greenburgh; Sarah Pawlczak
Data Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced: July 2015

Legend

1 inch = 1,311 feet

Sewer Line Locations

8-17
reviews and educating residents on the process for entering a sewer district are two ways to minimize the number of homes that must continue to rely on septic systems.

8.4 Stormwater

Stormwater runoff drains naturally and/or into constructed systems. Natural systems include percolation into the ground and/or into sheet run-off into watercourses, wetlands and floodplains. Constructed systems include culverts, detention and retention basins, and storm drains. These constructed systems, similar to natural systems, can percolate into the ground or be diverted into watercourses, wetlands and floodplains. Both systems play an important role in water quantity and water quality. Water quantity, the amount of stormwater flow, can impact downstream areas and contribute to flooding. Water quality is associated with the amount of pollutants affecting water. Water quantity and quality are interrelated. A goal of best management practices (Section 8.4.4) is to design constructed systems utilizing natural solutions.

8.4.1 Stormwater Infrastructure and Management

The Division of Highways, part of the DPW, is responsible for the maintenance of constructed stormwater systems such as culverts, storm drains and storm sewers located in the Town’s rights-of-way. Some detention or retention basins, located on private property and owned by the Town, are also maintained and operated by the DPW. The maintenance/upkeep of municipal stormwater infrastructure includes catch basin cleaning, catch basin and storm sewer repairs, and the removal of storm sewer blockages. Storm channel maintenance is also a responsibility of the Division of Highways. Collectively, these DPW duties are instrumental in minimizing flooding. Other Town responsibilities within Town rights-of-way, are further discussed in Section 8.6.
Many stormwater conveyance systems - drainage pipes, ditches or streams - and stormwater collection systems, such as drywell units, detention and retention basins, located on private property, are the responsibility of private property owners. Maintenance of these private property systems is also very important to minimize flooding.

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s stormwater management policies comply with NYSDEC regulations and consist of: (1) Public Outreach; (2) Public Involvement/Participation; (3) Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination; (4) Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control; (5) Post-Construction Stormwater Management; and (6) Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operators. These six major areas are required as part of unincorporated Greenburgh’s designation as a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS-4 Community) and address water quantity and water quality issues. Tables 8.10 through 8.15 highlight key components of each control measure.

Table 8.10: Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Stormwater Infrastructure and Management Control Measures (Public Outreach)

- Tabletop displays on stormwater exhibited at public facilities
- Information repository of stormwater related educational materials
- Stormwater article inserts for Town newsletters
- Stormwater page on the Town’s Web site
- Mailings that include information on recycling, household chemical clean-up, and sanitation schedules
- Maintenance of signage within the Town related to illegal dumping, pet waste management, littering
- Participation by Town employees and Board members in stormwater related conferences, training and workshops


The control measures listed in Tables 8.10 and 8.11 have been or are in the process of being carried out in unincorporated Greenburgh. Each has a public participation component.

Table 8.11: Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Stormwater Infrastructure and Management Control Measures (Public Involvement/Participation)

- Preparation of a Stormwater Management Program Annual Report for public review and comment
- Designation of a stormwater contact person
- Utilization of a storm drain marker program involving stenciling of storm drains by volunteers
- Initiation of an adopt-a-stream program, where appropriate
- Organization of clean-up days for volunteers to assist in cleaning up streams and parks within the Town, where permitted

The control measures listed in Table 8.12 relate to issues of water quality concern. Town records include over 60 drawings and hundreds of microfilm records related to drainage systems. None of the data is available electronically but the records are accurate and thorough regarding pipe locations, sizes and layout. The records do not include catch basin sequencing or invert elevations. Only a handful of outfalls have been identified (in the Bronx River basin). The preparation of GIS mapping for storm drain systems, including outfall locations, will also provide water quantity information.

**Table 8.12: Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Stormwater Infrastructure and Management Control Measures (Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination)**

- Perform visual screening and inspections by Town roadway crews for illicit discharges
- Visually screen, clean and maintain catch basins
- Maintain signage within the Town related to illegal dumping, pet waste management, littering
- Evaluate current regulations and adopt an ordinance to prohibit illicit discharges
- Establish a hotline that can be used to report illegal dumping and illicit discharges
- Prepare GIS mapping for storm drain systems including outfall locations


Table 8.13 contains management control measures that are used by various Town staff and approving authorities such as Greenburgh’s Town Board, Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals when reviewing proposed developments.

**Table 8.13: Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Stormwater Infrastructure and Management Control Measures (Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control)**

- Evaluate regulations regarding site plan review, protection of steep slopes, wetlands and watercourses, and erosion and sediment control
- Review stormwater erosion and sediment control plans as part of the construction site plan/building department permit review process
- Require measures to retain additional stormwater on site, where feasible and appropriate.
- Enforce stormwater management ordinance for land development activities involving the disturbance of more than 500 square feet
- Perform site inspections and enforcement on construction projects

Chapter 248 (Stormwater Management) of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh, created in 2008, established minimum stormwater management controls in accordance with MS-4 Community requirements. The regulations in Chapter 248 apply to any land disturbance equal to or greater than 500 square feet. The code establishes regulations for the preparation of stormwater pollution prevention plans for both minor land development activity (equal to or greater than 500 square feet but less than 20,000 square feet) and major land development activity (equal to or greater than 20,000 square feet). It requires the maintenance and repair of stormwater facilities both during and after construction. The appropriation of any necessary easements and agreements are required for maintenance activities in accordance with the NYSDEC’s Stormwater Management Design Manual and New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control. Table 8.14 focuses on management control measures for the post-completion of projects.

Table 8.14: Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Stormwater Infrastructure and Management Control Measures (Post Construction Stormwater Management)

- Perform inspections of sites after completion of construction and prior to operation
- Evaluate existing ordinances pertaining to post-construction stormwater runoff controls
- Establish a requirement for annual reporting and maintenance for all sites with on-site stormwater maintenance
- Adopt ordinances for protection of steep slopes, wetlands and watercourses and stormwater management


Table 8.15 lists routine maintenance carried out by various Town staff that provides water quantity and water quality benefits.

Table 8.15: Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Stormwater Infrastructure and Management Control Measures (Pollution Prevention/Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operators)

- Road maintenance including street cleaning and sweeping, street and bridge maintenance and repairs, winter road maintenance and indoor salt storage
- Stormwater system maintenance including culverts and catch basin cleaning, catch basin and storm sewer repairs, and removal of storm sewer blockages
- Park and open space maintenance including stream cleanup, park cleanups and park litter basket pickups
- Solid waste management including recycling of batteries, antifreeze, cleaning solvents, oil, and tires
- Vehicle and fleet maintenance including indoor vehicle washing
- Municipal building maintenance
- Annual employee training on pollution prevention practices and hazardous materials and spill response


Westchester County’s Household Material Facility (H-MRF), located off Grasslands Road, accepts household hazardous waste and other items worthy of special handling on a year-round, appointment-only basis.
8.4.2 Watersheds in Unincorporated Greenburgh

A watershed or “drainage basin” is an area of land where surface water from rain and melting snow or ice converges to a single point, usually the exit of the basin, or where the waters join another waterbody such as a river, lake, reservoir, estuary or wetland. Unincorporated Greenburgh is divided into two major drainage basins: the Hudson River Basin to the west and the Bronx River Basin to the east. The Hudson River major drainage basin is further divided into three drainage sub-basins: the Lower Hudson River, the Sheldon Brook and the Saw Mill River drainage basins. The Bronx River major drainage basin consists of the Grassy Sprain, the Sprain Brook and the Bronx River drainage sub-basins. Figure 8.8 depicts the major drainage basins and sub-basins. Each of the basins includes land area in more than one municipality, highlighting its regional importance. Topography has great influence on watershed drainage patterns.

8.4.3 Flood Prone Areas

Flooding occurs in low lying areas and is often associated with watercourses. As depicted on Figure 8.8, the Saw Mill River and Bronx River have large drainage basins. Land adjacent to portions of these rivers has been prone to flooding. Figure 6.6 shows flood zones as identified on the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). Flooding has been known to occur in five “cluster locations” where there is a larger contiguous area of frequent flooding. Throughout unincorporated Greenburgh lesser scale flooding occurs on smaller individual sites. When overlaying the identified flood prone cluster areas with FEMA flood zones, there is a close correlation in locations, as is noted on Figure 6.6. The five cluster zones are listed in Table 8.16. Recently, an increasing number of severe storms has further highlighted the flood-prone nature of these areas.

Flooding generally disrupts the public’s daily activities by blocking roadways and causing businesses to temporarily close. Residents in each of the eight visioning areas identified stormwater management as an important element of the Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.16: Unincorporated Greenburgh’s Major Flooded Clusters Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hartsdale Avenue/Central Park Avenue Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. 9A from Payne Street to Fairview Park Drive and areas to the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babbitt Court Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Jackson Avenue/Jackson Avenue Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.8: Regional Watershed Drainage Patterns

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Produced by: Town of Greenburgh; Sarah Pawliczak
Data Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced: July 2012
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### 8.4.4 Stormwater Management Best Practices

Flooding in the vicinity of watercourses is a natural occurrence. The ecological function of floodplains is described further in Chapter 6.0 (Environmental Resources and Related Systems). Flooding can be exacerbated by development as increased impervious surfaces restrict the absorption rate of stormwater, and building footprints displace areas where water would typically flow unabated. In addition, as Figures 6.6 and 8.8 highlight, stormwater management and related flooding issues are a regional matter as watercourses and their respective watersheds cross municipal boundaries. Locally, a combination of infrastructure maintenance and management policies, outlined in the MS-4 control measures listed in Section 8.4.1, are employed to address flooding. In addition to existing local codified stormwater procedures, innovative best management practices are commonly utilized on a voluntary basis, as a mitigation measure during environmental review, or, as part of compliance with our local LEED Law. Table 8.17 lists a toolbox of “green” stormwater design elements and landscaping concepts. This toolbox should be applied not only in flood prone areas but also throughout unincorporated Greenburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element/Concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rain Garden</td>
<td>A depressed landscaped area containing native wetland and/or upland vegetation that collects stormwater to allow for settling and filtration of pollutants as the water percolates into the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Wetland</td>
<td>A constructed wetland that removes pollutants through the settling and biological uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetated Swales</td>
<td>A channel for stormwater that is planted with trees, shrubs, and/or grasses to reduce runoff volumes and infiltrate stormwater usually from adjacent impervious surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Parking</td>
<td>Alternate pavers or permeable pavement, and the use of bio-retention areas for stormwater treatment (see permeable pavement below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeable Pavement</td>
<td>A structural matrix with voids filled with a material such as sand, gravel or soil that allows stormwater to infiltrate into the underlying soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil-Grit Separator</td>
<td>A filter system that removes hydrocarbons and sediment from parking lot runoff prior to conveyance to an infiltration or storm drain network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Roof</td>
<td>A roof that is partially or completely covered by soil and vegetation to reduce stormwater runoff and peak flows from storm events, removes pollutants, and increases insulation and energy efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downspout Disconnection</td>
<td>A downspout carrying stormwater from a roof to the storm sewer system that is redirected and diverted to a rain barrel or cistern for storage and later use for irrigation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planter Boxes</td>
<td>Trees, shrubs and plants planted in planter boxes and placed on an impervious surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Planting/Tree Preservation</td>
<td>Trees planted and/or maintained in rights-of-way and on public and private property to provide stormwater uptake benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.18 lists many of the environmental benefits of green stormwater infrastructure.

Table 8.18: Environmental Benefits of Stormwater Best Management Practices

- Reduced stormwater runoff volumes entering the stormwater system by increasing pervious ground cover to utilize natural retention and absorption of vegetation and soils
- Enhanced groundwater/aquifer recharge rates to maintain base flow in rivers and streams as well as increasing the supply of drinking water
- Reduced stormwater pollutants by the infiltration of runoff close to the source which allows soils, plants and microbes to filter and break down pollutants and prevent them from entering nearby surface waters
- Reduced sanitary sewer overflow events by reducing runoff volumes and delaying stormwater discharges
- Increased capture and removal of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere/air quality improvements through tree preservation and tree planting.
- Mitigation of the effects of urban heat islands by decreasing the displacement of trees and natural vegetation
- Increased areas for recreation and wildlife habitats
- Increased land values

*Hackley School science class explores on-site wetland*

*Increased amounts and varieties of landscaping, in place of impervious surfaces or traditional lawn areas, is a simple and common best management stormwater practice.*

*Trees and vegetation have a natural cooling effect and associated reduction of energy demands by lowering the need for air conditioning.*
The inclusion of green stormwater infrastructure into new projects is important; however, when coupled with a broader range of planning initiatives (Table 8.19), water quality and water quantity benefits are maximized.

### Table 8.19: Additional Planning Initiatives Related to Stormwater Management

- Review off-street parking regulations to determine if excess parking exists
- Review allowable impervious surfaces to determine if excess building footprint and stormwater runoff are inadvertently encouraged
- Introduce Town road standards correlated to volume of usage, in an effort to minimize impervious surfaces
- Reduce sanitary sewer overflow events by reducing runoff volumes and delaying stormwater discharges
- Utilize subdivision regulations to maximize contiguous open space and minimize stormwater impacts
- Utilize shared driveways, where feasible and appropriate
- Consider pervious pavers, grass-crete and gravel as pervious surfaces (perhaps as a percentage), where feasible and appropriate

#### 8.4.5 Regional Stormwater Management and Partnerships

In addition to local review, various government agencies on the federal and state level play a role in the evaluation and mitigation of flooding and flood prone areas. On the federal level, FEMA is responsible for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is involved in flood damage reduction projects and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is involved in flood mitigation. The New York State Emergency Management Office (SEMO) is responsible for coordinating the activities of all State agencies to protect New York’s communities and the environment from natural and other disasters and emergencies. The NYSDEC is involved in issuing permits for work in dams and rivers, as well as regulating floodplain management.

Intergovernmental coordination is often called upon to mitigate stormwater impacts. On a local level, “partnerships” are typically established between existing residents and businesses, as well as developers of future residential and commercial and properties. Participation involving residential homeowners can be as simple as adhering to local restrictions which prevent dumping landscaping refuse in a wetland area. Participation involving a commercial owner is the private bi-annual cleaning of an oil-grit separator. The collective use of best management practices outlined in this chapter will place less stress on our infrastructure.
8.5 Solid Waste, Organic Waste and Recyclables

The Bureau of Sanitation, which is a division of the DPW, collects solid waste and recyclables. Currently, bi-weekly pickups are scheduled for solid waste. Recycling pickups are scheduled once a week, alternating between paper and commingled materials. Organic yard waste, bagged leaves, grass and clippings, are also collected by DPW. There has been a recent town-wide effort to mulch yard waste, where possible, to encourage organic recycling and reduce collection costs.

Costs associated with solid waste and organic waste are significant. Solid waste disposal cost was $40,827 in June 2013 ($26.68 per ton x 1,530.25 tons), a cost that is paid to Westchester County. Organic waste disposal cost, also paid to Westchester County, was $26,613 in June 2013 ($16.32 per ton x 1,630.74 tons). Recycled commingles consisted of an average tonnage of 121.5 per month in 2012, while recycled paper averaged 232.8 tons per month in 2012. Since there are no additional costs for the disposal of these recycled materials, the financial advantage of recycling is evident.

Solid waste is transported to the Westchester County solid waste transfer station in Yonkers and is then transported to Westchester RESCO for incineration. Recycling is transported to the Westchester County Material Recovery Facility in Yonkers for processing. Table 8.20 lists the approximate tons of solid waste, recyclables and organic yard waste collected for the years 2006 through 2012. Westchester County’s Household Material Recovery Facility (H-MRF), located at 15 Woods Road in Valhalla, accepts household hazardous waste and other items requiring special handling on a year-round, appointment-only basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Solid Waste Collected (Tons)</th>
<th>Recyclables Collected - Commingles (Tons)</th>
<th>Recyclables Collected - Paper (Tons)</th>
<th>Organic Yard Waste Collected (Tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>23,574</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>27,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>23,070</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>14,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20,418</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>3,272</td>
<td>17,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>18,824</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>3,031</td>
<td>13,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>17,832</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>20,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17,654</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>2,999</td>
<td>19,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>16,997</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>22,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Public Works, Town of Greenburgh

Using an average cost of $26.00 per ton, the Town saved over $100,000 by recycling commingles and paper in 2012.
8.5.1 Resource Recovery

Resource Recovery is the collection and separation of certain waste materials for processing into new forms, which are ultimately marketed as raw materials for new products. This process is cost effective as it reduces the amount of waste for disposal, saves space in landfills, is more energy-efficient than burning materials, and conserves natural resources. Recycling is a component of resource recovery, however, other facets of resource recovery can include public-private partnerships, or solely private enterprises, that coordinate more efficient uses of waste-streams. Local applications could include enhanced recycling initiatives, a composting pilot project with the Greenburgh Nature Center, and a new indoor organic waste receive facility in an industrial portion of the Town.

8.6 Right-of-Way Infrastructure

The Division of Highways, part of the DPW, is responsible for the maintenance of over 130 miles of Town road or over 260 lane miles. The inventory of Town roads increases when new development projects contain roads built to Town standard and are accepted by the Town. Municipal and public responsibilities within Town rights-of-way include, but are not limited to, resurfacing and repair, curbing, sidewalk repairs, snow/ice control, line painting, tree removal/trimming and signage. The Town Highway Department has a 2014 operating budget in excess of $7,000,000. The unpredictability of severe winters and the potential toll they can have on roads and maintenance equipment, coupled with the aging of equipment, are ongoing concerns for unincorporated Greenburgh.

8.7 Police Protection

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s police department (GPD), located at 188 Tarrytown Road, is the largest town police force in Westchester County and as of 2014 was comprised of 115 professional officers and 42 civilians. The GPD is organized into three divisions: Patrol, Detective and Staff Services.

The Patrol Division is responsible for all general police services and usually provides the first response to all requests for services. These services are provided 24 hours a day, seven days a week, three hundred and sixty-five days a year. The division is comprised
of a captain, four lieutenants, ten sergeants, ten detectives (which includes eight paramedics), sixty-three police officers, eight civilian paramedics and eight dispatchers. The Patrol division is organized into the following units: Uniformed Patrol, Paramedic Unit, Street Crime Unit and Community Affairs Unit.

The Detective Division has three squads, each of which has one Sergeant and three Detectives. Their functions include: criminal investigations, accident investigations and reconstructions, crime scene processing, execution of warrants, maintenance of warrant files, fingerprinting and photographing, and the supervision of all evidence taken by the department. Additionally, the department’s Juvenile Aid Unit (JAU) is under the jurisdiction of the Detective Division.

The Staff Services Division supports the line functions of the department, oversees the purchase and implementation of department equipment and provides the services for the Traffic and Safety Unit, the Training Unit, the Records and Licensing Unit, the Crime Prevention Unit, Information Technology, and the Ceremonial Unit.

The GPD also provides services such as administration of alarms and fingerprinting, child safety seat inspections and the D.A.R.E. program to school-aged children. Greenburgh is served by a number of Special Operations teams including a Special Weapons and Tactics (S.W.A.T. Team), Hostage Negotiation Team, Technical Rescue Team and K-9 unit.

The GPD is unique in that it is one of the few police agencies to provide emergency medical services and Advanced Life Support services as well as law enforcement services to its constituents. The department has been providing medical treatment/transport since the early 1950’s. All officers, regardless of rank or position, receive certification to provide basic first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation. The department currently has 23 certified Paramedics and 19 Emergency Medical Technicians.

### 8.8 Fire Protection

As depicted on Figure 8.9, fire protection in unincorporated Greenburgh is independently provided through three combination (career and volunteer) fire districts and under contract for seven volunteer fire protection districts, which are operated by village fire departments. In the case of a multi-alarm fire, local departments from Westchester municipalities can be called to assist under a mutual aid program. Mutual Aid is dispatched by the county’s 60-Control system located at the Grasslands Reservation.

Each independent combination fire district is an autonomous entity, governed by a Board of Fire Commissioners elected by voters within the fire district. Each year the Board of Commissioners prepares a budget and submits it to the voters of the district on the second Tuesday in December. After approval, the cost of operating the district is apportioned among the taxpayers of the district.

Under New York State Law, the Town Assessor is responsible for assessing all property within the Town (including the villages) for school, county, Town and fire taxes. Fire District taxes are based on the assessment roll provided by the Town Assessor. The Town of

The Town of Greenburgh Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) consists of volunteers who support emergency responders and volunteer for projects that improve community emergency preparedness, through training supervised by the Greenburgh Police Department and other Emergency Service Agencies.
Town Receiver of Taxes is responsible for collecting fire district taxes and remitting them in full to the individual districts.

### 8.8.1 Independent Combination Fire Districts

The Fairview Fire District (FFD) consists of 45 career firefighters and 16 active volunteers. There are two stations, one located at 19 Rosemont Boulevard and another at Dobbs Ferry Road and Worthington Road. The FFD covers an area of approximately 5.5 square miles.

The Greenville Fire District (GFD), located at 711 Central Park Avenue South, operates with 30 career firefighters and 20 active volunteers. The GFD covers an area of approximately 2.9 square miles.

The Hartsdale Fire District (HFD) operates with 37 career firefighters and 12 active volunteers. There are two stations, one located at 25 Central Park Avenue South and another at 300 West Hartsdale Avenue. The HFD covers an area of approximately 4.5 square miles.

### 8.8.2 Volunteer Fire Districts

Seven volunteer fire protection districts, served by the contiguous village fire departments, are contracted to provide fire protection to those areas of unincorporated Greenburgh not protected by the three combination fire districts.

The West Elmsford and North Elmsford Fire Protection Districts are served by the Elmsford Fire Department which has 90 volunteers. The Elmsford Fire Department has stations at 5 North Lawn Avenue (Live Oak Engine Company #1) and 144 East Main Street (Elmsford Fire Company #1), and headquarters at 15 South Stone Avenue, all in the Village of Elmsford.

The East Irvington Fire Protection District is served by the Irvington Fire Department which has 37 volunteers. The Irvington Fire Department has its station and headquarters located at 90 Main Street in the Village of Irvington.

The Donald Park Fire Protection District is served by the Hastings-on-Hudson Fire Department, which has 120 volunteers. The Hastings-on-Hudson Fire Department has stations at 50 Main Street (Hook and Ladder No. 1), 83 Euclid Avenue (Riverview Manor Company No. 3), 25 Rose Street (Uniontown Hose Company No.2) and 573 Warburton Avenue (Protection Engine Co. 1), and its headquarters at 7 Maple Avenue, all located in the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson.

The Chauncey and South Ardsley Fire Protection Districts are served by the Ardsley Fire Department which has 46 volunteers. The Ardsley Fire Department has its station and headquarters located at 505 Ashford Avenue in the Village of Ardsley.

---

**All numerical totals of fire personnel are as of 2013.**

---

**Hartsdale Fire District - Station 1 (25 Central Park Avenue South)**
Figure 8.9: Fire Districts and Fire Protection Districts
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The Glenville Fire Protection District is served by the Tarrytown Fire Department, which has 92 volunteers. The Tarrytown Fire Department has five stations: 157 White Plains Road, (Washington Engine No. 2), 177 Sheldon Avenue (Consolidated Engine Company No. 1), Mechanics and Central Avenue (Phoenix Hose Company No.2), 50 Main Street (Conqueror Hook & Ladder Company No. 1), White and Franklin Street (Riverside Hose Company No. 2), and a firehouse/headquarters at 50 Main Street, all located in the Village of Tarrytown.

8.9 Town-owned Buildings

Major municipal buildings and offices are located at seven different locations listed in Table 8.21 and depicted on Figure 8.10. All of these buildings are maintained by the DPW Division of Building Maintenance. It is important to plan for the efficient use of these buildings and properties and consider their maintenance, lifespan, adequacy of size and location. In terms of structural lifespan, there are no immediate concerns with our municipal buildings.

The Police Headquarters and the Town Court Building, both located at 188 Tarrytown Road are undersized. As detailed in a 2006 Greenburgh Police Headquarters/Town Court Needs Assessment Study (NAS), the existing buildings and site no longer meet operational and security needs, and there is insufficient parking to accommodate the department, staff and public. Adequately sized facilities for both uses are estimated to require approximately 55,000 sq. ft. as well as parking to accommodate 350 cars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Bldg. (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Lot Size (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, P.O. Greenburgh</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>45,084</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Headquarters</td>
<td>188 Tarrytown Road, P.O. White Plains</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>30,600 (total)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Court</td>
<td>188 Tarrytown Road, P.O. White Plains</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Dept. Garage</td>
<td>181 Knollwood Road, P.O. White Plains</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>19,094</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDYCC</td>
<td>32 Manhattan Avenue, P.O. White Plains</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>60,683</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW Garage</td>
<td>Old Sprain Road, P.O. Hartsdale</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11,406</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>300 Tarrytown Road, P.O. Elmsford</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>45,078</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Bronz Building***</td>
<td>30 Manhattan Avenue, P.O. White Plains</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview Storage Building</td>
<td>Longview Drive, P.O. Scarsdale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Offices</td>
<td>Olympic Lane, P.O. Ardsley</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5,723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Center and related buildings</td>
<td>Olympic Lane, P.O. Ardsley</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8,222</td>
<td>31.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some land area of the park is located in the Village of Ardsley
** Renovation Complete in 2009
*** Adjacent to the Theodore D. Young Community Center

It is important to plan for the efficient use of our municipal buildings and to consider their respective lifespans.
Figure 8.10: Town of Greenburgh Municipal Buildings/Sites
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The NAS discusses three potential onsite improvement configurations, as well as a fourth off-site option. A new facility (the fourth option) is deemed the best alternative based on the added cost of constructing structured parking at the existing site and/or the inability to expand the surface parking lot to meet the estimated off-street parking need. When consideration is given to alternate locations for a new combined police station and court house, on an existing Town-owned property or on a property to be acquired, the relocation costs of these facilities could be partially off-set by the sale of the existing facilities.

8.10 Emergency Preparedness and Hazard Mitigation

The Town of Greenburgh prepared a Comprehensive All-Hazards Emergency Management and Mitigation Plan (available on the Town Website). It was adopted by the Town Board on October 12, 2011, and addresses risks to flooding, coastal storms and other severe storms. The creation and adoption of this plan helps the Town prepare for and respond to hazard events and disasters and to obtain future mitigation funding from FEMA.
8.11 Telecommunication Network

A telecommunications network is a collection of systems and links capable of carrying audio, visual, and data communications and includes telephone service providers, the internet, microwave and wireless equipment. These systems are located throughout unincorporated Greenburgh in traditional wired networks, satellite and personal wireless facilities. Personal wireless facilities include antennas and their supporting structures, which can include monopoles, flagpoles and roof-supported systems.

8.12 Electric and Gas Distribution Network

Electric and gas service in unincorporated Greenburgh is provided by Con Edison. In 2016 residents and small businesses in the Town of Greenburgh became part of the Westchester Community Choice Aggregation Program, or Westchester Power, which enabled the purchase of electricity supply in bulk. Fuel oil and natural gas are the most commonly used residential heating fuels in Westchester County. Natural gas accounts for approximately 45 percent of the heating fuel. Electric heat is used in approximately ten percent of homes.

8.13 Education

School districts are special purpose units of government, authorized by the New York State Constitution and established by the State legislature to provide elementary and secondary education to the children in the state. Nine excellent public school districts serve students residing in unincorporated Greenburgh and enhance the quality of life in the Town. As shown on Figure 8.11, ten public school districts are located within the Town of Greenburgh; however, the Dobbs Ferry Union Free School district, also excellent, does not serve students in unincorporated Greenburgh. Each school district’s boundary is unique. Only one school district, Edgemont Union Free School District, is located entirely within unincorporated Greenburgh. The boundaries of five districts cross village municipal boundary lines and the boundaries of three districts cross the municipal boundary lines of neighboring towns.

Each public school district is an autonomous entity, governed by a school board elected by voters within the school district. Each year the school board prepares a budget and submits it to the voters of the district on the third Tuesday in May. The cost of operating the school district is apportioned among the taxpayers of the district.

Under New York State Law, the Town Assessor is responsible for assessing all property within the Town (including the villages) for school, county, town and other taxes. School district taxes are based on the assessment roll provided by the Town Assessor. The Town Receiver of Taxes is responsible for collecting school taxes and remitting the full amount due to the individual school districts.

Although separate entities, cooperative planning between the schools and Town, to the extent practical, can result in achieving mutual goals. As an example, an understanding of the pedestrian routes used by students and parents can allow the Town of Greenburgh to prioritize sidewalk improvements. Referring land-use development applications (subdivision, site plan and special permit) to the applicable school district could foster coordinative planning. For large scale projects, and projects which could require an Environmental Impact Statement, inviting a school district official to contribute comments/recommendations regarding SEQRA studies and for a Consultant, early in the process, could promote better planning.
Figure 8.11: School Districts
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Appendices F, G, H, I and J provide school-related information.

**8.13.1 Ardsley Union Free School District**
The Ardsley Union Free School District boundaries encompass all of the Village of Ardsley, portions of the Villages of Dobbs Ferry and Irvington, and approximately 1,443 acres in unincorporated Greenburgh. The district serves students in kindergarten through fourth grade at the Concord Road Elementary School at 2 Concord Road in the Village of Ardsley. Students in grades five through eight attend the Ardsley Middle School at 700 Ashford Avenue in unincorporated Greenburgh (Ardsley Post Office address). Students in grades nine through twelve attend the Ardsley High School at 30 Farm Road in the Village of Ardsley.

Approximately 53 percent of the land area in the Ardsley School District is located within unincorporated Greenburgh. The district includes approximately 12.4 percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

**8.13.2 Edgemont Union Free School District**
The Edgemont Union Free School District is the only district located entirely within unincorporated Greenburgh. Students in grades kindergarten through sixth grade attend either the Seely Place School at 51 Seely Place, or the Greenville Elementary School at 100 Glendale Road. Students in grades seven through twelve attend the Edgemont Junior/Senior High School, located at 200 White Oak Lane. All schools have a Scarsdale Post Office address.

The Edgemont Union Free School District includes approximately 1,720 acres, which is approximately 15 percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

**8.13.3 Elmsford Union Free School District**
The Elmsford Union Free School District boundaries encompass part of the Village of Elmsford, a small portion of the Village of Irvington and approximately 1,216 acres in unincorporated Greenburgh. Students in pre-kindergarten and first grade attend the Carl L. Dixson Primary School at 22 South Hillside Avenue. Students in grades two through six attend the Alice E. Grady Elementary School at 45 Cobb Lane. Students in grades seven through twelve attend the Alexander Hamilton Junior/Senior High School at 98 South Goodwin Avenue. All schools are located in the Village of Elmsford with an Elmsford Post Office address.

Approximately 69 percent of the land area in the Elmsford School District is located within unincorporated Greenburgh. The district includes approximately 11 percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

**8.13.4 Greenburgh Central School District**
The Greenburgh Central School District boundaries include approximately 3,759 acres in unincorporated Greenburgh and a portion of land located in the Village of Elmsford. Students in pre-kindergarten attend the Early Childhood Program at 475 West Hartsdale Avenue (Hartsdale Post Office address). Students in kindergarten and first grade attend the Lee F. Jackson Elementary School at 2 Saratoga Road (White Plains Post Office address). Students in grades two and three attend the Highview Elementary School at 200 North Central Avenue (Hartsdale Post Office address). Students in grades four through six attend the Richard J. Bailey School at 33 West Hillside Avenue.
(White Plains Post Office address). Students in grades seven and eight attend the Woodlands Middle School and students in grades nine through twelve attend the Woodlands Senior High School, both located at 475 West Hartsdale Avenue (Hartsdale Post Office address).

The Greenburgh Central School District includes approximately 33 percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

8.13.5 Hastings-on-Hudson Union Free School District
The Hastings-on-Hudson Union Free School District boundaries encompass the Village of Hastings-on-Hudson and approximately 311 acres of land in unincorporated Greenburgh. The district serves students in kindergarten through fourth grade at the Hillside Elementary School at 120 Lefurgy Avenue. Students in grades five through eight attend the Farragut Middle School at 27 Farragut Avenue. Students in grades nine through twelve attend the Hastings High School at 1 Mount Hope Boulevard. All schools are located in the village with a Hastings-on-Hudson Post Office address.

Approximately 20 percent of the land area in the Hastings-on-Hudson School District is located within unincorporated Greenburgh. The district includes approximately three percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

8.13.6 Irvington Union Free School District
The Irvington Union Free School District boundaries encompass most of the Village of Irvington, approximately half of the Village of Tarrytown and approximately 497 acres of land in unincorporated Greenburgh. The district serves students from kindergarten through third grade at the Dows Lane Elementary School at 6 Dows Lane. Students in grades four and five attend the Main Street School at 101 Main Street. Students in grades six through eight attend the Irvington Middle School and students in grades nine through twelve attend the Irvington High School, both located at 40 North Broadway. All schools are located in the village with an Irvington Post Office address.

Approximately 14 percent of the land area in the Irvington School District is located within unincorporated Greenburgh. The district includes approximately four percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

8.13.7 Pocantico Hills Central School District
The Pocantico Hills Central School District boundaries encompass approximately 1,118 acres of land in unincorporated Greenburgh as well as lands in the Town of Mount Pleasant and the Village of Sleepy Hollow. The district serves students from pre-kindergarten through eighth grade at the Pocantico Hills Central School at 599 Bedford Road (Sleepy Hollow Post Office address) in the Town of Mount Pleasant. The district does not have a high school. Students in grades nine through twelve may choose to attend one of three high schools: Briarcliff High School (Briarcliff Union Free School District), Pleasantville High School (Pleasantville Union Free School District) or Sleepy Hollow High School (Union Free School District of the Tarrytowns).

Approximately 21 percent of the land area in the Pocantico Hills School District is located within unincorporated Greenburgh. The district includes approximately 10 percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.
8.13.8 Union Free School District of the Tarrytowns
The Union Free School District of the Tarrytowns boundaries encompass portions of the Villages of Tarrytown and Sleepy Hollow and approximately 370 acres in unincorporated Greenburgh. The district serves students in pre-kindergarten at the John Paulding School at 154 North Broadway (Tarrytown Post Office address). Students in grades one and two attend the Winfield L. Morse School at Pocantico Street (Sleepy Hollow Post Office address). Students in grades three through five attend the Washington Irving Intermediate School at 103 South Broadway (Tarrytown Post Office address). Students in grades six through eight attend the Sleepy Hollow Middle School, and students in grades nine through twelve attend the Sleepy Hollow High School, both located at 210 N. Broadway (Sleepy Hollow Post Office address).

Approximately nine percent of the land area in the School District of the Tarrytowns is located within unincorporated Greenburgh. The district includes approximately two percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

8.13.9 Valhalla Union Free School District
The Valhalla Union Free School District boundaries encompass approximately 941 acres of land in unincorporated Greenburgh as well as lands in the Town of Mount Pleasant and Town of North Castle. The district serves students in kindergarten through second grade at the Virginia Road Elementary School at 86 Virginia Road (White Plains Post Office address). Students in grades three through five attend the Kensico School at 320 Columbus Avenue in the Town of Mount Pleasant (Valhalla Post Office address). Students in grades six through eight attend the Valhalla Middle School, and students in grades nine through twelve attend the Valhalla High School, both located at 300 Columbus Avenue in the Town of Mount Pleasant (Valhalla Post Office address).

Approximately 29 percent of the land area in the Valhalla School District is located within unincorporated Greenburgh. The district includes approximately nine percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh.

8.13.10 Other Educational Facilities
In addition to the ten public school districts, there are many and varied educational facilities located within or within easy access of the Town. Excellent private and parochial primary and secondary schools exist as well as nursery schools and day care facilities. Numerous technical and professional schools, colleges and universities are located within a 20-mile radius of unincorporated Greenburgh.
8.14 Public Infrastructure and Essential Services Goals, Objectives and Policies

GOAL 8.1: Ensure well-maintained, safe and cost-effective infrastructure systems that provide public potable water, sewer services, stormwater management and other utility services.

OBJECTIVE 8.1.1 Maintain infrastructure systems that promote sustainable land use, protect natural resources and provide for orderly growth and expansion.

POLICY 8.1.1.1: Carry out infrastructure improvements according to the following guidelines:

- Eliminate a proven or obvious hazard to public health and safety;
- Fulfill a legal commitment;
- Preserve, refurbish, achieve full use, or replace existing facilities;
- Provide or bring an existing facility up to an adequate level of service;
- Further policies adopted in other elements of this plan; and
- Ensure consistency with plans of other agencies having responsibility for public facilities within unincorporated Greenburgh.

POLICY 8.1.1.2: Obtain sewer easements as part of development reviews, where projected need exists.

POLICY 8.1.1.3: Educate residents on the process for developing a sewer district.

POLICY 8.1.1.4: Facilitate the connection of the water system to decrease the amount of dead end water lines.

OBJECTIVE 8.1.2: Apply analytical and decision making tools to infrastructure planning.

POLICY 8.1.2.1: Identify and monitor the condition of infrastructure on a regular basis to determine the remaining operational life of individual elements.

POLICY 8.1.2.2: Develop a capital asset database that links with GIS to provide accessible information on the condition, replacement value, depreciated value, and optimum replacement dates for public infrastructure.

POLICY 8.1.2.3: Integrate existing systems to provide an overall Engineering Asset Management System that will provide analytical tools that allow system managers to optimize capital and maintenance program expenditures.

POLICY 8.1.2.4: Incorporate the concept of sustainability into the development of capital replacement plans.

Policy 8.1.2.5: Plan for and implement pilot or demonstration projects that test the feasibility of new approaches or technologies.
OBJECTIVE 8.1.3: Integrate infrastructure systems to achieve multiple sustainability objectives.

POLICY 8.1.3.1: Explore the utilization of resource recovery as a component of infrastructure projects and future land-uses to recover material, gas, heat and energy from the co-management of solid and liquid waste streams.

POLICY 8.1.3.2: Explore opportunities for harvesting heat or energy from sanitary and/or water systems.

POLICY 8.1.3.3: Coordinate co-operative planning efforts between unincorporated Greenburgh and respective utility agencies for development projects.

POLICY 8.1.3.4: Facilitate the continued upgrading of electronic communications infrastructure in support of high tech and bio tech businesses and industry.

POLICY 8.1.3.5: Require electrical distribution and feeder lines to be underground in all redevelopment areas, where feasible.

POLICY 8.1.3.6: Work with Con Edison and other utilities to retrofit existing utility lines underground, along significant access roads.

GOAL 8.2.: Develop, operate and maintain an environmentally sound, economically efficient potable water treatment and distribution system.

OBJECTIVE 8.2.1: Ensure high quality water distribution systems and supply facilities.

POLICY 8.2.1.1: Install and maintain water purification supply facilities and distribution works in accordance with Federal and State requirements.

POLICY 8.2.1.2: Annually plan for and modify a capital improvement program to provide for new and additional equipment/facilities to meet technology and energy efficiency improvements.

POLICY 8.2.1.3: Design water supply and distribution facilities based on allowable and projected development build-outs within Consolidated Water District No. 1.

POLICY 8.2.1.4: Continue to provide sufficient water pressure to service area customers.

POLICY 8.2.1.5: Require public and private water distribution system improvements to ensure sufficient fire flow capacity to maintain current ISO (Insurance Service Organization) fire ratings for new developments through system improvements or development of secondary sources where necessary.
POLICY 8.2.1.6: Explore the feasibility of cooperatively constructing a new pump station across the street from the existing Knollwood Pump Station.

POLICY 8.2.1.7: Apply for a Consolidated Funding Application or other State/Federal funding mechanisms to make water infrastructure upgrades identified through water modeling analyses.

OBJECTIVE 8.2.2: Encourage water conservation.

POLICY 8.2.2.1: Continue public education efforts to promote the utilization of conservation measures such as reclaimed water, leak detection and repair programs, and fixture exchanges.

POLICY 8.2.2.2: Continue to implement development incorporating LEED water conservation components.

POLICY 8.2.2.3: Encourage conservation of potable water, particularly as it relates to irrigation, lawn watering and car washing during periods of drought, supply reduction and other emergencies.

POLICY 8.2.2.4: Incorporate xeriscaping (drought resistant, low water requirement) into development of projects and municipal landscaping endeavors.

POLICY 8.2.2.5: Encourage education initiatives and support Westchester County and New York City Department of Environmental Protection in any programs related to water conservation.

OBJECTIVE 8.2.3: Identify and correct facility deficiencies on a continuing basis.

POLICY 8.2.3.1: Use the capital improvement program and annual work program as an on-going means for correcting facility deficiencies.

POLICY 8.2.3.2: Continue to maintain a staff of qualified maintenance personnel to correct any immediate problems, deficiencies, or equipment failures.

POLICY 8.2.3.3: Provide maintenance personnel with periodic training regarding equipment and maintenance procedures.

GOAL 8.3: Develop, operate and maintain an environmentally sound, economically efficient sanitary sewer collection system for meeting current and future needs.

OBJECTIVE 8.3.1: Continue to maximize the use of existing sanitary sewer facilities.

POLICY 8.3.1.1: Investigate the feasibility of consolidating the boundaries of existing sanitary sewer districts.
POLICY 8.3.1.2: Continue to operate and maintain existing collection lines and transmission mains at their present size and capacity in conjunction with the ongoing maintenance, upgrading and expansion program.

POLICY 8.3.1.3: Complete Figure 8.5 (Existing Sanitary Sewer Districts) as an addendum to the Plan.

OBJECTIVE 8.3.2: Ensure non-sewered lots do not cause harm to the environment.

POLICY 8.3.2.1: Establish a catalogue of existing residential properties that are not hooked up to public sanitary sewer infrastructure.

POLICY 8.3.2.2: Develop a long range plan to facilitate a reduction in the number of unsewered lots, including potential easements in connection with land use development proposals.

OBJECTIVE 8.3.3: Correct existing facility deficiencies as needed and minimize future facility deficiencies.

POLICY 8.3.3.1: Use the capital improvement program and annual work program to establish priorities for correcting any facility deficiencies.

POLICY 8.3.3.2: Continue to maintain an adequate staff of qualified professional and maintenance personnel to correct any immediate problems, deficiencies, or equipment failures, ensure that all equipment is properly serviced and maintained and ensure updating regarding state-of-the-art equipment and maintenance procedures.

POLICY 8.3.3.3: Ensure that developers contribute a fair-share proportion of utility upgrades as part of new development projects.

OBJECTIVE 8.3.4: Ensure adequate carrying capacity and coordinate extension of any wastewater facilities required to meet future needs.

POLICY 8.3.4.1: Using the capital improvements program and annual work program, develop a program for upgrading and expanding collection lines and transmission mains that provide for controlled, orderly growth in the service area.

POLICY 8.3.4.2: Investigate additional means of effluent reuse/disposal in order to provide additional system flexibility.

GOAL 8.4: Provide a safe, environmentally sound stormwater management and drainage system which protects human life, minimizes property damage, improves stormwater quality, and provides for on-site mitigation opportunities.

OBJECTIVE 8.4.1: Manage stormwater runoff to reduce flooding and erosion, and facilitate ground and surface water replenishment.
POLICY 8.4.1.1: Implement new drainage infrastructure to be consistent with the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual utilizing Best Management Practices, when possible.

POLICY 8.4.1.2: Review development procedures and regulations regarding properties in floodplains, to minimize negative impacts.

OBJECTIVE 8.4.2: Continue to provide stormwater management and drainage facilities.

POLICY 8.4.2.1: Implement “Green” Best Management techniques established in Table 8.17.

POLICY 8.4.2.2: Maintain and enhance systems from frequently occurring (e.g., two-, five- and ten-year) storm events.

POLICY 8.4.2.3: Require the design of drainage systems which protect the functions of natural groundwater recharge areas and natural drainage features, and which maintain or enhance groundwater quality when feasible.

POLICY 8.4.2.4: Acquire property or inspection easements to ensure continued proper maintenance of system wide drainage facilities located on privately owned lands.

POLICY 8.4.2.5: Consider the creation of stormwater drainage districts for new subdivision and site plan applications with proposed above ground storm water systems.

POLICY 8.4.2.6: Adopt intermunicipal agreements or take other multi-jurisdictional initiatives to evaluate proposals addressing drainage areas that extend across jurisdictional boundaries.

POLICY 8.4.2.7: Review and examine all options available to reduce stormwater impacts to the Bronx River and Saw Mill River and work with the various agencies responsible for drainage in these basins.
GOAL 8.5: Ensure that a safe, environmentally sound, and efficient solid waste management system will be provided, utilizing resource recovery, recycling and source reduction.

OBJECTIVE 8.5.1: Continue to encourage strategies to reduce per capita generation of solid waste.

POLICY 8.5.1.1: Explore the potential of creating a compost-related pilot program involving the Town/Greenburgh Nature Center, local residents and businesses.

POLICY 8.5.1.2: Promote continued resource recovery through education to residents and businesses regarding the recycling of waste products.

POLICY 8.5.1.3: Encourage safe disposal of hazardous waste.

POLICY 8.5.1.4: Promote proper disposal of bio-hazardous waste.

POLICY 8.5.1.5: Continue to use Westchester County facilities for proper disposal of refuse/solid waste.

POLICY 8.5.1.6: Continue to partner with Westchester County in its organic waste program and explore the feasibility/potential for expanded organic waste handling options in the Town.

GOAL 8.6: Provide and facilitate adequate community services.

OBJECTIVE 8.6.1: Continue to coordinate the demand for additional community services in connection with new development applications.

POLICY 8.6.1.1: Continue to refer land-use development proposals to the applicable departments and agencies (Police, Water, Legal, Building and Engineering Departments, applicable Fire Districts) upon initial receipt of submission.

POLICY 8.6.1.2: Include the applicable school district in the initial distribution of subdivision, site plan, special permit and zoning amendment applications/petitions.
Chapter 9.0 Transportation, Mobility and Access

9.1. Relationship to our Guiding Principles
Planning for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods is an integral part of the comprehensive planning process. Local and regional transportation systems directly influence future development patterns, economic growth, the environment, and quality of life. In the past, transportation planning typically focused on the automobile and the maintenance and improvement of the traditional road network. Today, transportation planning must offer a spectrum of opportunities and alternative modes of travel.

9.2. Transportation Choices/Modes
The multi-modal transportation network in unincorporated Greenburgh is comprised of roadways and parking facilities, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and bus and rail transport systems. To strengthen this transportation network, supportive land-use development patterns and related site design components are necessary. In addition, policies must be implemented to comply with adopted New York State “Complete Streets” legislation.

New York State envisions transportation as a seamless system in which travelers conveniently shift between modes to complete trips that meet their individual and business needs. (Strategies for a New Age: New York State’s Transportation Master Plan for 2030, NYSDOT, 2006.) To that end, on June 21, 2011, New York State became the fifteenth state to adopt “Complete Streets” legislation that applies to the planning, design, construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation of roadways that receive federal or state funding. The legislation mandates state, county and local agencies to consider design features that provide accommodations and increased safety for pedestrians, bicyclists and public transportation riders, as well as drivers/passengers in automobiles and commercial vehicles. The Westchester County Planning Department’s regional comprehensive plan, Westchester 2025, supports these concepts.

The Complete Streets legislation mandates and/or incentivizes new and retrofitted roadways to have both functional improvements, such as sidewalks, bike lanes and benches, and aesthetic improvements, such as street trees and buried utility lines. Strategies to achieve these improvements for the full range of transportation choices include:

- zoning requirements that consider all modes of mobility when regulating land development projects;
- land-use strategies that enhance existing roadways and transportation facilities such as train stations and bus stops;
- site design and construction that promotes safe pedestrian and bicycle use and connections to transit services; and
- public and private investment in a multi-modal transportation network.
Chapter 12.0 (Land Use and Zoning) highlights several Planning and Study areas that can better support existing transit options, incorporate additional pedestrian amenities, and can contain enhanced traffic calming measures and other Complete Streets components.

9.2.1. Pedestrians

Pedestrian infrastructure (sidewalks, paths, crosswalks, signals) provides important links between transportation systems, places of employment, public facilities, and recreational and shopping destinations. Safe pedestrian mobility is a primary objective, particularly in more densely populated areas and near schools. During local area visioning sessions, attendees commonly cited enhanced pedestrian access as an important quality of life element.

Enhanced opportunities to walk in safe spaces are important to residents, visitors and businesses. Children are more likely to walk or bicycle to school when sidewalks or safe routes are present. A population aging in place desires continued mobility and independence; therefore, pedestrian amenities with connections to alternative transportation modes are important considerations.

In unincorporated Greenburgh, existing sidewalks are primarily located in commercial areas along portions of state roadways and in clusters in some residential areas. New sidewalks are generally constructed privately as part of new residential and non-residential developments but also have been incorporated into public road improvement projects. Existing sidewalk locations are shown on Figure 9.1. This figure also highlights areas where the installation of new sidewalks and/or sidewalk connections could significantly increase pedestrian safety. It may not be feasible, however, to include sidewalks on every street due to right-of-way impediments, topography, safety, or other considerations. To increase the acceptability of sidewalk installations on heavily used roads, the Town should explore the feasibility of maintaining and plowing such sidewalks, in order to ensure they are accessible to the public.
Figure 9.1: Sidewalk Network
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Prioritized areas for sidewalks are listed below.

- Schools
- Parks and recreation facilities
- Commercial corridors
- Transportation hubs
- Collector Roads
- Local Roads

Sidewalks alone do not render a street or community pedestrian-friendly. Correlated infrastructure such as crosswalks and signalization, the reduction of vehicle speeds through traffic calming measures, and site design with an emphasis on avoiding car-dependent environments, all contribute to a more pedestrian-friendly community.

### 9.2.2. Bicycles

Bicycle infrastructure (bicycle paths, lanes, etc.) provides transportation choice, increased opportunity for recreation and physical activity, savings relative to car costs, and reduced traffic volumes. A cycling network should provide a wide range of facilities to meet the needs and expectations of commuters, utilitarian, and recreational users. At local area visioning sessions, suggestions were made to strengthen cycling opportunities.

The planning and design of roads to provide safer access for bicyclists is an important contributor to a cycling network. Bicycle routes should be sited and designed to avoid gaps and circuitous travel patterns and take into account unincorporated Greenburgh’s hilly terrain and often narrow roads. Marked bicycle lanes alongside appropriate roadsides would provide enhanced visibility for bicycle users and may be most feasible on NYS roadways in connection with NYSDOT improvements. Municipalities across the country are utilizing dedicated on-street bicycle lanes. Dedicated bicycle lanes installed in the City of White Plains are the closest example.

Weather protected bicycle racks should be a component of non-residential and multi-family residential developments. Public transit facilities should provide space for bicyclists to ensure connectivity between the two modes.
Existing bicycle routes in unincorporated Greenburgh include designated off-road trailways as well as on-road corridor routes. The Tarrytown-Kensico Trailway is an on-road route, although it does not contain marked lanes. The three dedicated off-road trails used by bicyclists are the North/South County Trailway, the Tarrytown Lakes extension, and the Bronx River Pathway. The North/South County Trailway is intersected by the Tarrytown Lakes extension, providing an excellent connection. Figure 9.2 depicts where connections to these trails exist and where better connections are desired.

Several routes shown on Figure 9.2 have been mapped by the Westchester County Department of Planning for future development of a bicycle route system. The routes were selected based on a number of factors, including their ability to link centers with commercial and recreational areas. These routes are identified and used by established cycling clubs. A commitment to enhancing bicycling can be achieved through the:

- identification of a preferred future network of bikeways;
- connection of gaps in the existing bicycle network;
- integration of the bicycle network with transit service;
- promotion of cycling through education, encouragement and enforcement of safe cycling rules; and
- identification of potential connections to existing trailways.
Figure 9.2: Bike Routes
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9.2.3. Rail Transportation

Unincorporated Greenburgh and the Town’s villages have access to commuter rail service. Rail lines are shown on Figure 9.3 with $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and one mile offsets from six of the local train stations. Western portions of the Town are served by Metro North's Hudson Line via stations located in Tarrytown, Irvington, Ardsley-on-Hudson, Dobbs Ferry and Hastings-on-Hudson. Eastern portions of unincorporated Greenburgh are served by Metro North’s Harlem Line via the North White Plains, White Plains, Hartsdale and Scarsdale railroad stations. The Hartsdale station is the only train station located in unincorporated Greenburgh. Permit parking near the Hartsdale station is provided to residents of unincorporated Greenburgh, and in limited numbers to non-residents, by the Hartsdale Public Parking District. The proximity of these stations provides support for the various Planning and Study areas identified in Chapter 12.0.

**Hartsdale Train Station**

Westchester County provides bus shuttle service to the Hartsdale train station during rail rush hours. County commuter bus service from portions of the Edgemont area is also provided to the Scarsdale train station. Several residential developments in unincorporated Greenburgh utilize private jitney services to the Hartsdale, Irvington, and Tarrytown train stations. Some businesses provide private jitney services to the Tarrytown, Irvington, and North White Plains train stations. Westchester County also runs a shuttle from the White Plains train station to the Taxter Corporate Park.

**Covered bus stop and a Westchester County BeeLine Bus**

Local commuter rail access (Metro North) is provided through the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which has direct connections to Amtrak.
Figure 9.3:
1/4, 1/2, 1 Mile Train Station Offsets
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9.2.4. Bus Transportation

Bus transportation (local and express), primarily provided by the Westchester County Bee-Line Bus system, is an important transportation option for residents. The three major corridors, Route 119 (White Plains/Tarrytown Road), Route 100 (Central Avenue) and Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road) are well served by bus routes. Figure 9.4 shows the 25 different bus routes that travel in or through unincorporated Greenburgh. The bus system's central hub, located in the City of White Plains, provides connections to destinations throughout Westchester and provides access to New York City. The system provides discounted fares for students and seniors and accepts the MTA MetroCard. Connections to Westchester Community College, the Westchester Medical Center campus and major office parks are available. Regional/long distance bus lines also make connections to White Plains.

Many residents live close to an existing bus route and are within a five minute walk to a bus stop. Existing bus service supports many existing multifamily developments and can support the various Planning and Study areas identified in Chapter 12.0 (Land Use and Zoning).

9.2.5. Para-transit and Senior Transportation

A number of residents in unincorporated Greenburgh, because of age, location, or physical limitations, do not have access to the fixed-route bus system. Westchester County provides para-transit service for approved elderly or disabled persons. Unincorporated Greenburgh currently provides transportation for seniors to daily activities at the Multipurpose Center and at the Theodore D. Young Community Center, for medical appointments, and to grocery shopping on a limited basis. These services improve the quality of life for residents aging in place. Demand for para-transit and senior transportation is expected to grow as the percentage of seniors increases.

9.2.6. Air Transportation

Proximity to several airports, shown on Figure 9.5, is important to businesses and residents. Westchester County Airport in the Town of Harrison is approximately a 20 minute drive from unincorporated Greenburgh. Westchester County Airport can also be reached by Bus #12 of the Bee-Line Bus System. Stewart International Airport in Orange County, New York is easily accessed from Interstate 87 and Interstate 84 and is approximately 40 miles from unincorporated Greenburgh. The greatest number of flights and destinations is provided from LaGuardia Airport and John F. Kennedy (JFK) International Airport, both located in Queens, New York, approximately 24 and 33 miles south of Greenburgh, respectively. Another option is Newark Liberty International Airport in Newark, New Jersey, less than 35 miles from unincorporated Greenburgh. JFK, LaGuardia and Newark airports can be reached from any Metro-North station along either the Harlem or Hudson line by taking a train to Grand Central and then a dedicated bus from Pershing Square to JFK, LaGuardia or Newark.
Figure 9.5: Regional Airport System
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9.2.7. Truck Transportation

Planning and zoning for local and regional infrastructure should consider that efficient truck circulation, the movement of goods to local businesses and industrial areas, is vital to economic success. Figure 9.6 depicts roadways that permit commercial trucks. Saw Mill River Road (NYS Rt. 9A) between Grasslands Road (NYS Rt. 100) and the Village of Elmsford is a significant truck route with travel in this corridor difficult due to the number of trucks, the narrow roadway width, bottlenecks and tight turning radii. The parkways passing through unincorporated Greenburgh do not permit truck traffic. The Bronx River Parkway and Saw Mill River Parkway were not designed to accommodate large vehicles. The Sprain Brook Parkway, while engineered in a manner to support truck use, was always intended for use by non-commercial vehicles. The Town of Greenburgh supports the restriction of trucks on this parkway because of its close proximity to existing residential areas.

The Route 9A Bypass is a planned roadway improvement project that would remove significant truck traffic from portions of Route 9A, provide better access for the non-residential destinations of trucks, reduce overall vehicular congestion, and facilitate land-use changes along the corridor. Section 9.4.1 discusses the Bypass further while Section 12.8.2 elaborates on related future land-use considerations.

9.3. Transportation System Management

9.3.1. Road Network and Functional Classification

The roadways traversing unincorporated Greenburgh are divided into four major classifications based on American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) standards. The roadway classifications are shown on Figure 9.7.

- **Interstates/Principal Arterials** are routes that carry most of the trips entering and leaving unincorporated Greenburgh, as well as significant intra-area travel. Interstate 287 (Cross Westchester Expressway) is a heavily traveled east-west highway that connects Rockland County and New Jersey to Interstate 95 (New England Thruway) in Connecticut. Interstate 87 (New York State Thruway) is an important north-south arterial that connects New York City to the New York State/Canadian border. Interstate 87 merges with Interstate 287 in unincorporated Greenburgh near Taxter Road and, as a merged highway, crosses the Tappan Zee Bridge into Rockland County. The Sprain Brook Parkway, Saw Mill River Parkway and Bronx River Parkway are limited access Principal Arterials providing alternate travel for passenger vehicles in a north-south direction.

- **Minor Arterials** are streets that interconnect with and augment the Principal Arterial routes and accommodate trips of moderate length. Minor Arterials provide access to highways and major shopping or business destinations. Minor Arterials include Route 119 (White Plains/Tarrytown Road), Route 100 (both Central Park Avenue and Hillside Avenue), Route 100A (Knollwood Road/West Hartsdale Avenue), Route 100B (Dobbs Ferry Road), Route 100C (Grasslands Road), Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road), East Hartsdale Avenue, Jackson Avenue and Ardsley Road.
Figure 9.6: Major Truck Routes
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Collector Streets connect Principal or Minor Arterials to retail, office and residential neighborhoods. Collector streets often enter into residential neighborhoods. Some of the more recognizable collector streets are Fort Hill Road, Henry Street, Old Army Road, Payne Street, Ridge Road, Secor Road, Sprain Road, Taxter Road, and Underhill Road.

Local Streets serve travel within neighborhoods and developments and provide direct access to all abutting lands. Local streets are generally located in residential areas. These roadways generally provide good access to collector streets; however, there are clusters of neighborhoods that have limited access and some large parcels of land that inhibit the ability to provide better connectivity. Connectivity enhances the mobility of emergency and municipal services and allows residents to utilize more efficient options. Dead-end roads and roadway networks that require circuitous routing contribute to longer vehicle trips, inefficient snow plowing, inefficient refuse and recycling pickup, longer emergency response times and increased carbon emissions. Needing to travel even a few blocks out of the way can reduce the likelihood that people will choose to walk or bicycle. When feasible, newly constructed roads should be connected to the existing road network to provide as many circulation options as possible.

Although unincorporated Greenburgh is responsible for its local and collector streets, it has no formally adopted roadway design manual. The lack of a roadway design manual can require construction of a street that is out of scale with its surroundings. The creation of a manual with organized standards that include roadway design, access and driveway spacing, location and design criteria for accommodating transit stops and accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians would provide clearer direction for public and private roadway improvements.
Figure 9.7: Road Classification
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9.3.2. Travel Trends

Table 9.1 summarizes the travel modes used by both unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County residents. In general, the modes of travel are similar for unincorporated Greenburgh and for Westchester County residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Travel</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car, truck or van</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive alone</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car pooled</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus or trolley bus</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street car or trolley car</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway or elevated</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferryboat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi, motorcycle, other</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at home</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Workers Age 16+

22,091                      442,922

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B08006 (12 December 2012)
Table 9.2 summarizes vehicle availability for owner-occupied and renter-occupied housing. The average percentage of vehicles per household in unincorporated Greenburgh was higher than the County average for owner-occupied housing but lower for renter-occupied housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicles Available</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No vehicle</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 vehicle</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vehicles</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more vehicles</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Renter-Occupied Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicles Available</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No vehicle</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 vehicle</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 vehicles</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more vehicles</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B25044 (12 December 2012)

Table 9.3 depicts the workplace destination of Town of Greenburgh residents. Approximately 23 percent of Town of Greenburgh residents live and work within the Town. A comparable number of residents (24.5 percent) commute to Manhattan. The average commute time for Town of Greenburgh residents was 32 minutes in 2009. Approximately 53 percent of residents reported commuting under 30 minutes while 18 percent commuted over 60 minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Destination</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYC (Manhattan)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Greenburgh</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Westchester County</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of NYC (Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of White Plains</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland, Nassau, Orange, Dutchess, Putnam and Suffolk Counties</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3.3. Traffic Volumes

Travel demand is an important metric in transportation planning. Traffic volumes are collected on roadways and summarized for a daily total and for peak hours (generally the AM and PM commuter hour). This information can be maintained over time to determine fluctuations in traffic levels. Traffic volume data was obtained from the NYSDOT. Locally, the Greenburgh Police Department owns traffic counting equipment and performs counts as needed or requested; however, there is no formal database that maintains or tracks the traffic volume information.

Figure 9.8 shows the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes. These volumes were reported by the NYSDOT and represent the year 2013 for the AADT. AADT volumes were found to range from 5,901 vehicles per day (vpd) on Route 100 (Hillside Avenue) near the northern Town boundary to 121,920 vpd on I-87/I-287 (western Town boundary). Other noted AADT volumes include:

- Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road, at the northern boundary) – 19,744 vpd
- Route 100 (Central Park Ave.) near West Hartsdale Avenue – 24,144 vpd
- Route 119 (Tarrytown Road, near Dunnings Drive) – 26,469 vpd
- Jackson Avenue (near Town line) – 15,862 vpd
- Ardsley Road – (Sprain Road to Route 100) – 9,201 vpd

Peak hour volumes were found to range from 558 vehicles per hour (vph) on Route 100B (Dobbs Ferry Road) west of the Sprain Brook Parkway to 9,795 vph on the Sprain Brook Parkway near the northerly Town boundary. Other noted peak hour volumes include:

- Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road) (northern boundary) – 1,533 vph
- Route 100 (Central Park Ave.) near West Hartsdale Avenue – 2,063 vph
- Route 119 (Tarrytown Road) (near Dunnings Drive) – 2,603 vph
- Route 100A (West Hartsdale Ave.) near Dobbs Ferry Road – 1,130 vph

The travel demand model uses trip generation (origins and destinations), trip distribution (distribution of trips among destinations), modal-split (trips by mode) and trip assignment (paths taken by each trip).
Figure 9.8: Annual Average Daily Traffic Volumes (2013)
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Historic traffic count data, obtained from the NYSDOT, is summarized in Table 9.4. In general, traffic volumes have been decreasing on State roadways. Some volume fluctuations may be attributed to traffic delays and backups caused by the reconstruction of I-287. Although it is not documented, travelers may have used other routes or modes of transportation. The prevalence of working from home also may play a role in fluctuations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AADT Volume (year)</th>
<th>AADT Volume (year)</th>
<th>AADT Volume (year)</th>
<th>AADT Volume (year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road)</td>
<td>Route 100 B (Dobbs Ferry Road)</td>
<td>14,400 (00)</td>
<td>13,410 (03)</td>
<td>13,130 (06)</td>
<td>12,091 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 100C (Grasslands Road)</td>
<td>21,090 (96)</td>
<td>21,040 (02)</td>
<td>20,220 (06)</td>
<td>19,744 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-87</td>
<td>Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road) - Ardsley</td>
<td>29,850 (04)</td>
<td>28,140 (07)</td>
<td>27,450 (10)</td>
<td>27,530 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rockland line</td>
<td>62,980 (98)</td>
<td>58,680 (01)</td>
<td>76,820 (04)</td>
<td>84,500 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 100 (Central Park Avenue/ Hillside Avenue)</td>
<td>Route 100A (West Hartsdale Avenue)</td>
<td>25,660 (00)</td>
<td>27,580 (03)</td>
<td>24,530 (06)</td>
<td>24,900 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-287</td>
<td>10,660 (99)</td>
<td>12,790 (02)</td>
<td>13,720 (05)</td>
<td>11,660 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Road</td>
<td>5,060 (00)</td>
<td>8,010 (03)</td>
<td>5,920 (06)</td>
<td>5,980 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 100A (West Hartsdale Road/ Knollwood Road)</td>
<td>Route 100B (Dobbs Ferry Road)</td>
<td>13,580 (99)</td>
<td>15,140 (02)</td>
<td>15,370 (05)</td>
<td>11,960 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-287</td>
<td>23,050 (97)</td>
<td>19,480 (00)</td>
<td>20,080 (04)</td>
<td>20,940 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 100C (Grasslands Road)</td>
<td>8,720 (02)</td>
<td>9,770 (03)</td>
<td>7,350 (06)</td>
<td>11,780 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 100B (Dobbs Ferry Road)</td>
<td>Route 100A (West Hartsdale Avenue/Knollwood Road)</td>
<td>16,100 (00)</td>
<td>18,630 (03)</td>
<td>16,170 (06)</td>
<td>16,380 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 119 (Tarrytown Road)</td>
<td>10,830 (00)</td>
<td>12,530 (03)</td>
<td>10,090 (06)</td>
<td>10,170 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 100C (Grasslands Road)</td>
<td>Old Saw Mill Road</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11,650 (02)</td>
<td>15,480 (05)</td>
<td>4,540 (08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 100 (Hillside Avenue)</td>
<td>17,730 (00)</td>
<td>21,880 (03)</td>
<td>19,400 (06)</td>
<td>23,010 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benedict Avenue</td>
<td>13,570 (00)</td>
<td>15,250 (04)</td>
<td>11,960 (07)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-87/I-287</td>
<td>29,850 (04)</td>
<td>28,140 (07)</td>
<td>27,450 (10)</td>
<td>27,530 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saw Mill River Parkway</td>
<td>20,350 (00)</td>
<td>25,870 (03)</td>
<td>20,850 (06)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road)</td>
<td>26,900 (00)</td>
<td>27,890 (03)</td>
<td>25,200 (06)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 100B (Dobbs Ferry Road)</td>
<td>19,880 (00)</td>
<td>22,510 (03)</td>
<td>18,610 (06)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 100 (Central Avenue) overlap</td>
<td>28,340 (00)</td>
<td>29,000 (03)</td>
<td>26,250 (06)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-287</td>
<td>Route 100 (Central Avenue)</td>
<td>134,560 (00)</td>
<td>138,560 (02)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New York State Department of Transportation and Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. 2008; updated by Dept. of CD&C (Greenburgh)
Traffic counts were also obtained from Westchester County for County roads. Table 9.5 summarizes these counts.

### Table 9.5 Traffic Count Data Summary – Westchester County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Beginning Point</th>
<th>Ending Point</th>
<th>Average Annual Daily Traffic (year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road)</td>
<td>Sprain Road (south)</td>
<td>17,557 (08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx River Parkway</td>
<td>Yonkers city line</td>
<td>White Plains city line</td>
<td>38,258 (06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx River Parkway</td>
<td>Greenburgh town line</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant town line</td>
<td>19,069 (08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Road</td>
<td>Route 100 (Hillside Avenue)</td>
<td>Bronx River Parkway</td>
<td>11,463 (08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict Avenue</td>
<td>Tarrytown village line</td>
<td>Route 119 (Tarrytown Road)</td>
<td>14,521 (n/a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley Road</td>
<td>Route 100 (Central Avenue)</td>
<td>Scarsdale village line</td>
<td>15,212 (07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>Route 100 (Central Avenue)</td>
<td>Bronx River Parkway</td>
<td>14,350 (07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Road</td>
<td>Sprain Road</td>
<td>Hillcrest Road</td>
<td>5,059 (n/a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprain Road</td>
<td>Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>Ardsley Road</td>
<td>5,028 (06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/a = Not Available

Source: Westchester County DOT and provided by Fitzgerald & Halladay, Inc. in 2010

9.3.4 Traffic Congestion

Traffic volumes can indicate the travel demand for a roadway, but do not indicate the operational performance (i.e. capacity of road to handle volume). A “roadway link capacity” evaluation, which determines the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio, can be useful for determining and managing roadway congestion. NYMTC evaluates roadway segments as part of its congestion management system. This data should be obtained annually to complement local congestion management systems.

There are intersections in unincorporated Greenburgh that are prone to vehicular congestion. Many of these locations primarily experience congestion at times of workweek rush hours; however, some of the intersections also are congested at various times on weekends. Figure 9.9 depicts the locations where traffic congestion in the Town is most commonly encountered. Some of the congestion is attributed to the fact that a few of the Town’s local transportation routes, such as East Hartsdale Avenue and Ardsley Road, are significant east-west networks with regional traffic. Other minor arterials and local roads also become overburdened when through traffic detours to avoid congestion on the principal arterials such as I-287.
Figure 9.9: Vehicular Peak Time Congestion Areas*

Legend
- Red: Vehicular Peak Time Congestion Areas (Unincorporated Greenburgh)
- Orange: Selected Vehicular Peak Time Congestion Areas (outside of Unincorporated Greenburgh)

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Produced by: Town of Greenburgh: Sarah Pavlick-Iczek
Data Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced: July 2015

* Does not include highway congestion.
There is no singular solution or simple fix for existing traffic congestion. A multi-faceted approach is most appropriate, and, at best, can minimize congestion. Enhancing the safety and efficiency of all modes of transportation, coordination with regional transportation planning partners and site plan review in connection with individual development projects are steps that can ease traffic congestion.

### 9.3.5. Road Safety

Another metric used in the planning of a safe and efficient transportation system is crash data. Records maintained by the Town of Greenburgh Police Department provide information on traffic accidents, including: location, amount of damage, severity of injuries, cause, and contributing factors. It is prudent to examine crash data on a routine basis to identify trends. Locations that experience a consistently high number of accidents may be locations requiring safety related improvements. Table 9.6 notes the number of accidents that were reported at various intersections over a three year period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley Road at Fort Hill Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley Road at Central Avenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 100 A (West Hartsdale Avenue/Knollwood Road) at Route 100 B (Dobbs Ferry Road)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hartsdale Avenue at Rockledge Road</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Avenue at Grassy Sprain Road</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Avenue at Sprain Brook Parkway</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road) at Lamont Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road) at Payne Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 119 (Tarrytown Road) at Fulton Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 119 (Tarrytown Road) at Hillside Avenue</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 119 (Tarrytown Road) at Manhattan Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc. and Greenburgh Police Department.*
9.3.6. Traffic Calming

Traffic calming, as defined by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), is the combination of measures that alter driver behavior and improve safety conditions. Traffic calming can be a self-enforcing traffic management approach. Techniques may include education, enforcement or engineering to shift traffic patterns or to reduce speed.

Roadway narrowing, speed humps (e.g., Columbia Avenue), raised intersections (e.g., South Washington Avenue), flashing yellow lights (e.g., Taxter Road), radar feedback signs (e.g., Benedict Avenue), “Do Not Block the Box” pavement markings (e.g., NYS Rt. 100A), traffic circles (e.g., Fulton Park), signage and other traffic calming techniques have been utilized in unincorporated Greenburgh. Raised crosswalks on East Hartsdale Avenue are present near the Hartsdale Train Station to facilitate safe pedestrian movement. Successful traffic calming programs involve public participation and local coordination to develop reasonable solutions that address neighborhood concerns. Some traffic calming measures, such as signage, painted crosswalks and speed humps, have also been successfully incorporated into new development projects. Suggestions from the public have been the impetus for a number of amendments to the Vehicle and Traffic regulations found in Chapter 460 of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh. All amendments to these regulations must be recommended by the Chief of Police.

9.3.7. Access Management

Access Management is a transportation planning tool that identifies the optimum number and locations of driveway access points to help sustain the capacity of roadways, decrease the need for additional road widening, and minimize excessive curb cuts. When successfully implemented, access management preserves the safe and efficient flow of traffic while increasing pedestrian safety by minimizing the number of vehicle access points that pedestrians cross. From a design perspective, the location of site ingress/egress points, side/cross streets, signals, medians, and turn lanes, all contribute to safe utilization of roadway systems. Access management includes curb cut plans for driveways and intersections, along with regulations to manage ingress/egress of future developments onto a roadway.
On commercial or mixed-use properties, a preponderance of free-standing buildings with individual curb cuts and no adjacent site interconnections, reduces safety and contributes to a lack of cohesive aesthetic conditions. Graduated density zoning, a concept highlighted in Section 12.7 of this Plan, provides a process that can incentivize property owners to implement access management policies.

### 9.3.8. Safe Routes to School

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a Federal, State and local effort to encourage and enable children to walk and bicycle to school to reduce traffic, improve air quality and improve the health of children. It strives to make walking and bicycling to school safe and appealing. The goal of New York’s Safe Routes to School Program is to assist New York communities in developing, planning, and implementing projects and programs that encourage safe and efficient walking and bicycling to school. Each year the Seeley Place School in the Edgemont School District participates in International Walk to School Day.

### 9.4. Transportation Planning Initiatives

As part of its comprehensive plan, *Westchester 2025*, Westchester County identified 16 important corridors, three of which are partially located in unincorporated Greenburgh: (1) Route 119 (White Plains/Tarrytown Road); (2) Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road); and (3) Route 100 (Central Park Avenue). Each of these corridors is the subject of local, County, State and Federal planning initiatives. This Plan supports implementing policies that will strengthen the viability of these three corridors in connection with existing transportation strengths and proposed transportation improvements, in concert with community needs.

#### 9.4.1. Regional Transportation Partners

Regional planning partners, including Westchester County, local municipalities, New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) and the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC), are coordinating significant transportation improvement projects that will affect transportation conditions in unincorporated Greenburgh and will also facilitate potential development investments. Major projects include the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement and related mass transit options, the Central Park Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, and the Route 9A Bypass.

BRT is an innovative, high capacity, lower cost (when compared to rail) public transit solution that can significantly improve mobility. It is a permanent, integrated system that uses buses or specialized vehicles on roadways or dedicated rights-of-way to transport passengers to their destinations efficiently. BRT systems can be customized to community needs and incorporate state-of-the-art, low-cost technologies, such as prepay stations and limited stops that result in quicker routes than traditional bus systems.
Tappan Zee Bridge Replacement is a significant regional transportation initiative that will impact unincorporated Greenburgh. The scope of the planned bridge replacement project has varied among several design alternatives. These include mass transit throughout a larger 30-mile I-287 Corridor Project across Westchester and Rockland counties to the approved iteration which called for a bridge replacement only. The approved bridge design, however, reportedly does not preclude future mass transit-related and construction operations. Construction commenced in 2013. Land use and travel patterns will be affected, especially in the Route 119 (White Plains-Tarrytown Road) corridor.

Residents of unincorporated Greenburgh, elected officials and Town staff, as well as other stakeholders, have participated in the planning and review of this project from its inception through representation at Community Working Group Meetings and the Transit Oriented Development Technical Assistance Initiatives. Due to the numerous benefits of a mass transit component, planning partnerships with local and regional agencies will be continued as bridge construction progresses. Connections between planned development and transportation improvements, consistent with the tenets of this Plan, are discussed in Section 12.8.2.
Central Park Avenue Bus Rapid Transit is a County initiated transportation improvement plan that would benefit unincorporated Greenburgh and the region. An assessment for the Central Park Avenue BRT was completed in the summer of 2009 by the Westchester County Department of Transportation (subsequently merged with the Westchester County Department of Public Works). The County’s BRT project report depicts potential stations and/or stops at prominent intersections, such as Hartsdale Avenue, Marion Avenue, Underhill Road, Old Army Road and Ardsley Road.

The County has completed design of Transit Signal Priority (TSP) for Central Avenue. The TSP system will be the first component of BRT to be implemented. Construction of the TSP system is expected to take place in 2015. It has been determined that elements of BRT will be implemented in phases based on inter-jurisdictional approvals and funding availability.

View looking northbound towards the intersection of East/West Hartsdale Avenue and Central Park Avenue (“Four Corners”)

The land-use and future land-use sections of this Plan (Chapter 12.0) have zoning policies that are specific to the existing commercial corridors. While the creation of attractive, pedestrian-scaled development in appropriate areas is not dependent upon a BRT system, the creation of BRT stations could enhance the viability of these Planning Areas.

Route 9A Bypass is a transportation proposal with a goal of creating more efficient truck transit in portions of unincorporated Greenburgh and the Village of Elmsford. The NYSDOT first prepared a Bypass study for the Route 9A (Saw Mill River Road) corridor in 1986. Alternatives included improvements to the existing right-of-way and a partial and/or full Bypass road off Route 9A. Initial public meetings were conducted in 2002. The NYSDOT is currently evaluating a Bypass alignment that would provide access to
the Fairview Industrial Park. In 2015 New York State allocated $2,000,000 in design funding for this project.

From a future land-use perspective, potential benefits of a Bypass are articulated in Section 12.8.2 in connection with the “Greenburgh/Elmsford Route 9A Planning Area.” The ease of circulation for trucks serving industrial, office and other businesses in the unincorporated Greenburgh and Village of Elmsford portions of Route 9A would increase efficiency of business opportunities, although it would be more efficient if it connected further north.

Figure 9.10 shows the approximate area of a potential Route 9A Bypass in Elmsford and depicts an envisioned component in the Village of Ardsley, where a new northbound entrance ramp could connect to the New York State Thruway (I-287). This ramp would further reduce the numbers of trucks using the Rt. 9A corridor along an approximate 5.25 mile stretch.

**9.4.2. Planned and Programmed Improvements**

NYMTC, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) that administers the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the NYSDOT, coordinates significant projects in, or adjacent to, unincorporated Greenburgh. The TIP is a five-year plan that identifies all proposed federally funded projects. The current TIP is for the 2011-2015 TIP period and was adopted on August 15, 2011.

The following is a listing of transportation projects/plans in or adjacent to unincorporated Greenburgh:

- Bridge replacement/rehabilitation of the Bronx River Parkway over the Bronx River and the Metro-North Harlem Division at Crane Road
- Cross Westchester Expressway (I-287) rehabilitation with operational and safety improvements including installation of Intelligent Transportation System, currently in Stage 3. (Exit 8E reconstruction began in 2010)
- New York State Thruway Authority improvements to I-87, including pavement rehabilitation, noise barriers, Intelligent Transportation System and operational improvements to the toll barriers
- Metro-North Railroad plans - investing in rolling stock and station improvements, and a major strategic intermodal facility/parking expansion at North White Plains
- Westchester County’s focus - the maintenance of bus service with continued vehicle replacement, rehabilitation and enhancements to bus stops and bus garages, and continued funding of the Westchester County SMART COMMUTE Program.
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects, including the completion of the South County Trailway

Table 9.7 lists the programmed roadway projects in unincorporated Greenburgh.
Figure 9.10: Potential Rt. 9A Bypass

Legend
- Potential Location of Rt. 9A ramp to Thruway
- Potential 9A bypass ramp to I-87/I-287 exit
- Potential Rt. 9A to have Significantly Less Truck Traffic (approx. 5.25 miles)
- Highways and Interstates
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency PIN</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (millions) for 5-Year Program</th>
<th>FFY (Initial Funding)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 821670</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Pkwy; Cross Westchester Expy to I-684.</td>
<td>Improve capacity and efficiency of the traffic network, including signalization.</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 821671</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Pkwy, I-287 to I-684.</td>
<td>Installation of fiber optics cable.</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 821681</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Pkwy/Route 9A (Saw Mill River Rd).</td>
<td>Replace existing deficient bridge with no addition of lanes.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 821669</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Pkwy to Cross Westchester Expy.</td>
<td>Improve capacity and efficiency of the traffic network, including signalization.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 810628</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Pkwy over Route 119 (Tarrytown Road)</td>
<td>Bridge replacement.</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>Pre-2008</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester 811013</td>
<td>Bronx River Pkwy/Bronx River and MNR at Crane Road</td>
<td>Bridge rehabilitation.</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 810622</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Pkwy from Bronx River Pkwy to I-287/Cross Westchester Expy.</td>
<td>Improve capacity and efficiency of the traffic network, including signalization.</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 810623</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Pkwy from I-287/Cross Westchester Expy to Taconic State Pkwy.</td>
<td>Improve capacity and efficiency of the traffic network, including signalization.</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 810322</td>
<td>Route 9A (Saw Mill River Rd), Route 119 (Tarrytown Road), Executive Blvd.</td>
<td>New/reconstruction of Route 9A, which is 4 lanes undivided into 4 lanes divided with left-turn lanes. Improve existing sidewalks and add new.</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 802304</td>
<td>Route 100A (Knollwood Rd) and 100B (Dobbs Ferry Road).</td>
<td>Intersection improvements, resurface pavement restoration, minor drainage improvements.</td>
<td>4.905</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 802016</td>
<td>Route 119 (Tarrytown Rd) at Route 100A (Knollwood Road).</td>
<td>Intersection reconstruction, Stage 1, split from PIN 8020.11.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT 802017</td>
<td>Route 119 (Tarrytown Road) at Route 100B (Dobbs Ferry Road).</td>
<td>Intersection reconstruction, Stage 2, split from PIN 8020.11.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.5 Environment

Transportation planning that coincides with land-use planning should support strategies to minimize carbon footprint. Currently, the transportation sector is the largest contributor to local and regional air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. It is the fastest growing carbon dioxide source in the United States, with emission rates rising two percent per year. The 2009 National Household Transportation Survey finds that 53 percent of all trips in metropolitan areas are three miles or less and 30 percent of these trips are one mile or less. However, 60 percent of trips under one mile are by automobile. This is a decrease of 5 percent from the 2001 survey and can be attributed to an improvement in infrastructure in communities. Biking and walking make up 11.9 percent of all trips in the country, up from 9.5 percent in 2001.

9.6 Parking

Parking location and supply influence the makeup of a community. In unincorporated Greenburgh’s one-family residence districts, off-street parking spaces are situated on each lot, with on-street parking permitted in some areas. Commercial and multi-family site off-street parking is primarily comprised of surface parking lots and multi-level or interior parking structures. On-street metered parking is located in the East Hartsdale Avenue corridor and along portions of Tarrytown Road and Central Park Avenue. Parking in existing and proposed commercial and mixed-use districts, shared parking strategies and “park once” policies are discussed in Section 9.6.1 through 9.6.3.

9.6.1. Off-Street Parking (Existing Commercial Districts)

Existing zoning regulations, such as the landscape buffer requirement, have helped to improve the aesthetics of commercial corridors; however, the orientation of surface parking lots and the numbers of parking spaces required in many commercial districts have produced auto-oriented developments. Auto-oriented developments are sites designed with minimal or no pedestrian considerations and typically include a freestanding building surrounded by expansive surface parking lots.

In 2009, in coordination with Westchester County, NYMTC sponsored a parking management workshop for unincorporated Greenburgh. The workshop was led by Michael R. Kodama of Michael R. Kodama Planning Consultants and focused on parking in the Central Avenue corridor. The workshop led to the development of the Town of Greenburgh Parking Management Workshop Final Report, published in July of 2009. It contains a set of guiding principles based on increasing economic vitality, reducing traffic impacts and creating a “sense of place.” Because Central Park Avenue shares design traits and parking challenges with unincorporated Greenburgh’s other non-residential areas, many of the policy recommendations contained in the Town of Greenburgh Parking Management Workshop Final Report are addressed as part of this Plan and have been applied beyond the Central Park Avenue corridor.

On-street parking is prohibited in most areas from December 1st to March 15th between the hours of 1:00am and 6:00am.
The Town of Greenburgh Parking Management Workshop Final Report found that throughout most of the Central Park Avenue corridor, excessive off-street parking capacity exists. A review of existing off-street parking requirements suggests that minimum parking requirements are excessive. Procedurally, applicants often seek a parking waiver or a parking variance to occupy vacant and existing commercial square footage with new uses. Simplified and more flexible parking standards for commercial shopping districts could contribute to increased economic vitality.

9.6.2. Shared Parking

Shared parking programs can enable a reduction in overall parking requirements. Unincorporated Greenburgh currently has two shared parking policies as part of its Zoning Ordinance:

- The Planning Board, upon recommendation by the Building Inspector, may reduce the total parking requirement on parcels with two or more uses, when one or more such uses will be generating a demand for parking spaces primarily during periods when the other use or uses is not or are not in operation.

- An approving Board, by special permit, can approve accessory parking spaces for a particular lot on an adjacent lot within 250 feet of the subject lot, subject to an easement or restrictive covenant.

These provisions facilitate greater opportunities to efficiently use vacant commercial spaces. Alternatives to easements or restrictive covenants should be explored, to encourage additional shared parking opportunities.

9.6.3. “Park Once” Policy

A “Park Once” program can help create a pedestrian-friendly environment. Parking facilities (on-street and off-street, private and public) should be designed so that visitors to an area are within a comfortable walking distance of more than one destination. Advanced technologies such as digital parking meters can facilitate flexible stay time and ease of payment options, and promote more efficient parking.

Developments containing active frontages, a mix of land uses, pedestrian connections within adjacent sites, and access management utilization allow one to park in one place and make several pedestrian stops rather than driving from one destination to another.

The downtown Hartsdale train station area and the related Hartsdale Public Parking District is the best example of a park once node in unincorporated Greenburgh. Users of the existing structured parking or on-street parking spaces have access to a train station and a variety of commercial businesses within close proximity. In other portions of unincorporated Greenburgh, infill development, pedestrian friendly site alterations and site-to-site connections can help retrofit districts to minimize the need for multiple automobile trips.
At the intersection of East Hartsdale Avenue and Central Park Avenue, known as Four Corners, numerous vacancies of spaces traditionally leased with commercial uses may partially be attributed to a lack of off-street parking. There are existing parking spaces nearby at the Hartsdale Public Parking District’s “Site C”; however, these spaces are routinely at or close to capacity during the winter months in the evening when the Town’s snow ordinance is in effect. On street spaces on Central Park Avenue North provide parking; however, these spaces may not be adequate if all of the vacancies were filled with new businesses or offices.

**Figure 9.10: Hartsdale Public Parking District**
9.7. Transportation, Mobility & Access Goals, Objectives & Policies

Goal 9.1.: Promote safe and connected pedestrian infrastructure in appropriate areas.

Objective 9.1.1.: Facilitate a safe and walkable environment.

Policy 9.1.1.1.: Require new or expanded development to install sidewalks in locations consistent with Figure 9.1.

Policy 9.1.1.2.: Coordinate with appropriate regional entities (County, NYSDOT) to install sidewalks in locations consistent with Figure 9.1.

Policy 9.1.1.3.: Promote Safe Route to School Initiatives, including “walking school buses” and walking connections to local schools.

Policy 9.1.1.4.: Where appropriate, require new development to be pedestrian scaled/oriented.

Policy 9.1.1.5.: Where appropriate, consider incorporating pedestrian-only traffic lights and diagonal cross-walks.

Policy 9.1.1.6.: Explore the feasibility of alternative funding and enabling mechanisms for the purposes of facilitating new sidewalk construction in locations consistent with Figure 9.1.

Policy 9.1.1.7.: On heavily used roads, explore the feasibility of maintaining and plowing sidewalks as a Town service.

Goal 9.2.: Promote safe and connected bicycle infrastructure in appropriate areas.

Objective 9.2.1.: Provide enhanced opportunities for bicycling.

Policy 9.2.1.1.: Require new or expanded development to incorporate bicycle racks and/or bicycle storage space for development projects, as appropriate.

Policy 9.2.1.2.: Coordinate with adjacent municipalities and the county on inter-regional greenway projects to enhance access to trails.

Policy 9.2.1.3.: Promote bicycling through site design.

Policy 9.2.1.4.: Advocate for bicycle lanes on roadways where feasible, and consistent with Figure 9.2.

Policy 9.2.1.5.: Advocate for adequate bicycle storage at the Hartsdale train station.
Policy 9.2.1.6.: Inquire with Westchester County about the feasibility of a bike share program associated with County trails (Bronx River Pathway, North/South County Trailway).

Goal 9.3.: Reduce the need for single occupant vehicle use by improving mode choices.

Objective 9.3.1.: Support efforts to provide safe, convenient, accessible and cost effective public bus transportation.

Policy 9.3.1.1.: Require, where appropriate, that new developments along the Central Avenue and Tappan Zee Bridge/I-287/Tarrytown Road corridors, in coordination with Westchester County or other regional entity, be compatible with BRT planning and include provisions for transit access easements.

Policy 9.3.1.2.: Explore locations for park & ride spaces, to encourage mass transit use.

Policy 9.3.1.3.: Require, where appropriate and approved by Westchester County, that new or expanded development along bus routes provide bus stops and provisions for shelters, information kiosks, and/or bus pull outs.

Policy 9.3.1.4.: Require, where appropriate, residential developments to provide shuttle service to train stations and nearby bus stops.

Policy 9.3.1.5.: Work with Westchester County to enhance commuter shuttle service to existing transportation hubs.

Goal 9.4.: Promote flexible standards correlated to roadway usage.

Objective 9.4.1.: Design, maintain and improve unincorporated Greenburgh’s roadways consistent with existing roadway classifications and this Plan.

Policy 9.4.1.1.: Create a roadway design manual, based on the Complete Street concept, that complements the existing roadway classification system and can be tailored to accommodate local needs and conditions.

Objective 9.4.2.: Minimize the number of curb cuts along minor arterials and collector streets.

Policy 9.4.2.1.: Require that site design utilize access management techniques, where appropriate.
Goal 9.5.: Consider future roadway circulation as part of development proposal review or transportation improvement projects.

Objective 9.5.1.: Identify future opportunities to enhance roadway connectivity.

Policy 9.5.1.1.: Discourage dead-end and looped residential streets, where the new roadways will not promote “cut through” traffic.

Policy 9.5.1.2.: Plan for efficient east-west mobility enhancements in the Town.

Policy 9.5.1.3.: In conjunction with land development review, consider future roadway connection alternatives.

Goal 9.6.: Address roadways that experience, or are expected to experience, congestion.

Objective 9.6.1.: Plan and prioritize congestion mitigation measures.

Policy 9.6.1.1.: Coordinate with NYMTC to receive updated roadway congestion management system data.

Policy 9.6.1.2.: Actively participate in the SEQR reviews of adjoining municipalities where adverse impacts may occur to unincorporated Greenburgh’s roadway system.

Policy 9.6.1.3.: Develop a roadway link capacity evaluation to determine and manage roadway congestion.

Policy 9.6.1.4.: Coordinate with NYSDOT to synchronize stop lights and review the potential for turning arrows (Underhill Road/Central Park Avenue), etc., on state and local roads, and to potentially and strategically remove ‘No Turn on Red’ restrictions from Central Park Avenue onto side streets where safety is not compromised.

Goal 9.7.: Continue to identify locations with accident history.

Objective 9.7.1.: Plan and prioritize safety improvements based on accident data.

Policy 9.7.1.1.: Continue to utilize unincorporated Greenburgh’s safety management system to annually track and have access to accident history.

Policy 9.7.1.2.: Consider safety enhancement needs when reviewing development applications and transportation projects.

Policy 9.7.1.3.: Continue to evaluate, prioritize and approve, where appropriate, traffic calming requests.
Goal 9.8.: Maximize the positive benefits of regional transportation project investments.

Objective 9.8.1.: Continue to support initiatives consistent with the tenets of this Plan related to the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement and potential BRT along the Rt. 119 and Central Park Avenue corridors, respectively.

Policy 9.8.1.1.: Continue to participate actively with regional transportation entities and advocate for improvements consistent with this Plan.

Goal 9.9.: Promote community character as a component of the transportation system.

Objective 9.9.1.: Plan for and implement roadway system changes to contribute to unincorporated Greenburgh’s sense of place.

Policy 9.9.1.1.: Create aesthetic gateways for the travelling public entering the Town.

Policy 9.9.1.2.: Minimize sign clutter.

Policy 9.9.1.3.: Identify candidates for designation as scenic roadways and viewsheds.

Goal 9.10.: Promote green transportation initiatives and energy conservation.

Objective 9.10.1.: Promote healthy neighborhoods with a transportation system that protects and improves environmental quality.

Policy 9.10.1.1.: Explore options for placing charging stations for plug-in electric and/or hybrid vehicles.

Policy 9.10.1.2.: Continue to expand the use of energy efficient vehicles in the municipal fleet.

Policy 9.10.1.3.: Promote programs that reduce single-occupant vehicle use, such as ride share, transit assistance, van pools, shuttle services, guaranteed ride home, alternate work hours and working from home.

Policy 9.10.1.4.: Encourage/support car-sharing providers in and around existing multi-family residence clusters and existing office/business districts.
**Goal 9.11.:** Ensure that transportation components of proposed future development support desired future land-use form.

**Objective 9.11.1.:** Promote parking standards that are matched to demand and complement surrounding land-use.

**Policy 9.11.1.1.:** Update minimum non-residential off-street parking requirements based on concepts established in the 21st Century Land Development Code or equivalent accepted industry standards.

**Policy 9.11.1.2.:** Consider adding maximum non-residential off-street parking provisions.

**Policy 9.11.1.3.:** Facilitate parking spaces for compact vehicles, where appropriate.

**Policy 9.11.1.4.:** Apply flexible parking standards when dedicated car-sharing, jitney buses, and close proximity to existing or proposed mass transit is required or available.

**Policy 9.11.1.5.:** Provide flexible mechanisms for land-banking parking spaces.

**Policy 9.11.1.6.:** Explore alternatives to easements or restrictive covenants, to encourage additional shared parking opportunities

**Goal 9.12: Create a “Park Once” policy**

**Objective 9.12.1:** Reduce the need for multiple trips within adjacent and nearby sites along commercial corridors.

**Policy 9.12.1.1:** Require pedestrian connectivity in adjoining sites, where appropriate.

**Policy 9.12.1.2:** Encourage the use of structured parking facilities to allow for infill development that connects developments.

**Policy 9.12.1.3:** Support graduated density zoning that can facilitate the combining of lots and related reduction of separate curb cuts.

**Policy 9.12.1.4:** Explore the potential to expand off-street parking options in the vicinity of Four Corners, working with the Hartsdale Public Parking District.
CHAPTER 10.0 Demographics and Housing

10.1 Relationship to Guiding Principles

The location, density and types of housing within a community should provide a spectrum of residential opportunities. Unincorporated Greenburgh’s range of one-family and multi-family dwellings and special needs housing provides choices for residents at all income levels, ages, lifestyles and physical capabilities.

Housing policies should be influenced by demographics and population projections and through land-use patterns that protect and enhance established residential neighborhoods. This chapter contains census data that gives context to existing housing stock. Regional projections of population increases are provided that highlight the need to plan for expected growth of a diverse population. Housing should be enhanced by an efficient and accessible transportation system, adequate utilities, connections to open space, and cultural and recreation opportunities, all of which are interrelated guiding principles of this Plan.

10.2 Demographics

Demographics (statistical data on population, age, ethnicity, income, etc.) provide information on current and past conditions and assist in identifying future residential needs. The data in this Chapter was obtained from the eleven census tracts whose boundaries are depicted on Figure 10.1. These eleven tracts are located in unincorporated Greenburgh, except for a few blocks located in census tract 111.01.

10.2.1 Population

Table 10.1 lists the population by census tracts obtained from the most recent 2010 census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract (2010)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107.01</td>
<td>5,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.02</td>
<td>5,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.01</td>
<td>3,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.03</td>
<td>3,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.04</td>
<td>2,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.01</td>
<td>2,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.02</td>
<td>5,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.03</td>
<td>4,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.02</td>
<td>2,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,863</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P001, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P1, (12 December 2012)
Population in unincorporated Greenburgh increased by 1,035 people from 2000 to 2010, a change of approximately two percent.

The significant population increases in Greenburgh from 1950 to 1970 coincide with people moving out of New York City.

Table 10.2 lists population data for unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County from 1940 to 2010. With the exception of a small decrease between 1970 and 1980, population has increased each decade. Both unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County saw large increases in population in the decades between 1940 and 1970. The initial 2010 to 2020 population projection increase for unincorporated Greenburgh was anticipated to be 3%. With the release of recent American Community Survey (ACS) population estimates, which are based on a variety of factors including live births, death rates and new development, the 2020 projection is 8.4%. A large development known as Avalon, which represents 512 units occupied since 2010, represents a relatively large percentage of this increase (over 1,300 new residents).

In order to assess the impacts of future population growth and development within the Town, land use Boards have the authority, in the decision making process through the SEQRA process and/or through the Town Code, including the Zoning Ordinance, to require the mitigation of potential impacts such as traffic and other impacts on air, water, noise and artificial night light pollution. When studies are necessary, the analysis often includes supporting data, and an analysis of the impacts in the context of the project’s specific surrounding area and on impacted corridors. Existing population and projected population growth are important components of these analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>12,869</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>573,558</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>16,295</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>625,816</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>33,585</td>
<td>106%</td>
<td>808,891</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>40,540</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>894,104</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>40,289</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>866,599</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>40,579</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>874,866</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>41,828</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>923,459</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42,863</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>949,113</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (Population Estimate) *</td>
<td>45,269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (Projection) **</td>
<td>46,458</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>985,827</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 (Projection) **</td>
<td>47,852</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1,011,927</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
* Population Estimates, prepared by Westchester County; US Census ACS Estimates
** Westchester County Planning Department, 2011 & U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P001, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P1, (12 December 2012) & (17 August 2005) New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (Demographic and Socioeconomic Forecasting) (-) Represents a decrease
10.2.2 Age

Table 10.3 notes that the median age of residents in both unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County increased between 2000 and 2010. This trend is expected to continue. Similarly, the median age of residents in New York State increased during the same time period. According to census data, the median age statewide rose from 35.9 in 2000 to 38.0 in 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh (weighted mean)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P013, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P13, (12 December 2012)

Table 10.4 lists 2000 and 2010 census data for certain age cohorts. The number of unincorporated Greenburgh residents in the 55-64 and 65+ age cohorts has increased dramatically in the last decade with percentage changes between 2000 and 2010 mirroring those of Westchester County. In 2020, there will be dramatic changes again as the baby-boom generation moves into the 55-64 and 65+ age cohorts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>(11.0%)</td>
<td>(11.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>7,570</td>
<td>7,755</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>6,469</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td>(6.0%)</td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>14,118</td>
<td>13,043</td>
<td>(7.6%)</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41,828</td>
<td>42,863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Westchester County Planning Department, 2011 & U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P001, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P1, (12 December 2012)

(1) Represents a decrease

Planning for future expansions of recreation, transportation and services infrastructure based upon the community’s evolution, and with their input, is necessary.
10.2.3 Ethnicity

Unincorporated Greenburgh is an ethnically diverse community. Table 10.5 lists the ethnicities of residents for the years 2000 and 2010.

Table 10.5: Unincorporated Greenburgh Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24,786</td>
<td>23,322</td>
<td>(5.9%)</td>
<td>(1.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>8,298</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>(9.4%)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3,422</td>
<td>5,797</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4,347</td>
<td>5,235</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more Races</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41,828</td>
<td>42,863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P008, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P9, (12 December 2012)

(-) Represents a decrease

10.2.4 Households

The next several sections contain tables and information based on U.S. Census data. A mini glossary is provided to assist the reader with terms as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, which may differ with definitions established in the Code of the Town of Greenburgh.

**Household** - A person or group of people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence. The number of households equals the number of occupied housing units in a census. Households are classified by type according to the sex of the householder and the presence of relatives. Examples include: householder living alone, married couple family; male householder, no wife present; female householder, no husband present.

**Householder** - The member of a household who lives at a housing unit and owns, is buying, or rents the housing unit. If there is no such person present when the Census Bureau contacts the household, any household member who is at least 15 years old can serve as the householder for the purposes of a census or survey.

**Family Household** - The householder and all (one or more) other people living in the same household who are related to the householder by blood, marriage, or adoption. Examples include Married-Couple, Male Householder and Female Householder.

**Non-Family Household** - A nonfamily household consists of a householder living alone (a one-person household) or where the householder shares the home exclusively with people to whom he/she is not related.
**Household size** - The total number of people living in a housing unit.

**Housing unit** - A single-family house, townhouse, mobile home or trailer, apartment, group of rooms, or single room that is occupied as a separate living quarters or, if vacant, is intended for occupancy as a separate living quarters.

**Occupied Housing Unit** - A housing unit is classified as occupied if it is the current place of residence of the person or group of people living in it at the time of interview, or if the occupants are only temporarily absent from the residence for two months or less, that is, away on vacation or a business trip.

Tables 10.6, 10.7 and 10.8 provide household data for unincorporated Greenburgh with comparisons to Westchester County. The number of households in unincorporated Greenburgh increased 2.6 percent from 2000 to 2010 as compared to a 3.0 percent increase in Westchester County over the same period, as depicted in Table 10.6.

### Table 10.6: Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh</td>
<td>16,001</td>
<td>16,424</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>337,142</td>
<td>347,232</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Projections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020 (Westchester Projection) *</th>
<th>2030 (Westchester Projection) *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362,074</td>
<td>367,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P021, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P18, (12 December 2012) & * August 17, 2005 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (Demographic and Socioeconomic Forecasting))

From 2000 to 2010 unincorporated Greenburgh followed Westchester County’s downward trend in average household size. Average household sizes declined due to lower birth rates, increased divorce rates, delays in marriage and increased longevity producing more single-person senior households. In the years 2020 and 2030 average household projections for Westchester County are very consistent with averages in the years 2000 and 2010 as depicted in Table 10.7.

### Table 10.7: Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change 2000-2010</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh (weighted average)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 (Westchester Projection) *</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 (Westchester Projection) *</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P17, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P17, (12 December 2012) & * August 17, 2005 – New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (Demographic and Socioeconomic Forecasting))
The U.S. Census Bureau divides households into several categories including: single person households, married couples/family, single householder/no spouse and non-family households. Household types in unincorporated Greenburgh were comparable in terms of percentages with those of Westchester County in the years 2000 and 2010, as indicated in Table 10.8.

### Table 10.8: Household Type 2000 & 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh (2000)/Percentage</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh (2010)/Percentage</th>
<th>Westchester County (2000)/Percentage</th>
<th>Westchester County (2010)/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple/Family</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Householder/No Spouse</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P013, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P13, (12 December 2012), U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table P18, (20 December 2012); Westchester County Data Book

### 10.2.5 Income

Unincorporated Greenburgh is a relatively affluent community. Table 10.9 lists median household income and indicates that in 2000 and in 2011, unincorporated Greenburgh’s weighted average median household income exceeded that of Westchester County’s median household income.

### Table 10.9: Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh (Weighted Average Median Household Income)</td>
<td>$87,154</td>
<td>$116,698</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County (Median Household Income)</td>
<td>$63,582</td>
<td>$80,725</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the income data in Table 10.9, Table 10.10 notes that in 2000 and in 2011, per capita income in unincorporated Greenburgh exceeded that of Westchester County.

Table 10.10: Per Capita Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>% Change 2000-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh Weighted Average Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$45,037</td>
<td>$59,923</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County (Per Capita Income)</td>
<td>$36,726</td>
<td>$48,306</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 10.11 indicates that, similar to Westchester County, the largest number of households living below the poverty level in unincorporated Greenburgh is in the category of non-family households. In 2011, a family of four earning less than $22,350 was deemed to be in poverty, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 10.11: Poverty by Household (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married-Couple (Family)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder (Family)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder (Family)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>8,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>14,427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B17017 (12 December 2012)
Table 10.12 lists household income brackets for unincorporated Greenburgh and for Westchester County in 2000 and in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Greenburgh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P052, (12 December 2012) & U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B19001 (12 December 2012)
10.2.6 Housing Ownership
Table 10.13 lists the numbers and percentages of owner-occupied housing units. Compared with Westchester County, a greater percentage of housing units in unincorporated Greenburgh were owner-occupied.

Table 10.13: Owner-Occupied Housing Units 2000 & 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Owner-Occupied 2000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied 2010</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh</td>
<td>12,434</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>13,365</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>202,673</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>213,888</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table HO04, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table H16, (12 December 2012)

10.2.7 Housing Vacancy
A housing vacancy rate of five percent typically suggests some balance in the market, meaning that there is a sufficient supply of housing. In 2010, approximately 4.4 percent of housing units in unincorporated Greenburgh were vacant. The percentage of vacancy rates in unincorporated Greenburgh was comparatively less than in Westchester County in 2000 and 2010, as depicted in Table 10.14.

Table 10.14: Housing Unit Vacancy 2000 & 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000 Vacant</th>
<th>2000 Vacant %</th>
<th>2010 Vacant</th>
<th>2010 Vacant %</th>
<th>Change 2000 - 2010 (Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Greenburgh</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>12,303</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>23,589</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table HO03, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census SF1, Table H3, (12 December 2012)

10.3 Housing Profile
Greenburgh evolved from its roots as a farming community to a suburban center. Greenburgh’s housing stock is the product of historic events — federal policies, a post-WWII housing boom and transportation routes. Because of its proximity to New York City and the Hudson River, and its abundance of undeveloped land, Greenburgh provided a relatively blank slate for suburban expansion.

Many neighborhoods in unincorporated Greenburgh represent cohesive groups of buildings constructed within similar timeframes, evidenced by the large number of Depression-Era and Post-WWII subdivisions. The relatively large size of unincorporated Greenburgh, coupled with expanses of open space (parks and environmentally sensitive lands), recreational areas (golf courses), institutional uses, and road/highway corridors, contributed to the creation of many distinct one-family and multi-family neighborhoods.
Table 10.15 lists an approximate breakdown of the years in which percentages of housing units were constructed in unincorporated Greenburgh and in Westchester County.

### Table 10.15: Year Structure Built (current thru 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Housing Units Built</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005 or later</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 2004</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 1999</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 - 1989</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - 1979</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 1969</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 - 1959</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 - 1949</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B25034 (12 December 2012)

Approximately 44 percent of our housing stock was constructed between 1950 and 1970.
Table 10.16 lists the types of residential units by percentage in unincorporated Greenburgh and in Westchester County. Appendix H includes a breakdown of housing unit by type, within each of the nine school districts.

Table 10.16: Residential Units by Percentage (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>17,758</td>
<td>369,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Family detached</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Family attached</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 Units</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Units</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 Units</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 49 Units</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more Units</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, Van, etc.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B25024 (12 December 2012)

10.3.1 One-family Residences

One-family homes, representing approximately 61 percent of the housing inventory, are the predominant housing type in unincorporated Greenburgh. Comparatively, one-family units in Westchester County account for 50 percent of its housing stock.

One-family residences in unincorporated Greenburgh are primarily detached and of varying architectural styles. Neighborhoods such as the Cotswold area contain large numbers of homes with similar architecture. Some one-family neighborhoods have historic and thematic significance, such as the Parkway Homes area, one of the first predominantly African American subdivisions in the country. The following partial list of one-family residential areas of the Town give a flavor to the number of neighborhoods that have unique identities.

- Ardsley Estates
- Babbitt Court
- Beaver Hill
- Birchwood
- Broadview
- Cotswold
- Dalewood
- Deer Hill
In unincorporated Greenburgh, one-family homes are the predominant housing type, representing approximately 61 percent of the housing inventory.

Every chapter of the Plan contains policies that support, enhance and preserve one-family neighborhoods. A majority of these policies are quality of life or environmentally based. These policies include, but are not limited to: enhancing pedestrian safety through new sidewalk connections where feasible; encouraging green design to reduce the impacts of storm events through stormwater collection; suggesting strategies to preserve open space; facilitating the continued viability of recreation areas; planning for the next generation of tree canopy coverage; facilitating easements for new water and sewer services to existing and future residences; and reviewing allowable floor area ratios for one-family residences to ensure that new construction is not out of scale with the existing character of neighborhoods. These policies are also applicable to the multi-family and PUD zoning districts in unincorporated Greenburgh.
10.3.2 Multi-family Residences

Multi-family residential units in unincorporated Greenburgh range from two-family units to the High Point, a 472-unit multi-family building complex. Structures with 50 or more units currently comprise approximately 16 percent of housing units. Some of the multi-family housing units were constructed between the years of 1930 and 1970 partially as a result of Federal Housing Administration financing for new apartment house construction. Many multi-family units are located within close proximity to the Hartsdale train station or along major roadway corridors. Table 10.17 lists existing multi-family buildings with at least 10 units and includes the year constructed and location of these buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 East Hartsdale Ave.</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 East Hartsdale Ave.</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Oak St./90 &amp; 100 Manhattan Ave.</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>33 Oak St./90 &amp; 100 Manhattan Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 East Hartsdale</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>100 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 East Hartsdale Ave.</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 East Hartsdale Ave.</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>140 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon Phase I</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Taxter Road - Town Green Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon Phase II</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Taxter Road - Town Green Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech St./Maple Ave./Oak St. Apartments**</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Beech St./Maple Ave./Oak St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Classic</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>50 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Colony</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Colony Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Apartments</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgebrook Estates</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>33 Lawrence Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgemont Apartments</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>370-372 Central Park Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Esplanade</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>250 Central Park Avenue South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountainhead Owners Coop</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1 Fountain Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Park Apartments</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22 Tarrytown Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville Gardens*</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Old White Plains Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halston House Condominiums</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>410 - 416 Benedict Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet at Hartsdale</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75 W. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Executive House</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>45 East Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Federal Public Housing Site; ** New York State Public Housing Site
Table 10.17: Unincorporated Greenburgh Multi-Family Development (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Gardens</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27-47 N. Central Park Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Highlands</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>125 N. Washington Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Manor Co-op Apts.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>120 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Towers</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>E. Hartsdale Ave./Columbia Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The High Point</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>High Point Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Park Condominiums</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>355 Tarrytown Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Homestead</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>80 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Courts*</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Manhattan Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Kourt Manor</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Marion Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overbrook Hall</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>180 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinewood Gardens</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Pinewood Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pondside Village</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>308 Pondside Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve at Greenburgh</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Knollwood Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residences at Tarryhill</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100 Tarryhill Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Ridge</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>5 Fieldstone Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockledge House</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>177 E. Hartsdale Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarsdale Country Estates</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sentry Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarsdale Country Estates</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Campus Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scarsdale Fairway</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>300 S. Central Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scarsdale Meadows</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>555 Central Park Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarsdale Woods I</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>500-508 Central Park Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secor Heights*</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Secor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy Courts*</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Greenvale Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Ridge Manor</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>343-359 Central Park Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester Hills</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Old Country Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhab</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22 Tarrytown Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood Gardens</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Wildwood Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Hills</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>516 Woodland Hills Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands at Hartsdale</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>W. Hartsdale Ave./ Pinewood Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Federal Public Housing Site; ** New York State Public Housing Site
10.3.3 Planned Unit Developments

Eleven existing Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) in unincorporated Greenburgh account for 1,320 dwelling units. PUDs are residential developments of attached and/or detached units that were developed using flexible zoning controls to concentrate development and preserve contiguous portions of open space. These developments are listed in Table 10.18.

Table 10.18: Unincorporated Greenburgh Planned Unit Developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley Green - Faith Lane</td>
<td>1994/1996</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Sheldon Street/Faith Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Ridge</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Sprain Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Parc</td>
<td>1996/1999</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Tarrytown Road/Greenvale Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarewood</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Jackson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Hospital Home &amp; Westchester Meadows</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>120*</td>
<td>Grasslands Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew’s</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Old Jackson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Oaks</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>West Hartsdale Avenue/Pat Capone Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valimar</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Hillside Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Hill</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Old White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winding Ridge</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Old Tarrytown Road/Hillside Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyldwood</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Benedict Avenue/Skeggs Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,320</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*120 Independent dwelling units are located at Westchester Meadows. Hebrew Home Hospital is located within the same complex and contains 160 beds.

Wyldwood, a Planned Unit Development in unincorporated Greenburgh
10.4 Special Needs Housing

Certain populations, including some seniors, individuals who require specialized supportive social services (such as medical counseling/supervision, services associated with group homes) and persons with disabilities, often require housing that accommodates their special needs. In addition, the growing diversity of our population indicates a potential need for multi-generational/extended family housing, where appropriate.

10.4.1 Senior Housing (Independent Living)

Senior populations in unincorporated Greenburgh reside independently in one-family and multi-family units in both private residences and public housing units. Local, County and State demographic data and projections, as noted in Section 10.2.2, indicate that the percentage of seniors in the population will continue to grow, reinforcing the need to plan accordingly. Some seniors may wish to transition to smaller homes and apartments. It is important that housing units for the elderly provide accommodations, such as grab bars in the shower, and ramps and doorways of ample width to allow for wheelchairs and/or walkers. The greater the variety of housing options in terms of size, location and type, the greater likelihood our aging population will be able to age in place.

The phrase “aging in place” most often refers to an elderly person staying in her home as she ages rather than moving to a retirement community, senior home, or assisted living facility. As part of this Plan, the definition of aging in place should be expanded so that place can mean a city or town. (9)

Many locations in unincorporated Greenburgh offer walkability and access to transit and services. As our senior population increases, housing that is within easy walking distance to businesses, health services and mass transit stops will continue to be needed.

Independent senior-specific housing (age 62+) is a form of multi-family housing that is not permitted in the mixed-use corridors (Rt. 119, Central Park Avenue, and portions of Rt. 9A) of the Town. This type of privately operated housing does not require licensing through New York State, and often contains shared service components such as a dining hall.

To address the anticipated need, this type of housing could be viable in the mixed-use corridors of the Town due to proximity of transit options, walkability and the presence of non-residential uses (doctor’s offices, restaurants and retail options) and may be viable on lots similar to those that are currently eligible for Assisted Living Facilities.

Westchester Meadows is an existing independent living facility in unincorporated Greenburgh offering housing and specialized services that support seniors. There are 120 total units with one, two or two+ bedrooms within Westchester Meadows, which, in turn, is part of a larger onsite continuum of care program and campus.

The Greenburgh Housing Authority (GHA) operates the Manhattan Avenue Federal Site Senior Housing, which consists of 30 apartments. The following locations operated by the GHA also provide housing for seniors: 56 Manhattan Avenue, 4 Beech Street and 3 Maple Street.
10.4.2 Assisted Living Facilities

Assisted living facilities are an important component of the continuum of care with respect to housing needs. Such facilities provide private living quarters and on-site amenities that include personal care assistance, health services, communal dining, libraries, and recreation. In 2013, the Town adopted legislation allowing assisted living facilities as a special permit use in one-family residence districts on lots with a minimum of four acres. Brightview Senior Living has received approval to construct a 90-unit assisted living facility near the intersection of Benedict Avenue and White Plains Road (NYS Rt. 119). On smaller-sized lots, assisted living facilities could be viable, but are not currently permitted in mixed-use and commercially-zoned districts.

The existing Assisted Living Facility special permit regulations do not contain any minimum distance separation requirements. There exists potential, on Dobbs Ferry Road example, for there to be several additional proposals for Assisted Living Facilities on adjacent lots, which exist in excess of four acres. While one facility on a lot in excess of four acres may be appropriate in terms of architectural scale and character, two or more of these facilities within close proximity would likely have a negative impact on community character. A minimum distance separation requirement could mitigate this potential impact.

10.4.3 Agency Group Homes

Agency group homes are residences operated or sponsored by a public social service agency or a private nonprofit agency authorized or approved by the New York State Department of Social Welfare or other state agencies having jurisdiction to provide resident services and 24-hour supervision. Agency group homes are a special permit use in one-family residential districts and are most successful when their overall character and appearance are similar to other homes in the neighborhood. Zoning regulations require that agency group homes be dispersed and not concentrated in any one portion of a community. Existing agency group homes located in unincorporated Greenburgh are shown on Figure 10.2.

10.4.4 Persons with Disabilities, Mobility or Self-Care Limitations

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) has a three-part definition of disability. Under ADA, an individual with a disability is a person who (1) has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities; or (2) has a record of such an impairment; or (3) is regarded as having such an impairment. (4)

Mobility or self-care limitations include (1) a long-lasting condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activity, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting or carrying, and/or, (2) a physical, mental or emotional condition lasting more than six months that creates difficulty with dressing, bathing or getting around inside the home.
Figure 10.2: Agency Group Homes
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10.4.5 Skilled Nursing Care and Rehabilitative Service Facilities

Nursing homes are a special permit use on residentially zoned lots with a minimum site of ten acres. Two facilities in unincorporated Greenburgh are dedicated to caring for individuals with various disabilities, mobility or self-care limitations.

- **The Grove at Valhalla** is located off Grasslands Road and contains a 160-bed facility that provides a 40-bed unit for residents with Alzheimer's disease or dementia. Two other 40-bed units provide traditional long-term nursing care, while another 40-bed unit is split into two 20-bed units: the short-term (30 to 90 days) restorative rehabilitation unit provides physical therapy to those recovering from strokes and orthopedic injuries and the other unit provides medical care for patients with acute cardiovascular and cerebrovascular disease. The occupancy rate at this facility reported in January 2014 was 88.8 percent. The Hebrew Home Hospital is part of a Planned Unit Development that includes Westchester Meadows, independent senior residences.

- **The Sprain Brook Manor Rehab** is located on Jackson Avenue and contains 121 beds for short term rehabilitation, sub-acute care and skilled nursing services. The occupancy rate at this facility reported in December 2013 was 83.5 percent.

10.5 Affordable Housing

Housing can be defined as affordable when required to remain so for an extended period of time, or it can be affordable at market rate. Sections 10.5.1 and 10.5.5 describe specific local definitions of affordable and public housing. The existing stock of affordable market rate housing is addressed Section 10.5.2.

10.5.1 Affordable and Workforce Housing

In the Greenburgh Zoning Ordinance, affordable housing is defined as dwelling units constructed for families whose annual income does not exceed 80 percent of the actual Westchester County median income (not capped), as defined and periodically updated by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the annual rental cost of which does not exceed 30 percent of said income or, for
homeowners, the annual cost of the sum of principal, interest, taxes and insurance (PITI) and common charges, as applicable, does not exceed 30 percent of said income.

Workforce housing is a subset of affordable housing defined as having an additional requirement that the annual gross household income shall not be less than 30 percent of the actual Westchester County Area median income (not capped) as defined and periodically updated by HUD, and is applied to all multi-family districts.

In new multi-family housing projects, ten percent of the units in most zoning districts are required to be either affordable or workforce. These units are often referred to as affordable or workforce housing set-asides. Recent affordable housing set-asides include two of the 17 units at the Preserve at Greenburgh, located on Knollwood Road; 44 rental units at Avalon Green II, a 444-unit rental complex located off Taxter Road; Avalon Green III includes 68 additional units with seven affordable units; and five units at The Esplanade, an approved 51-unit rental building on Central Park Avenue South that is under construction.

Affordable and workforce housing units are also constructed by not-for-profit or governmental agencies. Housing provided by these entities is also required to maintain its level of affordability for a set duration of time, often a mandate of the grant or fund provider. The stock of affordable housing in unincorporated Greenburgh constructed with Federal, State and County grants include 192 units at 33 Oak St., 90 Manhattan Avenue and 100 Manhattan Avenue; 87 affordable units at the Residences at Tarryhill, and six units on Warren Avenue. Other affordable housing, operated through the Greenburgh Housing Authority is discussed in Section 10.5.5. A residential building with 28 rental units, known as Westhab is an example of workforce housing constructed by a not-for-profit agency.
10.5.2 Market Rate Housing

There is also a stock of housing in unincorporated Greenburgh that includes units sold or rented at market rate, affordable to new home buyers or renters using similar standards as in the Code of the Town of Greenburgh for “affordable” and “workforce” housing units. Market rate housing is subject to shifts in the residential marketplace and has no fixed affordability requirements.

The median household income in Westchester County was $104,200 in 2013.(5) Eighty percent of this amount means that a four person household earning a median income of $83,400 could afford, without exceeding the 30 percent expense threshold, a for sale housing unit costing approximately $275,000 or a rental unit costing approximately $2,605 per month. For further comparative purposes, HUD publishes affordability rent limits for households with incomes at 60 percent Area Median Income (AMI). Westchester County has pro-rated these figures using County AMI. These rent limits project as follows: 1-bedroom (not to exceed $1,192 rent), 2-bedroom ($1,441), 3-bedroom ($1,656) and 4-bedroom ($1,828). There are homes for sale or for rent in unincorporated Greenburgh that fall within these levels of affordability.

10.5.3 Westchester County Affordable Housing Programs

The New Homes Land Acquisition (NHLA) County Programs, run by Westchester County, assists in the acquisition of property that will be used for new construction, rehabilitation, or an adaptive re-use of fair and affordable housing. Both for sale and rental housing may be developed. The development may also be a mixed-income or mixed-use project. In all cases, the fair and affordable units must meet the minimum affordability thresholds for sale or rental projects. NHLA can only be used to acquire the property related to the affordable residential portion of the development.

The Housing Implementation Fund (HIF) program, also run by Westchester County in support of newly created fair and affordable homeownership or rental housing, assists in the construction of municipally-owned infrastructure. The development may include new construction, redevelopment or an adaptive re-use of existing property. The fair and affordable housing may be one-family or in multi-family buildings. The development may also be mixed-income or mixed-use, as long as the fair and affordable units meet the minimum affordability thresholds for sale or rental projects. The applicability of these programs may be through a public-private partnership.
10.5.4 Public Housing and the Greenburgh Housing Authority

Public housing is defined as dwelling units constructed, developed, owned or operated by or under the effective control of the Greenburgh Housing Authority (GHA). Financial or other assistance for people of limited means comes from federal, state or other governmental agencies.

The GHA, created in 1952, is a Public Housing Authority that oversees 41 buildings with 246 apartments at six Federal scattered public housing sites and one State site. These buildings are listed in Table 10.17. Two recent developments include eight units at Beamon Court and one unit at Greenburgh Common Way. The GHA also administers a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program in which a family pays no less than 30 percent but no more than 40 percent of its monthly-adjusted income. As of December 2013, the GHA’s Section 8 HCV Program had 303 vouchers, of which 42 percent were awarded to the elderly/disabled. (6)

10.5.5 Affordable Housing Challenges/Opportunities

In 2009, Westchester County entered into an agreement with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to build 750 units of fair and affordable housing in 31 communities. Unincorporated Greenburgh was not listed as a community deficient in affordable housing because of existing supplies of affordable housing units; however, maintaining and adding to the supply of affordable and workforce housing units remains important.

The One-Family Residence districts and the PUD District do not require an affordable housing set-aside. A comparable requirement for a ten percent affordable or workforce set-aside in these districts is desirable but may not always be feasible because of the anticipated higher costs of principal, interest, taxes, insurance and common charges associated with some new one-family residences or residential units in a PUD. An alternative mechanism could involve the creation of an escrow account, funded in connection with new one-family residential subdivision or PUD project requirements. Such an escrow account could be established to supplement affordable and workforce housing unit construction that would be affordable to families not exceeding the applicable area median income threshold.

The Town of Greenburgh’s commitment to maintaining a healthy balance of affordable housing units throughout unincorporated Greenburgh has traditionally been supported by the work of an affordable housing committee. This committee, with goals that align with the policies of the Plan, presents an excellent opportunity for community participation in addressing affordable housing opportunities throughout the Town.
10.6 Existing Housing Growth Potential

A build-out study carried out in connection with Chapter 12.0 (Land Use and Zoning) indicated that approximately 1,509 one-family residential units potentially could be built using existing zoning. Of these, 954 units are projected based on full development of all golf courses, day camps and tennis/swim clubs - an unlikely scenario. The potential build-out of units also may be inflated because the environmental review process (SEQRA) requires approving agencies to take a “hard look” at the environmental impacts, resulting in the approval of a less dense development.

Section 12.6.5 (Multi-Family Residence Build-out Under Existing Zoning) details the multi-family build-out potential that exists within the CA District.

10.7 Housing Opportunities

The residential build-out of housing units utilizing existing zoning districts and regulations indicates that one-family residential homes would comprise a vast majority of new housing units. Residents at the visioning sessions expressed concerns with regard to maintaining the character of one-family neighborhoods. There are no policies in the plan that would facilitate an increase in density of one-family residential units.

Another demographic trend with implications for the residential market involves the increased need for multi-generational housing. Factors such as the aging population, increased diversity through immigration, the rise in the median age of marriage, and increases in the cost of living are causing a greater reliance on extended family housing. Many communities are understanding that there is a growing demand for such housing and that design considerations for multi-generational living must be balanced with appropriate zoning provisions. Multi-generational housing can have an accommodating layout without becoming a two-family dwelling.

List of Sources

(3) Arvidson, Adam - Here’s to Long Life, American Planning Association, Planning August/September 2011
(4) http://www.ada.gov/
(5) http://planning.westchestergov.com/census-statistics
(6) http://www.greenburghhousing.org/
10.8 Housing Goals, Objectives & Policies

GOAL 10.1: Protect and Enhance the Character of One-Family Neighborhoods.

OBJECTIVE 10.1.1: Prevent one-family neighborhoods from becoming overly dense.

POLICY 10.1.1.1: Consistent with the future land-use map, preserve the density of existing underlying one-family residence districts.

POLICY 10.1.1.2: Promote walkable commercial development that acts as a gateway and is compatible with adjacent residential areas.

POLICY 10.1.1.3: Enhance code enforcement services to continue addressing safety concerns and overcrowding.

POLICY 10.1.1.4: Review allowable residential floor area ratios to prevent oversized/out of character homes from being constructed.

POLICY 10.1.1.5: Amend Section 285-10 of the Zoning Ordinance to include a minimum separation distance requirement associated with Assisted Living Facilities.

GOAL 10.2: Promote a Range of Housing Opportunities and Choices for Households of all Income Levels, Ages and Physical Abilities.

OBJECTIVE 10.2.1: Provide an adequate supply of housing for the Town’s senior population and special needs groups.

POLICY 10.2.1.1: Explore the creation of a special permit approval process associated with assisted living facilities in mixed-use and commercially zoned districts.

POLICY 10.2.1.2: Explore a special permit approval process associated with nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities, to facilitate these uses on lots less than 10 acres, where appropriate.

POLICY 10.2.1.3: Create a special permit process for independent senior (62+) housing in the Town's three major mixed use corridors, where appropriate.

POLICY 10.2.1.4: Explore a special permit approval process to allow for independent senior housing, when proposed in connection with Assisted Living Facilities, or on lots similar to those that are eligible for Assisted Living Facilities.

OBJECTIVE 10.2.2: Continue to facilitate the creation of affordable housing units in existing and future residential zoning districts.

POLICY 10.2.2.1: Explore provisions that could extend affordable and workforce housing requirements to one-family residence developments that have a
minimum number of units and/or project value.

POLICY 10.2.2. Require a 10% affordable or work force housing set-aside provision in any new zones that permit multi-family, or any zones that currently permit multi-family and do not already have such a requirement.

OBJECTIVE 10.2.3: Provide greater flexibility in residential site design.

POLICY 10.2.3.1: Explore the utilization of clustering in one-family housing developments.

POLICY 10.2.3.2: Explore the provisions of the PUD ordinance to ensure flexibility and site specific benefits.

OBJECTIVE 10.2.4: Ensure that affordable housing strategies are consistent with the Plan.

POLICY 10.2.4.1: Coordinate with the Affordable Housing Committee to integrate the policies of the Plan.

GOAL 10.3: Utilize demographic information and related projections to plan for the needs of the residents of the Town.

OBJECTIVE 10.3.1: Continue to provide necessary amenities and services.

POLICY 10.3.1.1: Plan for future housing, recreation, transportation and infrastructure needs based upon consistency with the Plan and demographic data, including existing population and projected population increases.
CHAPTER 11.0 Economic Development

11.1 Relationship to Guiding Principles
Economic development is the process of improving a community’s well-being through job creation, business and income growth. A healthy local economy is essential for a livable and sustainable community. It must be recognized, however, that economic considerations are just one of several aspects of a sustainable community. When planning for a stronger economy, a balanced approach also involves social and environmental considerations. Complementary development and redevelopment of existing residential, business, office and industrial districts are part of a comprehensive strategy for promoting unincorporated Greenburgh’s diverse set of businesses, educated and skilled residents and workforce.

11.2 Regional Planning Context
Economic development planning is best carried out in a regional context. Coordination and consistency with the policies of Westchester County and New York State are important as economic impacts stretch beyond municipal borders. Unincorporated Greenburgh is located within New York State’s Mid-Hudson Region, which consists of the following seven counties: Dutchess, Orange, Putnam, Rockland, Sullivan, Ulster, and Westchester. In this chapter, unincorporated Greenburgh’s economic development census data is often compared with Westchester County’s. Additional comparisons are often made within the Mid-Hudson and New York metropolitan regions.

11.2.1 New York State
Two regional policy guides (the Mid-Hudson Regional Economic Development Council’s REDC Strategic Plan; and the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan - MHRSP) and the process associated with the replacement of the Tappan Zee Bridge highlight excellent economic opportunities for unincorporated Greenburgh.

The Regional Economic Development Council (REDC), a public-private partnership, adopted a 5-year economic plan in November 2011 (updated in 2012) that is specific to the Mid-Hudson Region. The REDC Strategic Plan contains four major strategies, each of which is consistent with the local economic development strategies of this Plan.

The MHRSP was funded as part of the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority’s (NYSERDA) Cleaner Greener Cities program. It is complementary to the REDC Strategic Plan, with a focus on sustainability related to agriculture, energy, economic development, land-use, materials management and water.

Regional Economic Development takes place at the inter-municipal, County and State levels, and also within the framework of the Mid-Hudson Region, a seven County consortium.

The MHRSP was prepared by a seven county consortium, co-chaired by the Town of Greenburgh and Orange County.
The Tappan Zee Bridge Replacement is an estimated $3.1 billion project involving coordination with the New York State Transit Authority (NYSTA), New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC), Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), Westchester County and local municipalities. This major regional transportation investment is expected to extend beyond the bridge itself into corridors associated with I-287 (Cross-Westchester Expressway). Well into the future, it will facilitate economic opportunities throughout unincorporated Greenburgh. Continued coordination and planning is required to maximize local benefits.

11.2.2 Mid-Hudson REDC & Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan

The REDC Strategic Plan lists four overarching strategies: (1) invest in technology by targeting job creation investments in identifiable industry ‘clusters’ such as biotech, biomedical and healthcare, advanced manufacturing, and information technology; (2) attract and retain mature industries by undertaking initiatives to retain and stimulate anchor industries such as distribution, financial and professional services, and corporate food and beverage businesses; (3) grow natural resource-related sectors by leveraging the region’s assets, including tourism; and (4) support projects that improve key regional infrastructure to make the region more business-ready, foster housing investment to create construction jobs and an expanded housing supply and support the revitalization of centers as engines of regional prosperity.

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s economic development strategies are consistent with the REDC Strategic Plan. For example, local support of the growing industry ‘clusters’ such as the biotech, biomedical and biopharmaceutical sectors is evident in the planned initiatives associated with the Research & Development (R&D) Clusters, discussed in Section 12.10.
Retention and support of existing businesses are priorities as is fostering new economic development that preserves the Town’s natural assets and does not conflict with established residential neighborhoods.

11.2.3 Westchester County

Westchester County’s economic development strategies are found in the current Westchester 2025 initiative and in Patterns for Westchester: the Land and the People. A majority of these strategies have a land-use focus. Westchester 2025 notes that the health of the economy and environment depends on measures to protect a historic center/corridor/open space pattern. One County policy is to channel development, whenever possible, to centers where infrastructure can support growth, public transportation can be provided efficiently and redevelopment can enhance economic vitality. Beyond centers, Westchester 2025 indicates that developed corridors should be evaluated for steps needed to make these areas into efficient and attractive multi-use places. A primary component of the Plan is to facilitate investment in commercial corridors in order to produce lasting economic benefits, such as an increased tax base and successful places of employment. Where appropriate, economic development, consistent with Westchester 2025 policies is anticipated through continued coordination with Westchester County and adjacent municipalities.

11.2.4 Coordination with Adjacent Municipalities

Land-use decisions benefitting one community’s economy and tax base may adversely affect traffic patterns, housing demand, transportation accessibility, infrastructure needs and economic viability in neighboring municipalities. Coordinating economic development with surrounding communities can benefit each community’s economy and tax base and improve traffic patterns, housing options, transportation accessibility and infrastructure. Section 12.8 addresses the inter-municipal coordination necessary for various planning initiatives. Figure 12.16 highlights these coordinated planning areas.
11.3 Existing Conditions

Through numerous tables and statistical narrative Chapter 11.0 strives to place unincorporated Greenburgh in its social, economic and developmental place in Westchester County, New York State and the nation.

11.3.1 Income

Tables 11.1 through 11.3 provide year 2000 and year 2011 income data. In 2011, median household income in unincorporated Greenburgh was $116,698 compared to $80,725 in Westchester County. A household is defined as a person or a group of people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence. Because many households consist of only one person, average household income is usually less than average family income.

Table 11.1 indicates that after accounting for inflation, in terms of buying power, median household income increased 2.4 percent in unincorporated Greenburgh, from $113,845 in 2000 to $116,698 in 2011. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) inflation calculator uses the average CPI for a given calendar year. This data represents changes in prices of all goods and services purchased for consumption by households.\(^{(1)}\)

Within a 30-minute drive from the intersection of Healy Avenue and Central Park Avenue, there are 7.5 million people with a median household income lower than that of unincorporated Greenburgh. However, this regional population still possesses relatively strong buying power at $61,832.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.1: Median Household Income (2000 &amp; 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Greenburgh</strong> (Weighted Median Household Income)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$87,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westchester County</strong> (Median Household Income)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Per capita, or per person income, was also higher locally when compared to County figures. In 2011, per capita income in unincorporated Greenburgh was $59,923 compared to $48,306 in Westchester County. Table 11.2 indicates that after accounting for inflation, in terms of buying power, per capita income increased 1.8 percent in unincorporated Greenburgh, from $58,830 in 2000 to $59,923 in 2011.
The policies for economic development in unincorporated Greenburgh are intended to increase local employment opportunities.

Household income distribution patterns in unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County are shown on Table 11.3. Approximately 80 percent of households in unincorporated Greenburgh earned $50,000 or greater in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Greenburgh</strong> (Weighted Per Capita Income)</td>
<td>$45,037</td>
<td>$58,830</td>
<td>$59,923</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westchester County</strong> (Per Capita Income)</td>
<td>$36,726</td>
<td>$47,973</td>
<td>$48,306</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


11.3.2 Labor Force

The resident labor force in unincorporated Greenburgh increased by 375 persons age 16+ from year 2000 (23,247) to 2011 (23,622). Table 11.4 indicates that the 2011 unemployment rate (4.9 percent) was less than Westchester County’s (7.2 percent). From the start of the U.S. recession in December 2007 through December 2009, the Mid-Hudson region lost 51,300 private sector jobs (-6.6 percent). Over the same period, New York State lost 4.6 percent of its private sector employment. Construction lost the most jobs (-15,000) in the region during this time. Several large projects in the region are on hold due to the economic downturn. Manufacturing also lost a large number of jobs (-8,500) during the downturn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.3: Household Income Distribution (2000 &amp; 2011)</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF1, Table P052, (12 December 2012) & U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B19001 (12 December 2012)
Chapter 11.0 Economic Development

The Mid-Hudson region boasts a highly talented and qualified workforce due to excellent public and private colleges, discussed in Section 11.3.5. The region has an approximate labor force of 1.1 million, which is a valuable asset. An estimated 200,000 workers in the region are underemployed and working at jobs that require less skill than they are able to offer. These regional figures are relevant because transportation and communication infrastructure affects the distance between supplies of labor and places of employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.4 Labor Force (2000 &amp; 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated Greenburgh</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 16+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census SF3, Table P043, (12 December 2012); U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B23025 (12 December 2012)

11.3.3 Employment by Industry

The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) is the standard used by federal statistical agencies in classifying business establishments by industry. As Table 11.5 notes, the top three industries employing residents in unincorporated Greenburgh were: (1) educational, health and social services; (2) professional, scientific, management, administrative and waste management services; and (3) finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing. Westchester County had the same top three rankings. This data is helpful when planning for economic development that is based on employment growth. Strategies should focus on strengthening the professional sectors in which residents are employed, by facilitating job growth locally to lessen commute times.
### Table 11.5: Employment by Industry - Unincorporated Greenburgh and Westchester County Residents * (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh *</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing</td>
<td>2,482</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, management, administrative and waste management services</td>
<td>3,453</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, health and social services</td>
<td>6,875</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services (except public administration)</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,431</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All values refer to the industries in which residents of unincorporated Greenburgh are employed. These industries may or may not be located in unincorporated Greenburgh or Westchester County.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table C24050 (12 December 2012)

---

**11.3.4 Occupational Employment**

The Bureau of Labor Statistics maintains the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system. The 2010 SOC system is used by federal statistical agencies to classify workers by occupation. Table 11.6 identifies the occupations of the 22,431 employed residents of unincorporated Greenburgh age 16+ in 2011. Major occupation sectors included those in management (3,377), office and administrative support (2,274), sales and related (2,170), health diagnosing, treating practitioners, and others related technical (1,929), business and financial operations (1,863), and education, training and library (1,828).
### Table 11.6: Occupational Employment Breakdown of Unincorporated Greenburgh Residents * (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed civilian population Age 16+</td>
<td>22,431</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management, business, science, and arts occupations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, and financial occupations:</td>
<td>12,798</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management occupations (3,377)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and financial operations occupations (1,863)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, engineering, and science occupations:</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and mathematical occupations (499)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and engineering occupations (382)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life, physical, and social science occupations (410)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, legal, community service, arts, and media occupations:</td>
<td>4,003</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and social service occupations (530)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal occupations (962)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, training, and library occupations (1,828)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations 683)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations:</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health diagnosing and treating practitioners and other technical occupations (1,929)</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health technologists and technicians (335)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service occupations:</strong></td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare support occupations</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective service occupations</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Fire fighting and prevention, and other protective service workers including supervisors (346)</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Law enforcement workers including supervisors (254)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation and serving related occupations</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care and service occupations</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales and office occupations:</strong></td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and related occupations</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and administrative support occupations</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations:</strong></td>
<td>947</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and extraction occupations</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations:</strong></td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production occupations</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation occupations</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material moving occupations</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All values refer to the occupations in which residents of unincorporated Greenburgh work. These occupations may or may not be located in unincorporated Greenburgh.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table C24010 (12 December 2012)
11.3.5 School Enrollment and Education Levels

Unincorporated Greenburgh has a highly educated population. As Table 11.7 notes, approximately 60 percent of unincorporated Greenburgh residents received a Bachelors Degree or higher. This percentage is greater than Westchester County (44 percent), the Mid-Hudson Region (37 percent) and New York State (32 percent). Of the 31,258 residents of unincorporated Greenburgh 25 years and over, 6,181 or 19.7 percent have received a Master’s Degree and 943 or three percent have received a Doctorate Degree.

As unincorporated Greenburgh seeks to partner in a regional strategy to support investment into technology and industry ‘clusters’ such as biotech, biomedical and healthcare, the Mid-Hudson Region’s high concentration of colleges and universities is an advantage. There are 29 two- and four-year institutions enrolling 125,000 students and graduating approximately 20,600 students per year. In addition, New York City has some of the best public and private schools in the country. The region’s educated and skilled workforce includes 41,000 scientists, engineers and computer/math specialists, and 30,000 people currently working in electronics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons 25 Years and over</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No diploma</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4,964</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No degree</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree or higher</td>
<td>18,986</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table B15002 (12 December 2012)

Nationwide, New York ranks first in degrees awarded in computer and medical sciences; second for degrees in electrical engineering, mathematics and biological sciences; and third in civil and mechanical engineering.
11.3.6 Small Sized Industry Sectors, Business Establishments and Employers

A distinct feature of the retail stores, restaurants and commercial service establishments throughout unincorporated Greenburgh is the prevalence of small, local “mom and pop” businesses. Businesses that have fewer than 10 employees accounted for approximately 75 percent of the total workforce. This is consistent with Westchester County’s percentage (approximately 80 percent). A majority of these businesses are located on or in close proximity to the three major corridors (Rt. 9A - Saw Mill River Road, Rt. 100 - Central Park Avenue and Rt. 119 - White Plains-Tarrytown Road) and other state roads, as well as the Hartsdale Train Station. Table 11.8 highlights the significance of small-sized businesses.

Table 11.8: Businesses in Unincorporated Greenburgh (Distribution by No. of Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Westchester County 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 49</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 99</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 +</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Town Business Registry List (2012) & Westchester County Databook 2010

11.3.7 Major Industry Sectors, Business Establishments, and Major Employers

Several major industry sectors and employers are headquartered in unincorporated Greenburgh. Table 11.9 lists businesses and agencies that employ at least 100 people. Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is the largest employer with approximately 1,700 employees. Major business sectors include commercial/restaurants and offices on Central Park Avenue (Rt. 100), commercial uses on Tarrytown Road (Rt. 119), an extensive office park on White Plains Road (Rt. 119), commercial, office and industrial uses on Saw Mill River Road (Rt. 9A) and research and development uses on Old Saw Mill River Road. Economic strategies for these distinct industry sectors are discussed in detail in Sections 11.7, 11.8 and 11.9.

The Town of Greenburgh and the public school districts located within the Town are also major employers.
The top three industries that employ residents of unincorporated Greenburgh are consistent with the industries that the REDC expects to grow in the Mid-Hudson Region.

11.3.8 Commutation to Work

Table 11.10 depicts the workplace destination of Town of Greenburgh residents. Approximately 23 percent of residents work within the Town. A comparable number of residents (24.5 percent) commute to Manhattan. The average commute time for Town of Greenburgh residents was 32 minutes in 2008. Approximately 53 percent of residents reported commuting under 30 minutes while 18 percent commuted over 60 minutes. Providing enhanced local employment opportunities is a component of the economic development strategies of this chapter.

Table 11.10: Commutation to Work (Town of Greenburgh Residents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Destination</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City (Manhattan)</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City (Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Greenburgh</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of White Plains</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County (other than Greenburgh/White Plains)</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland, Nassau, Orange, Dutchess, Putnam and Suffolk Counties</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee commutation into Westchester indicates that there is a highly mobile workforce. Table 11.11 indicates that 51.7 percent of Westchester’s workforce commuted into the County in 2010, with a majority of workers commuting from New York City. Comparatively, within the Mid-Hudson Region, more than 50 percent of workers leave their county of residence to go to work each day.

### Table 11.11: Commutation to Work into Westchester County (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commutation Origin from outside Westchester</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City (all five boroughs)</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Places (primarily NY, NJ and CT outer counties)</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk and Nassau Counties, NY</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield County, CT</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam County, NY</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchess County, NY</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland County, NY</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County, NY</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen County, NJ</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 11.11 illustrates the central location of unincorporated Greenburgh and its proximity to NYC, NJ and CT.

From unincorporated Greenburgh, Manhattan can be reached by commuter train in approximately one-half hour. The closest NYC borough can be reached by car in less than 15 minutes.

---

**Figure 11.1: Westchester Commutation Patterns**

Source: Westchester County
11.3.9 Tax Sources and Revenue

Table 11.12 provides an approximate property tax revenue breakdown by percentage for properties in unincorporated Greenburgh, 2010 to 2012. The percentages are consistent during this time period and indicate that almost 70 percent of property tax revenue was generated from residential uses. Approximately 75 percent of the residential property tax revenues was derived from single-family homes and 25 percent was derived from multi-family uses such as rental properties, condominiums and co-operatives. Commercial property tax revenue percentages were derived from office, retail, industrial, etc. land uses. Approximately 18 percent of the assessed value of properties were tax exempt. This percentage varies across district boundaries such as those associated with school and fire districts. Appendix I includes maps and related tables indicating the location and percentages of tax exempt properties in unincorporated Greenburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Residential %</th>
<th>Commercial %</th>
<th>Utilities %</th>
<th>Vacant Land %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unincorporated Greenburgh Property Tax Revenue Analysis (21 February 2013)

Table 11.13 lists the assessed value of taxable property from 2002 to 2014. Overall, the assessed valuation decreased $36,902,844. A town-wide tax revaluation, the first since the late 1950s, should be completed in 2016. The revaluation will include all properties in the Town of Greenburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Taxable Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$329,629,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$332,579,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$330,743,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$328,513,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$330,818,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$322,909,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$316,829,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$314,374,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$308,895,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$299,751,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$296,226,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$294,226,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$291,337,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Town of Greenburgh Tax Assessment Roll - 2014

Implementation of the economic development strategies of the Plan can help diversify municipal revenues.
Property tax, the major source of municipal revenue, is approximately 74 percent of the revenue in fiscal year 2013. Table 11.14 lists unincorporated Greenburgh’s municipal revenue from 2002 to 2014 as well as total expenditures.

New York State imposes a sales tax of 4.00 percent. Westchester County imposes a sales tax of 1.5 percent. Westchester additionally has an “Old Local” tax of 1.0 percent, 50 percent of which is returned to local governments, and a “New Local” tax of 0.5 percent, 20 percent of which is returned to local governments. An additional 0.375 percent is imposed on municipalities in the New York metropolitan area, which includes the Town of Greenburgh, to help finance the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA). Some cities in Westchester collect an additional sales tax. The sales tax is applicable to the retail sale of tangible personal property, commercial, nonresidential utility services, restaurant meals, take-out foods, admission charges and dues, and other specified services. Exemptions include food, medicines and health aids, newspapers and periodicals. The portion of sales tax revenue returned to municipalities is based on population.

From 2004 to 2013, unincorporated Greenburgh received between $5 and $6 million in annual sales tax returns.
11.4 Key Economic Assets and Opportunities

Strengths and opportunities increase future economic development strategies. Unincorporated Greenburgh’s assets and opportunities include central location, access to transportation, natural resources such as parks and open space, access to educational services, potential for investment through in-fill development, and potential for new development to complement regional strategies for industry ‘clusters’ such as biotech, biomedical and healthcare, advanced manufacturing and information technology.

11.4.1 Transportation Access

Transportation options for residents and businesses in unincorporated Greenburgh are multi-modal. Mass transit (bus and rail), an extensive highway network and airport options are strengths that support economic growth. Of the six interstate highways that intersect the Mid-Hudson Region, four (New York State Thruway [I-87], New England Thruway [I-95], Cross Westchester Expressway [I-287], and Interstate 684 [I-684]) pass through or are in close proximity to unincorporated Greenburgh. Interstate 84 (I-84) and Route 17 (future Interstate 86) are within twenty miles. Local commuter rail (Metro North) is provided through the MTA. Metro North has direct connections to Amtrak. Rail combined with local bus connections and private shuttles to existing business clusters and hotels provide prime market access. Five international airports service passengers in the Mid-Hudson Region, including Westchester County Airport, located an approximate 20-minute drive from unincorporated Greenburgh.

Aerial photo of Westchester County Airport
Area transportation improvements can support economic growth. The Tappan Zee Bridge replacement will have corridor-wide local impacts. Identified planning areas, such as the Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park Planning Area, discussed in Chapter 12.0 (Land Use and Zoning), are designed to take advantage of regional transportation projects that would enhance economic viability. Another transportation improvement, a potential Rt. 9A bypass (discussed in Section 9.4.1), should strengthen industrial areas along Rt. 9A.

11.4.2 Infrastructure and Services

Adequate infrastructure capacity is an indication of a community’s readiness for economic development. Availability of utility and infrastructure services is a major location analysis factor for many types of industries. Chapter 8.0 (Public Infrastructure and Essential Services) details existing conditions, deficiencies and planned improvements with respect to infrastructure.

Green buildings are designed, constructed and operated to improve environmental and economic performance. Green building construction addresses water conservation, energy efficiency, and improved indoor air quality, as well as lessens impacts on municipal infrastructure systems.

11.4.3 Land and Buildings

Site and building needs vary depending on the type of business and its functions. The demand for commercial real estate correlates with trends in economic activity and employment. The existence of productive, leasable commercial, office and industrial space increases living-wage employment opportunities and tax rateables. The Plan notes the importance of vacant land and, where appropriate, the potential for infill development on underdeveloped sites. The policies herein and the subsequent collaborative planning processes are the keys to successful economic development.

11.4.4 Educational Services

The educational institutions that exist in unincorporated Greenburgh and in the Mid-Hudson Region are exceptional. Our residents are served by nine excellent public school districts (Ardsley UFSD, Edgemont UFSD, Elmsford UFSD, Greenburgh Central School, Hastings-on-Hudson UFSD, Irvington UFSD, Pocantico Hills CSD, Tarrytown UFSD and Valhalla UFSD) which are located partially or wholly within unincorporated Greenburgh. Several private schools (pre-K through 12th grade - Hackley School, Maria Regina, School for the Deaf – Fanwood, Solomon Schechter, etc.) and Westchester Community College also have their campuses here. There are also licensed private nursery schools, pre-K and above. The Mid-Hudson region has eight State University of New York campuses (two-year and four-year institutions) with an enrollment of more than 55,000 students, a workforce of 7,135 employees and an annual payroll of $256 million. The region has 18 independent colleges and universities that offer varied curricula. Private schools, colleges and universities in New York City are some of the best in the country.
11.4.5 Natural Assets and Image

A high quality of life contributes to a favorable business climate and can influence business decisions on where to locate. Good schools, adequate infrastructure and public services, high quality neighborhoods, an attractive community appearance, green space, bike paths and trailways, a variety of recreational opportunities for persons of all ages, and clean air and water also attract businesses as well as residents. These attributes serve as economic development tools and should be enhanced.

Parks and open spaces make the Town environmentally friendly and are important to the economy. Unincorporated Greenburgh is also in close proximity to many cultural and historic sites. Continued preservation of these resources are vital to future economic potential. Consideration should be given to leveraging and growing business segments that are consistent with the Town’s character and this Plan. Sensitive environmental protection has resulted in a recognizable and marketable image of the Town as “green.” Promoting (“branding”) this image of the Town as “green” is a significant component of the Plan.

Aerial photo capturing the ‘Green’ of Greenburgh
11.5 Inventory Cluster Analysis

There is a benefit to the presence of clustering similar business uses in one geographic area through business incubators, programs designed to support the successful development of entrepreneurial companies, with a focus on startup and early stage businesses. The potential for incubators in unincorporated Greenburgh or in areas within close proximity presents economic development opportunities.

11.5.1 Existing Business Parks, High Technology and Related Service Companies, and Incubators

A cluster is defined as a group of closely-related and complementary companies and industries that operate within a particular region. Industries participating in a strong cluster register higher employment growth and higher wages. Cluster development succeeds when a region creates a competitive advantage of integrated industries. The existing and potential agglomeration of industries most applicable to coincide with economic development opportunities in unincorporated Greenburgh are research and development, corporate services, education, manufacturing, information technology and tourism.

Several existing areas of unincorporated Greenburgh contain a high proportion of similar uses. The office park located on White Plains Road (NYS Rt. 119), the office/flex buildings of Fairview Corporate Park and Cross Westchester Executive Park located on and near Saw Mill River Road (NYS Rt. 9A.), and the research and development companies on Old Saw Mill River Road have the potential to become enhanced clusters. Other portions of unincorporated Greenburgh can indirectly contribute to the success of clusters by providing housing options closer to the workplace.

A research and development cluster exists in the north portion of unincorporated Greenburgh on Old Saw Mill River Road and extends north into adjacent areas in the Town of Mt. Pleasant. The Mid-Hudson REDC promotes the creation of a life science incubator that offers start-up firms low-cost, well-equipped lab space, as well as business support and access to broader biological research infrastructure. New York Medical College is planning to implement this concept by installing a significant new biotechnology laboratory and advanced development center based in Valhalla, Town of Mt. Pleasant. Several subsequent sections of this Plan discuss the strategies and economic advantages of facilitating complementary land-uses to this growing cluster.

11.6 Residential Development

11.6.1 Residential Housing

Unincorporated Greenburgh is comprised of numerous well-established neighborhoods, including one-family homes and multi-family dwelling units. The presence of parks and open space interspersed among residential areas is a defining feature of the Town. The preservation of neighborhood character and environmental resources such as open space, as well as traffic and school impacts are all factors that preclude any recommendation for increased residential density.
11.6.2 Recent Local Residential Market Dynamics

Table 11.15 provides a twelve year summary (2000-2012) of residential projects that were approved by unincorporated Greenburgh land-use boards. A majority of the 706 residential units approved in this timeframe are the result of one approved 444-unit multi-family development known as Avalon Green II, located on Taxter Road. There were 39 individual subdivisions resulting in new one-family residences with 19 of those the result of subdivisions that created one additional one-family residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of New Residential Units Per Proposal</th>
<th>Number of Approvals</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Single Family/Multi-Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>706</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include new as-of-right single family residences subject only to a building permit (see Table 11.16).

New residential units may be approved as part of subdivision or site plan applications by the Town of Greenburgh Planning Board or Town Board.

Source: Town of Greenburgh Building Department, Department of Community Development Records
Table 11.16 lists the number of building permits issued between 2000 and 2012 for new one-family and multi-family construction purposes. A majority of the new residences constructed in this timeframe were part of Planned Unit Developments (PUD) or associated with Avalon II, a large multi-family development project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single-Family Permits</th>
<th>Multi-Family Permits</th>
<th>Resultant Number of Multi-Family Units</th>
<th>Total of New Units</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Many of the permits issued in 2000 and 2001 were in connection with developments known as Wyldewood, Faith Lane, Valimar and Stone Ridge Manor (All Approved prior to 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>All Multi-Family permits were for Avalon II (Taxter Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>All Multi-Family permits were for Avalon II (Taxter Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Town of Greenburgh Building Department Records
11.17 lists approximate sale and rental ranges for one-family and multi-family residential units. The table highlights the flexible range of housing options from a cost perspective. Appendix J lists average sales and rental cost information by school district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Estimated Total Range Sales Price</th>
<th>Estimated Majority of Sales Price*</th>
<th>Estimated Range of Rent Paid</th>
<th>Estimated Majority of Rent Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
<td>$199,500 to $3,250,000</td>
<td>$225,000 to $1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000 to $4,500</td>
<td>$2,000 to $3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative Unit</td>
<td>$125,000 to $1,125,000</td>
<td>$150,000 to $550,000</td>
<td>$1,000 to $4,000</td>
<td>$1,500 to $2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At least 50 percent of residential sales and rental prices fall within the specified range.

Source: Local Realtor Interviews

11.6.3 Residential & Demographic Market Dynamics

The percentage of population in the age groups 55-64 and 65 and over increased 28 percent and 20.6 percent, respectively, from 2000 to 2010. Members in the age group 20-34 decreased by six percent over the same time period. Traditional neighborhood centers not only are places of commerce, culture and entertainment, but also places where a growing number of people want to live. Residential housing that is within walking distances to businesses, health services, mass transit, entertainment, recreational and cultural amenities is anticipated to increase in desirability and attractiveness.

Seniors and young professionals are two demographic groups that desire housing in pedestrian-friendly mixed-use neighborhood developments.

Young professionals and retirees looking to downsize are two distinct segments of the population known to seek attractive, pedestrian-friendly and mixed-use design environments. Young professionals are of an age range of 23-35 with professional careers (finance, insurance, hospitality, banking, higher education, teachers, doctors, nurses, police, and fire, etc.) and an annual income of $50,000-$120,000. They seek reasonably priced apartments/townhouses ($1,500-$2,800 monthly rent) with desirable amenities (access to parks, green space, convenient parking or on-site garage, inviting community atmosphere, fitness, security, within walking or biking distance of public space, retail, dining, and mass transit). Retirees desire similar amenities. With a median home price in Westchester of $557,000, there is a lack of home ownership opportunities for young professionals and retirees. A supply of affordable market-rate multi-family housing exists in unincorporated Greenburgh.

On a regional basis, the net migration of young professionals out of Westchester County has been referred to as “youth flight” and “brain drain.” While the Hudson Valley is an attractive home for many families, individuals, and senior citizens, there is a demonstrative loss of skilled workers to New York City and other areas. (2)
Another demographic trend with implications to the residential market involves the increased need for multi-generational housing. Factors, such as the aging population, increased diversity through immigration, the rise in the median age of marriage, and increases in the cost of living are causing a greater reliance on extended family housing. Many communities are understanding that there is a growing demand for such housing and that design considerations for multi-generational living must be balanced with appropriate zoning provisions.

11.6.4 Projected Sales & Net New Development

No policies are recommended to extend existing one-family and multi-family residentially zoned districts into other areas of unincorporated Greenburgh. There are also no planned policies to allow a greater density of residential units or residences per acre in existing one-family and multi-family residentially zoned districts. It is anticipated that residential subdivision and site plan applications will trend in a manner similar to that depicted in the 12-year snapshot in Table 11.15, which had a proportionately higher percentage of new developments with lower numbers of new residential units.

11.6.5 Residential Tax collection

Approximately 75 percent of the land area in unincorporated Greenburgh is located in the one-family (R-5 thru R-40) residence districts. Lots with one-family residential uses occupy approximately 3,166 acres (32 percent) of total land area in these districts. Planned Unit Developments, which contain attached or detached residences, occupy 622 acres (5.5 percent) of total land area. There are seven multi-family residence districts (M-6 through M-174 and Scatter-Site Public Housing “PH”) which comprise approximately 478 acres (4.2 percent) of land area. Almost all of the lots in these multi-family districts contain multi-family residences. In 2012, approximately 69.6 percent of property tax revenue was generated from properties with residential uses. Appendix H includes a breakdown of parcels by use type (residential, utility, vacant, commercial, etc.) within each of the nine school districts, with their collective assessed value and town taxable totals.
11.6.6 Condominium/Cooperative Tax Structure

Section 581 of the Real Property Tax Law and Section 339-y of the Real Property Law mandates that “condos” and “co-ops” are valued for purposes of the real property tax by using a capitalization of income or cost approach. A comparable sales approach, which is used for most residential properties and is based upon the sales prices of individual units, may not be used (without the implementation of the Homestead Tax Option which can be carried out only after a systematic review and 100 percent valuation of all properties). The current law results in a ceiling on assessments that is based not on a type of property but on a classification of ownership.

11.7 Retail Development

11.7.1 Retail Development

Existing commercial development in unincorporated Greenburgh provides an array of goods and services for residents and regional customers. Many commercial uses are located within the three major corridors (Rt. 100, Rt. 119 and Rt. 9A), along other state roads, and near the Hartsdale Train Station. While each of these areas contains a variety of uses, certain business sectors are prominent. East Hartsdale Avenue in the vicinity of the Hartsdale Train Station has a cluster of attractive eating establishments. Tarrytown Road (Rt. 119) has a cluster of high end automobile sales businesses, many of which now occupy modern and efficient new buildings. A concentration of hotels on White Plains Road (Rt. 119) complement the existing office uses in that area. A distinct feature of the retail stores, restaurants and commercial service establishments is the presence of local “mom and pop” businesses. Commercial businesses in unincorporated Greenburgh are often located in freestanding buildings and strip mall developments.
11.7.2 Recent Local Market Dynamics

Table 11.18 lists major commercial developments approved between 2000 and 2013. These developments include the construction of one new supermarket and the retrofit of existing commercial spaces with several supermarkets. The existence of these larger anchor tenants along these commercial corridors is important as they provide significant employment opportunities and complement the numerous small businesses in unincorporated Greenburgh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Year Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-Mart</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Dalewood Shopping Center</td>
<td>37,486</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShopRite</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Midway Shopping Center</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hickory (Stop &amp; Shop)</td>
<td>General Commercial/Supermarket</td>
<td>600 White Plains Road</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
<td>543 Tarrytown Road</td>
<td>34,149</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planet Fitness</td>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>Midway Shopping Center</td>
<td>24,740</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Green’s</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Dalewood Shopping Center</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSG Training Center</td>
<td>Private Recreation</td>
<td>777 Old Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Town of Greenburgh Building Department, Department of Community Development Records

Several of the developments listed in Table 11.18 (H-Mart, ShopRite, and BMW) replaced formerly occupied spaces. A common occurrence is that major vacant spaces along commercial corridors have not remained unoccupied for long periods of time. Section 11.7.4 (Inflow/Outflow Analysis) analyzes local and regional buying power and indicates that businesses are drawn to our commercial corridors because of the prevalence of adequate buying power.

Table 11.19 lists typical smaller commercial developments constructed between 2000 and 2012. Goddard Day School, Snap Fitness, Will2Lose and IK Realty are developments that involved the reuse of a vacant building. Chase Bank, Walgreens and TD Bank were newly constructed stand-alone buildings. Not listed in this table are numerous new restaurants that have been introduced into vacant commercial spaces.
Table 11.19: Typical Smaller Scale Commercial Approvals (2000-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Year Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chase Bank</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Crossroads Shopping Center</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walgreens</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>870 Central Park Avenue South</td>
<td>8,840</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD Bank</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>300 Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>2,943</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddard Day School</td>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>1 Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap Fitness</td>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>251 Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will2Lose</td>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>303 Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop &amp; Shop Pea Pod*</td>
<td>Service Establishment</td>
<td>46 Central Park Avenue South</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK Realty</td>
<td>Warehouse/Office</td>
<td>249 Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>15,225</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Car (Ray Catena)</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
<td>Tarrytown Road</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trader Joes</td>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>Westchester Square Shopping Center</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Originally approved as a Starbucks (Starbucks never constructed)

Source: Town of Greenburgh Building Department, Department of Community Development Records

Table 11.20 lists approximate sale and rental ranges for various non-residential uses. The table highlights the flexible range of commercial options from a cost perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Est. Range Sales Price Per Square Ft.</th>
<th>Est. Majority of Sales Price Per Sq. Ft.*</th>
<th>Est. Range of Rent Per Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$50 - $1,000</td>
<td>$150 to $400</td>
<td>$20-$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$125 - $420</td>
<td>$175 to $350</td>
<td>$15-$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>$200 - $750</td>
<td>$250 to $400</td>
<td>$20-$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>$225 - $800</td>
<td>$325 to $625</td>
<td>$40-$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>$135 - $350</td>
<td>$225 to $300</td>
<td>$10-$25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At least 50 percent of commercial sales prices fall within the specified range

Source: Local Realtor Interviews
11.7.3 Regional Market Dynamics

Economic conditions evolve. 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.

The Central Park Avenue Market Positioning Analysis (Appendix D) notes that at the time of the adoption of the CA zoning district, retail was dominated by a large-scale general merchandise model. Large, stand-alone buildings surrounded with more than ample amounts of parking were considered the essential formula for a successful retail district. Central Park Avenue’s commercial areas possess many of the attributes of this model. Although businesses along Central Park Avenue are not suffering undue economic distress nor are they plagued by vacancies (other than those attributable to hard economic times), the corridor lacks a high quality built form and is underperforming economically.

“Experience-based retail” is a concept of providing an enhanced consumer space with access to a range of experiences beyond just buying goods and services. Simple components associated with experienced-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. A review of industry trends illustrates that the emergence of experience-based retail has dramatically changed the requirements for premium retail real estate. If policies for the corridor were revised to make it a more conducive place for experience-based retail, an increase in both property values and economic vitality in the corridor could be expected.

Regulatory controls for commercial corridors in unincorporated Greenburgh do not permit experience-based retail. Table 11.21 lists attributes of a range of typical suburban business districts which effect a lower or higher quality retail experience. The correlation that these attributes have to land value is noteworthy.

Built form refers to the layout and characteristics of a site including its buildings, pedestrian areas, landscaping, relationship to the street, etc.
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. Many of the attributes associated with the compact suburban business district listed in Table 11.21 are more applicable to the planning areas described in Chapter 12.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Dispersed Suburban Business District</th>
<th>Fragmented Suburban Business District</th>
<th>Compact Suburban Business District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Density</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor/Area Ratio</td>
<td>Up to 0.5</td>
<td>0.5 to 2.5</td>
<td>2.5 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>Up to 25 percent of lot area</td>
<td>25 to 50 percent of lot area</td>
<td>50 percent or more of lot area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>Generally exceeds ten acres</td>
<td>Greater than one acre</td>
<td>Less than one acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Layout</td>
<td>Superblock</td>
<td>Superblock</td>
<td>Grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation b/w buildings</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Dominate Space?</td>
<td>No, buildings setback from road; often one to two stories in height in campus/park setting</td>
<td>No, buildings set back from road and separated by surface parking lots</td>
<td>Yes, buildings built to street alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Subject to charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Parking Type</td>
<td>Surface parking (unrestricted access)</td>
<td>Surface Parking (restricted access)</td>
<td>Garages (restricted access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of transit service</td>
<td>Local, very infrequent</td>
<td>Local, infrequent</td>
<td>District-centric more frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian orientation and quality of public space</td>
<td>Very weak, developments far apart and not within walking distance</td>
<td>Weak, often no pedestrian linkages; encourages patrons to drive to adjoining developments</td>
<td>Strong, encourages pedestrian activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on cars for access</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice in mode of transportation</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Many of the existing regulatory controls for commercial corridors in unincorporated Greenburgh coincide with the attributes associated with dispersed suburban districts. Several land-use based strategies in the commercial corridors have been identified, where appropriate, to facilitate a stronger retail base in terms of business growth, job
creation and income growth. Section 12.7 lists policies that would facilitate greater flexibility to allow site improvements such as increased landscaping, better site to site integration and design. More flexible off-street parking standards and other bulk controls are necessary to allow site owners to provide a higher quality built form oriented to pedestrians and site users. Section 12.7 also notes the importance of providing consistent zoning regulatory controls in the Town’s major corridors and the importance of updating the permitted, special permit and accessory uses to ensure that these corridors have minimal vacancies and thrive as places of businesses. The review of uses in the Town’s commercial corridors must also take into account the evolving nature of retail and the need for flexibility, to compete with increased pressure from online sales.

11.7.4 Inflow/Outflow Analysis

A market positioning study specific to the Central Park Avenue corridor called the Central Avenue Market Positioning Analysis (Appendix D) was performed in connection with this Plan. Its surplus/leakage analysis determined that sufficient buying power exists within proximity to the corridor and that there is leakage for several sectors. Leakage exists when the local demand is met by stores outside the geographic area. The analysis takes into account local and regional demographics, competition and consumer markets. It concludes that Central Park Avenue is able to compete for virtually any type of retail opportunity.

Although the surplus/leakage analysis looks at very specific sectors, it notes that the critical issue for the corridor is not to define particular sectors in which it can compete but to ensure that Town policy supports a general approach to commercial development which will enable Central Park Avenue to compete overall in that regional marketplace.

The surplus/leakage analysis and conclusions generated for Central Park Avenue can be extrapolated for other unincorporated Greenburgh commercial corridors. The Central Park Avenue corridor and the portion of Rt. 119 east of the Village of Elmsford to the City of White Plains (Tarrytown Road) possess similar characteristics. Both have commercial businesses located within freestanding buildings and strip mall developments or are comprised of big box retail (a minimum of 50,000 sq. ft.). The main difference in the corridors is that Central Park Avenue has more multi-family residential buildings than this portion of Rt. 119. The Rt. 9A (Saw Mill River Road) corridor north of the Village of Elmsford also contains big box retail and commercial businesses mainly in free standing buildings. Because there is sufficient documented buying power locally and regionally, it can be expected that providing a higher quality built form would result in an increase in both property values and economic vitality in the Rt. 119 and Rt. 9A corridors.

11.7.5 Projected Sales & Net New Development

Retail sales are largely a function of the general health of the economy. When the regional and national economy are healthy, there tend to be fewer local vacancies. The retail sector in unincorporated Greenburgh has not experienced widespread economic distress or vacancies in the last 30 years, or even during the last difficult five years (2008-2013). There are other factors, however, that influence local sales. The increase in retail competition from nearby developments is one factor that should be
considered. Three of the largest nearby retail developments are listed below. A noteworthy aspect of these neighboring developments is the attention paid to pedestrian-friendly site design.

- Ridge Hill in Yonkers (1.3 million sq. ft., $842 million open-air mall that opened in 2012 on 81 acres)
- Cross County Shopping Center in Yonkers (recently underwent a $250 million modernization overhaul, adding new development for a total of approximately 1 million sq. ft.)
- City Center development in White Plains (a 1.1 million sq. ft. retail, entertainment and residential complex)

In the absence of changes to the current retail development policies in the existing CA, DS, CB and IB Districts, it is anticipated that the economic performance of the commercial corridors (employment growth, property values and tax revenues) will not vary from traditional output for the following reasons.

- A majority of the commercial corridors (Rt. 100, 9A, 119) do not have vacant sites where new development would add significant leasable space that would influence the percentage of economic growth.
- Commercial sites that exist often meet or exceed the allowable development potential permitted.
- Retail competitors outside unincorporated Greenburgh will likely continue to draw a growing percentage of local and regional sales.

The retail-based economic development strategies discussed in Section 11.7.3 are expected to positively influence employment growth, property values and tax revenues. The flexibility envisioned with respect to parking requirements and allowable floor area can result in site layout and aesthetic improvements that subsequently draw more consistent and greater sales. Existing customers that use retail businesses in unincorporated Greenburgh, through a better overall experience, may choose to conduct a greater percentage of their business here. New customers may be drawn in by a better shopping experience.

A strategy to influence increased business within the Town’s mixed-use corridors (Rt. 119, Central Park Avenue, and portions of Rt. 9A) involves attracting magnet uses. Magnet uses are defined as non-residential uses which draw spending dollars from within and from outside the community by virtue of being a destination-type business. One example is a car dealership. The presence of a dealership on Central Park Avenue, for example, attracts a wide range of customers, who also have the potential to use neighboring shops or restaurants, whereas otherwise, those customers may have never been drawn to Central Park Avenue. Specific strategies that would support the concept of magnet uses could entail the following: (1) reaching out to residents to identify which types of magnet uses, if any, would enhance the Town’s business corridors; and (2) once identified, a second strategy could be to have policies which provide to attract and enable particular magnet uses.
11.7.6 Tax collection

In 2012, approximately 22.90 percent of property tax revenue was generated from properties with commercial uses (inclusive of office and industrial uses). For the purposes of this section, commercial property tax revenue sources include all property tax that is not generated from vacant, residential or utility uses. As listed in Table 11.22, there are approximately 264 lots (2.29 percent) comprising 3.92 percent of land area with traditional retail uses such as stores, restaurants and service establishments. This breakdown excludes golf courses and private camps, office uses, industrial uses and utilities. Figure 11.2 shows the locations of these existing commercial uses in unincorporated Greenburgh.

| Table 11.22: Non-Residential Use Land Area Percentages (2012) - Unincorporated Greenburgh |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Year**                        | **Parcels**     | **Percent ***   | **Acreage**     | **Percent of Total Acreage** |
| Commercial                      | 264             | 2.29%           | 435             | 3.92%                        |
| Office                          | 83              | 0.72%           | 534             | 4.81%                        |
| Industrial                      | 59              | 0.51%           | 198             | 1.78%                        |

* Percentage of total number of lots in unincorporated Greenburgh (11,551)

Source: Town of Greenburgh GIS (21 February 2013)
Property owners in unincorporated Greenburgh pay: Town property tax, applicable school district tax, Westchester County tax, the applicable sanitary sewer district tax, the applicable fire or fire protection district tax, special district tax (if applicable), park district tax (if applicable), tax increment financing district tax (if applicable), and consolidated sewer maintenance district tax (if applicable). Appendix G includes lists various 2014 tax rates per $1,000 of assessed value.

An understanding of these tax-related dynamics, and an understanding of the connections between local budgets and land uses, is necessary to evaluate fiscal impacts. Individual fiscal analyses will be required in connection with applicable future development proposals in the Town.

11.8 Office Development

11.8.1 Market Overview

Existing office space in unincorporated Greenburgh is concentrated on White Plains Road (Rt. 119) and Taxter Road. Office space is scattered along Saw Mill River Road (Rt. 9A) and Central Park Avenue and is also located at various single sites throughout the Town. These spaces exist as office buildings for business, governmental and professional uses, including administrative training, data processing, publication, financial and sales offices; and offices or agencies for scientific or technical development, including laboratories and libraries. Research and development (R&D) uses are primarily located in or near the existing office park on Rt. 119, in the north portion of the Town along Old Saw Mill River Road, and in the southern portion of the Town along Rt. 9A. Table 11.23 lists office spaces of at least 100,000 sq. ft., of which there are at least 22 separate locations. Cross Westchester Executive Park on Route 9A features 26 office and office/flex buildings that offer 1.3 million square feet of space for corporate offices, technology-related facilities, and light industrial, distribution, and service centers.
### Table 11.23: Office/Flex Space Inventory (100,000 sq. ft.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Name/Complex</th>
<th>Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomed - Ardsley Park</td>
<td>715,700</td>
<td>430 Saw Mill River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spine Building</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>Spine Building (Landmark at Eastview Site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 White Plains Road</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>600 White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrytown Corporate Center</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>660 White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Warehouse Lane</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>4 Warehouse Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Landmark at Eastview</td>
<td>194,000</td>
<td>765 Old Saw Mill River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxter Corporate Park</td>
<td>173,000</td>
<td>565 Taxter Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrytown Corporate Center</td>
<td>171,761</td>
<td>520 White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxter Corporate Park</td>
<td>170,599</td>
<td>555 Taxter Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerox Corporation</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>580 White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Clearbrook Road</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>250 Clearbrook Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 6</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>600 Executive Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-420 Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>410-420 Saw Mill River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287 Corporate Plaza</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>100 Hillside Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 White Plains Road</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>560 White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 White Plains Road</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>555 White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASF</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>540 White Plains Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Fairview Corporate Park Drive</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>103 Fairview Corporate Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 Executive Blvd.</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>700 Executive Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444 Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>444 Saw Mill River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>777 Old Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>777 Old Saw Mill River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,125,060</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Ferrandino & Associates, 2009*
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11.8.2 Trends and Projections

It is anticipated that the demand for new office space will remain modest at best, partially because of the prevalence of existing vacant office space. The average area utilized per worker is also declining. In 1970, the average employee used 500-700 sq. ft. of work area. This area decreased to 176 sq. ft. in 2012 and is projected to decrease to 151 sq. ft. in 2017. (4) As information technology allows more and more work to be done by offices with smaller staffs or from off-site locations, the demand for office space will likely remain modest even as the economy recovers. The most desirable office space will be in campus settings and/or in spaces which offer state of the art and green amenities. Figure 11.2 shows the locations of existing office uses. The conversion of office space to alternative uses is also a strategy that has successfully and recently been utilized, particularly in Westchester County.

The potential for corridor improvements beyond the current scope of the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement is a regional factor that can influence the location of additional office space. The placement of a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station within the office park on Rt. 119 is an improvement detailed in Chapter 12.0 and Chapter 9.0 (Transportation). BRT stations are intended to be the focal point of a vibrant district. Office parks are enhanced when incorporating a better mix of uses, for example bike and pedestrian trailways. An increased demand for office space is anticipated in conjunction with additional investment in the Rt. 119 office park campus.

Section 12.11 details two specific strategies to gather momentum from the increase in the presence of the research and development (R&D) sector. The existing cluster of research and development and office buildings along Saw Mill River Road (Rt. 9A) south of the Village of Ardsley are part of the R&D Cluster South planning initiative. The strategy here is to facilitate a cluster of research and development activity in a campus setting. The conditions that support this strategy include the presence of highways, the South County Trailway, separation from single family neighborhoods, availability of workforce, complementary development in adjacent municipalities (Rivertowns Square in the Village of Dobbs Ferry) and the growing presence of the R&D sector. Increased demand for additional R&D space can be accommodated in unincorporated Greenburgh.

Section 12.11.1 details strategies associated with the R&D Cluster North planning initiative. In this area of unincorporated Greenburgh the comparative advantages include the presence of highways, the North/South County Trailway, separation from established residential neighborhoods, availability of workforce, proximity to universities, and the presence of adjacent and established similar research and development uses. A vacant 100-acre lot, located within this planning area, is anticipated to become the site of additional biotech and other life science uses.

11.8.3 Projected Office Employment Growth

New York Medical College is planning to install a significant new biotechnology incubator laboratory and an advanced development center in Valhalla as part of a public-private enterprise to enhance job growth in the private biotech sector. Biotechnology and the broader category of life sciences is the fastest growing industry sector in the Mid-Hudson Region, growing 86 percent in employment in the period 2000-2010.(2) Average annual wages of $107,280 in 2010 were the second highest in
the region. The areas identified on Figure 12.13 as Research and Development Cluster North, Research and Development Cluster South, and Research and Development Supportive-Planned Development contain significant land area and can accommodate major sector growth and a diverse mix of uses producing high quality jobs.

11.9 Industrial Development

11.9.1 Industrial Overview
Industrial land development, which primarily includes warehousing and manufacturing uses, was once the economic core of Westchester County and the Mid-Hudson Region. These uses appear to be steadily diminishing and occupy fewer than 2,400 acres of land in Westchester County, 0.8 percent of the county’s land area. Unincorporated Greenburgh, with approximately 198 acres, has the second highest number of acres of industrial uses in Westchester County.

11.9.2 Development Patterns
There is one major cluster of industrial uses, several smaller concentrations, and a few single-use industrial sites. The major cluster is located north of the Village of Elmsford along or within close proximity to Saw Mill River Road. Smaller concentrations of industrial uses are found just east of the Village of Elmsford along Tarrytown Road (NYS Rt. 119); between the Cross Westchester Expressway (I-287) and Old Tarrytown Road; and in the southeastern corner of unincorporated Greenburgh along the Village of Dobbs Ferry and Hastings-on-Hudson borders. Figure 11.2 shows the locations of existing industrial uses with good highway access or on state roads.

New York State’s recently adopted Beyond Waste Plan promotes the development of reuse and recycling infrastructure and end-use markets. State driven strategies include expanding market development initiatives to target the processing of compost materials as a means to create green jobs and to encourage local recycling based manufacturing. Local industrial development sites in Westchester traditionally have not been utilized for the recycling of organic waste. There may be an opportunity for a local processing facility in the existing industrial sector. This could lessen the amount of organic byproduct that currently leaves this region at a large economic and environmental cost.

11.9.3 Land Availability Constraints
There are 59 lots (0.59 percent of total lots) in unincorporated Greenburgh comprising approximately 198 acres (1.78 percent of total land area) that contain industrial uses. While there are additional land areas that are currently zoned for industrial uses, these lands are primarily developed with commercial or office uses. The clusters of industrial uses located north of the Village of Elmsford and south of the Village of Ardsley (both on Rt. 9A – Saw Mill River Road) are isolated from established single-family neighborhoods. Both of these clusters are also buffered by topography and/or the presence of highways, partially establishing the basis for greater intensities of development, as described in the R&D Sector North and South planning initiatives in Chapter 12.0. In terms of constraints, portions of the...
existing industrial cluster north of the Village of Elmsford are located within floodplains or areas that are prone to flooding. This condition highlights the need to develop in an environmentally sensitive manner.

11.9.4 Industrial Development Outlook
There are no planned policies to extend existing industrially zoned districts into other areas of unincorporated Greenburgh. However, there are policies to support additional uses that are complementary to the planned research and development sector in the northern portion of Town along Saw Mill River Road. Some of these complementary uses would be industrial sector-based. The potential future implementation of a Route 9A Bypass could significantly benefit the existing industrial areas in the vicinity of Warehouse Lane and Fairview Park Drive by providing enhanced highway transportation access. It is anticipated that industrial uses will continue to seek locations that are accessible to highways. It is also anticipated that there will be a continued “greening” effect within the industrial sector. Those manufacturing and industrial sectors with efficient, green buildings and processes will be desirable.

11.10 Development Strategies

11.10.1 Economic Development Implementation Programs
Planned growth occurs when a community undertakes a vision-based approach to expansion of commercial areas. A plan that shows where and how development can take place provides clarity with respect to a strong community-based vision. Changes to zoning regulations and/or adoption of new town policies are the primary methods to encourage smarter development based on the community’s vision. Regulations help protect the health and safety of a community and help maintain the quality of life. The economic development strategies of this Plan will require innovative, carefully reasoned zoning changes. These subsequent changes will be based on a collaborative public process to ensure conformance with the policies herein. Predictability is usually more appreciated by businesses than a lax regulatory system.

Governments sometimes offer incentives to businesses to encourage growth. As the policies of this Plan conform to County and State plans, potential access to funding through a variety of State and Federal grant programs becomes more viable. Through the incorporation of these concepts into a long term development strategy, the Town can ensure unincorporated Greenburgh is not at a competitive disadvantage when new business or development is looking to locate in the area.

New York State’s Consolidated Funding Application (CFA) provides potential funding associated with planning initiatives, consistent with the Mid-Hudson REDC Strategic Plan and the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan. NYERDA’s Phase II Cleaner, Greener Communities Program has up to $90 million in funding for planning initiatives that minimize GHG emissions and save energy while improving local economic opportunities.
The use of financial incentives to developers or businesses through Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) or bonding capabilities through a Local Development Corporation (LDC) to advance the policies herein are also tools which could be considered.

11.10.2 Livable Communities/Quality of Life

A municipality with amenities that enhance quality-of-life, such as recreational opportunities, a diverse and exciting culture, low crime, good schools, daycare facilities and a clean environment, attracts people simply because it is a nice place to be. Some quality of life factors are beyond the control of cities and regions (climate). Factors that local municipalities can influence are public services such as public safety, parks and open space, and environmental management.

11.10.3 Workforce Development

Following national trends, the Mid-Hudson Region’s economy has evolved into an economy based on the production and application of knowledge, with less of a focus on the production of physical goods. Therefore, a critical component to enhanced economic growth in unincorporated Greenburgh is to promote an adequately educated and trained workforce. One method entails coordinating with local and prospective businesses and the existing education community to develop a Workforce Development plan. By identifying what employers need and coordinating those needs with higher education institutions, the plan could foster a conduit between business/industry and schools. Coordinating business development with workforce development creates a network of organizations that will have local and regional economic benefits. Unincorporated Greenburgh can help develop these assets through public/private partnerships with local companies and educational institutions.

Westchester Community College, located in unincorporated Greenburgh, and New York Medical College, located nearby in the Town of Mt. Pleasant, are seen as potential partnership possibilities to help strengthen the growing biotech sector. There are several potential initiatives where businesses could partner with local high schools and colleges to develop management training, research and development work and internship programs. Westchester Community College has taken a successful lead in this type of development.

11.10.4 Infrastructure Development

Another factor to attract business is the ability to offer quality infrastructure. Infrastructure can be broken into two main categories, “hard/physical” infrastructure networks, such as local roads, water and sewer, drainage, recreation facilities, parks, and open space; and “soft” infrastructure services, such as cultural, civic and library facilities. Unincorporated Greenburgh offers both. The Plan notes where deficiencies exist and where and what improvements are expected in connection with future development. As the Plan is intended to direct private investment to distinct portions of unincorporated Greenburgh, it indicates why the improvements will benefit a particular site and provide benefits for the community as a whole.
11.10.5 Business Retention/Expansion

Strategies that are valid in attracting businesses and providing jobs across the economic spectrum are relevant to retaining existing businesses. It is important to understand what existing businesses value. Some of the strategies listed below are currently carried out in unincorporated Greenburgh. Such interactions have taken place in the absence of a unified and town-wide vision established as part of a Comprehensive Plan.

- Surveys of local businesses to determine plans for changes or expansions and attitudes toward local government
- Periodic business roundtables or breakfasts
- Creation of teams of local officials to expedite responses to problems identified by local businesses

Other strategies could include future consideration of economic development staffing (as Town budgeting can facilitate) and/or consideration of the creation of an economic development committee to attract new businesses and coordinate new development opportunities that are consistent with the Plan.

11.10.6 Marketing Campaign

A marketing campaign can showcase unincorporated Greenburgh as a great place to work, learn, live, visit, shop, and play. As companies and residents consider locating in our community, factors including schools, parks, housing, amenities, higher education, public safety, health and medical care are important. This Plan highlights existing assets. Implementation of the policies herein will strengthen these assets. Marketing will consist of a concerted effort to reinforce that investment consistent with this Plan will be embraced as a true public/private partnership. Direct marketing techniques can take many forms:

- Brochures or pamphlets, either general in nature or targeted to a specific industrial classification
- Advertisements in trade publications or generalized advertising supplements
- Direct mail to specific industries or locational consultants
- Participation in industry trade shows
- Telemarketing of potential businesses
- Hosting seminars for prospective businesses
- Websites (including information on development proposals that are consistent with the Plan)

List of Sources

(1) http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm
(2) REDC Strategic Plan - http://regionalcouncils.ny.gov/content/mid-hudson
(3) (Sarasota, FL – Sarasota’s Smart Growth Dividend; Asheville, NC – Nine Community Study – About Town, Building Revenue for Communities)
(4) Planning Magazine, 2014 - Office Density p.36
11.11 Economic Development Goals, Objectives and Policies

GOAL 11.1: Ensure that Private Investment Strategies are consistent with the Plan.

OBJECTIVE 11.1.1: Plan and implement economic development industry cluster strategies consistent with the regional approach of the Plan.

POLICY 11.1.1.1: Coordinate economic development strategies with adjacent municipalities, where applicable.

POLICY 11.1.1.2: Continue to utilize traditional inter-municipal coordination through the Westchester County Planning Department.

POLICY 11.1.1.3: Support planning initiatives that are consistent with Westchester 2025 and New York State economic development policies.

POLICY 11.1.1.4: Support planning initiatives that are consistent with the Regional Economic Development Council’s REDC Strategic Plan.

POLICY 11.1.1.5: Support planning initiatives that are consistent with the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan.

GOAL 11.2: Retain and Attract a wide range of Business Sectors.

OBJECTIVE 11.2.1: Strengthen the viability of economic development plans through a collaborative process that incorporates the knowledge of industry sectors.

POLICY 11.2.1.1: Utilize marketing techniques established in Section 11.10.5 for business retention, expansion and attraction.

POLICY 11.2.1.2: Conduct roundtables with leaders in the local R&D community to best understand the amenities and uses needed to create an enhanced industry cluster.

POLICY 11.2.1.3: Support the successful lead Westchester Community College has taken with regard to programs offered for workforce development and identify opportunities to foster close university/R&D sector interactions.

POLICY 11.2.1.4: Support policies in the Plan that seek to retain and stimulate small businesses and mature industries such as distribution, financial and professional services, food and beverage and health care.

POLICY 11.2.1.5: Enhance coordination with Westchester Community College and facilitate roundtables with area businesses.

POLICY 11.2.1.6: Implement economic development strategies that take into account the changing nature of retail (such as ever-increasing online sales).
GOAL 11.3: Improve Infrastructure to make Commercial Corridors more Business Ready.

OBJECTIVE 11.3.1: Utilize existing infrastructure assets and planned improvements to advance policies consistent with the Plan.

POLICY 11.3.1.1: Promote infrastructure investments in targeted growth areas.

POLICY 11.3.1.2: Work collaboratively with the private development sector to leverage regional funding sources to support necessary infrastructure upgrades.

GOAL 11.4: Foster Direct Connections between Transportation and Economic Development.

OBJECTIVE 11.4.1: Utilize existing transportation assets and planned improvements to advance policies consistent with the Plan.

POLICY 11.4.1.1: Continue to advocate for corridor-wide transportation improvements associated with the Tappan Zee Bridge.

POLICY 11.4.1.2: Continue to advocate for a Route 9A By-pass to improve access and enhance the economic viability of the industrial district and the R&D Cluster North and related supportive areas.

POLICY 11.4.1.3: Continue to advocate for a Route 9A By-pass to facilitate inter-municipal planning efforts with the Village of Elmsford and long-term improvements to the Rt. 9A Saw Mill River Road corridor consistent with the unincorporated Greenburgh/Elmsford Rt. 9A Gateway District.

POLICY 11.4.1.4: Support the continued use of shuttle buses and jitney service that transport employees to their places of employment.

POLICY 11.4.1.5: Support economic development initiatives that increase employment opportunities within unincorporated Greenburgh.

GOAL 11.5: Facilitate Enhanced Investment in our Commercial Corridors.

OBJECTIVE 11.5.1: Utilize innovative and flexible regulations that facilitate identified site improvements.

POLICY 11.5.1.1: Support the attributes of successful suburban business districts that promote pedestrian orientation and high quality of public space, where appropriate.

POLICY 11.5.1.2: Support flexible parking, increased floor area ratio, graduated density zoning, and other regulations that promote private investment into commercial sites, where consistent with the Plan.
POLICY 11.5.1.3: Support the continued use of landscaping buffers in major shopping centers which differentiate them from retail centers with no open space feel.

POLICY 11.5.1.4: Support park-once policies which promote easy access to multiple sites.

POLICY 11.5.1.5: Coordinate with the community and other stakeholders to identify which types of magnet uses would enhance the Town’s business corridors.

POLICY 11.5.1.6: Explore strategies which attract and enable particular magnet uses.

POLICY 11.5.1.7: Amend Chapter 240, Sign and Illumination Law to have greater consistency regarding signage requirements in each non-residential District, to be less restrictive regarding permitted size allowances, while maintaining an attractive corridor.

GOAL 11.6: Leverage Economic Benefits Associated with Development.

OBJECTIVE 11.6.1: Support job creation and an expanded tax base.

POLICY 11.6.1.1: Support the use of attractive structured parking that blends into and enhances a district as part of economic development and private investment into the targeted planning areas.

POLICY 11.6.1.2: Improve the image of the commercial corridors through development incorporating buildings with strong architectural qualities.

POLICY 11.6.1.3: Support development that is complementary to established one-family neighborhoods which will benefit property values and enhance quality of life.

GOAL 11.7: Utilize Town Staff Services and Municipal Assets to Facilitate Policies of the Plan.

OBJECTIVE 11.7.1: Strengthen the viability of economic development plans through a collaborative public process.

POLICY 11.7.1.1: Utilize public assets such as those associated with the Hartsdale Public Parking District, Police Headquarters and Town Court Building to advance initiatives of the Plan.

POLICY 11.7.1.2: Support revitalization of the Riley Pond as a public resource and centerpiece to economic development associated with the Riley Pond Study Area.
GOAL 11.8: Pursue Available Financial Assistance to Advance Potential for Private Investment.

OBJECTIVE 11.8.1: Apply for grants that have goals consistent with those established throughout the Plan.

POLICY 11.8.1.1: Submit Consolidated Funding Application’s to New York State for funding associated with the many planning initiatives that are consistent with the Mid-Hudson REDC Strategic Plan and the Mid-Hudson Regional Sustainability Plan.

POLICY 11.8.1.2: Submit Phase II Cleaner, Greener Communities Program funding applications for planning initiatives consistent with this Plan that seek to minimize GHG emissions and save energy while improving the local economy.

GOAL 11.9 Maintain a Healthy Economic Environment in Greenburgh.

OBJECTIVE 11.9.1: Sustain a balance of land uses that recognizes the unique qualities of Greenburgh.

POLICY 11.9.1.1: Guide development using the land use recommendations of this Plan.

POLICY 11.9.1.2: Require economic impact analyses for applicable projects, factoring in the various taxing jurisdictions listed in Section 11.7.7 and infrastructure costs/benefits.

POLICY 11.9.1.3: Ensure that new development does not negatively impact the value of surrounding property.

POLICY 11.9.1.4: Review the zoning ordinance to ensure that permitted, special permit and accessory uses contain enforceable provisions to provide for the protection and promotion of the public health, safety, convenience, comfort and general welfare.
Chapter 12.0 Land Use and Zoning

12.1 Relationship to our Guiding Principles

Land-use planning that follows the vision of this Plan can play a major role in improving our quality of life, facilitating better development, enhancing environmental protection, and supporting more efficient transportation and infrastructure. This chapter describes existing and proposed land uses. While other chapters of this Plan have some overlapping subjects, this chapter has extensive connections with all other sections of the Plan and is intended to preserve and enhance our strengths and shape future development. Chapter 12.0 confirms the need to evaluate development in relationship to indicated planned use and impacts on the surrounding community. It acknowledges the need for economic evaluation that assesses the impacts on the multiple municipal budgets that could be affected.

12.2 Enhancing Sense of Place in Greenburgh

‘Sense of place’ refers to the set of characteristics that make a community distinct. The preceding chapters of the Plan highlight the diversity in unincorporated Greenburgh. Our sense of place is derived from unique and varied neighborhoods, cultural institutions, landscape, history, and residents and businesses. Physical features such as the types of housing and other buildings in a community, the presence of parks and open space and the locations of these features also create a sense of place. Preservation of our uniqueness coupled with policies that facilitate planned enhancements will allow unincorporated Greenburgh to become an even greater place to live, work and play. Specific land-use policies are intended to complement existing neighborhoods.

12.3 Existing Conditions

12.3.1 Existing Zoning Map

Unincorporated Greenburgh’s GIS-based zoning map, adopted on September 12, 2012 and last revised on April 22, 2015, is presented as Figure 12.1. The 28 zoning districts include: seven one-family residence, seven multi-family residence, one planned unit development, one non-residential planned development, three office business, four commercial, two mixed-use, two industrial and one urban renewal district. There is also one overlay district. Each of these zoning districts regulates land usage and site layouts.

On Figure 12.2, the existing zoning districts have been combined into six usage groups (one-family, multi-family, general office-commercial, Planned Unit Development, industrial, and Urban Renewal) for the purposes of comparing existing land use and for future land-use planning.
Figure 12.1: Existing Zoning Map
12.3.2 Existing Land Use Map

Existing land uses, Figure 12.3.1, are broken down into 15 specific categories based on the property class code assigned to each parcel by the Assessor’s Office. The property class code is derived from historic data and ongoing monitoring that reflects the existing designation of each lot. The map contains specific use designations; however, some legal non-conforming uses exist. The map also depicts the location of vacant parcels. The number and location of vacant lots are used for deriving approximate potential build-out figures under existing zoning district regulations.

12.3.3 Existing Build-out Analysis

The build-out analysis is used to understand the current development potential of land area, taking into account unincorporated Greenburgh’s vacant and underdeveloped land, existing land use regulations, environmental constraints, conservation areas, and rights-of-way. The analysis is a tool for evaluating the impact of existing regulations and their effectiveness in implementing various aspects of a Comprehensive Plan. The build-out analysis is also useful for comparative purposes in future land-use planning. Within each use grouping that follows in this chapter, vacant land, underdeveloped parcels and parcels that could be redeveloped are noted and discussed in connection with their development potential.

12.4 Future Land-Use Mapping and Plan

The future land-use maps provide clarity with respect to planned conditions and development and are distinguished by three different formats.

The first format assigns land use categories to each parcel and is shown on Figure 12.3.2. These categories form the basis for retaining a parcel’s existing zoning district or proposing a zoning district change. A majority of the time the future land use designation is based on the existing underlying land use. Most of the recommended zoning changes are the result of zoning boundaries that segment existing lots. Each of the land use categories has a narrative description of existing conditions, future build-out under existing conditions and future land-use planning.

The second format involves planning areas where land use, inter-municipal and transportation strategies need to be coordinated. Figure 12.16 depicts planning areas in general locations that are not lot-specific. The reason for this distinction is that while the planning concept and envisioned development is articulated in this Plan, the exact totality of parcels required to bring the concept to fruition is unknown. As such, there are no immediate recommended zoning changes that will result from this map or the policies associated with the planned mixed-use areas.

The third type of future land-use map contains areas where opportunities for public-private partnerships exist or where public improvements are planned, as shown on Figure 12.18. Each of these areas contains at least one parcel owned by the Town of Greenburgh or another public entity. There are no immediate recommended zoning changes as a result of this type of future land-use overlay map. Several of the publicly-owned parcels highlighted fall within the planning areas described in Section 12.9.
Figure 12.3.1: Existing Land Use
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Produced by: Town of Greenburgh, Sarah Pawlczek
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Date Produced: June 2016
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Figure 12.3.2: Future Land Use
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12.5 Proposed Zoning Changes (Phased Implementation)

Zoning map changes which will follow adoption of this Plan are based on the lot-specific future land-use plan. These changes are considered “first phase” zoning map changes and require no associated zoning text amendments. First phase zoning changes are listed in Appendix E.

A “second phase” of zoning changes would require the elimination of one existing zoning district and the creation of new districts and associated zoning text amendments. It is anticipated that the second phase changes would be initiated within one year of adoption of the Plan. Twenty-seven of the 28 individual zoning districts and the one overlay district would remain. The Urban Renewal (UR) district, discussed in Section 12.6.39, would be eliminated. Section 12.6.24 contains a policy to create a public park zoning district for public parks.

Other zoning changes or additions are expected in a “third phase” of implementation and are anticipated largely as a result of the plans shown on Figures 12.16 and 12.18, and discussed in Sections 12.8 and 12.10. These zoning changes represent a targeted redevelopment strategy that can provide for non-residential redevelopment opportunities, where appropriate.

12.6 Land Use Groupings

In this section, land uses are grouped into 13 individual categories (one-family residence, multi-family residence, planned unit development, general office-commercial, institutional, government, industrial, public parks and dedicated open space, private recreation, research and development, cemetery, public utility and urban renewal). For each category there is a separate discussion of existing land uses, a hypothetical build-out scenario using existing zoning regulations and zoning map designations and a discussion of future land use. The future land use discussion contains recommendations for rezoning, where appropriate.

12.6.1 One-Family Residence (Existing)

The seven one-family residence districts (R-5 through R-40) occupy approximately 8,327 acres (75.0 percent) of land area. Table 12.1 lists the existing acreage of these districts and their allowable densities. One-family detached dwellings and approved accessory structures are the primary uses in these districts. Parcels actually containing one-family dwellings occupy approximately 3,166 acres (28.5 percent) of total land area and approximately 38.0 percent of the land area of one-family residence districts. Appendix H provides information related to one-family residences relative to school districts.

Public parks, playgrounds or similar recreational areas, firehouses, police stations, public safety and municipal buildings, places of religious worship and public schools are permitted uses in the one-family residence districts and account for many of the acres shown in Table 12.1. Special permit uses include but are not limited to private schools, camps and assisted living facilities. Agricultural uses such as those associated
with the farm on West Hartsdale Avenue and Secor Road are also permitted in one-family residence districts. The UR, Planned Unit Development (PUD), and various office-commercial districts also permit one-family residences. The locations of one-family residences are depicted on Figure 12.3.1, while areas currently zoned as one-family residence districts are depicted on Figure 12.4.1. Chapter 10.0 (Demographics and Housing) contains detailed information on one-family neighborhoods.

### Table 12.1: Existing One-Family Residence & Urban Renewal Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Existing Acreage</th>
<th>Existing Percent of Acreage*</th>
<th>Min Lot Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Max Allowable Residential Unit Density/Acre (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence (R-40)</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence (R-30)</td>
<td>1,331</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence (R-20)</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence (R-15)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence (R-10)</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence (R-7.5)</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence (R-5)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,327</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal (UR) (1)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Unincorporated Greenburgh Land Area

(1) Includes only the sub-areas (Residential A, low– and medium density) of the UR district that permit one-family residences.

(2) This calculation does not exclude land area needed for roads.

Poet’s Corner’s - A one-family neighborhood in unincorporated Greenburgh
Figure 12.4.1: Existing Zoning District Grouping (One-Family Residence Districts)
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12.6.2 One-Family Residence Build-out Under Existing Zoning

The maximum build-out of one-family residences is estimated using the number of vacant parcels in the R-5 through R-40 districts, the UR district, and the potential for subdivisions. Table 12.2 lists vacant lots in the one-family residence districts.

Table 12.2: One-Family Residence District Vacant Build-out Analysis Estimates *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Vacant Lot Total (1)</th>
<th>Total Potential Build-out Estimate(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-5 (5,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7.5 (7,500 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10 (10,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-15 (15,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-20 (20,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-30 (30,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-40 (40,000 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR District (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>446</strong></td>
<td><strong>555</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes land area containing public/private institutions, golf courses, day camps, swim/tennis clubs, etc. and does not take into account steep slopes/wetlands or other environmental review criteria used in connection with SEQRA.
(1) Individual or a collection of adjacent lots containing the minimum required lot acreage based on existing zoning.
(2) Number of One-Family residences (includes approved or sites under construction) - As of December, 2013
(3) Includes only the sub-areas (Residential A, low- and medium density) of the UR district that permit one-family residences

There are 446 existing vacant parcels in the one-family residence districts and the applicable portions of the UR district that have the minimum required lot size. Some of these vacant lots have been approved as buildable lots in connection with recent subdivisions and are yet to be developed with new residences. Other vacant lots may or may not require subdivision approval for development with one-family residences. In total, vacant parcels project a maximum residential build-out of 555 one-family units based on their land area and underlying zoning district or based on previous subdivision approvals.

Some lots contain a residence but have significant excess land area providing the potential for subdivisions. Several existing land-use regulations, such as setbacks and flag lot provisions, or environmental features such as wetlands, watercourses and steep slopes, are factors limiting the potential for subdivisions. There appear to be eight sites in unincorporated Greenburgh that could be subdivided to create five or more buildable lots.

One-family residential unit build-out estimates associated with private recreation areas are quantified in Table 12.3. The development potential of lands with existing private recreation areas are listed separately from vacant lands.

---

Excluding private recreation areas, there are 446 vacant parcels in the one-family and UR districts that could, based on existing zoning, result in a maximum build-out of 555 new one-family residences.
The six golf courses (with the exception of the Saint Andrew’s Golf Course, which is a PUD), several day camps, and private recreation areas listed in Table 12.3 consist of approximately 828 acres, 10.1 percent of the land area in the one-family residence districts. These existing uses serve important recreational and open space roles. For the purposes of a hypothetical build-out, when factoring only their land area, underlying zoning designations and space needed for internal streets, there is an estimated potential of 954 one-family residential units on private/recreational land. It should be noted that the site specific SEQRA reviews that would accompany the hypothetical subsequent residential development in these locations would likely further reduce the overall number of residential units.

Table 12.3: One-Family Residence District Land-Use Conversion Build-out Estimates *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Non-Residential Use</th>
<th>Existing Acreage</th>
<th>Existing Zoning District</th>
<th>Potential Residential Unit Build-out Estimate *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Country Club</td>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>R-30 (30,000)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knollwood Country Club</td>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>R-30 (30,000)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis Country Club</td>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>R-20 (20,000)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarsdale Golf Club</td>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>R-20 (20,000)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Saint Andrew's Golf Club</td>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>PUD **</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunningdale Country Club</td>
<td>Golf Club</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>R-30 (30,000)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester Golf</td>
<td>Driving Range</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>R-30 (30,000)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Hillard</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R-20 (20,000)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Day Camp</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R-30 (30,000)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Day Camp and Day School</td>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>R-10 (10,000)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarry Crest Swimming and Tennis Club</td>
<td>Swim/Tennis Club</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>R-40 (40,000)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maplewood Swim and Tennis Club</td>
<td>Swim/Tennis Club</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R-20 (20,000)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>844</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not take into account steep slopes/wetlands or other environmental review criteria used in connection with SEQRA. Formula (Existing Acreage / Underlying Zoning / 25% = Projected Build-out Estimate) - 25% accounts for space needed for internal streets.

** Land associated with this property is open space/private recreation in connection with PUD. Does not include residentially developed portion of Saint Andrew’s.

12.6.3 One-Family Residence (Future Land-use)

Areas highlighted on Figure 12.4.2 are those lands deemed appropriate for permitted, special permit and accessory uses allowed in connection with the seven existing One-Family Residence (R-5 through R-40) districts. Only a few first phase zoning changes are recommended to the one-family residence districts. These changes would eliminate multiple one-family zoning district classifications on a single lot. Recommended zoning changes are listed in Appendix E. The rezoning of public parks to a public park zoning district, discussed in Section 12.6.24, would reduce the total acreage of the one-family residence districts.
Figure 12.4.2: Future Land Use (One-Family Residential)

Legend

- One-Family Residential

1 inch = 1,311 feet

0 0.5 1 2 Miles

Town of Greenburgh, New York
Produced by: Town of Greenburgh: Sarah Pawlczak
Data Source: Westchester County GIS Data Warehouse and Town of Greenburgh
Date Produced: July 2015
12.6.4 Multi-Family Residence (Existing)

The seven multi-family residence districts (M-6 through M-174 and Scatter-Site Public Housing “PH”) occupy approximately 478 acres (4.3 percent) of land area. Table 12.4 lists the existing acreage of these districts and their allowable densities. The Central Avenue Mixed-Use Impact (CA) District, the UR District and the PUD District also permit multi-family residential units. The General Industrial (GI) District permits multi-family residential housing by special permit.

Multi-family dwellings consist of condominiums, co-operative and rental buildings. Two-family residential buildings are the smallest form of multi-family types in terms of units allowed per building and are currently permitted only in the Close Business (CB), UR or PUD districts. Public parks, playgrounds or similar recreational areas, firehouses, police stations, public safety and municipal buildings, places of religious worship and public schools are also permitted uses in the multi-family residence districts. Special permit uses include non-profit private clubs and private nursery schools. The locations of multi-family residences are depicted on Figure 12.3.1, while existing areas zoned M-6 through M-174, and PH are depicted on Figure 12.5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Existing Acres</th>
<th>Existing Percent of Acreage *</th>
<th>Min Lot Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Max Allowable Residential Unit Density/Acre (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M-6)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M-10)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M-14)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M-22)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;0.1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>21.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M-25)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>24.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M-174)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>174.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scatter-Site Public Housing (PH)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4,500 (15 Units) or 6,500 (16-25 Units)</td>
<td>9.68 or 6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>478</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal (UR) (1)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Unincorporated Greenburgh Land Area
(1) Includes only the sub-areas (Residential B, medium– and high density) of the UR district that permit multi-family residences.
(2) This calculation does not exclude land area needed for roads.

Clusters of multi-family residential uses are found throughout unincorporated Greenburgh. There are approximately 2,000 multi-family dwelling units fronting on or within walking distance of Central Park Avenue. Within the CA District, multi-family residential units and non-residential uses are permitted on the same parcel but are not permitted within the same building. Additionally, there are approximately 1,850 multi-family dwelling units on or near East Hartsdale Avenue within walking distance of the Hartsdale Train Station. Elsewhere, Avalon Green I, II and III consist of a multi-family cluster of 617 built units on Taxter Road.

Central Park Avenue’s intersections with Mt. Joy Avenue and with East Hartsdale Avenue contain small areas of residential units over commercial-use buildings; however, these mixed-use buildings preceded the CA District regulations.
12.6.5 Multi-Family Residence Build-out Under Existing Zoning

All sites zoned for multi-family residences are developed at or close to the maximum unit density under existing zoning regulations. There are small vacant lots in the UR district that could potentially be developed with multi-family housing units. One townhouse consisting of five units was approved on Beech Street but has not yet been constructed. The GI General Industrial District allows for multi-family residential uses by special permit.

In the CA District, one vacant lot (Healy/Central Park Avenue) in excess of two acres has a potential build-out of 84 bedrooms. Appendix K of the Plan lists parcels in the CA District in excess of two acres (the minimum acreage needed to propose multi-family development) that are vacant or not currently developed with multi-family residential uses. Appendix K indicates, theoretically, that there is the potential for approximately 3,312 additional multi-family bedrooms in the CA District if all of the existing non-residential buildings were replaced with residential. There is only one vacant two-acre parcel in the CA District. A multi-family residential building known as the Esplanade (51-units) is under construction on Central Park Avenue in the CA District.

12.6.6 Multi-Family Residence (Future Land-use)

The Plan recommends maintaining the diverse mix of uses that exist along unincorporated Greenburgh’s corridors. The CA District contains a good mix of uses with many (11 buildings existing with 1,043 units in the CA District plus additional approved units) multi-family residential buildings. Although the potential for new multi-family bedrooms along the Central Park Avenue corridor is limited due to the built out nature of this corridor, in order to prevent an imbalance of uses in the CA District, the approval process for multi-family residences should be reviewed to introduce a special permit requirement associated with these types of uses. Such a special permit could also inform any subsequent rezoning considerations for the Rt. 119 corridor. Policy 12.2.1.7 does not provide for an increase in the potential for multi-family residential units in the CA District or an increase in the density of such use.

Section 12.10.2 details the types of non-residential uses that would contribute to a concept known as the Research and Development Cluster South. The removal of the GI District from the Lawrence Street/Rt. 9A portion of the Town, and replacement with another zoning district, would be necessary to support research and development.

The UR district, which permits multi-family dwellings, is discussed separately in Section 12.6.37. Appendix E contains a few recommended zoning changes related to the multi-family residence districts, primarily as a result of the presence of multiple zoning districts on a single lot.
Figure 12.5.1: Existing Zoning District Grouping (Multi-Family Residence Districts)
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12.6.7 Planned Unit Development (Existing)

The eleven existing PUD districts highlighted on Figure 12.6.1 occupy approximately 622 acres (5.5 percent) of the land area. PUD district dwelling units may be detached one-family residences, semi-attached and/or attached condominiums and townhouses. Related open space is required based on the number of bedrooms. The Hebrew Hospital Home/Westchester Meadows PUD is a continuing care community comprised of independent residential units, assisted living units and a skilled nursing facility. The St. Andrew's PUD is unique in that its required open space is coterminous with the on-site private St. Andrew's Golf Club.

12.6.8 Planned Unit Development Build-out Under Existing Zoning

Existing zoning regulations permit PUD districts on parcels of at least 15 acres in one-family residence districts. The maximum density is based on the underlying zoning district; however, the PUD must accommodate a minimum of 50 residential units. Each of the eleven existing PUD districts appears to be fully developed with the maximum number of dwelling units permitted, based on the site’s land area. There are no vacant land areas zoned as a PUD district.

12.6.9 Planned Unit Development (Future Land-use)

As shown on the Future Land-Use map, Figure 12.6.1, no additional PUD districts are proposed. Three of the 11 PUDs retained their underlying one-family residence district designations. It is recommended that the previous underlying one-family residence district designations be reestablished on the other eight PUDs on the Zoning Map, for reference purposes.
Chapter 12.0 Land Use and Zoning

12.6.10 Office-Commercial (Existing)

Office-commercial areas include clusters of lots with commercial, office, residential uses or combinations thereof. Office and commercial uses are typically found in freestanding buildings or strip plazas along the three major corridors, Central Park Avenue (NYS Rt. 100), White Plains-Tarrytown Road (NYS Rt. 119), and Saw Mill River Road (NYS Rt. 9A). In some instances, non-residential uses are mixed within the same building on one site. In limited instances, residential uses are mixed with commercial and/or office uses within the same building (e.g., in the CA District as legal non-conforming uses).

The Hartsdale Train Station area and the Greenburgh Shopping Center on Knollwood Road contain concentrations of retail facilities. Smaller clusters are present at the intersection of Dobbs Ferry Road (NYS Rt. 100B) and West Hartsdale Avenue (NYS Rt. 100A), the intersection of Knollwood Road (NYS Rt. 100A) and Grasslands Road (NYS Rt. 100C), the intersection of Taxter Road and Mountain Road, and along Virginia Road. These areas function as neighborhood service clusters. Multi-family dwellings are the primary residential use in the office-commercial districts. Office buildings are scattered along the Central Park Avenue and Rt. 9A corridors, while Rt. 119, between the Villages of Elmsford and Tarrytown, contains significant clusters of office buildings in office park settings. Areas zoned for office-commercial are shown on Figure 12.7.1.

Several zoning districts (CA, CB, DS, Hartsdale Center “HC,” Intermediate Business “IB,” Limited Office Building “LOB,” Office Building “OB,” Office Building “OB-1,” Planned Economic Development “PED,” and UR) allow office-commercial uses. These districts comprise approximately 952 acres (8.7 percent) of land area and, with the exception of the CB district, prohibit residential and non-residential uses in the same building. The CA, CB and HC districts permit office and commercial uses within the same building. Table 12.5 lists the existing acreage of these districts. The CA District is unique among the office-commercial districts in that it permits multi-family residential buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Existing Acres</th>
<th>Existing Percent of Acreage *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Avenue Mixed-Use Impact (CA)</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Business (CB)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designed Shopping (DS)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Center (HC)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Business (IB)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Office Business (LOB)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Business (OB)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Business District (OB-1)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Economic Development District (PED)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal District (UR) (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total Unincorporated Greenburgh Land Area
(1) includes only the sub-areas (Neighborhood Shopping, Planned Commercial Development, and General Commercial) of the UR district that permit one-family residences
Figure 12.7.1: Existing Zoning District Grouping (General Office-Commercial Districts*)
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12.6.11 Office-Commercial Build-out Under Existing Zoning

The maximum build-out of the office-commercial districts was estimated using the number of vacant lots with development potential in the CA, CB, DS, HC, IB, LOB, OB, OB-1 and PED districts, and the office-commercial portions of the UR district. One large vacant parcel (approximately 100 acres - Loop Road Holdings, LLC - Landmark at Eastview) in the PED District can facilitate up to 1,300,000 sq. ft. of non-residential space. Table 12.6 lists vacant lots in the various office-commercial districts and their associated vacant lot analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Vacant Lots</th>
<th>Non-Residential Sq. Ft. Estimate</th>
<th>Residential Bedrooms Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA District</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59,366 (1)</td>
<td>84 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,471</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOB District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41,817</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB-1 District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED District (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,300,000 (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,423,659</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not take into account steep slopes/wetlands or other environmental review criteria used in connection with SEQRA.
(1) Associated with one 2.41-acre lot on Central Park Avenue South (Parcel ID: 8.290-220-14). Alternatively, approximately 31,500 sq. ft. of space represents a commercial/office build-out.
(2) Loop Road Holdings, LLC - Part of Landmark at Eastview, Subject of Environmental Impact Statement and related Findings Statement.
(3) For multifamily residential build-out see Section 12.6.5.

The non-residential vacant lot build-out analysis indicates that there is the potential for constructing approximately 1,425,000 sq. ft. of new gross floor area. It is difficult to quantify the potential non-residential build-out of underdeveloped parcels throughout the Town; however, based on an analysis of previously developed sites, there is minimal potential to add significant gross floor area to an existing site or building. As an example, a review of several major shopping centers (Crossroads, Midway, Greenville, Dalewood I, II and III) indicates that there is little or no additional gross floor area permitted without the need for a parking and/or an FAR variance. Since 2000, there have been few amended site plan applications that have added more than 20,000 sq. ft. of gross floor area to an existing building in the office-commercial districts referenced.

Similar to the projections associated with the residential build-out analysis, there is a need to qualify the non-residential square footage projection. Anticipated site specific SEQRA reviews would accompany subsequent development applications of vacant and underdeveloped lots and further reduce the overall office-commercial square footage by some percentage.
Figure 12.7.2: Future Land Use (General Office - Commercial)
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12.6.12 General Office-Commercial (Future Land-use)

Areas highlighted on Figure 12.7.2 are those lands deemed appropriate for uses allowed in connection with the office-commercial districts. There are few zoning change recommendations associated with these districts. See Appendix E.

Figure 12.16 depicts planning areas where short to long range implementation could result in developments with new mixed-use buildings containing non-residential uses. These future planned areas are intended to vary in scale and are described in detail in Section 12.8. General strategies for lands outside of the special planning areas are discussed in Section 12.7.

12.6.13 Institutional (Existing)

Institutional uses, including public and private schools, occupy approximately 948 acres (9.8 percent) of land. These uses are permitted as principal uses and as special permit uses in the one-family and multi-family residence districts. Figure 12.3.1 shows location of existing institutional uses. All of the schools contain a recreational and/or open space component, aspects of which are discussed in Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities).

Houses of worship are also institutional uses permitted as a principal use in the one-family and multi-family residence districts. Because these uses are often located within mixed-use buildings or on smaller individual parcels, they have not been separately mapped or quantified.

12.6.14 Institutional Build-out Under Existing Zoning

Existing institutional uses such as public and private schools are exclusively located in the one-family residence districts. Houses of worship are located in a wider variety of zoning districts. The respective build-outs of private institutional uses are a function of underlying bulk criteria, such as FAR and setbacks. Recent improvements to private schools include athletic field expansions and existing building modifications to allow more square footage.

12.6.15 Institutional (Future Land-use)

Figure 12.8 shows the locations of institutional uses. There are no recommended map rezoning policies in connection with these institutional uses. According to a review of public school district five-year plans, there do not appear to be any plans for major school-related expansions that would occur on adjacent or other un-owned parcels. Therefore, there are no new areas on the institutional future land plan map that are different from the parcels that are currently occupied by institutional uses.

Two future land use strategies, Research and Development Sectors (North and South) discussed in Section 12.10, and the Riley Pond Study Area discussed in Section 12.8.4, involve planned coordination with local universities and the Greenburgh Central School District. This school district has indicated that consolidating its school buildings on the existing main campus is desired.

Elsewhere in the Town, Hackley, a private school, has plans to construct a fourth phase of improvements, including a new indoor athletic facility (gymnasium). Westchester Community College and the New York School for the Deaf – Fanwood – contain large campuses, and school-related expansions could occur within these campuses. The School for the Deaf plans to build two new classroom buildings.
Figure 12.8: Existing/Future Land Use (Schools)
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12.6.16 Government (Existing)

Town-owned facilities include the Library, the Town Hall, the Sanitation/Highway Garage, the Police Department Headquarters, the Town Court building, the Taxter Road organic waste transfer site, as well as many smaller parcels and buildings. Municipally-owned assets occupy approximately 48.26 acres (0.43 percent) of the land area and the locations of these sites are depicted on Figure 12.3.1. Also included in this category are assets owned and operated by the independent Greenburgh Consolidated Water District No. 1 and the three independent fire districts (Fairview, Greenville and Hartsdale) serving unincorporated Greenburgh residential and business properties.

12.6.17 Government Build-out Under Existing Zoning

Major Town buildings such as the renovated and expanded Library (completed in 2008), Sanitation Garage (expanded in 1999) and Town Hall (purchased and remodeled in 2003) are of sufficient size and are unlikely to require expansion in the foreseeable future. With the exception of the Police Department Headquarters and the Town Court building, it is not anticipated that other Town-owned buildings will be expanded or relocated.

12.6.18 Government (Future Land-use)

Figure 12.9 shows the locations of existing municipal sites. There are no recommended rezoning policies associated with municipal uses. The Police Department Headquarters and the Town Court building need to be significantly upgraded and enlarged. This may require vacating the existing buildings and moving to new or adaptively reused facilities, which would be the subject of a feasibility analysis. A discussion of this need can be found in Section 8.8 (Town-owned Buildings).

12.6.19 Industrial (Existing)

Industrial land uses occupy approximately 198 acres (1.7 percent) of land in unincorporated Greenburgh and can include manufacturing, warehousing, assembly, distribution, storage, motor vehicle sales and repairs, adult establishments, gas stations and related accessory retail. These uses are permitted as principal and special permit uses in the Light Industrial LI, General Industrial GI and Nonresidential Planned

The Greenburgh Public Library, Sanitation Garage and Town Hall have been renovated or expanded in the last 15 years and will not require expansion in the foreseeable future.
Development PD districts. These districts are shown on Figure 12.10.1. The PD district also permits office, warehousing and a number of commercial uses. Figure 12.3.1 shows the locations of existing industrial uses and Table 12.7 lists the acreage of districts zoned industrial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Existing Percent of Acreage *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial (LI)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial (GI)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential Planned Development (PD)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of Total unincorporated Greenburgh Land Area

A major cluster of industrial uses is located along NYS Rt. 9A (Saw Mill River Road) adjacent to and north of the Village of Elmsford. Smaller concentrations are also found along Tarrytown Road (NYS Rt. 119), between the Cross Westchester Expressway (I-287) and Old Tarrytown Road, south of the Village of Elmsford along Saw Mill River Road (NYS Rt. 9A), and in the southwestern corner of unincorporated Greenburgh along the Villages of Dobbs Ferry and Hastings-on-Hudson borders.

### 12.6.20 Industrial Build-out Under Existing Zoning

Table 12.8 lists the approximate build-out potential of vacant lots in the industrially-zoned districts. Parcels in these areas are not developed to their fullest extent, indicating that building expansions could account for potential industrial square footage increases. The maximum vacant build-out of industrial districts was estimated using the number of vacant lots with at least 10,000 square foot in the GI, LI and PD districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Vacant Lots</th>
<th>Non-Residential Sq. Ft. Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GI District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>159,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI District</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>236,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not take into account steep slopes/wetlands or other environmental review criteria used in connection with SEQRA.
Figure 12.10.1: Existing Zoning District Grouping (Industrial Districts)
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Figure 12.10.2: Future Land Use (Industrial)
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12.6.21 Industrial (Future Land-use)

Areas highlighted on Figure 12.10.2 are those lands deemed appropriate for permitted uses, special permit uses and accessory uses allowed in industrial districts. See Appendix E for recommended zoning changes.

Figure 12.10.2 depicts a special planning area along Saw Mill River Road entitled “Industrial Mixed-Use,” where the existing parcels and future planned uses could be more successful with mixed-use components. These lands are currently zoned LI, which does not allow commercial/retail components although several of the parcels fronting on Saw Mill River Road currently contain commercial components. Allowing parcels fronting on Saw Mill River Road to contain a broader mix of uses while also retaining light industrial components could produce compatible uses in the corridor. A more flexible industrial zoning district of this nature does not currently exist in the zoning ordinance.
12.6.22 Public Parks and Protected Open Space (Existing)
Public parks may be owned solely or jointly by Town, County, State, Federal and/or not-for-profit entities. Open space for the purpose of this section consists of undeveloped lands containing a legal provision precluding subsequent development. These areas may be publicly owned, or portions of PUDs or other privately owned lands on which development is restricted. Vacant privately owned lands without a binding open space provision are not included in this section because of their potential for future development. Public parks and protected open space occupy approximately 1,490 acres (13.18 percent) of land and are permitted in all zoning districts. Figure 12.3.1 shows the location of existing public parks and open space.

12.6.23 Public Parks and Protected Open Space Build-out Under Existing Zoning
Existing public parks and protected open space are intentionally excluded from the build-out analysis as these lands cannot be developed beyond customary structures associated with parks.

12.6.24 Public Parks and Protected Open Space (Future Land-use)
Areas highlighted on Figure 12.11 are those lands that exist as or are planned to be “dedicated parkland.” Many of these lands were formally dedicated as parkland; however, it is recommended that a resolution or local law formalize all these areas as parkland.

The rezoning of the public parks to a newly designated park zone is also recommended. The rezoning of public park parcels will result in a net loss of lands zoned one-family residential, as a majority of public parks fall within these districts.

Also highlighted on Figure 12.11 are those lands that exist as protected open space areas. Open space areas are distinct from public parks although they often have similar passive use qualities. Some open space is associated with existing PUDs while other open space consists of undeveloped portions of land in connection with conservation easements. Open space portions of institutional land uses are not shown on Figure 12.11 because they can be used for uses other than open space purposes. Rezoning of open space areas depicted on Figure 12.11 is not recommended.
Figure 12.11: Future Land Use (Public Parks)
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12.6.25 Private Recreation (Existing)

Private recreation land includes golf courses, tennis/swim clubs, camps and indoor facilities such as skating rinks. These uses occupy approximately 852 acres (7.6 percent) of land and are permitted in the LI district and as special permit uses in the one-family, multi-family, PD, DS, CA and IB districts. Figure 12.3.1 shows the location of existing private recreation uses.

12.6.26 Private Recreation Build-out Under Existing Zoning

It is not anticipated that any of the existing private recreation uses will significantly increase in land area, but there is the potential for permitted structures to be built within existing private recreation sites.

12.6.27 Private Recreation (Future Land-use)

A majority of the private recreation uses in unincorporated Greenburgh are located within the one-family residence districts. There is potential for these lands to be developed for residential purposes, quantified in Table 12.3 (One-Family Residence District Land Use Conversion Build-out Estimates) or continue as is. Chapter 7.0 contains a policy to allow for private recreation uses in the non-residential OB Office Building District.

As noted in Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreational Facilities), camps and recreational uses provide unique services and/or open space and/or park-like qualities; therefore, it is important to support a variety of these permitted recreational uses.

Golf clubs, camps, and swim and tennis clubs provide important recreation and open space benefits.

View looking towards the housing development at the Saint Andrew’s Golf Course
Figure 12.12: Future Land Use (Private Recreation)
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12.6.28 Research and Development (Existing)

Research and development, including agencies for scientific or technical development, occupy approximately 260 acres (2.3 percent) of land and are permitted as principal uses in the CA, OB, OB-1, LOB, PD, LI, GI and PED districts. Figure 12.3.1 shows the existing locations of research and development uses which are clustered in the vicinity of the Eastview site on old Saw Mill River Road bordering the Town of Mount Pleasant, and along Saw Mill River Road in the vicinity of the borders with the Villages of Dobbs Ferry and Hastings-on-Hudson. Research and development companies also are located on White Plains Road (NYS Rt. 119) and on Benedict Avenue.

12.6.29 Research and Development Build-out Under Existing Zoning

The existing research and development clusters are either close to or over capacity based on existing zoning regulation requirements, with the exception of the 100-acre Loop Road Holdings - Landmark at Eastview site, which was the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement and Findings Statement and can facilitate up to 1,300,000 sq. ft. of research and development space.

12.6.30 Research and Development (Future Land-use)

Highlighted on Figure 12.13 are lands that exist or are planned to be developed with research and development uses. Two special planning nodes, the Research and Development Cluster North and the Research and Development Cluster South are areas where short-to-long range implementation would result in a unified campus-like research and development hub. These special planning areas are discussed in Section 12.10.

The “spine building” connecting research and development uses in unincorporated Greenburgh and the Town of Mount Pleasant
Figure 12.13: Future Land Use (Research and Development Clusters)
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12.6.31 Cemetery (Existing)
At least eight cemeteries, occupying approximately 294 acres (2.6 percent) of land, are located in unincorporated Greenburgh.

12.6.32 Cemetery Build-out Under Existing Zoning
Cemeteries and crematories in existence on January 1, 1963 are permitted, provided that the land area of the cemetery shall not be increased. Potential exists for permitted structures to be built within existing cemeteries.

12.6.33 Cemetery (Future Land-use)
Since the Zoning Ordinance prohibits expanding land area used for cemetery purposes, no new land areas are shown on Figure 12.14.

Section 291 of New York State Town Law, indicates that a town is responsible for maintaining an abandoned cemetery, including any abandoned cemetery located within a village of the town. An abandoned cemetery is defined as one that was previously owned by a cemetery corporation organized pursuant to the Not-for-Profit Corporation Law or one that existed by virtue of the Membership Corporation Law, for which there no longer exists any corporate board or body to maintain it, and for which there is no sufficient trust fund or endowment to provide ordinary and necessary care and maintenance. Avoiding the need for municipal takeover is important.
Figure 12.14: Future Land Use
(Cemetery, Public Utility, Highways and Interstates)
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12.6.34 Public Utility (Existing)

Public utility land uses include parcels containing publicly or privately-owned utility structures such as water tanks, aqueducts, utility towers, connected lines and a covered reservoir facility. These uses occupy approximately 420 acres (3.7 percent) of land and are permitted in all districts and as as-of-right uses on public utility rights-of-way containing tower-elevated high-voltage electric power transmission lines. Existing transmission lines in unincorporated Greenburgh are located within two public utility rights-of-way, both containing Consolidated Edison-owned and maintained infrastructure. Figure 12.14 does not include easements on individual lots that contain public utilities such as water or sanitary sewer lines.

12.6.35 Public Utility Build-out Under Existing Zoning

It is not anticipated that any of the existing public utility lands will increase in land area, but there is the potential for related structures to be built for utility purposes within existing parcels.

12.6.36 Public Utility (Future Land use)

No new land areas are shown on Figure 12.14 beyond those land areas already utilized for public utility purposes. No zoning text amendments are recommended other than as may be needed to address advances in technology. If a new project were of such magnitude as to require a new utility structure such as a water tank, it is expected that a portion of the parcel would be dedicated for that purpose as part of any subsequent environmental review and related approval process. Policies associated with public utilities such as enhanced tree preservation and tree planting within utility rights-of-way are discussed in Chapter 6.0 (Environmental Resources and Related Systems). The potential for utility access easements, for public recreation purposes, is discussed in Chapter 7.0 (Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities).
**12.6.37 Urban Renewal (Existing)**

The Urban Renewal (UR) district comprises approximately 132 acres (1.1 percent) of land and contains a mix of residential, commercial and governmental uses. Shown on Figure 12.15.1, the UR District was created in 1957 as part of a broad federal policy to revitalize “blighted” neighborhoods. Nationally, this policy had varying outcomes and often resulted in the removal or demolition of dense urban areas without subsequent reinvestment. In lands zoned UR within unincorporated Greenburgh, however, comprehensive development plans resulted in significant improvements related to public housing, community facilities, stormwater and a variety of commercial and residential development.

Because of these improvements, the classification of the area as “blighted” and the continued zoning designation as an Urban Renewal Zoning District are no longer appropriate.

**12.6.38 Urban Renewal Build-out Under Existing Zoning**

The UR district zoning contains regulations that apply to several sub-districts. Permitted uses include residential (one-family, two-family, multi-family, and housing specifically for seniors), public and semi-public uses (e.g., religious institution or neighborhood community center), neighborhood shopping, planned commercial development and general commercial uses. Within this area, there are several vacant and underdeveloped parcels zoned UR which present the potential for additional residential units and non-residential development.

**12.6.39 Urban Renewal (Future Land use)**

The UR district was the subject of comprehensive development plans, resulting in residential and non-residential construction. Many properties within the UR district have characteristics identical to other residential or non-residential districts, with the exception of the UR district’s greater percentage of two-family and low density multi-family residential uses. The UR district along with the CB and PUD districts allows two-family residences. Figure 12.15.2 contains five future land-use designations that are intended to form the basis for rezoning lands currently zoned UR. Some of these zoning map amendments will entail related zoning text amendments. 

The future land-use designations that form the basis for rezoning existing properties in the UR District are designed to maintain the existing character of these areas and facilitate development consistent with the Plan.

The areas depicted on Figure 12.15.2 as One-Family Residential (Limited two-family) contain a majority of one-family residences but also contain at least 30 (10 percent) two-family residences. The recommended zoning text change would create a zoning district that allows one-family residences as a permitted use and allows two-family residences as a special permit use. Special permit criteria, such as prohibiting excessive paved areas for off-street parking, would be established to allow two-family residences in a manner that preserves the character of the existing neighborhood. Prohibiting excessive exterior paved areas for off-street parking would be an example of a criterion that would help preserve the character of the neighborhood.
Figure 12.15.1: Existing Zoning District Grouping (Urban Renewal District)
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The areas depicted as One-Family Residential (Limited multi-family) on Figure 12.15.2 contain a majority of one-family residences but also contain at least 20 (10 percent) two-family and multi-family residences. The recommended zoning text change would create a zoning district that allows one-family residences as a permitted use and allows two-family and low density multi-family residences as a special permit use. Special permit criteria would be established to allow two-family and multi-family residences within the areas designated on Figure 12.15.2 in a manner that preserves the character of the respective existing neighborhoods, such as prohibiting excessive exterior paved areas for off-street parking.

Rezoning to an existing commercial district such as the DS district is recommended for the areas depicted as general office-commercial on Figure 12.15.2. A change of this nature will not take place immediately following the adoption of the Plan since other zoning text amendments described in Section 12.7 are expected to be carried out affecting the existing office/commercial districts. Less restrictive off-street parking standards and revisions to FAR for existing office/commercial districts will take place concurrently with rezoning recommendations for the UR district’s office-commercial areas.

Aerial view of the existing UR District
Figure 12.15.2: Future Land Use (Urban Renewal)
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12.7 Corridor-wide Enhancement Strategies

Saw Mill River Road (NYS Rt. 9A), Tarrytown-White Plains Road (NYS Rt. 119) and Central Park Avenue (NYS Rt. 100) comprise unincorporated Greenburgh’s primary commercial and mixed-use corridors. Strategies consistent with policies throughout this Plan can be implemented through zoning text amendments applied to several of the existing office-commercial zoning districts along these corridors. A few overriding processes should guide such amendments, such as providing consistency of regulations and updating permitted, special permit and accessory uses to ensure that these corridors have minimal vacancies and thrive as places of business.

Where practical, bulk criteria should be consistent for portions of the corridors that have similar attributes. Examples include criteria governing large shopping centers or free-standing buildings in the corridors. Updating bulk criteria for consistency will require cross-referencing the existing office-commercial zoning districts of the Town (CA, CB, DS, HC, IB, LOB, OB and OB-1), a process which should immediately follow adoption of the Plan. Uniform standards may not always be practical.

From a use perspective, many of the office-commercial districts have not been comprehensively reviewed and/or updated in decades. A review of these districts from a permitted, special permit and accessory-use perspective should be carried out to understand if there are uses allowed in some districts of the Town that could be viable in the zoning districts of the three major corridors. Similar to the recommended bulk criteria review, where practicable, uses should be reviewed for consistency purposes.

General mixed-use policies should aim to create greater flexibility to allow site improvements such as increased landscaping, better site-to-site integration, and a design oriented to pedestrians and site users. As noted in Chapter 9.0 (Transportation, Mobility and Access), a preponderance of free standing buildings with excessive curb cuts compromise pedestrian and vehicular safety. As noted in Chapter 8.0 (Public Infrastructure and Essential Services), excessive parking requirements equate to excessive amounts of impervious surface, which are unsightly and place stress on stormwater facilities and downstream areas. Less restrictive parking requirements can provide for increased landscaping and other site improvements. Chapter 9.0 (Transportation, Mobility and Access) discusses characteristics that facilitate flexible commercial and residential parking policies.

Structured parking facilities can be constructed underground or partially underground, minimizing stormwater run-off and allowing for maximizing green/open space.

Graduated density zoning is an alternative that can encourage property owners to voluntarily merge small abutting lots to benefit from zoning incentives. It can be adopted as a zoning text amendment and be permitted only when a direct benefit can be realized to the potential subject sites, the surrounding corridor, and the community. Benefits consistent with this Plan that can be implemented through graduated density zoning are (1) an increase in meaningful open space, landscaping and/or public space; (2) a minimization of curb cuts and/or facilitation of a park once policy; (3) an overall reduction in impervious surfaces when compared to existing conditions and/or increases in stormwater quality/quantity infrastructure; and (4) additional pedestrian amenities and safety. Refined criteria should be established, whereby implementation and subsequent approvals can be authorized through a density bonus as part of the site plan approval process.
Greater density through higher Floor Area Ratio (FAR) can be achieved when small lots are combined. Several office-commercial districts in unincorporated Greenburgh contain small parcels with fragmented ownership. Due to low existing FAR maximum allowances which generally range from 0.10 to 0.30, many existing lots on Central Park Avenue, Tarrytown Road/White Plains Road and Saw Mill River Road are at or over FAR capacity. This existing condition dissuades lot amalgamation and can prevent a site owner from making site improvements. For comparative purposes, a compact suburban business district typically has the following attributes: (1) medium development density; (2) greater and more efficiently used FAR; (3) increased building coverage; and (4) lower spatial separation between buildings. The establishment of criteria consistent with this Plan for a graduated density zoning strategy can trigger investment in areas not specifically noted in Sections 12.8 and 12.9.

12.8 Special Planning Areas

A diverse mix of uses exists throughout unincorporated Greenburgh; however, several unique locations have been identified as targeted planning areas.

Figure 12.16 depicts these coordinated planning areas. These areas may require inter-municipal coordination and/or public-private partnerships. Implementation of any one of the targeted mixed-use plans could foster local- and community-wide benefits. Successful long term implementation of several of these concepts could create a series of focal points, improving the viability of existing corridors and complementing adjacent residential areas.

12.8.1 Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park Planning Area

The Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park Planning Area is a coordinated Planning Area located within unincorporated Greenburgh and the Village of Tarrytown, as shown on Figure 12.16. A concept for a planning area in this vicinity was initially envisioned by the Westchester County Department of Planning as part of a 2008 affordable housing/office park study that explored the concept of creating housing within existing office parks in Westchester County. The potential for residential units was based on the presence of under-utilized portions of sites and a shared parking plan.

A more general mixed-use concept for this planning area was formed at a “Building Quality Communities Around Transit – Technical Assistance Program” visioning session, held on February 24, 2010, regarding the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement and the prospect for related Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) connections. At this visioning session, a hypothetical BRT station was superimposed between 600 White Plains Road (Sheraton/Stop & Shop) and 660 White Plains Road (free standing office building). Under-utilized portions of surface parking in the existing office park site were identified. These areas were the subject of a rendering that depicted a more attractive and unified corridor containing open and public spaces, infill development with buildings that connected sites more efficiently and an enhanced mix of uses. It was envisioned that new structured parking would be a major component of the re-allocated and reclaimed spaces.

The Tappan Zee Bridge replacement combined with a BRT system traversing unincorporated Greenburgh’s existing office park sector near Benedict Avenue or running along Rt. 119 would provide opportunities for redevelopment. Inter-municipal coordination would be necessary. In a long range planning scheme, local support for an enhanced Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park Planning Area provides increased
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rationale for regional transportation investments. A series of locally-planned and targeted mixed-use planning areas, coordinated within inter-municipal jurisdictions, could be integrated with transportation investments with benefits, such as increased employment centers and stronger tax bases. This Plan recommends a pro-active approach to the siting of these planning areas to maximize their benefit to the Town. The Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park District should contain complementary uses which strengthen it and are consistent with the Guiding Principles of this Plan. The impact of regional transportation benefits on other initiatives of this Plan, are discussed in Section 12.8.3.

The Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park District should contain complementary uses which strengthen it and are consistent with the Guiding Principles of this Plan. The impact of regional transportation benefits on other initiatives of this Plan, are discussed in Section 12.8.3.

12.8.2 Greenburgh/Elmsford Rt. 9A Planning Area

The Greenburgh/Elmsford Rt. 9A Planning Area is located within the Town of Greenburgh and the Village of Elmsford, as shown on Figure 12.16. The impetus for this long range plan revolves around two regional transportation initiatives: the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement and the proposed construction of a Rt. 9A Bypass. The concept for a district on Rt. 9A in the vicinity of I-287 was formed at a visioning session with Greenburgh Town officials and Village of Elmsford officials held on March 8, 2010, in connection with the Tappan Zee Bridge replacement and the prospect for a related BRT connection in this area. At the visioning session, and consistent with the potential BRT station location identified in Westchester 2025, a BRT station near I-287 and Rt. 9A could increase the mixed-use potential in the area. This corridor traverses downtown Elmsford (Elmsford/Centennial Square) and could be envisioned as an enlarged mixed-use gateway district. Attractive buildings fronting on Rt. 9A would be a centerpiece of the district. Recent plans to join a disconnected section of the South...
County Trailway in unincorporated Greenburgh and the Village of Elmsford would further the pedestrian and bicycle friendliness of the district.

A large number of commercial vehicles currently traverse the Rt. 9A corridor. The bypass, discussed more thoroughly in Section 9.4.1, would be designed to provide an alternate and more efficient route for truck traffic in the Village of Elmsford and in unincorporated Greenburgh. The bypass would provide commercial access to the existing industrial sector and remove a large segment of commercial traffic from Rt. 9A. This could further facilitate the evolution of Rt. 9A into a more viable corridor. As far back as 1998, various concepts and alternatives for a Rt. 9A bypass were discussed. The benefits of a bypass could be further augmented when planned in connection with BRT or express bus service and supported by long-term, coordinated planning between the Town of Greenburgh and the Village of Elmsford.
12.8.3 Rt. 119/Knollwood Road Planning Area

The Rt. 119/Knollwood Planning Area is located within the unincorporated Greenburgh and the Village of Elmsford coordinated planning area, as shown on Figure 12.16. This planning initiative coincides with: (1) a regional transportation initiative: the Tappen Zee Bridge replacement and potential BRT; (2) a local transportation initiative: the planned underpass removal at the intersection of Rt. 100A/Knollwood Road and Rt. 119/Tarrytown-White Plains Road; (3) newly completed development in the area; and (4) existing transportation options.

At the Tappen Zee Bridge (TZB) visioning sessions noted in Section 12.8.1, and in *Westchester 2025*, the potential for a BRT station was identified in the vicinity of several existing businesses (currently Bed, Bath and Beyond, Burger King, Sports Authority, etc.) on the north side of Rt. 119 in the Village of Elmsford and adjacent to I-287. The location was chosen primarily because of minimal grade differences and the potential for further development in the area. The TZB visioning sessions produced conceptual sketch designs that depict potential infill development, shown on Figure 12.17. The focus at the session was on creating redevelopment around a BRT station. Redevelopment in this portion of the Village of Elmsford as a result of a BRT station, and within the identified coordinated planning area shown on Figure 12.16, would give shape to the Rt. 119/Knollwood Road Planning Area.

As identified in the New York State Department of Transportation Improvement Project list, the east-west underpass at the intersection of Rt. 100A and Rt. 119 is proposed to be replaced with a full, at-grade intersection. This planned improvement will make the intersection more pedestrian friendly through the use of enhanced crosswalks and signalization, a marked departure from existing conditions. The area currently contains several east-west bus routes and is within close proximity to north-south connections.

![Figure 12.17: Westchester County-Prepared Conceptual TOD Model](image-url)
Several sites within the Rt. 119/Knollwood Road Planning Area have seen significant investment. The Greenburgh Public Library, located at 300 Tarrytown Road, was expanded in 2008. The Greenburgh Health Center, located on Knollwood Road, was completed in 2013 with a new sidewalk connection to the intersection of Rt. 119 and Rt. 100A. A new auto dealership, located at 543 Tarrytown Road, was completed in 2013. On the north side of Rt. 119 at 500-540 Tarrytown Road, another auto dealership is approved on a site that contains several successful and recently renovated auto dealerships.

Multi-jurisdictional support of future mixed-use development planned in connection with transportation-related improvements, will further the Rt. 119/Knollwood Road Planning Area concept and create another important area for residents and businesses.
12.8.4 Riley Pond Study Area

The Riley Pond Study Area, depicted on Figure 12.16, contains the site of the Police Department Headquarters and Town Court. Development patterns in this area could be influenced by the future presence of a newly constructed Police Department Headquarters and Town Court. As noted in Section 8.8 of this Plan, the Greenburgh Police Headquarters and the Town Court buildings are undersized and have insufficient parking. A study is needed to determine if the present site has the capacity to meet the space (building square footage) and off-street parking needed; and can be built more efficiently from a cost perspective than other sites which may or may not require acquisition costs. It is anticipated that the study will factor in the potential to include adjacent or nearby sites such as the Richard J. Bailey School, if these sites become available. If redevelopment of the Police Department Headquarters and Town Court is deemed feasible, further study should be done to see if the neighboring properties contain appropriate permitted non-residential uses that could complement a new court house/police station, creating a justice center feel.

If redevelopment were deemed infeasible, and a new court house/police station needed to be constructed elsewhere, the establishment of a public-private partnership should be considered for potential sale and redevelopment of the site.
12.8.5 Greenburgh Gateway Planning Area

The Greenburgh Gateway Planning Area, shown on Figure 12.16 is located near the Greenburgh border with the City of White Plains. This Planning Area has close proximity to the White Plains Train Station and the White Plains TransCenter, both of which are within one-half (½) mile.

A mix of residential and non-residential uses exists within this area. A few contiguous blocks of residential-nonresidential mixed-use buildings are bordered by a commercial plaza, auto-related/industrial businesses, an office building (former Verizon site), existing multi-family units, and a commercial big-box retailer (currently CVS). The contiguous blocks of residential-nonresidential mixed-use buildings are located partially in unincorporated Greenburgh and partially in the City of White Plains; therefore, joint municipal and neighborhood level discussions should be undertaken to understand how better planning efforts could take advantage of the area’s unique walkability to major mass transit options. The “gateway” aspect of this district coincides with the area as an entry point into unincorporated Greenburgh.

The area has the potential to be an anchor along Rt. 119, with a more walkable connection to the Crossroads Shopping Center, Riley Pond Study Area and the Greenburgh Public Library.

Aerial Photo of the Greenburgh Gateway Planning Area
12.8.6 Hartsdale Four Corners Study Area

The Hartsdale Four Corners Study Area is located at the intersection of Central Park Avenue and East Hartsdale Avenue and West Hartsdale Avenue. This area is known primarily for its existence as an intersection. Three of the four corners are occupied with low-rise buildings while the fourth corner contains an automobile-oriented strip commercial use. This intersection experiences traffic congestion. Coordination with the New York State Department of Transportation is necessary to ensure signalization efficiency. A sidewalk connection from the intersection heading west along West Hartsdale Avenue would greatly improve the area’s pedestrian network. Long term considerations in the Hartsdale Four Corners Study Area could include the potential of roadway widening which could enable an additional turn lane.

The leasable spaces at Four Corners have experienced higher rates and concentrations of vacancies than other areas in the Town’s commercial corridors, likely attributed to a lack of convenient off-street parking. There may be an opportunity for a public-private partnership which would include redevelopment in the area of Four Corners that incorporates structured parking. Such structured parking could serve any new uses and have additional spaces allocated for users of the existing nearby commercial and residential uses. Additional studies would be required to fully understand if adequate land area and non-tax payer funding sources exists to accommodate these types of uses.
12.8.7 Hartsdale Train Station Study Area

The Hartsdale Train Station Study Area, shown on Figure 12.16, is the only example of a downtown/mixed-use area in unincorporated Greenburgh. Several sections of the district are within walking distance of the train station. The area has significant pedestrian activity, therefore, the continued presence of safe sidewalks is a priority. The mix of thru-traffic, buses, taxis and users of the area’s stores and restaurants warrant a review of vehicular circulation patterns. Coordination with local residents and civic associations, local business owners, the Hartsdale Public Parking District, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA/Metro North), the Village of Scarsdale and Westchester County will complement such review.
12.8.8 Ardsley Road/Central Park Avenue Planning Area

The Ardsley Road/Central Park Avenue Planning Area is located at a prominent intersection and exists as a major retail cluster. The intersection of Central Park Avenue and Ardsley Road is an important Planning Area as Ardsley Road east of this location is the main thoroughfare to the Scarsdale Train Station and Ardsley Road west of this location is the main access to several major north/south routes and the Village of Ardsley. Some form of shared structured parking on a large site such as the Midway Shopping Center could allow for flexibility to facilitate several infill buildings, public park or plaza space, and enhanced pedestrian friendly design.
12.9 Public-Private Partnership and Public Improvement Areas

The Town of Greenburgh Police Headquarters and Town Courthouse, the Richard J. Bailey Elementary School site and the Hartsdale Public Parking District sites, shown on Figure 12.18, are all locations that can complement planning initiatives listed herein.

12.9.1 Town of Greenburgh Police Headquarters and Town Courthouse

The Greenburgh Police Headquarters and the Town Courthouse are undersized and have insufficient parking. These Town Buildings will need to be replaced in their current location or relocated to a different site. Section 12.8.4 (Riley Pond Study Area) details the Land-Use-based implications of redevelopment of the Police Headquarters and of the Town Courthouse and the partnerships that can facilitate this process.

12.9.2 Hartsdale Public Parking District

The Hartsdale Public Parking District (HPPD) is a special district created in 1952 by a New York State legislative act to provide commuter parking for residents of Unincorporated Greenburgh and to provide general public metered parking in support of the local business community. The HPPD operates six separate parking facilities within unincorporated Greenburgh. All of these parking facilities are located within two mixed-use planning areas: the Hartsdale Four Corners Study Area and the Hartsdale Train Station Study Area.

- Site “A” is a multi-level structure offering metered parking, overnight permits, 24-hour permits, merchant permits and resident commuter permits. The site contains 270 parking spots and is located at the rear of retail shops (196 - 222 East Hartsdale Avenue), on the south side of East Hartsdale Avenue adjacent to Scarsdale Golf Club.

- Site “B” is a surface level parking lot of 15-hour metered parking (69 spots) for use by the general public, located on the north side of East Hartsdale Avenue adjacent to the train station.

- Site “C” is a surface level parking lot containing 99 metered parking spots available to the general public and/or by permit in lieu of coins to residents of East Hartsdale Avenue. It is located on Central Park Avenue South and also has access from East Hartsdale Avenue.

- Site “D” is a surface level parking lot of 15-hour metered parking, resident and non-resident commuter permits containing 140 deed-restricted commuter parking spots and 39 metered spaces. It is located off of the south-bound entrance to the Bronx River Parkway adjacent to the train station.

- Site “E” Pipeline Road is a surface level parking lot of resident commuter permits and contains 121 deed-restricted commuter parking spots located off East Hartsdale Avenue. It runs from Station Plaza along the south-bound railroad track to and from Edgemont Road.

- Site “F” is a multi-level parking structure of resident commuter permits with security access. This parking location contains 340 spaces deed-restricted to resident commuter permit parking. It is located on the north side of East Hartsdale Avenue.
Figure 12.18: Targeted Public - Private Partnership Areas
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• In addition, 39 street metered spaces are in the Hartsdale business district in the vicinity of 189 East Hartsdale Avenue. Fifty-one metered spaces are located in the vicinity of 180 East Hartsdale Avenue, and in the business district there are 27 additional metered spaces located near Four Corners.

Continued coordination with the Hartsdale Public Parking District is necessary to ensure a safe and efficient Hartsdale downtown District.

Potential opportunities to enhance parking at the Four Corners portion of the Town are detailed in Section 12.8.6. (Hartsdale Four Corners Study Area). Other strategies to alleviate parking problems in this area and the Hartsdale Train Station District include exploring the potential for: (1) existing multi-family residential buildings to utilize car sharing services; (2) alternate side of the street parking during the winter months, where practical; (3) shared parking flexibility at existing commercial parking lots, for use by residents overnight; (4) encouraging better marketing of multi-family residential units, so that potential buyers/renters fully understand the limited nature of off-street parking; and (5) working with Westchester County regarding the potential for additional/more frequent shuttle buses or bus lines.
12.10 Research and Development Clusters

Unincorporated Greenburgh offers the following factors to attract the R&D sector: (1) its proximity to the New York metropolitan area with efficient vehicular and mass transit options, (2) the regional presence of premiere medical institutions, (3) available buildable land area, (4) an established R&D base, (5) complementary land uses, (6) municipal partnerships, (7) colleges and universities, and (9) regulatory amenability.

The southern portion of unincorporated Greenburgh is less than 20 miles from midtown Manhattan while the northern border is approximately 25 miles away. Numerous parkways and interstates provide direct access from New York City, Connecticut, and New Jersey. Train service and shuttle bus connections also provide convenient access. Local institutions such as the Westchester Medical Center offer the research resources and human capital that R&D companies need to operate and succeed. This Plan recognizes that the scientific work done in the R&D industry takes place in collaborative groups and that ample space is needed in state-of-the-art laboratories.

Several biotechnology firms are located in unincorporated Greenburgh and in adjacent municipalities. These companies are pioneering medical advances and are an important economic sector, creating concentrations of employment. Prime developable land area exists in the locations detailed on Figure 12.13 for biotechnology companies to expand, for the siting of new companies and/or for the relocation of entities seeking to agglomerate into a biotechnology campus. The Town of Greenburgh is committed to a collaborative planning process that will facilitate the two research and development clusters outlined in Sections 12.10.1 and 12.10.2.

12.10.1 Research and Development Cluster North (R&DCN)

The Research and Development Cluster North (R&DCN), depicted on Figure 12.13, envisions a unified biotech or other science-based sector campus development. The R&DCN is located on Old Saw Mill River Road, the municipal boundary separating Greenburgh from the Town of Mount Pleasant to the north. The site is bordered by the Saw Mill River Parkway to the west and two existing Non-Residential Planned Development Districts to the south and to the east. Predominant land uses in the vicinity include an athletic training facility, research and development laboratories, recreation, open space, commercial (e.g., retail, offices) light industrial, warehouse and storage, and office park developments.

The vision for a unified R&D campus arises from a combination of: (1) the existing successful industries that occupy areas of the R&DCN; (2) proximity to several universities and hospitals; (3) underdeveloped parcels with infill development potential and adjacent vacant parcels; and (4) convenient highway and airport access. Existing biotech facilities at the site include: Regeneron, Inc. (777 Old Saw Mill River Road), a leader in human antibody technologies, with approximately 1,700 employees; and PsychoGenics Inc. (765 Old Saw Mill River Road), a leader in preclinical research and drug discovery, with approximately 80 employees. In addition, several similar facilities exist and/or are planning expansion on adjacent sites in the Town of Mount Pleasant. The benefits of agglomeration, commonly seen in larger hubs such as in the Massachusetts biotechnology industry, could happen in this portion of Westchester with appropriate planning.
The site of the existing biotech facilities appears to be underdeveloped when considering its expansive surface parking lot areas. An adjacent 100-acre undeveloped site to the south also provides great potential for a unified research and development cluster. This cluster is envisioned as part of a Westchester County hub of facilities containing a broad range of research and development uses, commercial and office uses, and satellite office/research uses of universities and medical centers. This portion of unincorporated Greenburgh is unique in that it is heavily buffered from residential uses by distance, site topography, and wooded coverage. These unique site features provide the potential for greater densities and heights of buildings to spur economic development through job growth.

Regeneron, Inc., with approximately 1,700 employees, is the largest employer in unincorporated Greenburgh.
An R&D campus development could be expected to encompass open space preservation, bike and pedestrian trails, structured parking, and compact development with greater Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and building heights. Attractive complementary buildings at the junctions of Old Saw Mill River Road, Saw Mill River Road and Grasslands Road, would assist the visual transition to the R&DCN and act as a gateway to the area.

The area is currently zoned OB Office Building District and PED Planned Economic Development District, which contains provisions consistent with the unified R&D campus concept. The PED District’s related lot and bulk requirements permit the flexibility necessary to justify structured parking and/or other unified site components for an R&D campus. The existing 100-acre parcel within the R&D Cluster North is intended to support many of the R&D-related concepts herein.

The planned R&DCN sites contain environmental features such as wooded areas, steep slopes, wetlands and watercourses, and are located near areas prone to flooding. By concentrating future development on the existing biotech facility sites and by utilizing structured parking to eliminate expansive surface parking, compact site layouts can be achieved. The continued transformation of this acreage into a major unified research

Figure 12.19: R&DCN and supportive use Future Land-Use Area
and development cluster could provide local and regional economic benefits and should be supported through future rezoning efforts.

The area depicted as “Research and Development Supportive-Planned Development” on Figure 12.13 and on Figure 12.19, contains industrial, warehouse, storage, and office park developments. In order to further support the R&DCN, uses complementary to those necessary for successful R&D clusters could be permitted in the adjacent LI and PD zoning districts.

12.10.2 Research and Development Cluster South (R&DCS)

The Research and Development Cluster South (R&DCS), depicted on Figure 12.20, represents a future land use designation similar to the R&DCN in that a unified biotech campus spanning several sites is envisioned. The R&DCS contains an existing successful biotechnology company and the potential for additional research facility space.

The R&DCS is bordered by the New York State Thruway (I-87) to the east, the Saw Mill River Parkway to the west, the Village of Ardsley to the north, the Villages of Dobbs Ferry and Hastings-on-Hudson to the west, and cemeteries to the south. Predominant land uses existing in the vicinity of the R&DCS include research and development laboratories, recreation, commercial (e.g., retail, offices), light industrial, and warehouse and storage facilities.

Aerial Photo of the existing cluster of uses in the R&DCS
The vision for an R&D campus arises from a combination of the existing presence of the R&D industry; underdeveloped parcels with infill development potential and undeveloped vacant parcels; proximity to highway and airport access; and planned complementary development in adjacent municipalities. Located within the R&DCS is Acorda Therapeutics, Inc., (420 Saw Mill River Road), a biotechnology company whose mission is to develop and market therapies that restore neurological function and improve the lives of people with multiple sclerosis, spinal cord injury and other disorders of the nervous system. Acorda has approximately 210 employees and occupies approximately 138,000 sq. ft. of space. Development approved by the Village of Dobbs Ferry includes a project in the Village known as “Rivertowns Square,” which proposes a 138-room hotel and residential and commercial mixed-uses. A well-planned mix of uses in close proximity to the R&DCS would provide services not currently existing in the area.

Similar to the R&DCN, the southern cluster is also heavily buffered from residential uses by distance, site topography, wooded areas and highway rights-of-way. These features provide the potential for greater densities and heights of buildings in the R&DCS. A broad range of research and development uses, commercial and office uses, and satellite office/research uses of universities and medical centers could be located in this area. In order to further support the R&DCS (Figure 12.20), non-residential uses complementary to those necessary for successful R&D clusters could be developed on adjacent existing sites.

Figure 12.20: R&DCS and supportive use Future Land-Use Area
12.11 Land use and Zoning Goals, Objectives & Policies

GOAL 12.1: Update the Zoning Map to be consistent with the Plan.

OBJECTIVE 12.1.1: Implement Zoning Map changes that do not require related Zoning Text changes.

POLICY 12.1.1.1: Rezone parcels consistent with the recommendations in Appendix E.

GOAL 12.2: Utilize Zoning Districts and/or zoning criteria to appropriately plan for a range of uses.

OBJECTIVE 12.2.1: Update Zoning Districts and/or zoning criteria consistent with the Plan.

POLICY 12.2.1.1: Create new zoning districts for lots currently zoned UR, consistent with the designations shown on Figure 12.15.2.

POLICY 12.2.1.2: Create a public park zoning district for public parks.

POLICY 12.2.1.3: Create an industrial zoning district that permits a broader range of uses, consistent with the locations shown on Figure 12.10.2.

POLICY 12.2.1.4: Review permitted, special permit and accessory uses to ensure consistency in the mixed-use corridors to the greatest extent practicable, and update the Zoning Ordinance as deemed appropriate.

POLICY 12.2.1.5: Review permitted, special permit and accessory uses to ensure consistent bulk criteria in the mixed-use corridors to the greatest extent practicable, and update the Zoning Ordinance as deemed appropriate.

POLICY 12.2.1.6: Review permitted, special permit and accessory uses to ensure that viable uses consistent with the environmental and economic development goals of the Plan are not precluded.

POLICY 12.2.1.7: Update the CA District to introduce a special permit process for multi-family residential uses. Such a process can also inform any re-zoning associated with the Rt. 119 corridor.

POLICY 12.2.1.8: Update Section 285-54. Standards (Site Plan) of the Zoning Ordinance and Article III General Design Requirements and Design Standards of Chapter 250 of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh to be consistent with the Plan.
OBJECTIVE 12.2.2: Utilize innovative zoning techniques to facilitate enhanced site layouts in locations consistent with the Plan.

POLICY 12.2.2.1: Consider utilizing graduated density zoning or other innovative zoning techniques to promote cohesive development through land assembly.

GOAL 12.3: Explore the potential for redevelopment along Saw Mill River Road (NYS RT. 9A), White Plains/Tarrytown Road (NYS RT. 119), Central Park Avenue (NYS RT. 100) and at the Hartsdale Train Station.

OBJECTIVE 12.3.1: Explore the potential for redevelopment in the Rt. 119/White Plains Road Office Park Planning Area.

POLICY 12.3.1.1: Explore the potential for non-residential mixed-use development consistent with Section 12.8.1, and in the locations shown on Figure 12.16, by coordinating with appropriate stakeholders (area residents and businesses, Village of Tarrytown, Tappan Zee Bridge replacement stakeholders, Westchester County, Town staff, etc.).

OBJECTIVE 12.3.2: Explore the potential for redevelopment in the Greenburgh/Elmsford Rt. 9A Planning Area.

POLICY 12.3.2.1: Explore the potential for non-residential mixed-use development consistent with Section 12.8.2, and in the locations shown on Figure 12.16, by coordinating with appropriate stakeholders (area residents and businesses, Village of Elmsford, Tappan Zee Bridge replacement stakeholders, Westchester County, Town staff, etc.).

OBJECTIVE 12.3.3: Explore the potential for redevelopment in the Rt. 119/Knollwood Road Planning Area.

POLICY 12.3.3.1: Explore the potential for non-residential mixed-use development consistent with Section 12.8.3, and in the locations shown on Figure 12.16, by coordinating with appropriate stakeholders (area residents and businesses, Village of Elmsford, Tappan Zee Bridge replacement stakeholders, Westchester County, NYSDOT, Town staff, etc.).

OBJECTIVE 12.3.4: Explore the potential for redevelopment in the Riley Pond Study Area.

POLICY 12.3.4.1: Coordinate future land-use studies based on the results of a Police Headquarters and the Town Courthouse redevelopment feasibility analysis.

OBJECTIVE 12.3.5: Explore the potential for redevelopment in the Greenburgh Gateway Planning Area.

POLICY 12.3.5.1: Explore the potential for non-residential mixed-use development consistent with Section 12.8.5, and in the locations shown on
OBJECTIVE 12.3.6: Explore the potential for public improvements in the Hartsdale Four Corners Study Area.

POLICY 12.3.6.1: Coordinate with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) to determine if signalization improvements are feasible at the Four Corners intersection.

POLICY 12.3.6.2: Coordinate with NYSDOT regarding pedestrian enhancements in the Four Corners area.

OBJECTIVE 12.3.7: Explore the potential for public improvements in the Hartsdale Train Station Planning Area.

POLICY 12.3.7.1: Explore grant opportunities for the purposes of making pedestrian and stormwater upgrades in the Hartsdale Train Station Planning Area.

OBJECTIVE 12.3.8: Explore the potential for redevelopment in the Ardsley Road/ Central Park Avenue Planning Area.

POLICY 12.3.8.1: Explore the potential for non-residential mixed-use development consistent with Section 12.8.8, and in the locations shown on Figure 12.16, by coordinating with appropriate stakeholders (area residents and businesses, Westchester County, Town staff, etc.).

GOAL 12.4: Strengthen Development in connection with Locally and Regionally Planned Transportation Improvements along White Plains/Tarrytown Road (NYS RT. 119), Central Park Avenue (NYS RT. 100) and Saw Mill River Road (NYS RT. 9A).

OBJECTIVE 12.4.1: Provide clear rationale for public transportation improvements in desired locations.

POLICY 12.4.1.1: Advocate and continue to plan for I-287/Tappan Zee Bridge replacement related infrastructure/mass transit stations that support non-residential mixed-use in locations consistent with those shown on Figure 12.16.

POLICY 12.4.1.2: Advocate and continue to plan for a NYS Rt. 9A bypass that supports non-residential mixed-use in locations consistent with those shown on Figure 12.16.

GOAL 12.5: Strengthen Research and Development Corridors and create opportunities for Expansion and Complementary Uses.

OBJECTIVE 12.5.1: Facilitate the creation of two research and development clusters.
POLICY 12.5.1.1: Support research and development, and research and development supportive uses consistent with Sections 12.10.1 and 12.10.2, and in locations consistent with those shown on Figure 12.13.

POLICY 12.5.1.2: Remove the GI District in the locations depicted as Research and Development Cluster South and in locations depicted as Research and Development Supportive, and rezone, to allow non-residential uses that will contribute to a successful R&D Cluster.

GOAL 12.6: Factor Municipal Assets into land-use planning.

OBJECTIVE 12.6.1: Establish public-private partnerships where feasible.

POLICY 12.6.1.1: Plan for the renovation/relocation of the Town Police Headquarters and the Town Courthouse as part of any public-private partnership.

POLICY 12.6.1.2: Continue to coordinate with the Hartsdale Public Parking District.
Chapter 13.0 Implementation and Monitoring

13.1 Relationship to our Guiding Principles

Each policy of the Plan is consistent with the guiding principles. Successful implementation of these policies suggests that a wide range of benefits are expected for existing residents and businesses and for those who will choose unincorporated Greenburgh as a place to reside, to visit and/or to start a new business. Instituting the policies of the Plan will place unincorporated Greenburgh on a path to achieving the stated goals and objectives. The success of the Plan is dependent on efficient and “full implementation.” This chapter outlines how the Plan will be implemented, identifies the various stakeholders that will have a role in implementation, and provides timeframes for implementation. How, when, and who monitors progress of the Plan’s implementation is also a significant focus of this chapter.

13.2 Implementation of Interconnected Policies

Each chapter of the Plan contains overlapping policies. In Table 1.2 of Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 1.0) each guiding principle is stated and followed by list of the numerous chapters that contain related policies. “Full implementation,” noted in Section 13.1 (Relationship to our Guiding Principles), refers to the fact that implementing the policies of one chapter are only likely to provide Town-wide benefits and support our guiding principles when implemented in connection with the polices of each chapter of the Plan.

13.3 Implementing the Plan (How)

The adoption of the Plan is the first step in the implementation process. Continuing action to implement the Plan will be needed for it to have lasting impact. This section identifies how the goals, objectives and policies for the immediate and long-range protection, enhancement, growth and development of unincorporated Greenburgh are translated into concrete actions. The Plan will be implemented in several ways. These methods are noted below in generalized categories and are assigned to each policy in Table 13.4, as appropriate.

- **Continuation of Municipal Support** (Symbol: CMS) – Implementation that involves ongoing/future support of existing policies or protocol by land use boards, committees and the staff of unincorporated Greenburgh.

- **Creation of a Directory List** (Symbol: CDL) – Implementation that requires the creation of a new directory or the supplementation of existing lists.

- **Formal Policy** (Symbol: FP) – Implementation that does not expressly require a zoning text amendment but should be referenced by land use boards, committees, staff, residents, businesses and any agencies conducting actions in unincorporated Greenburgh.

*Directory lists are catalogues of Town information such as total park listings and acreages, or a catalogue of existing businesses in the Town.*
• **Inter-municipal/Regional Coordination** (Symbol: IM/RC) – Implementation that requires coordination with municipalities outside unincorporated Greenburgh and various regional governmental and non-governmental agencies.

• **Leverage Funding Sources** (Symbol: LFS) – Implementation that requires and will be enhanced by acquisition of grants and/or regional governmental funding sources.

• **Private Sector Coordination** (Symbol: PSC) – Implementation that entails coordination with private sector industries and companies to understand the information and resources needed for business retention and expansion.

• **Town Department Coordination** (Symbol: TDC) – Implementation that involves coordination within various Town of Greenburgh departments.

• **Zoning Map Amendment** (Symbol: ZMA) – Implementation that requires an amendment to the Zoning Map of the Town of Greenburgh.

• **Zoning Text Amendment** (Symbol: ZTA) – Implementation that requires an amendment to the text of the Code of the Town of Greenburgh.

### 13.4 Plan Implementation Responsibilities (Who)

The Department of Community Development and Conservation, in coordination with a range of implementation partners, will be the lead facilitator to implement the Plan and coordinate consistency reviews among municipal departments. This section identifies the various representatives from Town staff, existing boards and committees, and other key stakeholders that will be charged with ensuring that the Plan is used and followed. These entities will be responsible not only for coordinating overall implementation of the Plan but also working to ensure that public outreach and education is achieved. Table 13.1 lists the departments of the Town of Greenburgh that will contribute to the Plan’s implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Office</td>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Engineering *</td>
<td>BoE</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Highways *</td>
<td>BoH</td>
<td>Sanitation/Highway Garage</td>
<td>100 Sprain Road, P.O. Ardsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Sanitation *</td>
<td>BoS</td>
<td>Sanitation/Highway Garage</td>
<td>100 Sprain Road, P.O. Ardsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development &amp; Conservation</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources (TDYCC)</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Theodore D. Young Community Center</td>
<td>32 Manhattan Avenue, P.O. White Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptroller’s Office</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Water Dist. No.1 *</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Water Shop</td>
<td>181 Knollwood Road, P.O. White Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Works *</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Nature Center</td>
<td>GNC</td>
<td>Nature Center</td>
<td>99 Dromore Road, P.O. Scarsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Public Library</td>
<td>GPL</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>300 Tarrytown Road, P.O. Elmsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Public Access TV</td>
<td>PATV</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Town Court</td>
<td>GTC</td>
<td>Town Court Complex</td>
<td>188 Tarrytown Road, P.O. White Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Information Systems</td>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Town Attorney</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Administration Building</td>
<td>11 Olympic Lane, P.O. Ardsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>PLY</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Police Department Headquarters</td>
<td>188 Tarrytown Road, P.O. White Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Department</td>
<td>PURCH</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Department</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Clerk’s Office</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Historian</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Supervisor/Town Board</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>177 Hillside Avenue, Greenburgh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Bureaus of Engineering, Highway and Sanitation are within the Department of Public Works
Table 13.2 lists the boards and committees of unincorporated Greenburgh, as well as the Hartsdale Public Parking District. For implementation responsibilities, these entities are assigned to each appropriate policy in Table 13.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board or Committee</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Committee</td>
<td>AHC</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antenna Review Board</td>
<td>ARB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture Committee</td>
<td>A&amp;CC</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Ethics</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resources Advisory Board</td>
<td>CRAB</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Advisory Council</td>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Library Board</td>
<td>FLB</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Nature Center Board of Directors</td>
<td>GNCBoD</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Public Library Board of Directors</td>
<td>GPLBoD</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Contextual Review Committee</td>
<td>HCRC</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Landmarks Preservation Board</td>
<td>H&amp;LPB</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Advisory Board</td>
<td>P&amp;RAB</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department Advisory Board</td>
<td>PDAB</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Board</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Board of Appeals</td>
<td>ZBA</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Public Parking District</td>
<td>HPPD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes alternate
Table 13.3 lists inter-municipal and regional planning partners. For implementation responsibilities, these entities are assigned to each appropriate policy in Table 13.4. Inter-municipal agencies typically refer to the municipalities that are adjacent to unincorporated Greenburgh (Village of Ardsley, Village of Dobbs Ferry, Village of Elmsford, Village of Hastings on Hudson, Village of Irvington, Town of Mount Pleasant, Town of North Castle, Village of Scarsdale, Village of Tarrytown, City of White Plains and the City of Yonkers), although inter-municipal coordination is expected with non-adjacent municipalities. Each of these municipalities are highlighted as coordinated planning areas in various portions of the Plan.

Two groups are not listed in Table 13.3; however, these groups are the most important planning partners with regard to the Plan’s implementation. The residents and businesses of unincorporated Greenburgh, through continued public outreach and education, will contribute heavily to the success of the Plan’s implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Partner</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicable School District</td>
<td>ASD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Edison</td>
<td>ConEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River Valley Greenway</td>
<td>HRVG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Valley Regional Council</td>
<td>HVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermunicipal Agencies *</td>
<td>IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit Authority</td>
<td>MTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Regional Economic Development Council</td>
<td>MHREDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Municipal Transportation Council</td>
<td>NYMTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Department of Environmental Conservation</td>
<td>NYSDEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Department of Environmental Protection</td>
<td>NYSDEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Department of Transportation</td>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Energy Research and Development Authority</td>
<td>NYSERDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Emergency Management Office</td>
<td>NYSEMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>NYSHPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Thruway Authority</td>
<td>NYSTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Water</td>
<td>UW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army Corp of Engineers</td>
<td>USACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester Community College &amp; Regional Universities</td>
<td>WCC/RU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Typically consists of municipalities adjacent to unincorporated Greenburgh
13.5 Plan Implementation Timeframes (When)

Plan implementation will begin following adoption of the Plan. The timeframe for implementing each policy is listed in Table 13.4. It is anticipated that policies designated “short term” will be implemented within one to two years. Implementation of policies designated “long term” will take longer than two years. Policies designated with an “ongoing” timeframe are not tasks or actions that can be completed but rather policies and protocols, either existing or newly adopted with the Plan, that require ongoing adherence.

Although the Plan will be used to guide decision-making and actions affecting the enhancement, growth and physical development of unincorporated Greenburgh over the next 20 years, it is expected that subsequent plan review and updates will occur every five years. In addition, continual monitoring of the Plan’s progress will take place. The monitoring process is described in Section 13.7.

13.6 Plan Implementation Procedure Matrix

Table 13.4 lists each policy number found in the Plan. This matrix notes the methods to be used to carry out the respective policy, the entities responsible for implementation, and a timeframe associated with each policy.
### Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 3.0 Sustainable Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.1.1</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.1.2</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.1.3</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.1.4</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.1.5</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.1.6</td>
<td>FP, ZTA, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.1.1.7</td>
<td>FP, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, PB, BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2.1.1</td>
<td>FP, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, MHREDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2.1.2</td>
<td>FP, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, HVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2.1.3</td>
<td>FP, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2.1.4</td>
<td>LFS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.2.1.5</td>
<td>FP, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, BD, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.3.1.1</td>
<td>FP, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.3.1.2</td>
<td>FP, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.4.1.1</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, OA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.4.1.2</td>
<td>TDC, LFS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.4.1.3</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>BD, BoE, DPW, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.4.2.1</td>
<td>CMS, LFS</td>
<td>BD, DPW, TB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.4.2.2</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>BD, DPW, TB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.1</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>BD, CD&amp;C, CR, P&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.2</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>ACC, CD&amp;C, H&amp;LPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.3</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>BoE, BoH, CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.4</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, P&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.5</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>BoE, BoH, CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.6</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>BoE, BoH, CD&amp;C, DPW, WC, NYSDOT, NYMTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.7</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.8</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, MHREDC, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.5.1.9</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, WC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Chapter 13.0 Implementation and Monitoring

### Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.6.1.1</td>
<td>CMS, FP, PSC, TDC</td>
<td>BD, BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW, NYSDEC, NYSEPA, NYSEMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.6.1.2</td>
<td>CMS, FP, PSC, TDC</td>
<td>BD, BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW, NYSDEC, NYSEPA, NYSEMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 3.6.1.3</td>
<td>CMS, FP, PSC, TDC</td>
<td>BD, BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW, NYSDEC, NYSEPA, NYSEMO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 4.0 Community Well-Being

| Policy 4.1.1.1      | FP                            | CD&C, CR, P&R            | Ongoing |
| Policy 4.1.1.2      | FP                            | ACC, CR, CD&C            | Ongoing |
| Policy 4.1.1.3      | FP                            | P&R                      | Ongoing |
| Policy 4.1.1.4      | FP, IM/RC                     | CD&C, IM                 | Ongoing |
| Policy 4.1.1.5      | FP                            | CD&C, DPW, P&R, PB, TB   | Ongoing |
| Policy 4.1.1.6      | TDC                           | CD&C                     | Short Term |

### Chapter 5.0 Art, Culture and Historic Resources

| Policy 5.1.1.1      | CMS, FP, PSC                  | ACC, CD&C                | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.2      | TDC, FP                       | ACC, CD&C                | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.3      | TDC, IM/RC                    | CD&C, H&LPB              | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.4      | PSC                           | ACC, CD&C                | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.5      | CDL, CMS                      | ACC, CD&C, H&LPB, TC     | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.6      | TDC, FP, PSC                  | ACC, CD&C                | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.7      | TDC, FP, PSC                  | ACC, CD&C                | Long Term |
| Policy 5.1.1.8      | FP, ZTA                       | ACC, CD&C, TA            | Short Term |
| Policy 5.1.1.9      | CMS                           | H&LPB, CD&C              | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.10     | CMS                           | H&LPB, CD&C, TB, PB      | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.11     | TDC, LFS                      | TH, H&LPB, CD&C          | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.12     | TDC, CMS, PSC                 | CD&C, TB, PB             | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.1.1.13     | TDC                           | TA, TB, CD&C, H&LPB      | Short Term |
| Policy 5.2.1.1      | CMS                           | CD&C                     | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.2.1.2      | CMS, FP                       | H&LPB, CD&C              | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.2.1.3      | CMS                           | H&LPB, PB, TB             | Ongoing |
| Policy 5.2.1.4      | CMS                           | H&LPB, CD&C              | Ongoing |
Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.2.1.5</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>H&amp;LPB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.2.1.6</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.2.1.7</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>TB, ACC, TB, H&amp;LPB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 5.2.1.8</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>TB, ACC, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 6.0 Environmental Resources and Related Systems

| Policy 6.1.1.1      | ZTA                            | BoE, CD&C, TA            | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.1.1.2      | ZTA                            | BoE, CD&C, TA, BD        | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.1.1.3      | ZTA                            | BoE, CD&C, TA, BD        | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.2.1.1      | CMS, FP                        | CAC, PB, TB, ZBA         | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.2.1.2      | CMS, FP, ZTA                   | CAC, CD&C, TB, TA, BD    | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.2.1.3      | CMS, FP, ZTA                   | CAC, CD&C, TB, TA, BD    | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.2.1.4      | ZTA                            | CAC, CD&C, TB, TA        | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.2.1.5      | FP, ZTA                        | CAC, CD&C                | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.2.1.6      | TDC, CMS, FP                   | CAC, CD&C                | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.2.1.7      | TDC, CMS, FP                   | CAC, PB, TB, ZBA         | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.2.1.8      | TDC, CMS, FP                   | CAC, PB, TB, ZBA         | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.2.1.9      | CMS, FP                        | CAC, PB, TB, ZBA         | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.3.1.1      | FP                             | CAC, PB, TB, ZBA         | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.3.1.2      | ZTA                            | BoE, CD&C, TA            | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.4.1.1      | TDC, FP, IM/RC                 | CAC, CD&C, NYSDOT, PB, TB, ZBA | Ongoing |
| Policy 6.4.1.2      | ZTA                            | BD, BoE, CD&C            | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.4.1.3      | ZTA                            | BD, CD&C, TB, CAC, TA    | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.4.1.4      | ZTA                            | BD, CD&C, TB, CAC, TA    | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.4.1.5      | CMS, FP                        | CAC, PB, TB, ZBA         | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.4.1.6      | ZTA                            | BD, CD&C, TB, CAC, TA    | Short Term              |
| Policy 6.5.1.1      | TDC, FP, PSC                   | PB, TB, ZBA              | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.5.1.2      | FP, ZTA                        | CD&C, PB, TA, TB, ZBA    | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.6.1.1      | DC, IM/RC                      | CD&C, NYSDOT, PB, TB, WC | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.6.1.2      | CMS, IM/RC                     | BoE, CD&C, ConEd, DPW    | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.6.1.3      | CMS, FP                        | CAC, PB, TB, ZBA         | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.7.1.1      | FP, ZTA                        | BD, CD&C, PB, TB, ZBA    | Ongoing                 |
| Policy 6.7.1.2      | IM/RC                          | BoE, BoH, CD&C, DPW, NYSDOT | Ongoing |
| Policy 6.8.1.1      | IM/RC                          | BoE, BoH, CD&C, DPW, NYSDOT | Ongoing |
### Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.8.1.2</td>
<td>CMS, FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.8.1.3</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.1</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.2</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.3</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.4</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.8.1.2</td>
<td>CMS, FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.8.1.3</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.1</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.2</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.3</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.9.1.4</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 7.0 Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities

| Policy 7.1.1.1      | CDL, TDC                     | P&R                      |
| Policy 7.1.2.1      | TDC                           | P&R                      |
| Policy 7.1.2.3      | TDC                           | P&R, TB                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.4      | CDL                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.5      | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.6      | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.7      | CDL, TDC                     | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.8      | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.9      | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.10     | CDL, TDC                     | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.11     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.12     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.13     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.14     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.15     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.16     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.17     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.18     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.19     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.20     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |
| Policy 7.1.3.21     | TDC                           | P&R, TA                  |

---

Chapter 7.0 Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.2.5.1</td>
<td>TDC, FP, IM/RC</td>
<td>BoH, HRVG, IM, NYSDOT, PB, P&amp;R, TB, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.2.5.2</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>HRVG, NYDOT, PB, TB, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.2.5.3</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC</td>
<td>HRVG, IM, P&amp;R, TB, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.2.5.4</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, P&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.2.5.5</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>P&amp;R, PB, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.2.5.6</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>P&amp;R, TA, TB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.2.5.7</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>P&amp;R, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.1</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>P&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.2</td>
<td>ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, P&amp;R, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.3</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.4</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.5</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.6</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.7</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>ConEd, TDC, IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.3.1.8</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC, LFS</td>
<td>P&amp;R, TB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.4.1.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW, PB, P&amp;R, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.4.1.2</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.4.1.3</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW, P&amp;R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.4.2.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW, PB, P&amp;R, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 7.4.2.2</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>BoH, DPW, P&amp;R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 8.0 Public Infrastructure and Essential Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 8.1.1.1</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>BoE, DPW</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.1.2</td>
<td>CMS/FP</td>
<td>PB, TB, ZBA, CD&amp;C, TA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.1.3</td>
<td>FP, TDC, PSC</td>
<td>TB, TA, CD&amp;C, BofE, DPW</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.1.4</td>
<td>FP, TDC, PSC</td>
<td>TB, TA, CD&amp;C, BofE, DPW</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.2.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.2.2</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.2.3</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.2.4</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.2.5</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.3.1</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.3.2</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.3.3</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, ConEd, DPW, UW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.3.4</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.3.5</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>BoE, DPW, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.1.3.6</td>
<td>IM/RC, PSC, TDC</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, ConEd, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.1.1</td>
<td>CMS, TDC</td>
<td>DPW, UW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.1.2</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.1.3</td>
<td>CMS, TDC</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.1.4</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.1.5</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC</td>
<td>BD, DPW, UW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.2.1</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.2.2</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.2.3</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.2.4</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.2.5</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW, NYCDEP, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.1.6</td>
<td>IM/RC, LFS, TDC</td>
<td>BoE, WD, TB, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.1.7</td>
<td>LFS, IM/RC, TDC</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, WD, TB, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.3.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.3.2</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.2.3.3</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.1.1</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.1.2</td>
<td>CMS, TDC, FP</td>
<td>ConEd, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.1.3</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.2.1</td>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.2.2</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.3.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>BoE, DPW, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.3.2</td>
<td>CMS, TDC, LFS</td>
<td>BoE, DPW, TB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.3.3</td>
<td>FP, PSC, TDC</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.4.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.3.4.2</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.1.1</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.1.2</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>TB, TA, BoE, CD&amp;C, BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.2.1</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.2.2</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>BoE, DPW, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.2.3</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>BoE, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.2.4</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.2.5</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW, PB, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.2.6</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW, IM, TA, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.4.2.7</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>BoE, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.5.1.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>BoE, CD&amp;C, DPW, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.5.1.2</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>DPW, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.5.1.3</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.5.1.4</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.5.1.5</td>
<td>CMS, IM/RC</td>
<td>DPW, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.5.1.6</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC</td>
<td>DPW, TB, TA, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.6.1.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 8.6.1.2</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 9.0 Transportation, Mobility and Access

<p>| Policy 9.1.1.1      | FP, PSC                       | CD&amp;C, DPW, PB, TB        | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.1.1.2      | TDC, FP                       | CD&amp;C, NYS DOT, WC        | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.1.1.3      | TDC, ZMA, ZTA                 | IM, PB, TB, WC           | Long Term |
| Policy 9.1.1.4      | TDC, FP, IM/RC, LFS           | CD&amp;C                     | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.1.1.5      | DC, FP, CMS                   | CD&amp;C, PB, TB, ZBA        | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.1.1.6      | TDC, FP, LFS, PSC            | TB, TA, DPW, CD&amp;C, NYS DOT| Ongoing |
| Policy 9.2.1.1      | TDC, FP, LFS, PSC            | TB, TA, DPW, CD&amp;C        | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.2.1.2      | ZTA                           | PB, TB                   | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.2.1.3      | FP, IM/RC, LFS               | CD&amp;C, WC, HRVG           | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.2.1.4      | TDC, IM/RC, PSC              | CD&amp;C, HRVG, WC, PB, TB   | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.2.1.5      | FP, TDC, IM/RC               | TB, CD&amp;C                 | Ongoing   |
| Policy 9.2.1.6      | TDC, IN/RC                   | CD&amp;C, WC, HRVG           | Long Term |
| Policy 9.3.1.1      | TDC, PSC                     | CD&amp;C, IM, NYS DOT, NYSTA, NYMTC, PB, TB, WC | Ongoing |
| Policy 9.3.1.2      | TDC, PSC                     | CD&amp;C, PB, TA, TB         | Long Term |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.3.1.3</td>
<td>TDC, FP, PSC</td>
<td>PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.3.1.4</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.3.1.5</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.3.1.6</td>
<td>TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, NYSDOT, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.4.1.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.4.1.2</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.5.1.2</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.5.1.3</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.6.1.1</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, NYMTC, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.6.1.2</td>
<td>FP, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.6.1.3</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.6.1.4</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW, NYSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.7.1.1</td>
<td>TDC, CS</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.7.1.2</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.7.1.3</td>
<td>CMS, TDC, IM/RC</td>
<td>TB, PD, CD&amp;C, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.8.1.1</td>
<td>TDC, FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.9.1.1</td>
<td>IM, RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, NYMTC, NYSDOT, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.9.1.2</td>
<td>CMS, FP, ZTA</td>
<td>TB, PB, ZBA, CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.9.1.3</td>
<td>CDL, TDC</td>
<td>TB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.10.1.1</td>
<td>CMS, TDC, PSC</td>
<td>TB, PB, DPW, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.10.1.2</td>
<td>CMS, TDC</td>
<td>TB, DPW, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.10.1.3</td>
<td>TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.10.1.4</td>
<td>FP, PSC, CMS</td>
<td>TB, PB, ZBA, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.11.1.1</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.11.1.2</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.11.1.3</td>
<td>FP, CMS, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.11.1.4</td>
<td>FP, ZTA, CMS, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, TA, PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.11.1.5</td>
<td>FP, ZTA, CMS, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, TA, PB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.11.1.6</td>
<td>FP, ZTA, CMS, TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, TA, PB, ZBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.12.1.1</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>PB, TB, CD&amp;C, NYSDOT, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.12.1.2</td>
<td>FP, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB, NYSDOT, WC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.12.1.3</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>TB, TA, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 9.12.1.4</td>
<td>IM/RC, TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, HCRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 10.0 Demographics and Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.1.1.1</td>
<td>ZMA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.1.1.2</td>
<td>TDC, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.1.1.3</td>
<td>CMS, TDC</td>
<td>BD, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.1.1.4</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>BD, CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.1.1.5</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.1.1</td>
<td>ZTA, TDC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.1.2</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.1.3</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.1.4</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.2.1</td>
<td>TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.2.2</td>
<td>TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.3.1</td>
<td>TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>BD, CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.3.2</td>
<td>TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.2.4.1</td>
<td>FP, TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, AHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 10.3.1.1</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 11.0 Economic Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.1.1.1</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.1.1.2</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.1.1.3</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, MHREDC, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.1.1.4</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, MHREDC, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.1.1.5</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, HVRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.2.1.1</td>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.2.1.2</td>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.2.1.3</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.2.1.4</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.2.1.5</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TB, WCC/RU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.2.1.6</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.3.1.1</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.3.1.2</td>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.4.1.1</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, NYMTC, NYSNODOT, PB, TB, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.4.1.2</td>
<td>TDC, IM/RC, PSC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, NYMTC, NYSNODOT, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.4.1.3</td>
<td>IM/RC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, NYMTC, NYSNODOT, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13.4: Implementation Procedures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Type</th>
<th>Primary Implementation Groups</th>
<th>Implementation Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.4.1.4</td>
<td>TDC, PSC</td>
<td>PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.4.1.5</td>
<td>IM/RC, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.5.1.1</td>
<td>ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.5.1.2</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.5.1.3</td>
<td>CMS, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.5.1.4</td>
<td>FP, TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.5.1.5</td>
<td>FP, TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.5.1.6</td>
<td>FP</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.5.1.7</td>
<td>FP, TDC, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.6.1.1</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.6.1.2</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.6.1.3</td>
<td>FP, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.7.1.1</td>
<td>FP, TDC, LFS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.7.1.2</td>
<td>FP, TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, HPPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.8.1.1</td>
<td>TDC</td>
<td>CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.8.1.2</td>
<td>TDC, LFS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, MHREDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.9.1.1</td>
<td>CMS, FP, PSC</td>
<td>TB, PB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.9.1.2</td>
<td>CMS, FP, PSC</td>
<td>TB, PB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.9.1.3</td>
<td>CMS, FP, PSC</td>
<td>TB, PB, CD&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 11.9.1.4</td>
<td>FP, IM/RC</td>
<td>TA, CD&amp;C, PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.1.1.1</td>
<td>ZMA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, PB, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.1</td>
<td>ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.2</td>
<td>ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.3</td>
<td>DC, TDC, ZMA, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.4</td>
<td>TDC, FP, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.5</td>
<td>TDC, FP, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.6</td>
<td>TDC, FP, ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.7</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.1.8</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, TA, TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.2.2.1</td>
<td>ZTA</td>
<td>TB, CD&amp;C, TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.3.1.1</td>
<td>IM/RC, PSC, CMS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, NYSDOT, NYMTC, NYSTA, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.3.2.1</td>
<td>IM/RC, PSC, CMS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, NYSDOT, NYMTC, NYSTA, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.3.3.1</td>
<td>IM/RC, PSC, CMS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, IM, NYSDOT, NYMTC, NYSTA, WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 12.3.4.1</td>
<td>IM/RC, PSC, CMS</td>
<td>CD&amp;C, HPPD, WC, PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 13.7 Plan Monitoring Responsibilities and Timeframes

The Department of Community Development and Conservation, consistent with facilitating implementation duties, will also take the lead role in monitoring progress of the plan. Following adoption of the Plan, an annual progress report will be issued indicating goals and objectives that have been achieved.
APPENDIX A

Greenburgh Comprehensive Plan Input Survey & Summary of Responses
Introduction and Overview

On March 19, 2009, two focus groups were held in the Greenburgh Town Hall to discuss the opportunities and constraints for redevelopment of Central Park Avenue and the other commercial corridors in Greenburgh. The first session involved members of the real estate profession who are involved with commercial properties in the Town. Participants in the second session included property owners and/or developers involved in properties along Central Park Avenue and the other commercial corridors. The groups identified the following issues and opportunities:

ISSUES:

Anti-development attitudes: In both sessions, Greenburgh was described as a community in which it was difficult to win approval for development projects.

High taxes/costs: In addition, both sessions highlighted the fact that high taxes in Greenburgh put it at a strong cost disadvantage compared to other locations in Connecticut, New Jersey or even Yonkers.

Costly/lengthy approvals process: The development approvals process was described as time-consuming and cumbersome, providing a further disincentive for the redevelopment of Central Park Avenue.

Outdated/Counterproductive Regulations: There was also widespread agreement in both sessions that Greenburgh’s current zoning regulations are a major factor in keeping desired development out of Greenburgh. Low floor area ratios and high requirements for parking make it difficult to attract restaurants and specialty retailers, such as furniture stores, as well as small footprint specialty stores that would be best suited for multi-tenant buildings. Inflexible signage regulations were also cited as a major problem for retailers. In addition, participants felt that some environmental regulations (e.g., the steep slopes regulations) created burdensome constraints for development that are unrelated to effective environmental stewardship.

Increased Competition: Central Park Avenue (as well as all commercial areas in Greenburgh) will be facing increased competition beyond just the problems associated with the current economic downturn. The imminent opening of Ridge Hill Village will introduce over 1.3 million square feet of retail space into the market at a time when the Central Park Avenue corridor has over 200,000 square feet of vacant retail space. In addition, the recent consolidation of corporations operating “big box” stores means that more and more locations will be competing for fewer and fewer of such stores. Finally, participants in both sessions pointed out that the trends in retail development are toward smaller foot-print stores in high-density, mixed-used developments. Under current zoning, such development is much more likely to consider locating in the Villages or White Plains rather than in Greenburgh’s commercial areas.
OPPORTUNITIES:

There was a near-unanimous sense that, with appropriate changes in attitude and policy, Greenburgh could be the site of significant amounts of high-quality sustainable development.

**High-density, Mixed Use Development:** Participants asserted that, if the regulations governing the development of Central Park Avenue (and the other corridors in town) could be revised to support nodes of higher-density, mixed use development, this could have multiple benefits. It would bring down the per-square-foot costs of taxes by spreading those costs across larger building footprints on appropriate sites. It will also make the corridors more attractive to progressive developers currently seeking sites for such neo-traditional, transit-oriented development.

**Reducing Costs & Delays in the Approvals Process:** Participants made the point that if the regulatory process could be simplified, the costs of doing projects in Greenburgh could be reduced and Greenburgh itself could become a much more attractive site for development. Suggestions to address this include the creation of Generic Environmental Impact Statements (GEIS) for key development areas in the Town.

**Enhanced Local Identify:** The creation of such nodes would create or strengthen the identity of the surrounding areas, enabling the development process to simultaneously strengthen the quality of life in Greenburgh through hamlet revitalization. It was also suggested that Greenburgh cooperate with the County, the Villages and other jurisdictions to ensure that development that is attracted to each community is complementary to the development goals of its neighbors, increasing the potential for further development in each of the participating jurisdictions.

**Improved Opportunities for Transit:** Finally, it was pointed out that the creation of such nodes would also make it more feasible to serve those areas with mass transit, potentially reducing some of the traffic problems on Central Park Avenue and elsewhere in Greenburgh.

**Promoting Local Business Association(s):** Participants also agreed that it may be useful to create a business association for Central Park Avenue (as well as for other areas in the Town). Such an association could provide a clear and strong voice for business interests as the Town considers revising zoning and other regulations to improve the Town’s economy and promote overall quality of life.

Detailed descriptions of each of these meetings follow. The sessions followed a similar format. They began with a discussion of “global issues” facing Greenburgh’s commercial corridors. Participants were asked to identify issues affecting Greenburgh that may not be directly related to the specifics of the local real estate market or local regulatory policies. From there, participants were asked to focus on “constraints” to development that were unique to Central Park Avenue and the other commercial
corridors in the Town. Following the discussion of constraints, the agenda moved on to “solutions.” In particular, participants were asked to identify policy responses (or other initiatives) to address the constraints identified earlier. Finally participants in both sessions were asked to define “opportunities” for development or redevelopment that exist for Central Park Avenue and the other commercial corridors in Greenburgh. The descriptions below summarize the discussions at each meeting. Note: these are summary descriptions, not transcriptions. In some cases, the topics discussed have been reordered or consolidated to provide the reader with a clearer, more concise description of the substance of the conversations than would be available through a literal transcription.

**Session with Real Estate Agents: March 19, 2009 9-11AM Jackson Conference Room**

**Attendees:**
Gene Berger, Aries, Deitch & Endelson  
Erminia P. Curcio, Resident, Project Manager  
Martin Deitch, Aries, Deitch & Endelson  
Dennis Dilmaghani, Dilstan Realty Corp  
Barry Endelson, Aries, Deitch & Endelson  
Donna Gage, Aries, Deitch & Endelson  
Bill Hesse, Aries, Deitch & Endelson  
Leda Maduriera, Aries, Deitch & Endelson  
Charles Whang, Prudential Rand Commercial Services  
Garret Duquesne, Town of Greenburgh  
Peter Fairweather, Fairweather Consulting  
Thomas Madden, Town of Greenburgh  
Fran McLaughlin, Greenburgh Planning Board, CSPC  
Francis Sheehan, Greenburgh Town Board, CPSC  
Walter Simon, Greenburgh Planning Board, CSPC

**Global Issues**
Participants expressed the concern that regulations on Central Park Avenue are “driving away” activities and uses that appeal to younger adults such as restaurants and entertainment. As a result, such activities are now concentrating in the Villages and White Plains.

At the same time, existing regulations do not respond to the needs of an aging population. For example, there are no sidewalks along much of Central Park Avenue. Similarly, there is little provision for buses or transit along the Avenue.
On the other hand, it was argued that pedestrian-friendliness is not as important for Central Park Avenue, given that most of the users of stores and services along Central Park Avenue expect to reach their destinations by private car. This still presents a problem in that much of Central Park Avenue features poor access and egress due to poor sight lines and the existence of many curb cuts. In addition the traffic lights along the Avenue are not timed with one another, making it more difficult and time-consuming to navigate Central Park Avenue.

Greenburgh’s relatively high real estate taxes also present a problem for Central Park Avenue. They tend to be 3 or 4 times higher than similar areas in Connecticut and New Jersey, with such taxes along Central Park Avenue now ranging between $7.00 and $10.00 per square foot. This difference is seen in even the immediate local market. For example, it was reported that Common Area Maintenance Charges and taxes for the Yonkers Gateway center are $6.00 per square foot compared to $13.00 per square foot for areas in the Edgemont/Scarsdale vicinity.

Central Park Avenue’s commercial corridor will also be coming under increasing competition due to several factors:

- The opening of the Ridge Hill project in Yonkers will introduce 1.3 million square feet of retail space into the market with national chains such as Williams Sonoma, Cheesecake Factory and Barnes & Nobles. The Center is open-air shopping has good road access and will provide shoppers with easy access to the regional road system.

- At the same time, an ongoing national consolidation among big box category killers (e.g., Home Depot, Barnes & Noble, etc.) means that more and more locations will be competing for fewer and fewer big name stores.

- In addition, Cross County Shopping Center in Yonkers (with 971,000 GLA) is also being upgraded to focus on higher-end retail and dining/entertainment, adding 250,000 square feet in the process.

- It was estimated that the Central Park Avenue corridor in Greenburgh currently has 200,000 square feet vacant.

While these trends are occurring, the national economic slowdown is causing more and more retailers to look for some relief from rents.

**Constraints specific to Central Park Avenue/Greenburgh**

The long abandoned Health Spa on Central Park Avenue was cited as an example of the regulatory constraints along the corridor. Steep slope regulations limit what can be done with that site even though the slopes on the property wouldn’t necessarily be affected by redevelopment. Those regulations reduce the allowable square footage for redevelopment. In addition, the general
restrictions on floor area ratios for the corridor make it impossible to redevelop the property in a way the produces a reasonable return.

Parking ratios were identified as a major constraint to redevelopment. The regulations require too much parking regardless of the proposed use. Thus a furniture store (which has a handful of customers at any one time) is held to the same parking standards as a general merchandise retailer (which may have dozens of customers at any one time). Parking ratios were cited as a major deterrent for higher-end restaurants.

Signage regulations were also given as an example of a constraint on Central Park Avenue. The current regulations have a single formula restricting signage, regardless of how far the business is set back from Central Park Avenue. Thus, a business that is located 200 feet from the road must have the same size sign as one that is found fifty feet from Central Park Avenue.

As in the specific case of the health spa property, floor area ratios in general were also identified as being too restrictive.

While Greenburgh was lauded for its environmentally progressive attitude, concern was raised about potential regulations that would require “green” roofs for commercial buildings. In particular, it was noted that such regulations require that local contractors be capable of installing green roofing. Thus, the Town should make sure that contractors are educated about such regulations and able to provide the needed facilities to developers/property owners.

Finally, there was widespread concern that the approvals process in Greenburgh is too time-consuming and costly for developers. The concerns raised had less to do with the substance of the regulations, but rather the costs and length of time (which imposes an additional set of costs) to secure approvals in the Town.

**Potential Solutions**

It was recommended that the floor area ratio of current regulations could be increased dramatically. One example given was to raise current restrictions that may be as low as 10 percent to at least 20 percent.

The realtors also argued that signage regulations should be relaxed. In particular, it was suggested that the size of the allowable sign should be calculated based upon the depth of the lot and the siting of the building on which the sign was to be located. Buildings set back farther from the road on deeper lots should be allowed to have larger signs. It was also suggested that greater variation should be allowed for the heights of signs, again depending upon where the sign is located within the parcel and/or where the building itself is located on the parcel.

It was also agreed that it may be desirable to interconnect parking lots and provide common access/egress to Central Park Avenue for contiguous commercial properties. This could be coordinated with an effort to provide better timing of the traffic lights along Central Park Avenue to make the
corridor more accessible for shoppers. It was also suggested that the Town increase the visibility of patrol cars along Central Park Avenue as a means of traffic calming in the corridor.

Facade improvements for properties should be encouraged by offering incentives to property owners (possibly tied to energy conservation). For example, the Town may be able to secure grants related to energy efficiency to seed a revolving loan fund to provide low-interest loans for properties to improve their facades while integrating energy saving features (e.g., higher r-value insulation, thermal glass, etc.)

Regulatory incentives were also identified as potential solutions. It was suggested that incentives be created in the zoning regulations to encourage desirable uses. For example, the floor area ratio calculations for restaurants could exclude the kitchen and storage areas, thereby increasing the allowable density for that use. As an illustration, it was pointed out that the former Barnes & Noble “Halloween” building could potentially house an attractive furniture store if the floor area ratio was increased and parking requirements decreased for that site.

Another potential incentive discussed was the possibility of using graduated density incentives to encourage the consolidation of smaller lots in the Town’s commercial corridors. For example, a smaller single 5-acre lot may have a maximum floor area ratio of 20 percent. If that lot was consolidated with an adjacent lot, the new 10-acre lot may have an allowable floor area ratio of 40 percent.

There was general agreement that it may be useful to create a Central Park Avenue Business Association to provide a single more powerful voice to advocate to the Town on behalf of business interests when it comes to such issues as regulation changes, tax policy, etc.

The question was raised whether commercial properties are over-assessed versus residential properties so that businesses are subsidizing the provision of Town services to residents. No such assertions were made, but the question was raised.

As an example of the importance of revising the zoning for Central Park Avenue, it was pointed out that some of the most attractive retail space in Town (the Hartsdale hamlet at the intersection of Central Park Avenue and 100A) consists of largely nonconforming uses. If those properties were lost to a fire, under current zoning they could not be redeveloped in the manner that makes them attractive now.

It was agreed that apartments located over retail along Central Park Avenue could be an attractive form of development if the apartments were reasonably priced and located in attractive school districts.

Another solution offered was to enable zoning to “respond to the deal,” that is, if zoning for Central Park Avenue (or other commercial corridors) had provisions that allowed for greater flexibility in terms of building placement, density, parking and mix of uses, it would be possible to work with developers who want to do creative mixed use projects along Central Park Avenue and elsewhere. The idea of creating special overlay districts to allow such an approach was seen as a worthwhile option to consider. This would allow the creation of higher density nodes of activity along Central Park Avenue that could
provide the type of mixed-use specialty retail experience that currently is diverted to the Villages and/or White Plains.

It was also recommended that the Town reconsider its policies that cause properties to lose rights to current nonconforming uses. It was argued that the severity of the current economic downtown will cause some currently non-conforming uses to close for extended periods of time. Under current zoning, such properties may lose their right to the current nonconforming use. This will make it extremely difficult to fill properties with desirable uses under Greenburgh’s current zoning (given the low floor area ratios and high parking requirements now in place). Thus, the Town may wish to consider extending the length of time a nonconforming use remains vacant before that use is extinguished.

Opportunities

Route 9A extending from Elmsford to Mount Pleasant was identified as an opportunity for redevelopment. The stretch consists of some undeveloped land mixed with older retail uses and underutilized residential parcels. The zoning for the area makes redevelopment difficult since one side of 9A is zoned retail and the other side is light industrial.
Global Issues

According to the International Council of Shopping Centers, 70 percent of shopping center space is rented nationally. That 30 percent vacancy rate is likely to increase before the economy recovers. Tenants are looking for relocations and reductions in rent and exercising escape clauses in leases in response to these deteriorating economic conditions.

One respondent indicated that the vacancy rates in the area are unprecedented in 25 years. While national conditions are responsible for much of this, it was pointed out that Greenburgh’s higher taxes contribute to this problem. It was suggested that Connecticut taxes are much lower than those in Westchester and there may be an opportunity to use this downturn to “benchmark” Greenburgh versus such locations as Greenwich and Westport (as an aside, it was mentioned that New York State’s public defined-benefit pension plans are a key driver in tax increases by local governments).

One key issue emerged from the discussion: the overarching direction that development is heading in metropolitan areas is toward mixed-use transit-oriented development. This raises serious opportunities and challenges for Greenburgh. The opportunity is that, once the national economy has begun recovery, these development opportunities will be available in Greenburgh. The challenge is that, in many ways, the Town does not appear prepared for them. As will be discussed in other sections, current zoning regulations in the Town appear almost diametrically opposed to such development. In this situation, Greenburgh could lose most if not all of this development potential to the nearby Villages.
and the City of White Plains, as they already have the plans, regulations and infrastructure in place to accommodate this type of development. Greenburgh must act quickly if it does not want to lose out on such opportunities.

**Constraints Specific to Central Park Avenue/Greenburgh**

It was agreed that Greenburgh has a reputation as an anti-development community. There is some perception that some of the regulations currently on the books were created more as anti-development measures than as environmental protection measures. The Town’s steep slope regulations were given as an example. They can constrain the allowable density of development on a site even if the proposed development does not impinge upon the steep slopes found on the site.

Greenburgh’s approach to development was characterized as viewing commercial development as something that was simply to be exploited, rather than being an integral part of the community. One participant described the difficulties he had in opening a new delicatessen on Central Park Avenue. He felt the signage regulations, combined with the deep set back of his building, resulted in a conforming sign that could not be read from the street. He described problems he had with enforcement authorities requiring him to remove tables from his premises since his use was not a restaurant and being fined for placing a large, temporary “grand opening” sign on his building.

Another example given of Greenburgh’s counter-productive regulations related to restaurants. It was argued that the Town’s restrictive parking regulations and its “comprehensive” approach to calculating floor area ratio (including the kitchen, etc.) was driving better restaurants away from Greenburgh and into the Villages.

The approvals process was described as time-consuming and burdensome, adding to Greenburgh’s reputation as an anti-development community. Getting approvals (even for as-of-right, conforming uses) was described as difficult and time-consuming. Fees and charges were characterized as very high compared to other locations. One participant indicated that the “processing costs” for residential development can run between $12,000 and $15,000 per unit of rental housing.

It was pointed out that physical constraints combine with regulatory constraints to make development difficult in Greenburgh. Virtually all of the flat land in Greenburgh is already developed. Yet buffering for steep slopes and other physical constraints was described as excessive, making it difficult to develop or redevelop sites that can support development without environmental degradation. This reduces the land available for development and drives up costs. One illustration given for this is the increasing consideration of incorporating parking structures in development in the region. Given the expense associated with those structures, their consideration is an indication that affordable, developable land is becoming extremely scarce.

Greenburgh’s policy of fostering lower-density development was questioned by a participant. He indicated that low-density development will never be able to generate sufficient demand for transit
service. Thus, such low-density development must always be served almost exclusively by automobiles, greatly increasing the traffic problems associated with development.

**Potential Solutions**

Floor area ratios need to be revised to better accommodate particular types of projects (e.g., restaurants and furniture stores) in particular locations (e.g., areas targeted as high-density nodes).

The speed of the approvals process must be improved (one participant indicated that it required 13 years for Avalon Green II to be approved with no variances involved.)

It was recommended that the Town prepare Generic Environmental Impact Statements (GEIS) for key corridors targeted for redevelopment. A GEIS would establish thresholds for development (e.g., traffic, water, etc.). In order to gain approval in the corridor, a proposed project would only have to show that it falls below the thresholds previously established by the Town when they approved the GEIS for that corridor.

Greenburgh should also consider working with the County and other municipalities to create multi-jurisdictional plans for key corridors that extend into and beyond Greenburgh. This will enable each jurisdiction to identify complementary uses it can promote that will serve to strengthen each corridor as a whole.

**Opportunities**

Routes 100 and 119 were described as “pots of gold” of which Greenburgh is not taking full advantage. Route 100 is in “redevelopment mode,” with upgrades and teardowns taking place along the corridor. Route 119 still has the capacity for new development that can accommodate shared parking and some mixed use, etc.

The I-287/Route 119 crossing is largely undeveloped and could be a site for neotraditional, mixed use development.

It was pointed out that Ardsley Road extends from the Hudson riverfront to the Long Island Sound. Greenburgh should be seeking the type of redevelopment that Stamford, Port Chester and Yonkers are pursuing.

One participant described White Plains’ approach to development as striking a deal with its citizens. As part of the deal, the City has identified those areas of the City where it can charge for parking and those areas where it will not charge. In addition, White Plains is committed to fostering higher density development in those areas served by public transit.

Greenburgh should take a similar approach to development, ensuring that new development is easily accessible by auto (in the short run by promoting internal site circulation, shared access and timed traffic lights) and by mass transit (in the long run by encouraging nodes of high density development that can be served by transit).
Participants asserted that, if Greenburgh can develop a coordinated approach with the Villages, it has the opportunity to go heavily into mixed use development. This has several advantages:

- Increased density of such development will reduce the cost per square foot to developers, thereby making Greenburgh more attractive on a cost-competitive basis.

- Under such conditions, Greenburgh has enough relatively cheaper vacant land to attract development that would otherwise seek to locate in the Villages.

- Development could be concentrated in higher-density nodes or hamlets, enabling that development to create or strengthen a sense of neighborhood identity and to promote the creation of transit (potential even via a private operator) to serve those hamlets.

The Town could create overlay zones to promote such development, drawing upon the experience of such places as Jersey City and White Plains.

It was suggested that the sense of place of the hamlets could be increased if Post Office substations were created for key hamlets (US Postal Service regulations permitting).

The group discussed the possibility of creating publicity for a redeveloped Central Park Avenue as a means of demonstrating Greenburgh’s changed attitude towards development and to let make potential developers aware of the attractive demographics associated with Greenburgh’s commercial corridors.

It was agreed that such a redevelopment effort should be presented to the residents of Greenburgh as a tax control measure. It would be important to keep this benefit prominent as a reason for pursuing this redevelopment strategy.
APPENDIX B

Summary of Visioning Meetings
TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADER – Joan Roche

- Roadways: classify – what can we do?
- Roadway linkability
- East/west highways: need more options
- East/west highways: the impact of trucks (more control over commercial vehicles)
- North/south highways – they were not created to handle today’s volumes and lack infrastructure
- Driver friendly roads
- Key corridors – Rte. 119, Rte 9A, Central Avenue, Saw Mill Parkway, Sprain Parkway, and Department of Transportation roads
- Look at neighborhoods: connectivity with travel choices (pedestrian, bike); better planned neighborhoods
- Commercial/residential connections (be efficient)
- Hard to get down Central Avenue
- Use of emerging technologies (e.g. PeaPod, the online grocery delivery service, for the elderly and disabled)
- Tappan Zee Bridge
- Lack of Parking (Hartsdale, congested areas and multi-families)
- Hartsdale train schedule, between 4:30 to 6:00 PM, influx peaks
- Woodlands Senior High School cannot be accessed by bikes or pedestrian
- Rte 9A sidewalks
- Ardsley High School – Secor Road and Rte 9A are too busy to cross to get to bus stop
- Access to Greenway
- Central Avenue – difficult to cross (e.g. a pack of 50-60 bike riders creating congestion on Saturday and Sunday mornings)
- Sidewalks for Edgemont’s heavily trafficked roads
- Sidewalk issues: maintenance (Town vs. resident), taxes (need to consider implications), and to define necessary services
- Roadway design manual
- Roadway signage
- Sign clutter (Four Corners looks trashy; Pond’s End sign on Knollwood Road); and too many signs, postings on telephone poles
- Balance – maintain quality of life
- Sense of place
- Pull together each Village/hamlet identity; maintain Greenburgh’s identity
- Plan for every neighborhood
- Public transportation – people come into Town (reverse commuting); long range; is it adequate?
- Sidewalk connections between Villages

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADER: John Noone

- Flooding problems
- Sewage backup maintenance
- Retain storm water on property
- Dangerous lack of sidewalks (Rte 9A, Knollwood Road, Harvey Drive, Dobbs Ferry Road)
• Enforcement of right of way
• New kind of pavements, as opposed to previous type
• Traffic backup
• Traffic light control
• Pedestrian safety
• Open space acquisition without tax increase
• Parkland: one group wants new nature trails at Warburton/Woodlands, approved by Town and District, maintenance shared by both (not looking to acquire new parkland), one group wants to have new trails or parkland without any additional cost to the tax payer, and one group wants to acquire additional parkland.
• Improve already established parkland
• Adequate parking for new developments
• Green technology for all buildings
• Expand sewer service to areas without it
• Water supply is adequate
• New construction must have utilities underground
• Maintain suburban environment, not a “city” look

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: GROUP LEADER: Frank Musantry**
• Improve the attractiveness of Central Park Avenue, Rte 119 and Rte 9A
• Support local businesses
• No “big boxes”
• Mixed use development
• Change infrastructure of roads to prevent congestion
• Create diversity – reflect the needs of all
• Tax concerns
• Methods to promote businesses
• Tappan Zee – how will it affect Greenburgh?
• Explore new and existing incentives
• What do other municipalities do?
• Improve historic landmarks
• Explore reassessment
• Preserve open space
• Preserve character of neighborhoods
• Affordable housing
• Explore high density housing along the corridors
• Enforce existing codes

**QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: Charles Brown**
• More cultural activities (free programs, events, speakers)
• Maintain undeveloped land – maintain suburban look and feel, with curvy roads
• Like to see open space – trees (diversity in landscape)
• Seniors – living economically, aging in place
• Reinforce environmental laws – create new codes/laws
• Over-building in some communities
• Over-parking with no reinforcement
• Too many people in dwellings – violation in single family homes
• Clustered building
• Better collaboration between local government and education
• Look at property values
• Look at school system and create better programs for youth
• Identity – inter-municipal exchanges
• Ability to obtain permits during working hours
• Alternative resources – solar and green technologies
• Enforcement of parking in residential areas (especially during winter and snow days)
• Geo-thermal fuel costs
• Town code needs to reflect “green” building
• Recycling – broaden the type of items, without impact on taxes
• Acceptance of plastic bags in local markets and groceries
• Cut back the amount of trash pick-ups per week
• Enforce laws/codes on signs and postings on telephone poles and trees (Central Avenue)
• Number of telephone poles
• No sidewalks on heavily trafficked road (i.e. Sprain Road)
• Expense of well water
• No bus service in some areas
• Garbage pick-ups in neighborhoods near businesses are very noisy at 5:00 AM
• Enforce noise ordinances – hours that leaf-blowers can be used?
• Calls to police need to be followed
• Reevaluate fragmented fire department – employment for residents in the unincorporated area fire section – subcontract to Ardsley

Questions and Comments from the Audience at Meeting’s End
• Considering Central Avenue, we can’t address its improvement alone - we need to work with other municipalities (White Plains, Yonkers, etc.).
• How do we do this but still maintain the uniqueness of Greenburgh?
• How do we deal with aging infrastructure? It should be all underground.
• Will you provide us with a summary of input received today?
• There is little difference between Route 9A and Central Avenue. Greenburgh has too many residences one block away from Central Avenue. New development needs to take this into consideration to make Central Avenue attractive.
• Greenburgh’s planning issues are very similar to surrounding municipalities.
• What are the general transportation needs of the Town, considering both commuting and reverse commuting?
• Great meeting, but I would like to see more participation in the future. What are you doing to increase participation?
• We need to get the youth, as well as seniors, involved in the process.
• Not all of Greenburgh students are in the Town’s schools.
• At every meeting (planning board, zoning board, etc.) announce the upcoming neighborhood meeting.
• Can we try to get shuttle buses for the meetings?
• How are realtors/businesses being involved in the process?
• Can we create a list-serve for the meeting process?
• Why is the survey biased? An issue can be important without paying more taxes.
Open Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION
Positive
• Possible BRT – Central Avenue
• Bee Line is good
• Like busing
Negative
• Need to improve public transportation
• Parking in Hartsdale for residents (all year round)
• Improper street lines for traffic control
• Traffic control and traffic light coordination on Central Avenue
• Impact of exits off major highways and parkways onto local roads
• Traffic from outside the Town
• Too much congestion
• Main roads (e.g. Rte 100) are under State control – we have no say on issues such as traffic flow or safety.
• Large vehicles on East Hartsdale Avenue
• Heavy traffic on Rte 119, Rte 100B and Central Avenue
• Why is there not free parking on Saturdays to encourage shoppers to come to town?

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
Positive
• Parks and recreation
• Sanitation and police
• Good town services
• Parks are adequate for current population
• Open spaces (but need grooming)
• Neighborhoods
• Playgrounds in Fulton Park for our children (possibly behind or at the end of Randolph Road)

Negative
• Code enforcement
• Flood control, flooding problems in Hartsdale
• Traffic, particularly when you look at the density of residential developments
• No sidewalks on heavily walked roads (i.e. Harvard Drive)
• East-west traffic
• More camping grounds
• Leaf removal
• Storm drainage is a big problem throughout the Town
• Lack of Town-wide fire services (to reduce cost)
• Parks, pools and recreation
• Sanitation
• Effect of Central Avenue Plan on adjacent neighborhoods
• At 22 Tarrytown Road, building must be under present M22 zoning, otherwise destroying our Fulton Park area
**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT**

*Positive*
- Parks
- Acquisition of open space

*Negative*
- Concerned about sale and development of land
- Need to increase economic base
- Limit development on Central Avenue – it has enough already!
- Current mixed use zoning on Central Avenue is a huge risk to keeping our town affordable while maintaining and improving our schools
- Over-development (commercial or residential)
- High-rise buildings
- The impact of more housing on our school districts
- Affordable housing must be affordable for both current and future residents
- We need commercial development to keep taxes in line
- Taxes, tax rates and tax increases move too fast
- Single family homes being used as multifamily homes (illegal conversions)
- Houses that are too large for their lot or neighborhood
- Too many banks on Central Avenue
- Concerned about construction initiatives
- We have enough parks – focus on neighborhood open space
- Improve existing commercial sites to increase accessibility
- Improve infrastructure (sidewalks, drainage, etc.)
- Need more and varied businesses on Central Avenue
- Keep residential development (especially East Irvington) to a minimum
- “Mom and Pop” stores are going out of business, which means less variety and more homogeneity and impersonality
- Neglected areas
- Lack of willingness to spend money on long range solutions
- Better land use on Central Avenue – more concern re: rateables

**QUALITY OF LIFE**

*Positive*
- Town is diverse in all categories
- Parks, pools and recreation
- Senior activities
- Quality of schools
- When Greenburgh Library is in full swing – it’s the epitome
- Proximity to major highways, close to White Plains and New York City, the Westchester County Center, and other attractions
- Diversity in people, culture and neighborhoods
- Neighborhoods
- Many small communities with their own identities
• Very responsive police and fire
• The quality of our police, sanitation and parks departments
• Excellent services (garbage collection, snow clearing, police department)
• Police department has excellent rapport with community
• Parks
• Green landscaping
• Open space
• Affordable housing
• Small size of Hartsdale
• Theodore Young Center and Anthony Veteran Park are gems (but nearing capacity)
• Open government
• Good schools
• Green look of community from mature trees and well landscaped properties

**Negative**
• Observing building violations, illegal apartments, Fulton Park apartments and building codes (electric and construction)
• Improve alternative energy sources in homes
• Taxes too high and going up faster than they should
• Cultural activities
• I take my scouts to Westmoreland Sanctuary because it is far more cost effective than Greenburgh Nature Center
• Funding for the Theodore Young Community Center should be grant funded not supported by taxpayers
• Better enforcement of multiple families in single family dwellings
• Safety
• Recycling
• Unincorporated Greenburgh is not as affordable as it was ten years ago
• The taxes are forcing fixed income residents out of town
• Too much traffic on Rte 100B and Central Avenue
• Quality of life is not keeping up with increase of taxes
• If this Plan is implemented, how will it affect tax structure?
• Local phone numbers are now prefix of non-local numbers, leading to many wrong numbers
• Improve historic landmarks
• Illegal apartments that don’t contribute to taxes
• Too costly to live here
• Slow slide to urbanization
• Better enforcement of parking rules in residential areas
• Having a 10603 zip code means I get to pay White Plains sales tax rates
• Need more cultural festivals
• Opening the Greenburgh Pool to outside communities is a dangerous practice. After Greenburgh Day last year, many people were coming in, making noise, crowds charged.

**OTHER:**

**Positive**
• Town’s diversity
• Closeness to New York City
• Nice parks and a good recreation department
• Shopping
• Police Department
• Princeton Plan in Greenburgh #7 public schools is good
• Great teachers in public schools
• I like the heterogeneous nature of our Town – a wide range of people that can come together.
• I value the schools (Edgemont) and the people
• Recycling area open to residents (in addition to regular recycling). A place to deposit scrap metal and a place to exchange reusable items.
• Daycare
• Diversity
• Access to Supervisor
• Town services generally excellent – can we still afford them?

**Negative**

• Taxes are high, especially for a school system that isn’t the best
• Lack of community-wide feeling
• Emergency communication for the MTA
• Too much money spent on outside consultants
• Lack of continued signage at Four Corners
• Central Avenue looks trashy because of a lack of control
• Large vehicles on residential roads
• Lack of small businesses with variety
• Jobs for youth
• Sidewalks
• Streets
• School District (especially Greenburgh Central School #7)
• Taxes are way too high
• How are we going to attract businesses?
• Affordable housing
• Rooming houses
• Police department
• Day care
• School system should be revamped, Central #7 is very poor
• Oversight of budgeted initiatives
• Tax assessment
• Traffic on I-287 and Rte 119
• Financial planning and management
• Civility at public meetings
• Lack of area support for Town-wide issues
• We agreed to increase taxes for a better library – now we can’t get Bookmobile or Sunday services?
  Community pride
  “Crazies” at Town meetings that divert progress of the meeting

---

**Comment Sheet Summaries**

**MY FAVORITE PUBLIC PLACE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS...BECAUSE...**

• Glenville Woods because it is accessible open space and the wildlife (anonymous)
• Downtown area because of the quaint, well maintained, good retail feel. (anonymous)
• Webb Park (Steve Lipken)
• My neighborhood because it is attractive (Theresa Mae Tori)

**MY LEAST FAVORITE PUBLIC PLACE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS...BECAUSE**
• Anthony F. Veteran Park because it is crowded and has wall-to-wall “boors.” (Steve Lipken)
• Route 9A and Route 119 because they are ugly. (Theresa Mae Tori)

**WHAT I LIKE MOST ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD (STRENGTHS) IS....BECAUSE**
• Small town feel. (anonymous)
• It is quiet and appears safe. (Steve Lipken)
• Its open space because it is the best mix of suburbs and less developed. (Theresa Mae Tori)

**WHAT I LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD (WEAKNESSES) IS...BECAUSE**
• No parking. (anonymous)
• No sidewalks, especially along Harvard Drive. People drive crazily and there is no where to go. (Steve Lipken)
• The number of highways and parkways that intersect the town because of the increasing air and noise pollution. (Theresa Mae Tori)
• THE FOLLOWING ISSUES, QUALITIES AND CHARACTERISTICS ARE IMPORTANT TO ACHIEVING MY PREFERRED VISION FOR THE TOWN’S FUTURE:
• Put in a sidewalk on the right side of Harvard Drive, going uphill, and Webb Park on Route 9. (Steve Lipken)
• Returning its underdeveloped feel and need to manage cost of fire and school services. (Theresa Mae Tori)

**EAST IRVINGTON / TOWN GREEN / GLENVILLE / WATCH HILL / WYLDWOOD / BENEDICT AVENUE MEETING**
March 11, 2008
Break Out Group Visioning

**TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADER – Doug Hoy**
• Need sidewalks
• Speeds on Taxter Road
• Traffic on Taxter Road
• Flooding in area near Taxter Road
• Sidewalks
• Tappan Zee Bridge – no benefit for East Irvington
• Taxter Road – Avalon Green II traffic
• Future buildout
• Possibilities for more mass transportation
• Problems of Benedict Avenue: used as a cut through, speeding, reckless driving (e.g. fatal accident recently), lack of police enforcement, trucks cut through to Tarrytown from Rte 119

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADER: Adam Pennington**
QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: Gregory Maugeri

- Lack of sidewalks
- Snow plowing
- Flooding issues – convergence of Taxter Road, Willow Lane, Cayuga Lane, and Mulligan Lane (hotspots)
- Too many layers of government, conflicts among Villages regarding building and traffic
- Compost/natural recycling facility – not monitored and strong odors
- Litter on Taxter Road
- Zoning violations – boats, cars, open dumpsters on properties
- Lack of alternative to Rte 119 - no major thoroughfares (parallel roadways)
- Town not responsive to individual concerns – snow plow on Glenville Woods
- Preserving and maintaining green space
- Unused facilities – poorly used, lack of programs for seniors.
- Poor relations due to intra-village coordination among area facilities
- Police protection is adequate
- Speeding on Taxter Road

TRANSPORTATION

- **Positive**
  - Bee Line going hybrid

- **Negative**
  - Reduce Taxter Road as an east/west corridor between Elmsford and Irvington
  - Improve Ashford Avenue as county east/west corridor
  - Speeding and the amount of traffic, especially on Taxter Road and Benedict Avenue
  - Amount of cars
  - Large trucks cutting through, needlessly
  - No established bus stops
  - Unsafe access to bus stops
  - Lack of all but one access route to middle school/ high school campus
  - Develop more bicycle and pedestrian facilities, utilize smart growth techniques when considering future development
  - No sidewalks from Tarrytown to Glenville
  - Not enough parking at the train station
  - When the Tappan Zee Bridge closes, either one lane, two lanes or closes completely, traffic shuts down all surrounding local communities

INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

**Positive**

- Preservation of local life
- Keep wild life around
- Preservation of woodlands and open space
- Acquisition of lands for parks
- Going green, especially with public buildings
- Keep open space
- Nice parks
Open government
Some woodlands still available in the immediate area
Garbage/refuse collection

Negative
Heavy salting of the roads kills trees and vegetation and gets into the storm system which ends up in the river.
We desperately need sidewalks in East Irvington
Traffic, traffic bottlenecks and traffic control
Flooding problems
Storm water infrastructure improvements – present system outdated
Flooding on Taxter Road, Willow Lane, Mulligan Lane and Cayuga Lane
Poor sewer system, needs updating and improvement
Water, water control and icing
Drainage planning
Park upkeep needs improvement
East Irvington needs a meeting facility for residents
Acquire more open space
Enforce speed limit on Taxter Road
Overdevelopment and lack of trees
Stop the trucking of materials into and out of Greenburgh’s leaf dump

ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT
Positive
Keep up efforts to acquire open space and limit additional residential building
Willingness to be creative and take risks
Parks are nice and beautiful
Park improvement

Negative
An excess of taxes
Too many layers of government
Parking
Tax relief: how much relief can be gained from new corporate growth?
Need to review commercial and industrial land use to optimize revenue
Flooding on Taxter Road and Sunnyside Lane
Lack of office occupancy
Overdevelopment (particularly apartments on Taxter Road)
All of the commercial buildings (office, etc.) have not helped our taxes at all.
How would new buildings help?
Not enough consideration to making parks usable
Need more gourmet food shops
No further housing development
Schools have become inadequate
Reduce tax burden without increasing residential development
Need closer stores (i.e. markets, dry cleaners, etc.)
• Concern regarding McMansions changing the character of neighborhoods
• Need more parking spaces in Town

QUALITY OF LIFE

Positive
• Nice recreation facilities (i.e. tennis court, swimming pool, etc), which are a big plus for families
• Good senior center
• Open and green space
• Beautiful areas
• Preserving green spaces
• Natural beauty of the area
• Rural nature of the area
• Safe and friendly communities
• Parks
• Library rebuilding
• Clean air
• Diversity
• Short term parking areas
• Great open space initiatives
• Taxter Ridge open space
• Good services (i.e. trash pickup, snow-plow, etc.)
• Character of villages like Irvington and Tarrytown

Negative
• A road through the towns to bypass Rte 9 to ease traffic through the villages
• Better transportation (bus, train, etc.)
• More efficient energy
• Lack of sidewalks (especially on Taxter Road)
• Inadequate enforcement of building codes
• Odor of compost area
• Fix flooding problem in advance of master plan
• High taxes
• Poor drainage resulting to flooding on Taxter Road, Willow Lane and Sunnyside Lane equals poor driving conditions
• Increase police protection
• I am against them taking our land for the Tappan Zee Bridge
• Traffic controls (slow people down to cross the street)
• I-287 and the Tappan Zee Bridge – the expansion of the bridge worsens the position of Greenburgh.
• We are a drive through community and the expansion will only make the situation worse.
• The people who make changes do not live here
• Against the development of a Stop and Shop on Rte 119 and assisted living
• These big buildings don’t fit in our neighborhood
• End the incorporated vs. unincorporated Greenburgh schism
• Zoning violations in East Irvington (dumpsters, garbage cans, boulders, etc. illegal in zone that applies to area of designation)
• Decaying infrastructure
• Please build that Stop and Shop on Rte 119 – we need a new market
• Community before development
• Traffic on Rte 119 from Tarrytown to White Plains
• Ardsley traffic is unbelievable
• Too much noise, speeding, increased accidents, and vibrations due to traffic on Benedict Avenue
• Garbage along side of Taxter Road is not picked up all winter
• Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure needs to be planned
• Turn old buildings into apartments, assisting living facilities, nursing homes or hospitals (there are a lot in Greenburgh)
• Off the Saw Mill Parkway, put a restroom in the park

OTHER:
   Negative
• Poor communication between Town and Villages
• Too many levels of government and services
• Too many chiefs, not enough Indians

Questions and Comments from the Audience at Meeting’s End
• Frame out the open group visioning process better (refocus the audience on subject matter).
• No consideration for mass-transportation – what about using smaller buses that make more frequent trips?
• A short while ago, a resolution passed regarding the flooding on Taxter Road – we don’t want to wait for the completion of this Plan to solve some problems (an item that requires immediate action).
• Issues may be focused by people to immediately where they live.
• These meetings need to consider broader issues – it’s difficult for people to engage on issues such as the new Library or Central Avenue.
• The post it notes cause the participant to focus on the specific.
• Greenburgh is an abstract – there’s the feeling of the unincorporated section of Greenburgh versus the incorporated sections.
• Residents don’t feel a part of anything.
• The Town should get Greenburgh residents to think of Greenburgh as a whole, not just their incorporated Village
• The challenge is that the public likes sidewalks, open space, and improved infrastructure, but no one wants to pay more taxes – the amount of County/Town and school taxes impact the answers to Town improvement (we support concepts but need to pay for them).

HARTSDALE MEETING
March 25, 2008
Break Out Group Comment Sheet Summaries

TRANSPORTATION
• Discontinue the blocking of road intersections (e.g. Route 100A and Washington Avenue).
• There should be better monitoring of speed limits by putting more speed monitors on the road, like signs that project the speed of the oncoming car. (anonymous)

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT
• Open spaces: do not develop all of it; use for pedestrian pathways, use for parks and recreation; and
east to west passages are needed.

- Build up historic sites: income from school visits and get on National Registry. (Pam Bove)
- More focus on marking the East Hartsdale Avenue area as a walkable community. Highlight commuter ease so fewer vehicles congest the available public and private parking. More and more people shop outside the area which impacts the local business district. East Hartsdale Avenue needs improved sidewalks and more sidewalks on Wilson Avenue, Columbia Avenue, and South Central Avenue. (Stephanie Kavounas)
- Flood control.
- Traffic light at Columbia Avenue (access to Bob Gold Parklet) – seniors/disabled/mothers pushing carriages are afraid to cross to Parklet.
- Need light with count down and delayed arrow for traffic turning from Columbia Avenue.
- Need “push button” to cross East Hartsdale Avenue at corner by Parklet (current light only has button for Columbia Avenue). (Deborah Bloom)

**ECONOMICS AND LAND USE DEVELOPMENT**

- Leave zoning unchanged.
- Single-family not subsidized. (anonymous)

**QUALITY OF LIFE**

- A comprehensive sign law – atrocious sign perpetrators should be fined.
- More continuous sidewalks to encourage pedestrians.
- More flowers, etc. on East Hartsdale Avenue.
- Our Town and our residents have a priority over working about taxes!
- P.S. A sign law won’t increase taxes. (Joan Driscoll)
- Town lacks identity.
- Encourage pedestrian friendly activity along East Hartsdale Avenue.
- Establish streetscape and signage regulations.
- Beautification – flowers, trees, awnings.
- Discourage chains and encourage small businesses in the downtown.
- Create sidewalks connecting strip malls/shopping centers.
- Allow higher building heights on Central Avenue.
- Support schools in terms of maintaining infrastructure. Greenburgh scored highest for elementary schools, lets promote high scores (inform realtors, etc.)
- Better infrastructure includes the aesthetics of buildings.
- Parks, recreation, arts and culture are strong and should be maintained (e.g. concerts in Yosemite Park).
- Rents on East Hartsdale Avenue are exorbitant – too many vacancies.
- To establish safety, create pedestrian amenities including sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.
- Clean up Four Corners – traffic conditions and beautification.
- Create a pedestrian culture.
- Gateway signage to Hartsdale is falling apart.
- The Town and School should work to use the Warburg Estate for more activities. (anonymous)
- Create a standard for streetscape improvement (e.g. flowers).
- Residents want sidewalks on East Hartsdale Avenue to encourage pedestrian activity. Connect malls with a sidewalk along the strip.
- Beautify the area.
- The court system has no space, as well as the police department. A woman was put in the bathroom because of the lack of space. Plus, people can’t get up the stairs.
Residents understand the cost of improvements means a cost to them. How can we reduce costs to use money more efficiently?

Can we vote from standpoint of cost? (anonymous).

**TRANSPORTATION**

*Positive*
- Love the new parking structure!
- Signage is very clear and easy to understand.
- Very good public transportation (Metro North to New York City and the Bee-Line buses)
- Proximity to major highways

*Negative*
- Four Corners traffic flow is still a nightmare.
- Too much traffic on Central Avenue and Route 119 and Hartsdale Avenue interchange.
- We need better rapid transit across the County (east-west).
- Downtown parking.
- Public transportation to library.
- Enlarging the street signs for better visibility at night.
- No repairs of potholes (Columbia Avenue, Central Avenue, East Hartsdale Avenue), yet you put Belgian block curbs in Manor Woods.
- Too few pedestrian paths, bikepaths and sidewalks (especially on Underhill Road, Fort Hill Road, West Hartsdale Avenue, Dalewood Drive and Central Avenue and Ardsley Road).
- Zoning rules allow for an ugly Central Avenue without a green element.
- Road infrastructure is inadequate.
- Flooding in downtown Hartsdale is a problem.
- Traffic control on East Hartsdale Avenue – seniors are afraid to cross the parklet.
- Bus service to the train station from East Hartsdale.
- Reduce the truck traffic on East and West Hartsdale Avenue.
- Very large buses carrying very few people (adds to congestion at train station and releases huge amounts of diesel emissions).
- Do not need extra parking.
- Who’s ever heard of paying to park in Hartsdale’s business area until 8:00 PM? Outrageous!
- Too little parking in residential areas.
- Bicycle parking and bicycle access to Hartsdale village and train station could be greatly improved.
- Not many people use this mode of transport due to safety issues on East Hartsdale Avenue.
- Would like better bike paths and trails (paved, not pebbles).
- More speed controls by autos (e.g. speed bumps).
- Enforcing bicycle traffic stopping for traffic lights like autos.
- Having parking on both sides of Jane Street can hinder the Fire Department from going through.
- Road congestion on Central Avenue (from September to December 31 and on Saturdays and Sunday afternoons) is a disaster, as well as parking there.
- Metro North is getting very expensive.
- BRT would help resolve traffic congestion but might require extra HOV lanes.
- Need more “jitneys” from complexes to train to reduce car use.
- I’d love to bike to the train but I’m scared to.
- We can reduce traffic on East Hartsdale Avenue by increasing public transportation to North and South Central Avenue, White Plains, and other areas of Town (library, parks, etc.)
• More traffic lights – signals needed on side streets to slow traffic.
• Reduce traffic.
• Traffic on Central Avenue and Hartsdale Avenue gets worse every year.
• Columbia Avenue is used to avoid traffic light at Central Avenue/East Hartsdale Avenue interchange.
• Parking too expensive.
• Parking garage in Hartsdale shopping area should be removed.
• Greenburgh police should patrol the streets.
• Reduce carbon footprint.
• Very dangerous situation – nonresidents from train station speed through Columbia Avenue and Jane Street to get to Central Avenue – children and walkers going to school and parks are definitely in danger.
• Need more parking at the train station for non-permit holders – a few more spots, at least.
• More enforcing of auto laws (e.g. ticketing motorists using cell phones and blocking intersections).
• Develop more off the road trails where sidewalks may not be practical
• “Smart cards” for parking in shopping area.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT**

**Positive**

• Great Town recreation programs for kids, adults and seniors.
• Great Town services (police, fire and sanitation).
• For over fifty years, the Sanitation Department has done a super job.
• Our Sanitation Department (garbage pickup, etc.) is super.
• Parks and Recreation Department is a big plus to Town.
• Fire Department response.
• Maintenance of our “green” emphasis in Greenburgh seems productive.
• Lots of parks and open space.
• Greenburgh Parks and Recreation Department (parks, pools and trails) are great.
• Town should continue its efforts in making its buildings and infrastructure “green”/energy efficient.
• I love the Harts Brook Nature Preserve – Parks and Recreation is the best!
• Fire Department is very responsive. They are helpful and caring of the residents.
• Public places without cars but space for everyone (young and old).
• Downtown is the center of town and a lively hub.
• Manor Woods is a beautiful neighborhood with a close proximity to downtown.
• I love Harts Brook Park – is it possible to create more small parks with walking trails?
• Recycling and trash pickup people are helpful and responsive.
• Addition of park land on Ridge Road is great – we need more.
• Limits to building on slopes and wetlands are good.
• Add solar panels to schools.
• Need more information on “green” technologies.
• Diversity.
• “Green” technology is very important to the Earth and pays off economically.
• Land use for recreation/open space (Town Park, Gaisman, Webb Field and Rumbrook are great).

**Negative**

• Fix flooding before anything else.
• Reduce waste.
• Improve plowing and leaf pickup.
More sidewalks (West Harstdale Avenue, Wilson Street, Columbia Avenue, Central Avenue, etc.)
Department of Public Works needs improvement, poor engineering and poor maintenance.
This County ignores our request to fix the flooding problem on Dalewood Drive. We had severe flooding problems last year and many in the past.
They’ve fixed the flooding in neighboring villages. Greenburgh Township has not done a good job – no visioning, no engineering.
Water quality is so bad sometimes we have to install a whole house water filter.
Aging infrastructure requires improved roads and drainage.
Inadequate parking for Four Corners shopping areas.
Reduce traffic on East Hartsdale Avenue as a shortcut to and from White Plains.
More efficient traffic lights on East Hartsdale Avenue.
I would like to see more and improved (that is, repaired) sidewalks.
Parking in Hartsdale is inadequate and overpriced.
Poor traffic plan on turning at Four Corners.
Downtown is scruffy and needs a dress up.
Too much traffic on East Hartsdale Avenue (needs more policing).
Parking.
More trees and open space, like mini parks.
East-west traffic solutions must be found.
I would like the Village to have a more uniform look – right now some of the merchants in Hartsdale have a horrible frontage.
Flood control system is broken – flooding and drainage is a huge negative.
We need to replace the sidewalks along East Hartsdale Avenue, as well as widening the Avenue, lighting the entire corridor and installing more traffic lights.
Sewage drainage.
Aging housing infrastructure needs work – although it can go green in renovation.
Sewer and water infrastructure seems to be aging.
More parking lots and paved areas cause flooding.
Greenburgh schools are so bad it’s ridiculous (you have to merge all the unincorporated school systems to solve the problem).
Poor school systems.
Littering and environmental problems.
More open space must be allocated before its too late.
Open/undeveloped land should be used for nature preserves and historic sites.
Preserve open space.
Poor schools.
The quality of schools.
Retrofitting existing multileased buildings to meet 21st century needs (e.g. air conditioning, telecommunication, etc.)
Flooding on Dalewood Drive.
Wider variety of stores in town.

ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT
Positive
The public transportation to activities is very good. However, it should be made known. Almost everyone I talk to knows nothing about it, including the bus for seniors to grocery stores and shopping areas.
The Town Board has a reputation for being tough and thorough.
• Keep residential zoning residential.
• Build affordable housing near Fairview, Elmsford and White Plains if needed.
• Fix and repair existing affordable housing.
• Many small businesses.
• Greenburgh Nature Center, keep up the good work.
• Keep the Hartsdale Farmers Market on West Hartsdale Avenue.
• Green vistas along Central Avenue.
• Small shops in downtown Hartsdale add a lot to the community feel.
• Market East Hartsdale Avenue as a walking community requiring fewer cars for transport, utilizing trains and mass transport.
• The developers who want to develop should have incentive to provide the funding for our municipal buildings.
• Charming Main Street if developed/made prettier with boutique shops – make it a “strolling” destination.
• Border plantings along Central Avenue.
• We have a lot of space in Town Hall – maybe the Police could use some of it?

**Negative**

• Central Avenue may be developing into a depressed area – it is vital that the area represents a prospering town.
• Four Corners and Central Avenue streetscape looks awful.
• Town should take more advantage of heritage tourism to help its economy.
• Reduce waste and reduce high taxes.
• We must change the tax status of the religious institutions in our Town.
• The idea that any single-family home is subsidized is extremely misleading – any new family is just as likely to incur or provide taxes as any other.
• Underdeveloped area along Central Avenue – too few businesses and too much turnover.
• “Big box” stores.
• Space being used that is not really necessary (e.g. golf course and vacant office space).
• Affordability?
• Central Avenue strip malls.
• When you can’t meet your budget, you need to find ways to reduce services and staff, not bill the homeowner. You do not correct the problem by raising taxes.
• Keeping taxes down at an even amount with no huge jumps in rate.
• Exit 4 to travel to Hartsdale looks more and more like Stamford, CT.
• Strip malls and stores do not have appropriate rules regarding parking, aesthetics, signage, etc.
• Unattractive.
• Allow businesses like the Candlelight Inn to expand.
• Employment opportunities.
• We should have a cap on taxes.
• Traffic cut through at South Washington Avenue to avoid the traffic lights will not be made better by commercial zones.
• Do not change residential zoning to mixed with commercial zoning.
• I’m very concerned that the increasing taxes will rush out the older people on a fixed income and the poor schools will bring down the house values to potential younger buyers.
• Affordable housing does not belong near Four Corners.
• I am concerned about the protection of the golf course – building should not be allowed if the golf course is sold. They should also not be allowed to put lights on the high fence around the golf course.
• The Central 7 School District has the worst reputation in terms of student safety – it bumps down home values and must be increasing costs.
• No, or little, industry within Town (employment opportunities).
• Affordable housing and taxes.
• Property taxes too excessive.
• Although I think there is a good reason not to develop on steep slopes, I feel that in obvious non-slope situations it is unfair to incur the additional expense of slope survey on the home owners for a building permit. It gives the Town the reputation of money grubbing.
• Zoning.
• Very concerned about taxes and how long people on fixed incomes can afford to stay in Hartsdale.
• Taxes are out of control and there is no accountability by the Town Board.
• It is difficult to get a new business going through the Zoning Board and Planning Board.
• School taxes are too high, yet school maintenance leaves much to be desired.
• Residential growth needs to be limited or we won’t have our open space.
• Allow homeowners to improve homes with energy efficient measures without increasing their taxes due to increase in property value.

QUALITY OF LIFE

Positive
• East Hartsdale Avenue and local downtown area made more identifiable as the Town center – businesses that attract people, like the homemade ice cream shops.
• Theodore Young Community Center.
• Senior services.
• Bus system.
• Greenways and bicycle facilities – extend the Bronx River Parkway bike path from Scarsdale to White Plains.
• The new library.
• We have wonderful programs for everyone from children to seniors – so great.
• Arts and culture committee programs add to the quality of life in Greenburgh.
• Small town flavor.
• Parks and recreation materials and communications are good.
• Nice people in the Hartsdale Parking District.
• Greenburgh is a greenway compact community and can take advantage of its benefits. Need more involvement from residents with the Greenway Committee.
• Keeping Greenburgh green.
• Great public transportation (Metro North, Bee-line buses and Town buses).
• Variety of inexpensive programs and services through Parks and Recreation. Continue this.
• Town services (Police Department, Fire Department and Sanitation Department).
• Love the look of the new library. I’m so glad we opted to build it. I’m sure it will be well used.
• Great people at Town Hall and Parking Authority.
• Great diversity – it would be great to provide opportunities for our youth from various communities coming together.
• Town services – library, Police Department, Fire Department, pool, recreational facilities and parks).
• Parks are beautiful (especially Hart’s Brook).
• Good athletic facilities.

Negative
• The Police Department should be paid by the neighborhoods that are the least safe.
• Village has no charm.
• Why was the day after Easter a holiday for our Department of Public Works?
• Ugly strip malls.
• Traffic patterns.
• No identity with the Town.
• We need sidewalks on Central Avenue to encourage walkers.
• We must urgently make a “sign” law – to protect our Town (especially our downtown area) from the ugliness of the litter of the number of postings on trees, poles, stores, etc.
• We need to encourage a pedestrian culture – walking is healthful and conservational. Continuous sidewalks on Central Avenue would do a lot for this.
• Leaf blowers should be banned or severely restricted.
• Improve landscaping on East Hartsdale Avenue – keep the avenue clean and appealing.
• We can’t afford the new library – cut their budget.
• Build a teen/senior center for East Hartsdale Avenue residents or more frequent transportation to existing facilities.
• Improved street lighting for the residential area of East Hartsdale Avenue.
• Satellite senior center for so many who cannot drive and need somewhere to socialize.
• Why do we make it so hard for restaurants to be allowed to have tables?
• Poor school system.
• Need to improve our school system. There is no reason why Hartsdale should have atrocious schools.
• Businesses need to get along – we need a liaison to bring them together.
• We should build a new skate park – we used to have one and we need a new one. It keeps kids busy and out of trouble.
• Maintain all of our schools with needed upgrades, inside and out.
• Improve the visual character of Central Avenue.
• Improve infrastructure of middle school and high school.
• More traffic control on East Hartsdale Avenue.
• If the school system does not improve year after year, young families will leave.

OTHER

Positive
• General info and communication of Town/services are good.
• Convenient, great Town with nice shops.
• Four Corners arrow has helped considerably.
• Hartsdale is a great Village to commute to New York City.
• The Comprehensive Plan is a real democratic approach to form our children’s and our future.

Negative
• Reduce taxes.
• Statutes of affordable housing for seniors needed.
• Town and Villages do not work together enough.
• Save the Carvel Woods (trees help us breathe).
• Be tougher on homes “renting” and having six “unrelated” people living and having six cars parked out front (e.g. South Washington Avenue).
• Court system and police station were never addressed and are obsolete buildings. Instead, you build a new library and a new Town Hall for millions.
• Limit affordable housing.
• Make Hartsdale into Scarsdale #2 (they did it).
• We should have a walking path completely around Webb Field for joggers and walkers.
• Make golf courses with lakes pay homeowners for floods they cause directly.
• We should attempt to define and provide a communal identity (i.e. Hartsdale, the town that service built).
• Zoning Board and Planning Board process is slow and archaic compared with other towns.
• We pay increasingly high taxes for ungodly and awful education (per test scores) – we want some value for our money.
• I have lived in Hartsdale for 40 years – the schools have not improved and taxes have increased to a point that I cannot afford my home.
• It is clear that Greenburgh pays more per family for less – should we address this?
• Rebuilding Town pools – aging system.

HARTSDALE MEETING
March 25, 2008
Break Out Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADER – Jens Warming

Traffic Congestion:
  o Central Avenue.
  o Hartsdale Avenue.
  o Blocking of intersections (e.g. 100A and Hartsdale Avenue).
  o Pass through from Columbia Avenue and Jane Street
  o Need more traffic management.
  o Reduce speed. Enforce it.
  o Enforce cell phone restriction laws.
  o Better management of public transportation.

Quantity of parking and price strategy to make improvements feasible.
Fire hazard for parking on both sides of narrow streets.
Poor street quality (e.g. potholes).
Pedestrian safety and bicycle traffic:
  Lack of sidewalks.
  Need to enforce bicycle traffic laws.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADER: Carla Holder

Flooding
  o Dalewood Drive.
  o East Hartsdale Avenue.
  o Impacts to homeowners, associations, businesses.
  o Open culverts, aging and clogged pipes, need maintenance.
  o Water course, maintenance/enforcement.
  o Better designs for new buildings to avoid flooding problems.

Access to parks and open space.
  o East Hartsdale Avenue and Columbia Avenue – pedestrian accessibility for a few.
  o Walking and biking to parks.
  o Retain open space and grant more access to it.

Sidewalk access and condition.
- Need more sidewalks.
  - East Hartsdale Avenue.
  - Dalewood Drive.
  - South Central Avenue to train.
- Street lighting for pedestrians.
  - East Hartsdale Avenue.
  - Dalewood Drive.
- Encourage “Green” technologies – new and retro.
  - Energy savings.
  - Include more incentives.
  - Solar panels on schools and public buildings.
- Water supply infrastructure is aging.
  - Windsor Park.
- Environmental impacts of lawn maintenance companies.
  - Noise.
  - Pesticides.
  - Erosion.
  - Add more paths to parks and other areas in Town.

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: GROUP LEADER: Patrice Ingram**
- Plan to retain open green space on golf courses and Webb Field.
- Acquire open space and keep existing.
- Focus development and redevelop areas already built up.
- Limit height of new buildings (*NOTE: disagreement among group: some like tall buildings*).
- Ensure diversity of businesses.
- Support small business.
- Support and attract commercial base.
- Improve visual impact of Central Avenue.
- Address heavy traffic on Central Avenue.
- Do good fiscal analysis for new development to ensure positive balance.
- Develop good retail model with adequate parking.
- 4 Corners area needs to be attractive for retail and shoppers.
- Mix use with parking underneath – ground floor retail, residences above.
- Address flooding that affects and homes.
- Keep residential areas quiet with no commercial encroachment.
- Taxes are out of control:
  - Increase government efficiency.
  - Cut costs.
  - Increase revenues—tax base shrinking. Too many tax certioraris.

**QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: Joan Roche**
- Hartsdale lacks identity.
- Encourage pedestrian-friendly activity along East Hartsdale Avenue.
- Improve streetscape – beautification (flowers, trees, awnings, etc.).
- Create sign regulations.
- Discourage chains and support small businesses in the downtown.
- Create sidewalks connecting strip centers/malls.
- Allow higher building heights on Central Avenue.
• Support schools/promote high elementary scores and improve aesthetics of buildings.
• Maintain strong parks/recreation, arts and culture.
• Create a “pedestrian” culture by improving safety:
  o provide pedestrian amenities—sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.
• Clean up the Four Corners area – traffic conditions plus facade improvements.
• Improve “gateway” signage at entrance to Hartsdale.
• Create partnership between schools and Warburg Estate.

EDGEMONT MEETING
APRIL 10, 2008
Break Out Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADER – Judy Seiff

• Pedestrian safety.
• Encourage pedestrian use to decrease traffic.
• Improve existing bus lines rather than developing more BRT.
  o The bus lines are already in place and a BRT may be not as big a priority. Commuters would like to use the train and bus more and their schedules should work together.
• Accessibility to mass transit (Metro North and Bee Line)
  o Related to Infrastructure, as it is dependent on the need for a sidewalk.
• The walk down Ardsley Road is now more accessible. Although traffic moves smoothly, there are still problems with the School crossing guard.
  o The guard talks on his cell phone and doesn’t pay attention.
• Sidewalks equal accessibility.
• Mount Joy Avenue is a major thoroughfare for teenagers and the elderly since it has major access to the 7-11 and A&P.
• Fort Hill Road is very dangerous.
  o It’s narrow.
  o A short cut from traffic lights.
  o There are no sidewalks (property owners could keep things clear).
  o Sight distance problems.
  o Speed bumps could help.
• Since Edgemont is a wealthy community, there are more cars, teenage drivers and the vehicles usually are bigger.
• Construction – rules about truck drivers.
• School traffic – drivers cut across narrow, residential streets.
• The timing of traffic lights on Central Avenue, especially during school hours.
• Senior card on buses – no one tells you about the Metro Card, which turns it into a circus.

TRANSPORTATION continued:
• After snow clearing, snow piles up between properties.
• Playground at the Greenville School – put up traffic/safety signs within the area (there is a parking lot behind the school). Also, directional signs are needed for the playground parking.
• Require parking spaces for bigger houses (using square footage to determine requirements), possibly require garages.
• Regarding the fields on the side of Seely Place during sports practices, parking on one side of Henry Street should be permitted, but it could be dangerous during time changes of different practices.
• Put a stop sign on Old Army Road, between Ardsley Road and Edgemont Road.
• Radar speed.
• One size doesn’t fit all.
• Sidewalk plan.
  o In order to gain money for sidewalks and the quality of sidewalks we like (rock), there should be a property law and the money gained from violations or delinquency of said property law could go towards sidewalks.
• Traffic calming.
• The following roads are arteries to schools and need sidewalks: Seely Place, Ardsley Road, Underhill Road and Cotswold Way.
• A bicycle path along Pipeline Road.
• Make Edgemont a walkable community.
• Parking for people who want to use mass transit.
• Bus stop at Central Avenue and Underhill Road (the shelter is gone).
• Expanding service times to the Highland bus route (Old Army Road, Edgemont).
• Senior transportation.
• The crosswalks at Ardsley Road need to be made safer.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADER: Brad Root**
• Cost of maintenance.
  o Alternatives such as plenty of negotiation and ongoing maintenance.
• Flooding due to topography.
• Destruction of Edgemont’s natural beauty.
• Wetlands: laws and their review.
• Too much impervious surface.
• Use or overuse of variances.
• Maintenance of open space.
• Sidewalks needed in residential and commercial areas.
• Town of Greenburgh Planning department and its impact on the community.
• Need for storm sewers.
• Greenburgh Nature Center – 33 acres of open, green space in the heart of our community. How do we best utilize the facility?
• Frequent flooding in areas of the community.
• Topography issues.
• Discussion of recreational facilities (ball fields and parks).
• Traffic on Ardsley Road and Old Army Road.
• Problem of east/west travel within Edgemont.
• Water issues (good or bad?):
  o Waste water
  o Water supply
  o Water pressure
  o Water runoff
• Diversion of underground water system.
  o New development cannot interfere with the underground streams and waters.
• Better control of tree-cutting, especially on smaller properties.

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: GROUP LEADER: Anthony Sarro**
• Increase commercial tax base.
• Target businesses that serve the needs and interests of the community.
• Try to achieve “village” feel.
  o Pedestrian zones
  o Sidewalks on busy streets
  o Communal life
• More parks and playing fields.
• Address wetlands and flooding problems.
• Improved management of certioraris (reassessment).
• No more multifamily housing.
  o Central Avenue zoning
  o Tax assessment methodology – New York State issue
• Trade-off of economic/business development with the quality of life.
• How do you raise commercial assessables?
• How do you reduce risk of further residential development (particularly multi-family) less than 55 units?
• Physical constraints on Central Avenue.
• The Consultants should examine impact on tax base of different forms of residential development and impact on school taxes as well as taxes and other.
• Creativity in property taxes (a deferral scheme for seniors so that taxes accrue and are paid when the home is sold).
• Certioraris affect planning ability and all taxing districts (particularly school and fire).
  o Difficult to predict fluctuations.
  o Hard to budget.
• Too few public “pocket parks” and playground.
  o Adds a burden to the school district.
• Can the Consultants get more public input for lobbying at the State level in the assessment methodology for multifamily units?
  o Spark a grass-roots letter campaign?
• Also, a grass-roots support against property tax caps for school taxes?
• What kind of development is acceptable?
  o OK: medical buildings, pedestrian friendly, buildings with less than 55 units of housing,
  o restaurants, office space and service businesses.
  o Not OK: Multi-family housing.
• New development needs to assess impact on traffic and noise. Also, clustered to reduce travel.

**QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: Wasimi Salimi**

• Seniors.
• Residents – can we have any control over land use?
• If country clubs are sold, what happens to the land use?
  **Positive:**
• Police and fire departments
• Convenience to shopping
• Sanitation department
• Greenburgh Nature Center
• Town Park

**Negative**
• Taxes. Multifamily dwellings are costing us taxes.
• All three schools have one way entrances and exits, which is dangerous. We need traffic loops.
• Every bank and gas station should have their own generator.
• Laundry hanging outside in full view of sheet
• Coyotes (animal control)
• Leaf blowers – noise
• No village center
• Town Supervisor arguing with Town Board members

Open Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION

Positive
• Access to transportation.
• It’s nice that I can walk to the train station and there is access to the bike path along the Bronx River.

Negative
• We need parking for users of buss express and local going from Westchester to Manhattan.
• We need to be able to walk to City express buses along Fort Hill Road, Underhill Road and Ardsley Road.
• We need a van that picks up seniors from their home to senior activities in Edgemont.
• Sidewalks along Fort Hill Road, north of Mount Joy Avenue, to encourage walkers and reduce traffic.
• Try to improve traffic flow at school’s dismissal time.
• Sidewalks needed on Ardsley Road to walk to Central Avenue.
• Improve traffic relating to school times.
• Fort Hill Road needs to have blacktop from Jackson Avenue to Underhill Road and not have any patches.
• Maintenance of improvement of bus lines along Central Avenue (I know these are run by the County, but what input do we have?)
• Add buses going to the commuter train in the mornings and afternoons.
• Central Avenue has too much traffic, needs more trees and landscaping, attractive parking areas, etc.
• We need lights to slow speeders on Underhill Road, Ardsley Road, and Fort Hill Road.
• Parking needed to take advantage of the buses to New York City.
• We need sidewalks on Underhill Road and Fort Hill Road.
• Traffic has to be mitigated, particularly east-west.
• I would like to see a bike path along Pipeline Road.
• Extend hours of the #65 Bus to the train station.
• Sidewalks on Fort Hill Road and Ardsley Road.
• High taxes.
• Road maintenance.
• Central Avenue traffic.
• We need sidewalks and they need to be cleared of snow.
• Increased traffic on major arteries without alternative major routes (as you increase development, you increase traffic).
• Traffic congestion – pass through traffic is starting to cut through Cotswold and Old Edgemont to avoid congestion on Central Avenue (particularly the Ardsley Road and Central Avenue intersection).
• A traffic light on the Fort Hill Road and Ardsley Road intersection is needed.
• Snow accident issues on Ardsley Road.
• Central Avenue traffic is a problem (as well as Hartsdale Avenue).
• There is no parking in Hartsdale or local Greenburgh train stations to go to New York City for the day.
• Public streets and thoroughfare.
• How do we address traffic patterns and control on Central Avenue? We have no control because it is a State road.
• Terrible traffic/congestion on all three schools drop off (8:00-8:30 AM) and pick up (3:00-3:30 PM) times.
• All the Central Avenue businesses are generating a lot of traffic, yet their taxes are going down as our taxes are rising.
• We need after school services in Edgemont, like the YMCA of Seely Place, so kids can stay after school and do homework while their parents are at work.
• Central Avenue traffic is at a standstill from Thanksgiving to Christmas or if there is an accident.
• There should be a traffic circle to slow people down on Central Avenue and Hartsdale Avenue. In Australia, the sign at the traffic circle reads “Give Way.” The problem is that people are discourteous.
• This, in of its self, creates accidents and mishaps.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT**

*Positive*

• The Greenburgh Nature Center is great – don’t let any development on the Dromore property, it connects to East Hartsdale Avenue. Keep it green, maybe put in a skate park?
• Seely Place School is a wonderful place for kids to play on the weekends and the parking lot is used by parents with children on bicycles and skate boards.
• The Greenburgh Nature Center is a jewel.
• Maintain the integrity of the Greenburgh Nature Center.
• The bike paths are also a jewel along the Bronx River Parkway in Edgemont.
• I like the brick sidewalks when they are in good repair.
• Very good program for sidewalk re-bricking.
• Access to shopping.
• Sanitation pick-up is efficient and the sanitation workers are cooperative and amiable.
• Excellent garbage removal and recycling system and facilities.
• The trees in Old Edgemont.
• Recycle changes made over the last two years are terrific – works well especially following the holidays.
• The sanitation department.
• Greenburgh Nature Center – 33 acres of green space in the heart of Edgemont.
• Green areas such as the high school, the Greenburgh Nature Center and the golf clubs.

*Negative*

• Underground the utilities.
• Proper and fair zoning (my property, 120 Inwood Road, is improperly zoned when compared to neighboring lots).
• Traffic congestion on main roads.
• Poor quality of roads that are in need of repair throughout the neighborhood.
• We need buses to schools so parents can be freed for an easier commute to work.
• Incentives for green design and more of a natural neighborhood feel.
• Better response for stump removal (I’ve been waiting 2 years at 120 Inwood Road).
• Major arteries to public places (i.e. train station, bus stop, schools, etc.) need to be maintained to protect residents and the Town (potholes, snow removal, etc.)
• Flooding.
• Soil erosion.
• The Planning Board understands the builders’ right to build while ignoring input and needs of impacted residents. This has resulted in greater flooding which all understand but no one stops.
• Residents are stuck with the problem.
• There must be a mutual land strip between homes that allows for shrubs, trees, etc., so that we can have more greenery and less fences.
• Ardsley Road is very dirty, we should implement a fine of $500 for littering and also ask residents to cut back overgrown shrubs.
• Sidewalks and bike accessibility.
• We have great open space – how can we make better use of it?
• Street paving for storm water runoff.
• Not enough sidewalks on Central Avenue for walkers. There is overgrowth on the only part of sidewalk on Central Avenue – we need to walk on the road.
• We still have no comprehensive tree plans. Too many trees are being cut down, which is bad for the environment, air quality, scenic beauty, etc. Most towns around us have rules about cutting down trees.
• Strict tree and zoning policies.
• Horrible roads.
• Greenburgh needs a skate park. It is unfair to all the kids who don’t have one. They are all over Edgemont and other areas, as skating is becoming a very popular activity.
• More sidewalks needed for kids on busy roads (Fort Hill Road, Ardsley Road, etc.)
• Poor drainage in many areas – consistently backed up sewers (e.g. Cotswold Way and 2 Worthington Road).
• Poor drainage and inadequate storm sewers.
• Seems to me that the Town could use more sidewalks to develop a more village-like atmosphere.
• Do we receive county funds for affordable housing, recreation, transportation, etc.? If not are there sources we should look at?
• Ensure new development takes into account school needs (physically and financially)
• Lack of enforcement of environmental laws.
• Better response to water flow problems (water flows from my neighbors and saturates and floods my yard, I live at 120 Inwood Road).
• Traffic flow on Central Avenue limits commercial growth.
• Flooding – we need more sewers.
• Lack of sewer system to deal with rain storm runoff.
• More sidewalks – kids walk to school and pedestrian commuters need them. Also, the crosswalk at Ardsley Road is dangerous.
• Local pedestrian shopping with village feel, like Scarsdale and not like Central Avenue.
• Overhead wiring (electricity) should be moved underground.
• Water runoff.
• Changes in the natural topography of land.
• Overbuilding.
• Impervious surface “driveways.”
• When you build, plan for water, make it green and don’t build it too close to property lines.
• No storm water infrastructure.
• We need sidewalks on Seely Place so that kids can safely walk to schools.
• Traffic congestion at the entrance to Seely Place School. There is no place for pedestrians (children) to walk to school. Seely Place is becoming a cut through street. Put up a “no commercial traffic, local deliveries only” sign at Ardsley Road and Seely Place intersection.
• Seely Place needs to be completely excavated and repaved. The curbstones are not high enough to protect the existing integrity of the neighborhood.

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT**

**Positive**
• Crane Pond in all seasons (I love the ice skating), although sometimes it is stagnant.
• The Greenburgh Nature Center
• Homes (tudors and colonials) which are beautiful in every season.
• Open (undeveloped) land around the school, the Greenburgh Nature Center and the community as a whole.
• Will the value of properties be affected by change?
• Sport fields.
• Town pool.
• Open spaces.
• Maintain and preserve local parks.
• Expand playground opportunities.
• Nature preserves (Greenburgh Nature Center, Hartsbrook and other land preservations).

**Negative**
• Limit development of apartments and other “school flooding.”
• Certain zoning processes could be streamlined, “making legal pre-existing conditions,” instead of going through a long process. At least have issues reviewed to see if it has to go to a Board and put on an agenda.
• There are no parks other than the Greenburgh Nature Center. We need playgrounds and ballparks as the rest of Greenburgh has.
• Taxes and growth of the school population is a threat to economic viability of the school system.
• High real estate taxes.
• We need to attract businesses that add to the communal life of the area.
• Overdevelopment of Central Avenue – it’s ugly and creates traffic.
• Stores are not the ones that best serve the community (looks and content).
• Affordable/alternative housing for empty nesters and young couples
• Edgemont is contributing a disproportionate amount of income to Town.
• Tax certioraris.
• Disproportionate cost structure of economics in a “town inside” vs. “town outside” structure and the arbitrary application of the few laws available.
• Lack of parks and playgrounds besides the school.
• Lack of town center for Edgemont.
• Tax runaway – businesses are not covering their share.
• We need more “community type” shopping on Central Avenue.
• Need to develop a vision of ourselves as a means to attract commercial development and revenue.
• Edgemont seems to be hit with excessive taxes but low services.
• Big box stores and financial institutions do not give local commercial or shopping appeal.
• The County continues to push for multifamily dwellings on Central Avenue. This negatively impacts
our schools. Demographic changes in Edgemont have exacerbated this issue.

- Residential land allows for overbuilding. We are allowing the character of our neighborhood to be changed by the construction of large homes on lots that had smaller homes and building on open lots.
- Central Avenue’s mixed use zone is dangerous.
- No more multifamily development within Edgemont School District.
- Regarding the wetlands, laws may be passed, but when they are implemented, residents who are impacted have not been part of the process or informed of the process until it is too late. This means a few who influence Town decisions ignore the rights of others. Town law is ineffective.
- Concerning wetlands and steep slopes, every agenda has requests for variances. Make laws which need few variances please.
- Large homes on small lots.
- Over-scheduled sports fields and not enough parks.
- High taxes, they are especially hard for retired people on fixed incomes. STAR, Enhanced STAR and rebates would help but are not enough.
- We need more commercial tax revenue in Edgemont (low density and appropriate uses)
- We are at a higher limit of multifamily housing. As more are built, single family taxes will rise to compensate – Edgemont should not pay for other districts.
- Be smarter about letting business development on Central Avenue and give us the tax revenues they have in Edgemont.
- Co-ops and condos assessed by income approach and don’t pay enough taxes to make up for the number of kids in the school district.
- Growth in school age population without corresponding growth in ratables.

**QUALITY OF LIFE**

*Positive*

- The police and fire departments should be commended for their work.
- Good schools.
- Convenience to shopping.
- Greenburgh library.
- Parks and recreation.
- Safe, peaceful neighborhood.
- Open spaces, especially park preserves. I would like to see more preservation of open areas and less development.
- Sanitation service is excellent. Keep up the good work.
- Green space, parks and playgrounds.
- Park system.
- Small town feel and safety.
- Anthony F. Veteran Park.
- Edgemont schools.
- Developing a Comprehensive Plan like this and the process you’re following.
- Garbage pick up, snow and leaf removal is good, but regard for property is weak. In the process, they tear up the streets, etc. They do their job well, but create other issues.
- Open space, nature trails and safe environmental practices.
- School system is strong (have to keep it that way).
- Edgemont has good schools, but there is pressure on the schools from multifamily housing on Central Avenue (taxes don’t cover cost of educating influx of students).
- The Greenburgh Nature Center.
- Police and fire departments are excellent, sanitation is very good and snow removal is satisfactory.
• Sense of community.

**Negative**

• Will taxes chase out retirees?
• Encourage more high-end shopping.
• Those running the Town (Supervisor and Board) spend time arguing with one another and ignore large issues, such as taxes, library spending, etc. No one is actually running everything. Department heads have too much power without leadership at the top.
• Development of multifamily housing in Edgemont that will destroy the school system and the tax base.
• No library facility in this part of Town.
• Shouldn't hang laundry outside.
• Crime wave in Edgemont over the past year.
• Congestion and traffic. Municipalities bordering us, their development and the impact of increasing traffic and pollution for us.
• Build upscale commercial development.
• Buffering living space from Central Avenue.
• We need senior center services and transportation to any center or services.
• No sense of “village.”
• No Town centers (for Edgemont or other parts).

**OTHER**

**Positive**

• Edgemont schools and community.
• Schools.

**Negative**

• Clarify the zoning code and clarify the critical path for the Zoning Board and Planning Board.
• Clarify the procedure for small claims court.
• Why does the commercial real estate owner win the cert cases to lower their taxes? Can’t the Town represent those in a better way who own homes and see their taxes keep rising?
• Certioraris destroy us – be sure to reassess these businesses and homes when they renovate – it can be done when the certificate of occupancy is issued.
• Edgemont does not get much attention from the Town (e.g. zoning).
• Taxes.
• Cost of heating the huge high spaces caused by the soaring roof of the library.
• Too many regulations for home owners.
• When we finish, will our study have any affect or change zoning, land use, etc.?
• To my knowledge, we have no program for preservation of historic buildings and places.
• Should Edgemont remain a part of Greenburgh?
• Poor maintenance of dangerous tree limbs.
• Too much “bad” politics (not necessarily caused by Feiner).
• Theft in Edgemont.
• So massively diverse, interests of different communities diverge, politically diverse, some areas are not well represented.

**SECOR AND RIDGE ROADS MEETING**
APRIL 29, 2008

Break Out Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADER – Ronald Hubert

- Stone Oak residents – it is impossible to get out during school hours.
- Hartsdale Avenue always has congestion – drivers are always locked in between Central Park Avenue, Route 100A and Route 100B.
- Transportation is about common sense and the plan of these roads does not have common sense.
- Our roads cannot handle the traffic demand.
- We should use a smaller, hybrid Town bus.
- Lots of places outside the U.S. are using hydrogen powered buses; we should consider it.
- Congestion at Four Corners.
- Buses should be expanded to serve the train as to cut vehicular traffic to the train station.
- There is no bus service to Huntley Estates.
- We need an easier way to serve seniors.
- The bus service into Manhattan is great. Let’s keep it and make it known.
- Drivers cannot get out of Pat Capone Road.
- The traffic on Route 100A is bad; it is the worst when schools get out.
- Soloman Schecter traffic.
- It’s a sharp turn onto Pat Capone Road from Hartsdale Avenue – should extend the left lane and extend the marking rather than have the sharp turn.
- We should have a camera on East Hartsdale Avenue – to capture real time information to see congestion and traffic patterns.
- There is no way to walk to Four Corners from Ridge Road.
- We are part of the problem – we all have more than one car.
- Streets that connect to Ridge Road also lack sidewalks (Hillcrest Road)
- Cutting in traffic – divert Hillcrest Road traffic to Ridge Road and West Hartsdale Avenue (holds up may not be able to avoid). People don’t take turns.
- Four Corners cannot handle the volume and pedestrians.

TRANSPORTATION continued:

- Secor Road and West Hartsdale Avenue intersection – there should be no turn on red because there is no visibility.
- There is no snow removal at bus stops.
- Four Corners bus stop needs shelter – move to front of Duane Reed (we don’t want to stand in the parking lot in the snow)
- Police are good on Central Avenue.
- Parking shortage on Hartsdale Avenue.
- Parking enforcement is too aggressive and issues too many tickets.
- Add sidewalks to promote walking (Hartsdale Avenue and Ridge Road).
- Residents cannot walk to the parks.
- We keep adding buildings to Hartsdale without addressing the effects on traffic.
- Consider a traffic signal at Pat Capone Road.
- There’s a helicopter that follows Ridge Road Park at 7:00PM and it flies so low that it shakes houses on Holmes Avenue.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADERS: Cynthia Doyle and Kristina Cascone
Positive
- Snow removal and road maintenance.
- Twice a week garbage pick up and once a week recycling pick up.
- Good police and fire departments, animal control officer.
- Department of Public Works.
- Tree care.
- Personal approach to Town government.
- Good community advocates.
- Small roads, little traffic and less pollution.
- Green drainage.
- Rural feeling.
- Open spaces.
- Parks with variety; lots of green areas (Ridge Road Park, Harts Brook Park).

Negative
- Sewers should be cleaned on a regular basis.
- Improve road maintenance.
- Speeding cars.
- Power outages.
- Noise along the Sprain Brook Parkway (tree cutting?).
- Leaf removal (leaves sit for months and only picked up once in the winter).
- Trees should only be pruned when necessary.
- Poor representation for unincorporated areas.
- Fix water pipe under road to prevent asphalt bursts.
- Flooding (poor drainage on Birchwood Lane, Jean Lane and Fern Lawn Cemetery).
- Lack of sidewalks along Ridge Road, Sprain Road, Joyce Road and West Hartsdale Avenue.
- Not enough appreciation or use of our open spaces.
- No neighborhood playgrounds in Joyce Road area.
- Recreation areas noisy along Sprain Brook Parkway.
- Clear-cutting of trees along power lines (Con-Ed) and not enough trimming.
- Large trees removed when they are healthy.
- Wetlands being filled in for wider driveways.

IN SUMMARY: Greenburgh has a lot of green space and needs to monitor/regulate/enforce rules on destruction of wetlands, trees, etc.

ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: GROUP LEADER: Natalie Werner
- We need more ratables. We should work at bring businesses into Town that are the right mix with existing businesses.
  
  *Disagreement with above point:* Keep Greenburgh quiet – businesses keep the Town divided from other uses and find tenants for vacant stores.
- Code enforcement – preserves the health of the neighborhood.
- Public spaces with pedestrian traffic (corridors as well as Hartsdale Avenue, go and spend time – congregate).
- Shopper friendly parking.
- Coffee shops.
- We need a good supermarket.
- No expansion of businesses in residential areas.
• Keep area of farm-stand in the residential zone.
• Look at codes and strengthen them or reinforce them.
• Keep developing in character of existing neighborhood.
• Sidewalks at least on one side of the street.
• Traffic calming on Secor and Ridge Roads.

QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: Irene Holsten
• Air quality issue.
• Commercial enterprise allowed to penetrate our homes – Secor Farms.
• School system – Central 7.
• Where are our taxes going?
• Preserve open spaces.
• Visual attractiveness of store fronts and strip malls.
• More businesses in Town for tax purposes – inequitable distribution of taxes for the homeowner.
• Discourage traffic – need to plan for better construction keeping traffic in mind.
• Police, fire and animal control departments are fine.
• Code enforcement (illegal boarders).
• Help seniors – keep them in their homes.
• Recreation services are great.
• Houses that are a blight to the neighborhood.
• Lead in the water.
• Save the trees (code enforcement).
• Day laborers on Central Avenue.

OTHER: GROUP LEADER: Joseph Lomartire
Positive
• Town services (police, fire and animal control).
• Open government.
• Community advocates.
• Community involvement

Negative
• Quality of schools
• Separate communities.
• Paul Feiner.
• Need to promote history of the Town.
• Corner of Birchwood Lane and Richard Terrace (after five years of complaining).
• Day laborers off Central Avenue.

SECOR AND RIDGE ROADS MEETING
APRIL 29, 2008
Open Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION
Positive
• Ample parking in major shopping areas.
• Parking is good at the A&P shopping center at Dobbs Ferry Road and Hartsdale Road.
• Close to mass transportation into Manhattan.
• Central location – parkways in all directions.
• Available parking at the train station.
• I love the bus to New York City.

Negative
• Traffic congestion – avoid building multi-resident properties in already congested areas with traffic and parking problems.
• Traffic on West Hartsdale Avenue.
• Commuter parking.
• Senior transportation.
• The image of elementary schools must be improved.
• There is no pedestrian path to walk along Ridge Road. We can’t walk to Hartsbrook – Ridge Road Park or Central Avenue.
• Clear the stone wall along Ridge Road (to expose the beautiful features).
• Lack of pedestrian walkways on busy roads.
• Cars exceeding the speed limit on Secor Road (placing speed bumps?)
• Dangerous disaster – traffic on Dobbs Ferry Road.
• Parking and public transportation to Metro North from Joyce Road is insufficient.
• Traffic – getting out of Pat Capone Road onto Hartsdale Avenue on weekdays, then getting to either Route 100B or Central Avenue is much worse than last year.
• We could use more mass transit – small buses for local travel to area shopping.
• Expensive commuter parking – the train station is not properly maintained.
• Traffic into Hartsdale and Route 9A into Ardsley.
• Traffic at Four Corners, East Hartsdale Avenue and Dobbs Ferry Road.
• Dalewood Drive is not safe – there is solid ice getting off the bus.
• I applied for a dial-a-ride, then mailed in the form with doctor’s letter. We should make this available on a Town or County level (senior transportation).
• We need more bicycle paths.
• Need easier transportation to train and parking.
• Train parking too expensive.
• Expand public transportation.
• Parking is too expensive and “anti-restaurant”.
• Flow of traffic on Hartsdale Avenue and Central Avenue and Route 100A and Route 100B intersections.
• Dangerous intersection: exiting Pat Capone Road onto Hartsdale Avenue.
• Traffic on Hartsdale Avenue has increased dramatically in the past few years.
• Sidewalks connecting Ridge Road and Hillcrest Road, please!
• Zoning on Hartsdale Avenue needs to be restricted for traffic generation.
• Too much traffic on Hartsdale Avenue.
• The traffic light at Four Corners is too slow east-west.
• Parking meters are often broken.
• There is no passenger parking for the bus into New York City.
• Lack of sidewalks and bike paths.
• We need snow and ice removal at bus stops, especially Four Corners.
• Stop the ability to make a right on red at Secor Road to Hartsdale Avenue – limited visibility.
• We need a safer bus stop and shelter at Four Corners south bound bus stop.
• We need a right on red turn lane on Route 100A and Route 100B.
• Make a safe shoulder on Hartsdale Avenue so pedestrians can safely walk from Secor Road to downtown.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT**

**Positive**
• We like Francis Sheehan!
• Twice a week garbage collection and recycling.
• Winter snow removal and maintenance.
• Very good police department.
• Very good fire department.
• Services provided in the neighborhood (Police, Sanitation, etc.)
• Keep superb sanitation and snow removal services.
• Having an animal control officer.
• Open space and green areas.
• Parks.
• Open areas like Harts Brook Park.
• Lots of areas that are green (e.g. Harts Brook Park, Ridge Road Park, etc.)
• Beautiful parks.
• Having a variety of parks and other outdoor resources.
• Large, expansive open spaces.
• Responsive Police department.
• The rural feel of the Ridge Road area.
• Rural feeling.
• Small town rural look and feel.
• Personal approach to Town government.
• Excellent services such as: garbage disposal, snow removal, responsiveness to tree care, fire and police department response time.
• Small roads with little traffic, no noise and less pollution.
• Sanitation is wonderful.
• Anthony Veteran pool complex

**Negative**
• Letting zoning issues slide to allow industries to get away with zoning regs – Westchester greenhouses.
• Public education system needs improvement.
• Cars going too fast through neighborhood.
• Poor government representation for unincorporated area.
• Sprain Brook Parkway is becoming less and less shielded by trees due to exorbitant clearing.
• Noise from Sprain Brook Parkway.
• No sidewalks on Joyce Road.
• Trees on public and personal property are not trimmed where there are power lines.
• Large trees being taken down when healthy.
• Filling in green space with wider driveways.
• Filling in wetlands.
• Recreation and community growth limits.
• Not enough value of open space and green areas.
• Neighborhood playgrounds are not here (Joyce Road area).
• Recreation areas located along Sprain Brook Parkway are too noisy because of highway traffic.
• Con-Ed’s clear out practices along the transmission lines.
• Flooding.
• Investigate and control drainage problem from Fernlawn Cemetery to Jean Lane.
• Difficulty for pedestrians to walk along Ridge Road and Sprain Road because lack of curbing has caused ruts along the road.
• Drainage on Birchwood Lane.
• Improve road maintenance.
• Freshly asphalted roads need to be dug up due to ancient water pipes (Ardsley).
• Frequent power failures.
• Limit power outages.
• Sewers in Poet’s Corner should be cleaned on a regular basis.
• Trees should be pruned when necessary.
• Leaf removal plan not enough (leaves sit for months and stay after picked up once all winter).

ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

Positive
• Residents taking care of their property as they are invested.
• Responsive police department.
• Low taxes relative to other towns in southern Westchester.
• Green space is sufficient and should not be the object of further expenditures.

Negative
• Town does not enforce “boarders” in one family homes.
• Land use.
• Taxes.
• Property taxes – unincorporated Town overburdened vis-a-vis other municipalities.
• Keep taxes affordable so that our seniors and retirees can stay in their home.
• Town Board changing or allowing variances to long established zoning codes.
• Lack of building code enforcement.
• Property taxes.
• Business certioraris.
• Desperate need for Town assemblies.
• We need a great supermarket (e.g. Wegman’s)
• Hold growth in expenditures and taxes to no more than the general rate of inflation.
• Enforce tenant restrictions in single family zoning more stringently.
• Taxes are too much.
• No “town” feeling or focal point (like a downtown).
• Too many banks.
• A comprehensive/enforceable tree removal code (for every tree takedown over 6 feet tall, six inches in diameter, two trees should be planted).

QUALITY OF LIFE

Positive
• Greenburgh recreation department.
• Anthony Veteran Park and pool.
• Police and fire departments.
• Recreation and parks.
• Recreational activities.
• Good animal control.
• High per-child spending at school.
• Sanitation department.
• Police and emergency response is great.
• Great recreation department.
• Parks and green spaces.
• Fire protection and prevention.
• New library.
• Maintain and increase open areas: Ridge Road park and Hart’s Brook Park.
• Francis Sheehan.
• Integrated populations (encourage various group needs).
• Recreational facilities.
• Community services are very good.
• The parks are beautiful.
• The neighborhood is a safe area with lovely homes.
• Police services.
• Open spaces, like Hart’s Brook Park.
• A rural quality for a suburb to New York City.
• Responsive police and fire departments.
• Had a small auto accident today – police came very quickly, took care of it and were very polite. I’m impressed.
• Garbage collection is great.
• Choices of private education.
• No major advertising on Central Avenue.
• Maintain exceptional pool facilities.
• Neighborhood gardens.
• Garbage collection is great.
• Good Town pool and parks.
• I love the outdoor pool.
• I love the open space and trees.
• I can walk safely in my neighborhood.
• People.
• Preserve the Jean, Jennifer and Barbara enclave from intrusion by access roads for adjacent developments.
• Secor Woods Park.
• Leisure activities.

**Negative**

• Air quality.
• Traffic.
• Schools.
• Street signs need to have larger lettering.
• Need to improve reputation of school district.
• Increasing the quality of education provided by the Town.
• Please think before you destroy a tree.
• Westchester Greenhouse / Secor Road – poor air quality due to smoke from industrial boilers.
• Helicopters fly too low over Holmes Avenue at 7:00PM every night, it shakes the house.
• Central 7 School district does not enjoy a good reputation.
• Lack of community among residences.
• Improve our school system.
• Youth centers.
• Consolidate public safety.
• Can’t we have pick up recycling on the same day as garbage so pails are out only 2 days a week as opposed to 3 days a week.
• Taxes too high.
• Bad odors from Westchester Greenhouses.
• Ineffective Town representation.
• Recreation (and homes) located along Sprain Brook Parkway are now too noisy from highway traffic combined with clear cutting along roadway.
• Combine Town and Village services to avoid duplication.
• Filling in of wetlands on Town property is a problem.
• We should have a welcome group for new residents to get acquainted with the Town and to be aware of what services and activities exist.
• Commercial planning, especially Central Avenue and Hartsdale hamlet.
• Too many transient residents.
• Educational ratings.
• Roads/areas near power lines are now an eye sore.
• Too much noise from the Sprain Brook Parkway.
• More appropriate fees and summons for various violations – make breaking the codes unprofitable.
• We need a public education system that attracts all groups.
• Sidewalks.
• Evaluating zoning by street – it seems inadequate.

OTHER

Positive
• Good community advocates (Ellen Cucise and Madelon O'Shea)
• Animal control.
• Community involvement.
• Responsive fire department.
• Open government.
• Town services are pretty good.
• Police department.

Negative
• Bad reputation of Greenburgh’s Central 7 schools.
• Poor school system.
• Need more promotion of the historical parts of Greenburgh to better teach our heritage to young folks.
• Separate communities (them vs. us) – communities interaction.
• Stagnant standing ponds of shallow water in Harts Brook (usable from Ridge Road) are mosquito breeding ground.
• Corner of Birchwood Lane and Richard Terrace is a mess (still, after five years of complaining).
• Day laborers off North Central Avenue.
• Paul Feiner.
• Improve the quality of the schools to put them on par with the best in Westchester.
FAIRVIEW MEETING  
MAY 19, 2008  
Break Out Group Visioning

**TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADERS – Tony Lavezzary and Tom Bock**
- Traffic speed limits on Hillside Avenue.
- Traffic issues throughout the Town.
- Air quality.
- Too much impervious space.
- Signal traffic coordination on Hillside Avenue, Route 119 and Virginia Road.
- TRAFFIC IS SCREWED UP.
- School buses – give us small buses to maneuver.
- Traffic studies – if traffic is at capacity, the study can’t just look at incremental changes.
- Hillside Avenue, Route 9A, Old Tarrytown Road and Mohawk Trail all need sidewalks – people have died.
- Zoning.
- Developers need to stick to code.
- Greenburgh is not bike friendly.
- Valimar is big – 165 homes. Developments, such as Valimar, are overbuilt and have not considered parking supply – especially visitor parking.
- Greenburgh is in a “no man’s land” – the Town needs to coordinate planning with White Plains and the other bordering municipalities (Yonkers, etc.).
- There needs to be a dialogue between the Planning and Zoning Boards so that the community’s concerns are not ignored by the developer. The developer should not always win because he has legal representation.
- The Town needs to listen to the community.
- The “Y” intersection at Hillside Avenue and Virginia Road has too many blind spots and buses get caught on the roads and have nowhere to go.
- Roads are not planned well.
- Change in timing of school buses vs. public buses.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADER: Gerald Yeung**
- Keep and maintain open space.
- Sanitation – regular pickups are good.
- Snow removal is good in neighborhoods.
- Tree maintenance and shrubs around signs need improvement.
- Flooding controls being installed on highways and parkways need to ensure water isn’t diverted to neighborhoods and homes.
- Maintenance of rivers and drains needs to occur on a regular basis.
- Flooding at Parkway Homes, Fulton Park, Manhattan Brook and Bronx River in general.
- Sidewalks need to be built and/or maintained (Hillside Avenue, Old Kensico Road, etc.)
- Bike paths need maintenance.
- Useless life of buildings and expansion to eliminate overcrowding.
- Stop giving property to tax-exempts and non-profits.
- Build for the future needs to be kept in mind.

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: GROUP LEADERS: Helen Lebowitz and Marie**
**Gomez**

- **LAND USE**
  - Keep rural look while considering Town needs.
  - “Open space”
    - Redefinition of purpose and utility of open space needs to be clarified.
    - Should be on the ground level (not a roof exchange).
  - Housing development – housing should be clustered to afford large open front and backyard space.
  - Variances in zoning should not take away open space considerations.

- **ZONING**
  - Strip malls should be reexamined for better commercial utilization (do not forget about parking).
  - Avoid zoning changes for special interest entities.
  - Current zoning should be better enforced.
  - What are the advantages or disadvantages of removing the “blighted area” designation?
  - More checks and balances in how zoning is changed – the immediate community that is affected needs a greater weight in the process.

- **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**
  - The Town needs controlled commercial development to expand tax paying base.
  - The Town needs to meet the need for more diverse retail options.

**QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: Mike Robinson**

- Enforce existing zoning and building codes and laws.
  - No variances to existing codes (e.g. multifamily dwellings).
- Public parks needed to blend communities (Fulton Park, a dog park, etc.)
- Remove “blighted” status for Fairview.
- Community based policing (responsible policing).
- Meetings relating to specific communities should not be influenced by those outside the community.
- Affordable housing should not mean congested living – new developments must blend in with the existing community.
- Explore the use of accessory apartments.
- Landscaping.

**FAIRVIEW MEETING**

**MAY 19, 2008**

Open Group Visioning

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Positive**
- The shuttle bus.

**Negative**
- There should be less malls or have less traffic.
- Better bus routes on Hillside Avenue – it’s very dangerous to exit.
- Ban overnight street parking.
- Lack of sidewalks.
- We need sidewalks on Old Tarrytown Road – three deaths in twenty years.
- Fulton Park has an unacceptable amount of traffic.
- There should be a left turn sign at the traffic light at intersection of Route 119 and Rosemont Boulevard and Dobbs Ferry Road – it is very dangerous to turn left onto Rosemont Boulevard.
- Traffic on Route 119 is dangerous for pedestrians.
- Need more sidewalks and bicycle routes.
- Use common sense when reviewing traffic studies and how they say “there’s no impact.”
- Control speeding better.
- Move stop signs in certain neighborhoods.
- Need traffic relief.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT**

*Positive*
- Green space.
- Sanitation workers are great – they are helpful and polite.
- Excellent snow plow services.
- Excellent trash removal services.
- Sanitation and highway departments.
- The fire department is in need a ten year plan.
- Scenic beauty.

*Negative*
- Flooding issues – ensure work will be done to eliminate flooding that will reroute to private homes.
- Sewer system needs to be improved.
- Flooding – Manhattan Park maintenance.
- The police station needs more lockers, offices and more space.
- Flooding off the Bronx River Parkway at Maryton.
- Removal of asbestos in all buildings that have it.
- Sanitation.
- Garage space for all people.
- Life of buildings.
- We need flood control.
- More active clean-up of litter needed.
- More use of sanitation department funds – e.g. cutting down trees, etc.
- Improve infrastructure and environment.
- Sidewalks need to be maintained and built.
- State of infrastructure is poor and failing.
- Flooding in Parkway homes / Bronx River.

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT**

*Positive*
- We need tax money – what kind/type of commercial development is being proposed?
- If the Comprehensive Plan is not developed in a specific time, how much will it cost?
- Parks and open spaces.
- Keep wetlands and trees on Hillside Avenue.

*Negative*
- Don’t spend money just because you get a grant.
• Taxes are too high and are ever increasing.
• No multiple dwelling homes.
• Greenburgh needs affordable houses – Fairview is over saturated with low income and “affordable” apartments.
• No more building – keep some open land.
• No more affordable housing at the expense of tax payers.
• Golf course off Knollwood Road appears to be better used as a public space, e.g. park.
• Appropriate housing assessments.
• Need sidewalks for walking.
• Drainage and flood control is seriously needed in Fairview.
• Spot zoning changes for special interest developers.
• Zoning codes are administered to be enforced, not the other way around.
• Maintain current zoning until the Comprehensive Plan is accepted.
• Do not use the open spaces much – they are not accessible.
• The Stuckley/Audi furniture stores did not plant trees to cover building area from houses on Randolph Road after leaves fall in autumn. The building is an eye-sore from behind – three stories high.
• Better lighting.
• Flooding issues.
• Zoning – will it affect different neighborhoods?
• What is the point of a Comprehensive Plan if zoning is going to be changed before the Plan is voted on?

QUALITY OF LIFE

Positive
• The Town should apply for CDBG funds to rehabilitate low income single family homes.
• Senior transportation – walkways.
• Medical care access.
• Individual characteristics of neighborhoods.
• Where local civic associations agree – allow accessory apartments in single family homes for families in need (seniors).
• Diversity.
• Intergenerational recreational facilities.
• Scenic beauty.
• Affordable housing (we need more).
• We’re here because we like the way it was.
• Public services are good.
• Continue to enhance community programs for all age groups (youth, adults and seniors).
• Maintain and increase, where possible, facilities and programs for our youth and seniors.
• I love all the “green-ness” of Greenburgh.
• Responsive and collaborative approach to government.
• A Town board, zoning board and planning board that listens and respects the residents.
• Town, planning and zoning boards that listen and respond to tax payers and Boards that listen and respect us.
• One family homes are well kept, especially landscaping.

Negative
• What about day workers standing on corners and streets in front of “Vavaros”?
• Better enforcement of housing codes i.e. single family homes are becoming rooming houses – the zoning laws need to be enforced.
• Illegal multifamily housing.
• Lower taxes!
• Limit run-down housing.
• Increase our tax base with businesses.
• No low income housing.
• No bus transportation at seniors residences i.e. Manhattan Avenue.
• Illegal rezoning of single family homes – multiple families living in single family homes and defying the Town’s zoning laws.
• Senior housing.
• Some housing needs to be refurbished.
• Recycle pickup used to include papers commingled on same day – why the change to separate and have separate pickup days?
• Allow Fulton Park to have affordable housing at 22 Tarrytown Road – but not a massive building.
• The police department just refinishing their building.
• Too much traffic on one roadway entrance and exit in Fulton Park.
• Fines for non-operational cars, no plates, and flat tires that look abandoned on properties.
• Fines for homeowners that leave trash in front of their houses.
• Keeping neighborhood whole, not divided (Fulton Park).
• Single family homes that are being used as multifamily.
• Flooding issues.
• Letting residents make decisions that pertain to their neighborhood to preserve their community.
• We need coordination with government officials and residents of the six villages – we cannot focus on Fairview alone.
• A “green roof” is not needed – we need a playground in Fulton Park (none available).
• Greenburgh school district (Central 7) needs to be improved – it does not have a reputation as a great school district.
• How long will it take to fill in the potholes on Route 119?
• Why does White Plains have nice trees along Route 119 and Greenburgh has crap? The trees are half dead.
• Seasonal flower planting and maintenance of public areas.
• Excessive speeding.
• Loitering on private residences.

KNOLLWOOD ROAD / ROUTE 100A / ROUTE 100B MEETING
MAY 29, 2008

Break Out Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION: F&A TEAM

• Railroad service.
• Lack of commuter parking at the White Plains train station and the express bus to New York City.
• There is no transit hub (centralized transportation center) – we would like shuttles.
• Poor bus service – times of service and the destinations covered:
  No service at 6:45PM (add later service to the number 38 bus).
• Lack of public transit on Knollwood Road.
• Shelter at bus stop on Route 100A (near the Hartsdale express/local bus stop).
• More walking paths/sidewalks:
• Along Route 9A and Knollwood Road (sidewalk to A&P Shopping Center).
• Groomed, widened pedestrian paths.
• Shuttle bus from Orchard Hill to swing around to Pondside condominiums.
• Route 9A traffic and noise conditions (State owned and operated road):
  • Pavement rattles (temporary pavement?)
  • Flooding conditions.
• Road entering Woodlands High School has potholes and needs repair.
• More traffic:
  • More pedestrian/bike choices and expanded opportunities/network.
  • Increase adequate parking (shoulder parking) and meters (which is Town maintained).

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: F&A TEAM**
• Greenburgh Nature Reserve and parks.
• No flooding issues- except 100B.
• Well maintained roads in winter; good plowing services.
• Good garbage pick-up services.
• Street drainage -- a catch basin cleaning is needed.
• Need to update sewer/water infrastructure; ongoing maintenance.
• Roads are cracked and decaying: Worthington and Woodlands Avenue curbs in need of repair.
• Scheme for sidewalk installation on Knollwood Road.
• No enforcement of upkeep of private property.
• Abandoned cars.
• Lowering property values.
• Need more frequent pick-up of fallen leaves in the fall.

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: F&A TEAM**
• Not enough 2-family housing.
• Lack of affordable senior housing or multi-family attached rentals.
• Overcrowding -- single family housing used as multi-family housing.
• Consequences related to lack of affordable housing.
• Lack of “sense of place”- no recognizable signage (strip malls), no collection place (social/civil core), no gateway/established entry point into the Town.
• Need to preserve landscaping of trees, and avoid clear-cutting with new development.
• Commercial upgrade to improve quantity and quality of Knollwood.
• Open space provided for high density housing throughout Town.
• Compatible zoning.
• Integrate individual plans into Comprehensive Plan (1980s, etc. –update as needed).

**QUALITY OF LIFE: F&A TEAM**
• School districts need improvement.
• Safety in schools and routes to school.
• Poor reputation -- low education attainment/varied and inconsistent quality of education.
• Harder to sell houses in this school district (Central 7) than others -- as a result of academics.
• Beautiful parks and recreation opportunities.
• More activities needed for teenagers -- teen center or a boys’ and girls’ club.
• Lack of senior services: abbreviated bus schedule/housing for seniors.
• Not enough playground space in parks.
Positive -- it’s nice to have “property cards” on Town’s web site!
Recycling is good.
Lack of sidewalks, connections to commercial areas.
Lack of uniform signage for commercial areas.
Poison ivy- West Hartsdale, Knollwood Road, Worthington.
Radio reception interference.
Core- Community Hub- library as central gathering point.

KNOLLWOOD / ROUTE 100A / ROUTE 100B MEETING
MAY 29, 2008
Open Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION

Positive
• Orchard Hill bus to Hartsdale Railroad station is a plus.
• Good transportation to New York City (MetroNorth)
• Adequate parking meters in areas outside village centers.

Negative
• Lack of parking for transportation (i.e. White Plains and Hartsdale train stations and the Express Bus to New York City).
• No transportation hub (shuttles primarily).
• Poor bus transportation.
• The outcomes of truck traffic on Route 9A – noise level and road conditions.
• Shelters for bus stops on Route 100A.
• More walking paths/sidewalks.
• Lack of public transportation along Knollwood Road.
• Abbreviated public transportation schedule.
• The number 38 bus runs only after 5:00PM – the last bus is about 6:45PM.
• The road into Woodlands High School.
• We need more pedestrian and bike opportunities – sidewalks and bike routes.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT

Positive
• Parks in Town and the Greenburgh Nature Preserve.
• Roads are well maintained in the winter.
• Garbage pickup is a good service.
• No flooding issues.

Negative
• Drainage is inconsistent on streets.
• Update sewer and water infrastructure.
• Safe sidewalks along Knollwood Road.
• Roads are cracked and decaying.
• No enforcement of upkeep of private property which brings values down.

ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT
**Positive**
- Preserve the landscaping (trees, etc.) on new construction sites.
- Open space for housing.

**Negative**
- Mixed zoning is not compatible with residential neighborhoods (Knollwood Road).
- Too many car dealers on Route 119.
- What happened to the old Targeted Rezoning Study of 1986?
- More tree pruning near power lines and street lights.
- Unincorporated Greenburgh needs a town square.
- There are not enough two family homes.
- Need to upgrade the Greenburgh Shopping Center at Knollwood Road (i.e. A&P) to attract shoppers.
- No affordable senior housing for middle class residents.
- More variety in communal areas.
- Better shopping – more quality stores.

**QUALITY OF LIFE**

**Positive**
- Overall school districts.
- Garbage and recycle collections are excellent.
- There is not much sound pollution caused by airplanes.
- Great cultural events at Westchester Community College and the library.
- Recreation programs.
- The police and fire departments and the ambulance emergency response are excellent.
- Beautiful parks – lots of greenery.
- Good recreation at Town Park and the Theodore Young Community Center.
- Many recreational offerings for all ages available.
- Westchester Community College and SUNY Purchase offer many courses for seniors and retirees.
- Quiet, peaceful neighborhoods.
- The new library should be a great gathering place.

**Negative**
- Rampant poison ivy along West Hartsdale Avenue, Hillcrest Avenue and Knollwood Road.
- More activities needed for teenagers.
- Not enough playground space in Broadview/Orchard Park.
- Maintenance of patches of public property on the side of the roads (litter removal, weeding, etc.) needed on Hillcrest Avenue, Knollwood Road and more.
- Radio reception and interference (e.g. 1010AM is hard to get at times).
- Create uniform signage guidelines for commercial areas.
- Lack of sidewalks in neighborhoods to access commercial areas.
- School safety.
- Greenburgh schools have a poor reputation.
- Lack of services for seniors.

**Other:**

**Negative**
TRANSPORTATION

**Positive**
- Highway connections- easy access on and off the freeways.

**Negative**
- Lack of sidewalks.
- Lack of bus service to train stations/particularly during rush hour 3 PM-5 PM.
- No east-west roads
- Need public transport/bus lines on Old Jackson Ave (to eliminate traffic).
- Railways- resident/non-resident parking rules are unfair to Clarewood residents.
- Build up of pollution from I-87 and parkway corridor due to traffic.
- Jackson Avenue -inadequate to handle growing volume of traffic between 9A and Central Park Ave/Sprain Parkway particularly during rush hour 3 PM-5 PM; same on Ardsley Road from Sprain Parkway to Village.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT

**Positive**
- Consistency in removal of dead trees from lots along winding roads.

**Negative**
- Need to institute Town wide composting of garden and kitchen scraps.
- Need to provide easy and proper disposal of fluorescent light bulbs.
- Grocery stores/supermarkets should implement reusable bags or charge for plastic bags.
- Need to institute a “Pay as You Throw” program to reduce wasteful practices and help to pay for the sanitation trucks.
- Major flooding problems on Saw Mill, Route 9A, and Jackson Avenue- what can be done? Critical problem in the neighborhood.
- Sprain-Jackson Drainage District and Flooding- need to implement what was planned and paid for in 1984 but never happened.
- Preservation of trees will help with flood control, noise and pollution problems.
- Sidewalks/bike ways/school buses- what happens when gas goes up to $10 a gallon?
- Ridge Hill’s impact on current support services and access roads.
- Safety of overhead wires.

ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT

**Positive**
- Single family housing, not a cloned community.
- Large property lots.
- Rural neighborhood with lots of trees- needs to be maintained.

**Negative**
- High taxes are growing at too fast a pace; reassess property value to adjust tax rates.
- No business partnership is promoted to help build jobs that will reduce taxes.
- Rezoning retail use to office use is needed.
- Residential communities are encroached by development (need to protect these communities).
- Oversized houses on too small lots.
- Should not allow proposed developments to move forward until Comprehensive Plan process is completed – must all be green.
- Need to protect/maintain open spaces; there are too many shopping areas.
- Hastings riverfront is a disgrace.

**QUALITY OF LIFE**

**Positive**
- Good recreational facilities and “green” parks.
- Tree lined streets and quiet neighborhoods.
- Diversity and culture offers variety of socio-economic groups, not a cookie cutter neighborhood.
- Good school districts (Hastings/Dobbs Ferry/Ardsley).
- Beautiful views of the Hudson River.
- Close proximity to NYC.
- In general, public services are very good.

**Negative**
- A need for Wi-Fi services in parks.
- Unlicensed massage parlor provides prostitution.
- Need for affordable housing.
- One town/village controls issues that affect other towns/villages who have no vote in the matter.
- Structure of public services is too cumbersome.
- Noise/smoke/fumes are a problem.
- Trash collection services are rude and unreliable.

**JACKSON AVENUE/DONALD PARK MEETING**

**June 10, 2008**

Break Out Group Visioning

**TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADER – Frank Doherty**
- Congestion on Jackson Avenue - making a left turn onto 9A.
- Clarewood is impossible to get out by the cemetery/Mount Hope.
- Lack of public transport on Jackson Avenue connecting Hastings to Central Avenue.
- Need an east-west link corridor for the overall community at large.
- Disparate rules for parking for Post Office and residents at Hastings train station.
- There are few exits off the Thruway, which causes a build up of truck and traffic congestion crossing Ardsley.
- Sidewalks needed on Central Avenue/Ashford Avenue/Rt. 9A.
- Ashford Avenue bridge construction - need a traffic light.
- Safe routes to school – Sprain and Ardsley need either 4-way traffic light or all-way stop.
- Approved residential projects on Ardsley border:
  - Winding Farm provides only one 2-lane road off Route 9A.
- Ardsley Green/Ardsley Estates - 18 houses.
- Access point through local streets in Ardsley - promised to connect development to Sprain and never happened.
- Residential development is adding to already congested traffic problems.

**INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADER: Lou Weinstein**

- Important focal points:
  - Water
  - Sewer
  - Storm water
  - Wetlands
  - Open space
  - Solid waste
  - Recycling
- Municipal water system on Old Jackson Avenue needs a system extension.
- Extended gas utilities needed.
- Septic systems are still being designed (Topland-Hawthorne).
- Flood control – a physical issue that needs to be assessed (available funding).
- Development impacts flooding and traffic, especially on Sprain Road.
- Sprain Brook is 7 miles long and joins Bronx River 3 miles south of Jackson Avenue.
- Old Grassy Sprain Reservoir- detention in old land fill?
- Tree management needs planned restoration before removal.
- Open space focus on Revolutionary Trail and Redoubt.
- Hastings Greenway to South County Trailway.
- Waste Generation Reduction- “pay as you throw” needs to be implemented.
- Required composting (homeowner) or to public site needed.
- Concerns of Gelsprain impact:
  - Cemetery impact
  - Runoff is too small under the Thruway
  - 25 Old Jackson- receives flooding (in 100 year flood zone).
- Major flooding occurs once every three years:
  - Old Jackson Avenue
  - Ashford Avenue
  - Ardsley (2 per year)

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: GROUP LEADER: Steve Hunt**

- Land Use:
  - Need to set the tone by paying attention to land use and stop development.
  - Less demand on infrastructure.
  - More focus on flooding and environmental impacts.
  - Schools need improvement.
  - Worried about changing the “character” of the neighborhood.
  - More controls on what is built or being built- mainly size restrictions on homes.
  - Stop variances- out of scale houses block lighting to others and neighborhoods are loosing
  - “green”.
  - Town needs to support residential land use around Donald Park/Jackson Avenue area.
  - Town needs to cut back on commercial development around 9A between Yonkers and Ardsley.
  - Roll back commercially zoned property on OB1-lots; similar to the direction 25 years ago-
- Mendham Avenue.
  - Major concern regarding impact of Ridge Hill on Jackson Avenue.
  - Greenway is very positive for re-use of land -38 miles.

- Economics:
  - Need to implement a plan to bring in business to commercial zones:
    - Vacant storefronts offer available space.
    - Reposition- Ciba Geigy
  - Greenburgh is economically diverse- a plus.
  - Need to preserve middle class character.
  - Concerns regarding “commercial creep”.

**QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: Evan Smith (F&A)**

- Focus on what brings and keeps people here.
  - Born and raised in community.
  - Average- people have been here 10-20 years.
  - Combination of access and good community resources.
  - Diversity of residents.
  - Ability to attract professionals (accessibility).
  - Suburban setting with access to NYC.
  - Public services are excellent.
  - Dislike recycling scheme; it is not as advanced as other communities- why are only type 1 and type 2 offered? Why not all seven?
  - Police services are very responsive.
  - Library is good.
  - Need to figure out how to create a more efficient government to:
    - Conserve spending and lower taxes
    - Sharing services with economies of scale
    - Central Avenue- is the State in control?
  - Need to develop a downtown to create a sense of identity- use of flags as an option for unity.
  - Artistic and cultural events such as an Arts Festival are needed to create a sense of identity.
  - “Celebrate Greenburgh Day” –a parade as a suggestion?
  - Good infrastructure, parks and green space.
  - Town should put all wires underground to eliminate problems with varied wires.
  - Ridge Hill: residents will move after completion.
  - How big?
  - How accessible?
  - Development near train stations will increase the quality of life, and add to diversity of neighborhoods/retail.
  - Mass transit will not reduce Greenburgh traffic.

**COMMUNITY CHARACTER: GROUP LEADER: Jill Barrett (F&A)**

- Greenburgh Nature Center is needed.
- Population is too overcrowded.
- Mini-districts are all different.
- Water co-linkage needs to be implemented.
- Third largest Town in the State.
- Identity and sense of community needed.
- Services provision is too confusing.
• “Greenburgh” doesn’t exist- different addresses throughout neighborhood.
• Multiple school districts separate the community.
• People feel positive being a part of a Village.
• No Post Office or Main Street to centralize the community.

Route 9A/NORTH ELMSFORD MEETING
JUNE 24, 2008
Open Group Visioning

TRANSPORTATION

Positive
• Good access to trains and major highways.

Negative
• Excessive noise from highways – 9A and dust.
• No mass transportation – small buses from Knollwood Road to train stations needed.
• The #40 bus -stop on Grasslands Road is needed on Mt. Pleasant side for employees of Westchester Meadow/Hebrew Hospital.
• No sidewalks in north Greenburgh, Knollwood Road, and for pedestrians on 9A (leading to 3 fatalities recently).
• No bus to rail transportation accessible to North White Plains Railroad Station; and no parking for Greenburgh residents.
• North Greenburgh traffic southbound on Route 9A/Payne Street – intersection needs a left turning lane and a turning signal.
• Excess truck traffic at certain hours – UPS/FedEx/Coca-Cola – between 8:30 and 9 AM.
• Excess traffic from movies and big box stores (Sam’s, Home Depot).
• Beaver Hill neighborhood – only one access – in the event of an emergency there is no emergency access. There is room for a possible regulated gate.
• Route 9A congestion – trucks stopping creates traffic jams.
• Knollwood Road has a speeding and excessive noise problem, particularly from motorcycles.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT

Positive
• Responsive local government.
• The parks in incorporated Greenburgh/Elmsford area.
• Public services and sanitation are well maintained.
• Police Department, Fire Department and DPW are well provided.

Negative
• Lights are needed on the streets off of Knollwood Road (North Manor and South Manor).
• Need to address flooding issues on Saw Mill River/Route 9A area.
• 9A can be completely flooded after a heavy rain, making it impossible to drive on.
• Reports suggest some contamination in the water supply purity.
• Drainage problems need to be addressed on Route 9A and Payne Street.
• No sewers on Taylor Road between Sprain Parkway and NYC aqueducts.

ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT
**Positive**
- Maintained and expanded affordable housing to foster diversity.
- Knollwood Country Club.
- Westchester Community College.
- New York School for the Deaf.
- Zoning separation between residential and commercial areas.
- North Greenburgh is a very busy, mixed use area with a plethora of businesses in addition to residential areas.

**Negative**
- Zoning issues – multiple families in one family houses renting rooms.
- Too many illegal immigrants create overcrowding.
- North Elmsford R-5 zone on lower streets off of Payne Street is too overcrowded. Needs R-7.5 zone.
- Lack of employment opportunities for young people 18-25 – especially youth of color.
- No public places with charm; needs upscale restaurants
- We need a “replacement” neighborhood restaurant at 9A and Payne Street. Restaurants have come and gone.
- Lack of enforcement with respect to illegal tenancies.

**QUALITY OF LIFE**

**Positive**
- Quiet, green open spaces.
- Good public services.
- Good schools in north Greenburgh, but only because of sharing with Mt. Pleasant school districts.

**Negative**
- Drug activity on Payne Street.
- Police patrol is lacking in some instances – illegal housing units is a problem.
- Pollution, debris, run down “ghetto” like living conditions on 9A in North Elmsford to 287 North Old Country Road.
- Lack of senior services –transportation/garbage and recyclables/meals/shopping assistance.
- Excessive noise from Sprain Parkway and cars speeding up Payne Street.
- Continuous harassment of black youth by police.
- Town “branding” is needed to create a physical “space” identity – parks/stores – to show that this is Greenburgh.
- It is hard to define for anyone where the “town” is.
- Need a neighborhood disaster plan.

**Route 9A/North Elmsford MEETING**

**June 24, 2008**

**Break Out Group Visioning**

**TRANSPORTATION: GROUP LEADER – F&A Team**

- Route 9A and Payne Street:
  - Too many trucks and accidents.
  - Dangerous left hand turning.
  - Dunkin Donuts – shouldn’t be able to make left turn in or out.
Safety issues.
- 9A bypass? Could this help?
- Purchase land for 9A bypass before it’s too late.

“Movement of the Brown Cows” (Fed Ex, UPS):
- FedEx between 8:30 AM – 8:45 AM traffic.
- Becomes a one-lane road.
- That’s the issue of our neighborhood – traffic!

Sidewalks:
- Knollwood Road coming down next to New York School for the Deaf is very dangerous.
- Bus route is very sporadic.
- Sign on Knollwood – “deer crossing”.
- In front of Police Station.
- No sidewalks in Beaver Hill – don’t want them!
- Same feeling on Knollwood Road – burden to shovel/maintain.

Noise and Highways:
- Sprain Brook Parkway.
- Louder with barrier walls.
- No enforcement of noise laws.
- Motorcyclists on Knollwood Road – loud and fast (worst at 5 PM – 6:30 PM).

Transit:
- Connect neighborhoods to train stations via bus.

Road Access/Emergency Access:
- Dead ends – install police controlled gates.
- Only way for an emergency road is on Knollwood Road – and this becomes impossible for emergency vehicles.
- It’s not an emergency gate – then it is a safety issue.
- Knollwood Road, Old Tarrytown Road – cars have to wait for oncoming traffic to clear to make a left turn. It becomes a safety issue for people to go around; need to make the road a little wider for bypass.

INFRASCTRUCTURE AND ENVIRONMENT: GROUP LEADER: F&A Team

- Not just a Greenburgh problem -- Hawthorne Circle was a diverter; Mt. Pleasant water flow down to us.
- Army Corps of Engineers – objected to Greenburgh removing debris.
- What about environmental issues with oil and grease getting into properties?
- Do a cost analysis for areas with flood plains – Babbit Court.
- Look at purity of water – water supply to impose a criterion for people at risk for infectious diseases.
- Different waterways – schools adopted streams to do water quality checks.
- Planning Board taking a look at better design in river flood plain area.
- Payne Street – Town needs to take a look at Cabot Avenue water in a flat area.
- Payne Street and Sears Street have two drains on the north side but none on the south side.
- Water used to run in between two houses to catch-basin near Elmsford line; now it does not.
- Stagnant water breeds mosquitos.
- No sewers between Sprain Brook Parkway.
- Route 9A flooding – not always caused by the Saw Mill River but water racing down Payne Street.
- Inadequate drainage along all of 9A.
- In the future – windmills? Columbia, Missouri cited as an example.
- Can community look at alternative energy resources?
• Provide tax breaks for “green incentives” -- general education in community for what can be done.
• Is there any budget to implement these ideas?
• Corporate sponsorship – standards for commercial development – need to build sidewalks.

**ECONOMICS AND LAND DEVELOPMENT: GROUP LEADER: F&A Team**

• The definition of residential and commercial land in the zoning code is a strength.
• Address affordability of local taxes – think about ways to expand tax base.
• Affordable housing property – “affordable” is a relative term.
• Homeless shelter, low income housing, condos, smaller houses, senior housing -- there is diversity in types.
• Already have a mix of homes and affordability.
• Tax impact on fixed income houses – diversity of tax base.
• Potential for selling land (example: School for the Deaf) and development potential – need to change zoning?
• Open land – priority to preserve?
• Will there be a moratorium on development?
• Cross-County corridor is a potential for transportation stops/areas.
• Supermarkets and upscale restaurants are needed.
• Need “late night” restaurant options.
• Lack of shopping in the area.
• No Starbucks or great coffee shops.
• After movie theater, need somewhere to go besides City Limits.
• Houses are too close together – need larger parcels.
• North Elmsford – building outside variances.
• Variance applications – need signs to notify neighbors.
• Upzoning of areas.

**QUALITY OF LIFE: GROUP LEADER: F&A Team**

• Community Center is a focal point – support from the Town has helped many youth and seniors.
• Cut off for School District boundaries in North Elmsford is strange – 2 sides to that debate that needs to be pursued on larger State platform.
• Debris and pollution are a problem.
• Illegal housing issues.
• Lack of police patrol in North Elmsford; when they do patrol, it is for the wrong reason.
• Police lacking on Route 9A – trucks stopping and zooming through red lights.
• Grasslands Road – homeless walk through property on reservation.
• Jurisdiction needs to be defined – Greenburgh on one side of the line; Mt. Pleasant on the other – a mix mash of “who covers what”.
• People hanging out in restaurant parking lots.
• Rules and regulations for homeless needed.
• Knollwood Road needs police patrol to address community needs.
• Police stagger at times at the park near Payne Street.
• Senior needs – what services are available?
• More awareness of recycling and getting them to the curb.
• DPW and sanitation do a wonderful job!

**COMMUNITY CHARACTER: GROUP LEADER: F&A Team**
• Culturally diverse -- hard to define “Greenburgh”; Villages define the Town.
• People care and are concerned about neighborhood.
• Services provided (snow, library, seniors).
• Ability of Town and Villages to work together/cooperation.
• Presence of police services.
• Wide, open spaces.
• Variety of programs and activities offered.
• Substantial industrial base.
• No “main drag” or “center”.
• Longevity – residents have lived here for a long time.
• Architectural differences and varieties of buildings.
• Mature town – buildings and homes.
• Easily accessible from highways.
• Mixture of working class and seniors.
• Suburban area.
• “Green” and peaceful.
• Polluted and dusty.
• Beaver Hill – adding on to single family homes; traffic makes it not a quiet place; trucks diverted into area; not how it “used to be”; tightly packed and narrow streets.
• Knollwood/Mayfair – adjacent to Westchester Community College; large open spaces.
• Mayfair Acres – dogs walking/kids playing.
• Hartsdale Hills – lack of development; golf course, golf range, no commercial area.
• Westchester Hills Condominiums – many do not know it exists; townhouses and apartment buildings; swimming pool; self-managed.
• North Elmsford – social and political ties.
• Not homogenous/diversity – negative.
• Divided by Sprain Parkway (bisects).
• Noise increasing over the years.
• Septic problems – no sewers in some areas.
• Flight plans for Airport – in flight path depending on weather.
• Major traffic arteries – mixed positive and negative.
• Fire engines, ambulances, helicopters into Westchester County Medical Center.
APPENDIX C

Central Park Avenue & Commercial Corridor Visioning
Introduction and Overview

On March 19, 2009, two focus groups were held in the Greenburgh Town Hall to discuss the opportunities and constraints for redevelopment of Central Park Avenue and the other commercial corridors in Greenburgh. The first session involved members of the real estate profession who are involved with commercial properties in the Town. Participants in the second session included property owners and/or developers involved in properties along Central Park Avenue and the other commercial corridors. The groups identified the following issues and opportunities:

ISSUES:

Anti-development attitudes: In both sessions, Greenburgh was described as a community in which it was difficult to win approval for development projects.

High taxes/costs: In addition, both sessions highlighted the fact that high taxes in Greenburgh put it at a strong cost disadvantage compared to other locations in Connecticut, New Jersey or even Yonkers.

Costly/lengthy approvals process: The development approvals process was described as time-consuming and cumbersome, providing a further disincentive for the redevelopment of Central Park Avenue.

Outdated/Counterproductive Regulations: There was also widespread agreement in both sessions that Greenburgh’s current zoning regulations are a major factor in keeping desired development out of Greenburgh. Low floor area ratios and high requirements for parking make it difficult to attract restaurants and specialty retailers, such as furniture stores, as well as small footprint specialty stores that would be best suited for multi-tenant buildings. Inflexible signage regulations were also cited as a major problem for retailers. In addition, participants felt that some environmental regulations (e.g., the steep slopes regulations) created burdensome constraints for development that are unrelated to effective environmental stewardship.

Increased Competition: Central Park Avenue (as well as all commercial areas in Greenburgh) will be facing increased competition beyond just the problems associated with the current economic downturn. The imminent opening of Ridge Hill Village will introduce over 1.3 million square feet of retail space into the market at a time when the Central Park Avenue corridor has over 200,000 square feet of vacant retail space. In addition, the recent consolidation of corporations operating “big box” stores means that more and more locations will be competing for fewer and fewer of such stores. Finally, participants in both sessions pointed out that the trends in retail development are toward smaller foot-print stores in high-density, mixed-used developments. Under current zoning, such development is much more likely to consider locating in the Villages or White Plains rather than in Greenburgh’s commercial areas.
OPPORTUNITIES:

There was a near-unanimous sense that, with appropriate changes in attitude and policy, Greenburgh could be the site of significant amounts of high-quality sustainable development.

High-density, Mixed Use Development: Participants asserted that, if the regulations governing the development of Central Park Avenue (and the other corridors in town) could be revised to support nodes of higher-density, mixed use development, this could have multiple benefits. It would bring down the per-square-foot costs of taxes by spreading those costs across larger building footprints on appropriate sites. It will also make the corridors more attractive to progressive developers currently seeking sites for such neo-traditional, transit-oriented development.

Reducing Costs & Delays in the Approvals Process: Participants made the point that if the regulatory process could be simplified, the costs of doing projects in Greenburgh could be reduced and Greenburgh itself could become a much more attractive site for development. Suggestions to address this include the creation of Generic Environmental Impact Statements (GEIS) for key development areas in the Town.

Enhanced Local Identify: The creation of such nodes would create or strengthen the identity of the surrounding areas, enabling the development process to simultaneously strengthen the quality of life in Greenburgh through hamlet revitalization. It was also suggested that Greenburgh cooperate with the County, the Villages and other jurisdictions to ensure that development that is attracted to each community is complementary to the development goals of its neighbors, increasing the potential for further development in each of the participating jurisdictions.

Improved Opportunities for Transit: Finally, it was pointed out that the creation of such nodes would also make it more feasible to serve those areas with mass transit, potentially reducing some of the traffic problems on Central Park Avenue and elsewhere in Greenburgh.

Promoting Local Business Association(s): Participants also agreed that it may be useful to create a business association for Central Park Avenue (as well as for other areas in the Town). Such an association could provide a clear and strong voice for business interests as the Town considers revising zoning and other regulations to improve the Town’s economy and promote overall quality of life.

Detailed descriptions of each of these meetings follow. The sessions followed a similar format. They began with a discussion of “global issues” facing Greenburgh’s commercial corridors. Participants were asked to identify issues affecting Greenburgh that may not be directly related to the specifics of the local real estate market or local regulatory policies. From there, participants were asked to focus on “constraints” to development that were unique to Central Park Avenue and the other commercial
corridors in the Town. Following the discussion of constraints, the agenda moved on to “solutions.” In particular, participants were asked to identify policy responses (or other initiatives) to address the constraints identified earlier. Finally participants in both sessions were asked to define “opportunities” for development or redevelopment that exist for Central Park Avenue and the other commercial corridors in Greenburgh. The descriptions below summarize the discussions at each meeting. Note: these are summary descriptions, not transcriptions. In some cases, the topics discussed have been reordered or consolidated to provide the reader with a clearer, more concise description of the substance of the conversations than would be available through a literal transcription.

Session with Real Estate Agents: March 19, 2009 9-11AM Jackson Conference Room

Attendees:
Gene Berger, Aries, Deitch & Endelson
Erminia P. Curcio, Resident, Project Manager
Martin Deitch, Aries, Deitch & Endelson
Dennis Dilmaghani, Dilstan Realty Corp
Barry Endelson, Aries, Deitch & Endelson
Donna Gage, Aries, Deitch & Endelson
Bill Hesse, Aries, Deitch & Endelson
Leda Maduriera, Aries, Deitch & Endelson
Charles Whang, Prudential Rand Commercial Services

Garret Duquesne, Town of Greenburgh
Peter Fairweather, Fairweather Consulting
Thomas Madden, Town of Greenburgh
Fran McLaughlin, Greenburgh Planning Board, CSPC
Francis Sheehan, Greenburgh Town Board, CPSC
Walter Simon, Greenburgh Planning Board, CSPC

Global Issues
Participants expressed the concern that regulations on Central Park Avenue are “driving away” activities and uses that appeal to younger adults such as restaurants and entertainment. As a result, such activities are now concentrating in the Villages and White Plains.

At the same time, existing regulations do not respond to the needs of an aging population. For example, there are no sidewalks along much of Central Park Avenue. Similarly, there is little provision for buses or transit along the Avenue.
On the other hand, it was argued that pedestrian-friendliness is not as important for Central Park Avenue, given that most of the users of stores and services along Central Park Avenue expect to reach their destinations by private car. This still presents a problem in that much of Central Park Avenue features poor access and egress due to poor sight lines and the existence of many curb cuts. In addition, the traffic lights along the Avenue are not timed with one another, making it more difficult and time-consuming to navigate Central Park Avenue.

Greenburgh’s relatively high real estate taxes also present a problem for Central Park Avenue. They tend to be 3 or 4 times higher than similar areas in Connecticut and New Jersey, with such taxes along Central Park Avenue now ranging between $7.00 and $10.00 per square foot. This difference is seen in even the immediate local market. For example, it was reported that Common Area Maintenance Charges and taxes for the Yonkers Gateway center are $6.00 per square foot compared to $13.00 per square foot for areas in the Edgemont/Scarsdale vicinity.

Central Park Avenue’s commercial corridor will also be coming under increasing competition due to several factors:

- The opening of the Ridge Hill project in Yonkers will introduce 1.3 million square feet of retail space into the market with national chains such as Williams Sonoma, Cheesecake Factory and Barnes & Nobles. The Center is open-air shopping has good road access and will provide shoppers with easy access to the regional road system.

- At the same time, an ongoing national consolidation among big box category killers (e.g., Home Depot, Barnes & Noble, etc.) means that more and more locations will be competing for fewer and fewer big name stores.

- In addition, Cross County Shopping Center in Yonkers (with 971,000 GLA) is also being upgraded to focus on higher-end retail and dining/entertainment, adding 250,000 square feet in the process.

- It was estimated that the Central Park Avenue corridor in Greenburgh currently has 200,000 square feet vacant.

While these trends are occurring, the national economic slowdown is causing more and more retailers to look for some relief from rents.

Constraints specific to Central Park Avenue/Greenburgh

The long abandoned Health Spa on Central Park Avenue was cited as an example of the regulatory constraints along the corridor. Steep slope regulations limit what can be done with that site even though the slopes on the property wouldn’t necessarily be affected by redevelopment. Those regulations reduce the allowable square footage for redevelopment. In addition, the general
restrictions on floor area ratios for the corridor make it impossible to redevelop the property in a way that produces a reasonable return.

Parking ratios were identified as a major constraint to redevelopment. The regulations require too much parking regardless of the proposed use. Thus a furniture store (which has a handful of customers at any one time) is held to the same parking standards as a general merchandise retailer (which may have dozens of customers at any one time). Parking ratios were cited as a major deterrent for higher-end restaurants.

Signage regulations were also given as an example of a constraint on Central Park Avenue. The current regulations have a single formula restricting signage, regardless of how far the business is set back from Central Park Avenue. Thus, a business that is located 200 feet from the road must have the same size sign as one that is found fifty feet from Central Park Avenue.

As in the specific case of the health spa property, floor area ratios in general were also identified as being too restrictive.

While Greenburgh was lauded for its environmentally progressive attitude, concern was raised about potential regulations that would require “green” roofs for commercial buildings. In particular, it was noted that such regulations require that local contractors be capable of installing green roofing. Thus, the Town should make sure that contractors are educated about such regulations and able to provide the needed facilities to developers/property owners.

Finally, there was widespread concern that the approvals process in Greenburgh is too time-consuming and costly for developers. The concerns raised had less to do with the substance of the regulations, but rather the costs and length of time (which imposes an additional set of costs) to secure approvals in the Town.

**Potential Solutions**

It was recommended that the floor area ratio of current regulations could be increased dramatically. One example given was to raise current restrictions that may be as low as 10 percent to at least 20 percent.

The realtors also argued that signage regulations should be relaxed. In particular, it was suggested that the size of the allowable sign should be calculated based upon the depth of the lot and the siting of the building on which the sign was to be located. Buildings set back farther from the road on deeper lots should be allowed to have larger signs. It was also suggested that greater variation should be allowed for the heights of signs, again depending upon where the sign is located within the parcel and/or where the building itself is located on the parcel.

It was also agreed that it may be desirable to interconnect parking lots and provide common access/egress to Central Park Avenue for contiguous commercial properties. This could be coordinated with an effort to provide better timing of the traffic lights along Central Park Avenue to make the
corridor more accessible for shoppers. It was also suggested that the Town increase the visibility of patrol cars along Central Park Avenue as a means of traffic calming in the corridor.

Facade improvements for properties should be encouraged by offering incentives to property owners (possibly tied to energy conservation). For example, the Town may be able to secure grants related to energy efficiency to seed a revolving loan fund to provide low-interest loans for properties to improve their facades while integrating energy saving features (e.g., higher r-value insulation, thermal glass, etc.)

Regulatory incentives were also identified as potential solutions. It was suggested that incentives be created in the zoning regulations to encourage desirable uses. For example, the floor area ratio calculations for restaurants could exclude the kitchen and storage areas, thereby increasing the allowable density for that use. As an illustration, it was pointed out that the former Barnes & Noble “Halloween” building could potentially house an attractive furniture store if the floor area ratio was increased and parking requirements decreased for that site.

Another potential incentive discussed was the possibility of using graduated density incentives to encourage the consolidation of smaller lots in the Town’s commercial corridors. For example, a smaller single 5-acre lot may have a maximum floor area ratio of 20 percent. If that lot was consolidated with an adjacent lot, the new 10-acre lot may have an allowable floor area ratio of 40 percent.

There was general agreement that it may be useful to create a Central Park Avenue Business Association to provide a single more powerful voice to advocate to the Town on behalf of business interests when it comes to such issues as regulation changes, tax policy, etc.

The question was raised whether commercial properties are over-assessed versus residential properties so that businesses are subsidizing the provision of Town services to residents. No such assertions were made, but the question was raised.

As an example of the importance of revising the zoning for Central Park Avenue, it was pointed out that some of the most attractive retail space in Town (the Hartsdale hamlet at the intersection of Central Park Avenue and 100A) consists of largely nonconforming uses. If those properties were lost to a fire, under current zoning they could not be redeveloped in the manner that makes them attractive now.

It was agreed that apartments located over retail along Central Park Avenue could be an attractive form of development if the apartments were reasonably priced and located in attractive school districts.

Another solution offered was to enable zoning to “respond to the deal,” that is, if zoning for Central Park Avenue (or other commercial corridors) had provisions that allowed for greater flexibility in terms of building placement, density, parking and mix of uses, it would be possible to work with developers who want to do creative mixed use projects along Central Park Avenue and elsewhere. The idea of creating special overlay districts to allow such an approach was seen as a worthwhile option to consider. This would allow the creation of higher density nodes of activity along Central Park Avenue that could
provide the type of mixed-use specialty retail experience that currently is diverted to the Villages and/or White Plains.

It was also recommended that the Town reconsider its policies that cause properties to lose rights to current nonconforming uses. It was argued that the severity of the current economic downtown will cause some currently non-conforming uses to close for extended periods of time. Under current zoning, such properties may lose their right to the current nonconforming use. This will make it extremely difficult to fill properties with desirable uses under Greenburgh’s current zoning (given the low floor area ratios and high parking requirements now in place). Thus, the Town may wish to consider extending the length of time a nonconforming use remains vacant before that use is extinguished.

Opportunities

Route 9A extending from Elmsford to Mount Pleasant was identified as an opportunity for redevelopment. The stretch consists of some undeveloped land mixed with older retail uses and underutilized residential parcels. The zoning for the area makes redevelopment difficult since one side of 9A is zoned retail and the other side is light industrial.
Global Issues

According to the International Council of Shopping Centers, 70 percent of shopping center space is rented nationally. That 30 percent vacancy rate is likely to increase before the economy recovers. Tenants are looking for relocations and reductions in rent and exercising escape clauses in leases in response to these deteriorating economic conditions.

One respondent indicated that the vacancy rates in the area are unprecedented in 25 years. While national conditions are responsible for much of this, it was pointed out that Greenburgh’s higher taxes contribute to this problem. It was suggested that Connecticut taxes are much lower than those in Westchester and there may be an opportunity to use this downturn to “benchmark” Greenburgh versus such locations as Greenwich and Westport (as an aside, it was mentioned that New York State’s public defined-benefit pension plans are a key driver in tax increases by local governments).

One key issue emerged from the discussion: the overarching direction that development is heading in metropolitan areas is toward mixed-use transit-oriented development. This raises serious opportunities and challenges for Greenburgh. The opportunity is that, once the national economy has begun recovery, these development opportunities will be available in Greenburgh. The challenge is that, in many ways, the Town does not appear prepared for them. As will be discussed in other sections, current zoning regulations in the Town appear almost diametrically opposed to such development. In this situation, Greenburgh could lose most if not all of this development potential to the nearby Villages.
and the City of White Plains, as they already have the plans, regulations and infrastructure in place to accommodate this type of development. Greenburgh must act quickly if it does not want to lose out on such opportunities.

**Constraints Specific to Central Park Avenue/Greenburgh**

It was agreed that Greenburgh has a reputation as an anti-development community. There is some perception that some of the regulations currently on the books were created more as anti-development measures than as environmental protection measures. The Town’s steep slope regulations were given as an example. They can constrain the allowable density of development on a site even if the proposed development does not impinge upon the steep slopes found on the site.

Greenburgh’s approach to development was characterized as viewing commercial development as something that was simply to be exploited, rather than being an integral part of the community. One participant described the difficulties he had in opening a new delicatessen on Central Park Avenue. He felt the signage regulations, combined with the deep set back of his building, resulted in a conforming sign that could not be read from the street. He described problems he had with enforcement authorities requiring him to remove tables from his premises since his use was not a restaurant and being fined for placing a large, temporary “grand opening” sign on his building.

Another example given of Greenburgh’s counter-productive regulations related to restaurants. It was argued that the Town’s restrictive parking regulations and its “comprehensive” approach to calculating floor area ratio (including the kitchen, etc.) was driving better restaurants away from Greenburgh and into the Villages.

The approvals process was described as time-consuming and burdensome, adding to Greenburgh’s reputation as an anti-development community. Getting approvals (even for as-of-right, conforming uses) was described as difficult and time-consuming. Fees and charges were characterized as very high compared to other locations. One participant indicated that the “processing costs” for residential development can run between $12,000 and $15,000 per unit of rental housing.

It was pointed out that physical constraints combine with regulatory constraints to make development difficult in Greenburgh. Virtually all of the flat land in Greenburgh is already developed. Yet buffering for steep slopes and other physical constraints was described as excessive, making it difficult to develop or redevelop sites that can support development without environmental degradation. This reduces the land available for development and drives up costs. One illustration given for this is the increasing consideration of incorporating parking structures in development in the region. Given the expense associated with those structures, their consideration is an indication that affordable, developable land is becoming extremely scarce.

Greenburgh’s policy of fostering lower-density development was questioned by a participant. He indicated that low-density development will never be able to generate sufficient demand for transit
service. Thus, such low-density development must always be served almost exclusively by automobiles, greatly increasing the traffic problems associated with development.

**Potential Solutions**

Floor area ratios need to be revised to better accommodate particular types of projects (e.g., restaurants and furniture stores) in particular locations (e.g., areas targeted as high-density nodes).

The speed of the approvals process must be improved (one participant indicated that it required 13 years for Avalon Green II to be approved with no variances involved.)

It was recommended that the Town prepare Generic Environmental Impact Statements (GEIS) for key corridors targeted for redevelopment. A GEIS would establish thresholds for development (e.g., traffic, water, etc.). In order to gain approval in the corridor, a proposed project would only have to show that it falls below the thresholds previously established by the Town when they approved the GEIS for that corridor.

Greenburgh should also consider working with the County and other municipalities to create multi-jurisdictional plans for key corridors that extend into and beyond Greenburgh. This will enable each jurisdiction to identify complementary uses it can promote that will serve to strengthen each corridor as a whole.

**Opportunities**

Routes 100 and 119 were described as “pots of gold” of which Greenburgh is not taking full advantage. Route 100 is in “redevelopment mode,” with upgrades and teardowns taking place along the corridor. Route 119 still has the capacity for new development that can accommodate shared parking and some mixed use, etc.

The I-287/Route 119 crossing is largely undeveloped and could be a site for neotraditional, mixed use development.

It was pointed out that Ardsley Road extends from the Hudson riverfront to the Long Island Sound. Greenburgh should be seeking the type of redevelopment that Stamford, Port Chester and Yonkers are pursuing.

One participant described White Plains’ approach to development as striking a deal with its citizens. As part of the deal, the City has identified those areas of the City where it can charge for parking and those areas where it will not charge. In addition, White Plains is committed to fostering higher density development in those areas served by public transit.

Greenburgh should take a similar approach to development, ensuring that new development is easily accessible by auto (in the short run by promoting internal site circulation, shared access and timed traffic lights) and by mass transit (in the long run by encouraging nodes of high density development that can be served by transit).
Participants asserted that, if Greenburgh can develop a coordinated approach with the Villages, it has the opportunity to go heavily into mixed use development. This has several advantages:

- Increased density of such development will reduce the cost per square foot to developers, thereby making Greenburgh more attractive on a cost-competitive basis.

- Under such conditions, Greenburgh has enough relatively cheaper vacant land to attract development that would otherwise seek to locate in the Villages.

- Development could be concentrated in higher-density nodes or hamlets, enabling that development to create or strengthen a sense of neighborhood identity and to promote the creation of transit (potential even via a private operator) to serve those hamlets.

The Town could create overlay zones to promote such development, drawing upon the experience of such places as Jersey City and White Plains.

It was suggested that the sense of place of the hamlets could be increased if Post Office substations were created for key hamlets (US Postal Service regulations permitting).

The group discussed the possibility of creating publicity for a redeveloped Central Park Avenue as a means of demonstrating Greenburgh’s changed attitude towards development and to let make potential developers aware of the attractive demographics associated with Greenburgh’s commercial corridors.

It was agreed that such a redevelopment effort should be presented to the residents of Greenburgh as a tax control measure. It would be important to keep this benefit prominent as a reason for pursuing this redevelopment strategy.
APPENDIX D

The Central Park Avenue Market Positioning Analysis
Town of Greenburgh, NY

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Central Park Avenue Market Positioning Analysis

August 2009
Revised February 17, 2011

Ferrandino & Associates Inc.
Planning and Development Consultants
Elmsford, New York

With

Dvirka and Bartilluci
Fitzgerald and Halliday, Inc.
Fairweather Consulting
Stephen Tilly, Architect
This page is intentionally blank
Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary................................................................................................................. 1
2. Purpose of Report..................................................................................................................... 6
   2.1 Databases Used ............................................................................................................... 6
   2.2 Market Areas Included ............................................................................................... 6
3. Demographic Analysis ............................................................................................................. 11
   3.1 Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Area.................................................................... 11
   3.2 Neighborhood Market Area ....................................................................................... 12
   3.3 Local Market Area ....................................................................................................... 13
   3.4 Regional Market Area .................................................................................................. 14
   3.5 Central Park Avenue in the Regional Retail Market ................................................... 16
4. Surplus & Leakage Analysis ................................................................................................... 16
   4.1 Neighborhood Market Area ....................................................................................... 19
   4.2 Regional Market Area .................................................................................................. 20
   4.3 Metropolitan Market Area ........................................................................................... 20
5. Key Findings .......................................................................................................................... 20
   5.1 The Opportunity: Making the Overall Corridor More Competitive ......................... 22
6. Emerging Trends in Retailing ................................................................................................. 22
   6.1 Market Polarization ....................................................................................................... 22
   6.2 Retail Polarization ......................................................................................................... 22
   6.3 The Move Toward “Experience-Based” Retail .............................................................. 23
   6.4 The Role of the Office Market along Central Park Avenue ........................................... 26
7. Recommendations .................................................................................................................. 26
   7.1 How Central Park Avenue Can Compete for “Experience-based” Retail ................. 28
8. Implementation Plan ............................................................................................................... 32

Report Appendices ................................................................................................................. 33
Appendix A. List of Economic and Planning Related Organizations.................................... 35
Appendix B. Detailed Data from Surplus/Leakage Analysis .................................................. 41
This page is intentionally blank
1. Executive Summary

The Town of Greenburgh is currently updating its comprehensive plan for the Unincorporated Area of the Town. Compared to the national average, Greenburgh is an affluent Town located in a very attractive retail market. As part of its comprehensive plan update, the Town is investigating all the commercial corridors in Unincorporated Greenburgh. The purpose of this report is to assess the current performance and competitiveness of Central Park Avenue as a corridor for retailing and to make recommendations that would allow the Town to provide redevelopment opportunities for pedestrian oriented and experience-based retailing. A “marketing position study” for the Central Avenue Corridor was prepared by Fairweather Consulting and is intended to provide background information for the Comprehensive Plan. The Central Avenue Corridor was last studied by Unincorporated Greenburgh in the late 1970s, when the Central Park Avenue Mixed Use Impact (CA) District was established in the Zoning Ordinance. While the District has, for the most part, worked well for Unincorporated Greenburgh, economic conditions have changed over the last thirty years and the corridor warrants an updated analysis that examines current and projected physical and market conditions.

At the time of the adoption of the CA zoning district, retail was dominated by the old large-scale general merchandise model. The preferred form was large, stand-alone buildings surrounded by a sea of parking. At that time, this was considered the essential formula for a successful retail district. Central Park Avenue is currently stuck in this old model. While this does not mean that Central Park Avenue is suffering undue economic distress or plagued by vacancies (other than those attributable to the current hard economic times), it does mean that the corridor does not provide a high quality built form and is underperforming economically.

“Experience-based retail” is a concept of providing an enhanced consumer space with access to a range of experiences beyond just buying goods and services, that includes a mix of uses (in some cases extending to residential) and provides for congregation spaces to support interpersonal interactions, live entertainment and special events. A review of industry trends illustrates that the emergence of experience-based retail has dramatically changed the requirements for premium retail real estate. If policies for the corridor were revised to make it a more conducive home for experience-based retail, an increase in both property values and economic vitality in the corridor could be expected. These policies can include land-use and non land-use based recommendations, discussed in detail in Section 7 of this report, that aim to foster pedestrian oriented, mixed-use centers, as opposed to policies focused on attracting particular sectors for the corridor. As discussed in the body of this report, retail locations have undergone a dramatic market polarization since the last study of Central Park Avenue in the 1970s. The “low cost” end of the pyramid features the big box discounters like K-mart, Wal-mart and various dollar/discount stores. The shift to more superior quality offerings is changing the shape and size of retail locations.
This report provides analyses of the 5-mile and 10-mile radii, as well as the corridor’s “surplus and leakage” position within the “neighborhood” market, the “local” market and the “regional market” segments in the tri-state area. Surplus refers to the estimates of current resident purchases for goods or services that are less than sales by existing stores of that type in a market area. For example, retail stores in that market area are selling more than would be supported by the local residents. Leakage refers to the estimates for current purchases by residents in a category are greater than the estimated sales by existing stores of that type in the market area. For example, local demand is being met by stores outside the geographic area. Fairweather Consulting found, as part of the corridor surplus and leakage analysis, that Unincorporated Greenburgh is a typical community with a lot of leakage within a small market area, which means that local shoppers are traveling outside of the area for goods and services. This leakage usually stops when a larger market area is studied. After studying the larger market, Unincorporated Greenburgh continued to experience substantial leakage and there were few sectors with surplus conditions. As the drive-time analysis is extended beyond 5-minutes from Central Park Avenue, it encompasses a greater number of affluent consumers as well as more retail outlets. This analysis suggests that the potential local, regional, and metropolitan opportunities are large enough so that Central Park Avenue is able to compete for virtually any type of retail opportunity.

To provide opportunities for experience-based retailing that is pedestrian scale and oriented, Unincorporated Greenburgh should promote a higher quality of mixed-uses along Central Park Avenue. A neo-traditional “downtown-style” development pattern supporting a variety of smaller footprint uses in close proximity fosters greater interaction among uses (and patrons of those uses) that creates the consumer experience essential for successful high-end retail. The primary component of facilitating compact, pedestrian oriented development in this corridor will be through innovative zoning regulations. Unincorporated Greenburgh can take the following steps in order to compete on the high-end of the retail market:

1) Identify areas in the Central Avenue Corridor that have the potential for a better mix of uses.

2) Develop a comprehensive set of mixed-use development standards and design principles for the corridor.

3) Consider developing Central Avenue as a series of intense nodes rather than one continuous dense commercial strip.

4) Evaluate if parking requirements for uses along the Central Avenue Corridor should be more flexible.

5) Promote Access Management along the Corridor that includes the promotion of internal secondary access roads in and among parcels, shared curb cuts among
adjacent parcels, increased use of transit along the corridor and other similar measures.

6) Use the Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS) to facilitate preferred development.

7) Develop “Specific Area Plans” that provide a policy framework for land use, transportation, and public improvements, and may include design guidelines, overlay zones, and public amenity requirements.

8) Promote the creation of a Central Park Avenue Association of merchants and property owners to support any redevelopment effort along the corridor.

Market demand and sustainable planning practices have coincided in Greenburgh, creating a tremendous opportunity. In order to respond to market trends and reinvigorate Central Park Avenue, the Town of Greenburgh must put in place policies and regulations to respond. The study outlines a twenty-four month plan that will help implement the study recommendations.
2. Purpose of Report

The Central Park Avenue corridor was last studied in the 1970s when the Central Park Avenue Mixed Use Impact (CA) District was established in the zoning code. While the zone has, for the most part, worked well for the Town, economic conditions have changed and the area warrants an updated analysis that examines current and projected physical and market conditions.

The purpose of this report is to assess the current competitiveness of Central Park Avenue as a corridor for destination retail. Along with routes 9A and 119, Central Park Avenue is a major retail area for the Town of Greenburgh outside of the villages.

This report discusses the analyses performed by Fairweather Consulting as part of the Comprehensive Plan and presents the results of the data analysis along with a summary of the findings. It concludes with an action plan for Central Park Avenue, identifying key steps to be taken and making recommendations regarding the parties that should be responsible for those steps.

2.1 Databases Used

In order to examine the market characteristics of areas surrounding the Central Park Avenue corridor, Fairweather Consulting used data compiled by Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI), a leading provider of geographic data and GIS. The ESRI database is a commercial database that provides estimates for consumer demographics and trends that are derived from Census data and the US Bureau of Economic Analysis Consumer Expenditure Survey. In addition, the LoopNet commercial real estate database (www.loopnet.com) was consulted to compare commercial real estate lease rates between Central Park Avenue area and competitive locations.

2.2 Market Areas Included

The figures below illustrate the market areas included in this analysis. Figure 1 shows the location we defined as the center of our analysis—the intersection of Healy Avenue and Central Park Avenue in Greenburgh. As shown in Figure 1, this intersection is approximately half-way along Central Park Avenue between White Plains to the north and Yonkers to the south.
Figure 2 shows Greenburgh’s market area divided into 1.75, 5, and 10-mile radii. While realtors and others often use radii to present market data, ESRI enables that data to be organized by “drive times.” This provides a more intuitive means for understanding the data and their implications. Few lay people think of the area in which they live, work or shop in terms of mile-

![Figure 2. Central Park Avenue Market Area Segmented by Radii.](image)

Source: ESRI, Inc.
base radii. However, virtually everyone can define those areas in terms of drive times. The drive times estimated by ESRI do not necessarily correspond to actual experience of drivers in those areas. However, we have used these “drive times” to approximate different market areas from which the businesses along Central Park Avenue may draw customers or clients. The area ESRI designates as a five-minute drive time is a reasonable approximation of a “neighborhood market” area from which businesses may draw convenience-oriented customers, particularly those who may be able to access the area on foot. The 15-minute drive time provides an approximation of a “local market” that draws customers from Greenburgh and adjacent towns and cities. The 30-minute drive time provides an approximation of a “regional market” area that draws customers from Westchester and Rockland counties, as well as from New York City. The sixty-minute drive time provides an approximation of a “metropolitan market” area that draws customers from the central counties of the New York City metropolitan area. These terms for the market areas will be used throughout this analysis.

Figure 3 portrays the area around Greenburgh segmented into areas within the “neighborhood” market (bounded by the red line), the “local” market (bounded by a green line) and the “regional market” (bounded by the blue line). As shown, the neighborhood market encompasses the neighborhood immediately adjacent to Central Park Avenue, and extends approximately the length of Central Park Avenue between White Plains and Yonkers. The local market includes northern sections of the Bronx, reaches across the Tappan Zee into Rockland County, and also reaches the Connecticut border to the northeast. The regional market as calculated by ESRI reaches as far east as Westport, Connecticut, as far south as Queens (and all of Manhattan) and includes communities along the Palisades from Rockland County south to the northern tip of New Jersey.

The map in Figure 4 includes metropolitan market (bounded by a blue line) which extends east to Hamden, Connecticut and Suffolk County on Long Island, west into Sussex County, NJ and as far north as the southern portions of Dutchess and Ulster counties.
Figure 3. Central Park Avenue Market Area showing neighborhood, local, & regional market areas.

Source: ESRI, Inc.
Figure 4. Central Park Avenue Market Area showing local, regional and metropolitan market areas.
3. Demographic Analysis

3.1 Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Area

Greenburgh is an affluent Town located in a very attractive retail market. When compared to the entirety of Westchester County, New York State, and the United States as a whole, Greenburgh presents a higher median household income, similar median age, and a higher percentage of owner occupied houses. These data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>% Owner-Occupied HHs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$50,007</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>52,944</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>77,856</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh</td>
<td>97,147</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The mapping and database firm ESRI compiles a Market Potential Index (MPI) that measures how likely consumers in a particular area are to purchase a particular good or service. If the MPI for a good or service in a geographic area is equal to 100, the purchasing patterns for consumers in that area are the same as for the entire USA. However, if the MPI is greater than 100, then the consumers in that area are more likely to purchase that good or service than the average American consumer. Conversely, if the MPI is less than 100, then the consumers in that area are less likely to purchase that good or service than the average American consumer. The MPI data clearly indicate that the market surrounding Greenburgh is both densely populated and highly affluent.
3.2 Neighborhood Market Area

The results of the analysis presented below list those goods and services within the neighborhood market area as defined above for which the MPI is over 150 or below 80. In this case, the picture is of an even more upscale demographic, with a median household income of $111,884 and accompanying shopping preferences. For example, they are more than twice as likely as the typical American household to spend over $3,000 on a foreign vacation or take more than 3 domestic plane trips in the past year. At the same time, they are much less likely than the typical American household to purchase gas or cigarettes at a convenience store.

Table 2. Demographics Summary: Neighborhood Market Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Summary: Neighborhood Market Area</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>40,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Adults</td>
<td>31,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>15,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household income</td>
<td>$111,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product/Consumer Behavior</th>
<th>Expected Number of Adults/HHs</th>
<th>Percent of Adults/HHs</th>
<th>MPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations: $3000+</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took 3+ foreign trips by plane in last 3 years</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on domestic vacations: $3000+</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took 3+ domestic trips by plane in last 12 months</td>
<td>5,063</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own any stock</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used full service brokerage firm in last 12 months</td>
<td>3,314</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign travel in last 3 years</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own shares in mutual fund (stock)</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used housekeeper/maID+professional cleaning service in last 12 months</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations last 12 mo: $1000-$2999</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise at club 2+ times per week</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to live theater in last 12 months</td>
<td>8,387</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations last 12 mo: &lt;$1000</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent $2000+ on home PC</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own shares in mutual fund (bonds)</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased MP3 player in last 12 months</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on toys/games in last 12 months: $50-$99</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased CD player in last 12 months</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at convenience store in last 30 days: $40+</td>
<td>7,384</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought gas at convenience store in last 30 days</td>
<td>6,377</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought cigarettes at convenience store in last 30 days</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled by Fairweather Consulting from data provided by ESRI
3.3 Local Market Area

The results of the analysis presented below list those goods and services within the local market area, which constitutes a 5-mile radius of the intersection of Central Park Avenue and Healy Avenue for which the MPI is over 150 or below 80.

Table 2 illustrates the fact that the area within a 5 mile radius of the intersection of Central Park Avenue and Healy Avenue is densely populated (with an estimated population of 253,222) and has a median household income of $102,667, twice the US median. Their shopping preferences clearly reflect an affluent lifestyle. These individuals are more than 1.5 times likely than the average American consumer to own stocks, as well as shares in mutual funds, spend on vacations both foreign and domestic, and employ the services of a housekeeper, maid, or professional cleaning service. Conversely, these individuals are less likely than the average American consumer to purchase a CD player, or spend money at a convenience store.

Table 3. Demographic Summary: Local Market Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Summary: 5-Mile Radius</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>253,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Adults</td>
<td>192,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>94,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$102,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product/Consumer Behavior</th>
<th>Expected Number of Adults/HHs</th>
<th>Percent of Adults/HHs</th>
<th>MPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations: $3000+</td>
<td>19,413</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took 3+ foreign trips by plane in last 3 years</td>
<td>18,463</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on domestic vacations: $3000+</td>
<td>18,117</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took 3+ domestic trips by plane in last 12 months</td>
<td>29,318</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own any stock</td>
<td>28,870</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations last 12 mo: $1000-2999</td>
<td>13,236</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign travel in last 3 years</td>
<td>77,673</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used full service brokerage firm in last 12 months</td>
<td>18,890</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise at club 2+ times per week</td>
<td>34,272</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used housekeeper/maid/professional cleaning service in last 12 months</td>
<td>23,494</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own shares in mutual fund (stock)</td>
<td>27,760</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went to live theater in last 12 months</td>
<td>37,654</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations last 12 mo: &lt;$1000</td>
<td>15,078</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased MP3 player in last 12 months</td>
<td>10,763</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own shares in mutual fund (bonds)</td>
<td>15,864</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased CD player in last 12 months</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at convenience store in last 30 days: $40+</td>
<td>44,451</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought cigarettes at convenience store in last 30 days</td>
<td>15,841</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought gas at convenience store in last 30 days</td>
<td>37,358</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: compiled by Fairweather Consulting from data provided by ESRI
3.4 Regional Market Area

The results of the analysis presented below list those goods and services within the regional market area as defined above for which the MPI is over 150 or below 80. As shown in Table 4, the area within a thirty (30) minute drive time of the intersection of Healy Avenue and Central Park Avenue is densely populated (7.5 million people) with a median household income that is lower than that of the local area, but still affluent at $61,832. However, the relative affluence of residents is at least partially offset by the higher cost of living in the area. While this is not as upscale as the areas in the immediate vicinity of Central Park Avenue, the median household income still exceeds US average by twenty (20) percent and still shows purchasing patterns consistent with that relative affluence.

Table 4. Demographic Summary: Regional Markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Summary: Regional Market Area</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>7,529,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Adults</td>
<td>5,797,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>2,855,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$61,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product/Consumer Behavior</th>
<th>Expected Number of Adults/HHs</th>
<th>Percent of Adults/HHs</th>
<th>MPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Took 3+ foreign trips by plane in last 3 years</td>
<td>422,914</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations: $3000+</td>
<td>395,148</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent on foreign vacations last 12 mo: $1000-2999</td>
<td>340,092</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign travel in last 3 years</td>
<td>2,039,622</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought any kitchen appliance in last 12 months</td>
<td>410,128</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH spent $500-$999 on home PC</td>
<td>396,446</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopped at convenience store in last 6 months</td>
<td>2,738,031</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have home mortgage (1st)</td>
<td>732,641</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently carry any life insurance</td>
<td>2,242,014</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought gasoline in last 6 months</td>
<td>3,874,986</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased 1 DVD in last 30 days</td>
<td>234,485</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH owns/leases any vehicle</td>
<td>1,879,417</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH owns 4+ TVs</td>
<td>432,649</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry homeowner insurance</td>
<td>2,144,385</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food/drive-in last 6 mo: take-out/curb thru</td>
<td>2,029,641</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any home improvement in last 12 months</td>
<td>598,269</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at convenience store in last 30 days: $40+</td>
<td>1,228,127</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH owns any pet</td>
<td>777,520</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought cigarettes at convenience store in last 30 days</td>
<td>498,680</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought/changed motor oil</td>
<td>1,948,682</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH owns any cat</td>
<td>381,870</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH owns any dog</td>
<td>502,527</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bought gas at convenience store in last 30 days</td>
<td>1,001,168</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled by Fairweather Consulting from data provided by ESRI
Figure 5. Major Retail Destinations in Westchester County

3.5 Central Park Avenue in the Regional Retail Market

The area demographics suggest that Central Park Avenue has access to an attractive consumer market. Another way of looking at the situation of Central Park Avenue is in terms of actual and potential competing locations for retail business. First glance shows that Central Park Avenue is in a highly competitive retail market. For example, Figure 5 provides a map of major retail destinations in Westchester County as compiled by the Westchester County Planning Department. It shows that Central Park Avenue is in the midst of a high concentration of retail activity, with clusters of retail operations just to the north in White Plains and just to the south in Yonkers. White Plains has significantly increased its retail capacity with the emergence of the City Center Development. Ridge Hill in Yonkers, a 1.2 million-square-foot mixed-use project, together with the approved 200,000 sq. ft. expansion (commercial and hotel) of the Cross County Shopping Center have the potential to draw revenues from Central Park Avenue merchants.

One way of quantifying the nature and extent of competition in the retail market is to weigh the competition from other stores (the supply side) versus the potential retail demand to define the extent and nature of unmet demand. This is done through a process known as “surplus and leakage” analysis.

4. Surplus & Leakage Analysis

Surplus and leakage analysis involves the following approach: For each category of retail stores, the analysis shows current sales by existing stores. This is the “supply” of retail stores in that category for that geographic area. Second, for each category of good or service, the analysis provides an estimate of current purchases by residents given the income levels and demographics of shoppers in that geographic area. This represents the “demand” by residents for goods in that retail category for that geographic area.

Finally, the analysis uses the difference between “supply” and “demand” to identify the extent to which “leakage” or “surplus” exists in that retail category for that geographic area. Leakage exists if the estimates for current purchases by residents in that category are greater than the estimated sales by existing stores of that type in the market area. This means that the local demand is being met by stores outside the geographic area. That is, sales are “leaking” out of the local market and into other areas. For each retail category, ESRI estimates leakage as a percentage of total retail activity in that category and assigns it a score between 0 and 100 percent.

On the other hand, surplus exists if the estimates of current resident purchases for a good or service is less than sales by existing stores of that type in that market area. It means that the retail stores in that sector are selling more than would be supported by the local residents. Consequently, those stores are likely to be serving demand from outside the area. For each retail category, ESRI estimates surplus as a percentage of total retail activity in that category and—to distinguish it from leakage—assigns it a negative score between 0 and -100 percent.

It is typical for there to be a lot of leakage within a small market area, which means that
local shoppers are traveling outside of the area for goods and services. This is true of Greenburgh. A great deal of leakage is also visible at the regional level. However, in a typical situation, leakage is reduced when enough geography is analyzed to include major retail centers. For example, it is not unusual for a small geographic area to contain substantial residential demand for durable goods such as home furnishings or appliances. Yet stores that sell such wares tend to be concentrated in retail destinations. Shoppers are typically willing to travel thirty minutes or more to make such purchases.

The analysis of the neighborhood market area may show substantial “leakage” for furniture or appliances. All of which suggests an opportunity for a new furniture or appliance store in the local area. This can be misleading. When the analysis is extended to a larger geographic area (e.g., the regional market area), the new territory tends to include bigger towns that have furniture show rooms or appliance stores. The leakage that appeared at the neighborhood level disappears when the analysis is extended to a regional level. Once the analysis is extended that way, it typically indicates that the actual market opportunities available in that smaller area tend to be limited to specialty niches (the larger retail centers found within the region are soaking up all of the “leakage” that shows up in the analysis of the neighborhood

**Figure 6. Surplus & Leakage for Central Park Avenue for the Neighborhood Market**
This is not the case in Greenburgh where, even in the metropolitan market area, there is substantial leakage and not many sectors with surplus conditions (Figure 8). This is because, even as the drive-time analysis is extended beyond 5-minutes from Central Park Avenue, it encompasses a greater number of affluent consumers as well as more retail outlets. This analysis suggests that the potential local, regional, and metropolitan opportunities are large enough so that Central Park Avenue is able to compete for virtually any type of retail opportunity. Indeed the existing array of stores (which range from restaurants and specialty shops to major durable goods dealers are evidence of this. Detailed results of the “surplus/leakage” analysis for Central

**Figure 7. Surplus & Leakage for Central Park Avenue for the Regional Market Area.**

![Surplus/Lackage Chart](image)

Source: ESRI, Inc.
Park Avenue are presented below for the neighborhood, regional and metropolitan market areas. In Figures 6 through 8, measures of surplus are represented by red bars; measures of leakage are shown as green bars.

4.1 Neighborhood Market Area

Within the neighborhood market area, there is a lot of leakage, with only a handful of sectors including shoe stores, furniture stores, full service restaurants, clothing stores, department stores, book, periodical and music stores, and sporting goods, hobby, and musical instrument stores experiencing a surplus. (See Figure 6.)

Figure 8. Surplus & Leakage for Central Park Avenue for the metropolitan market area.
4.2 Regional Market Area

While there is still a great deal of leakage within the regional market area, the number of industries experiencing surpluses are more numerous than at the local level. In addition to the surpluses seen at the local level, at the regional level surpluses can be seen in electronics and appliance stores, health and personal care stores, jewelry, luggage and leather goods stores, and used merchandise stores. (See Figure 7.)

4.3 Metropolitan Market Area

Even for the metropolitan market area, Greenburgh experiences substantial leakage (Figure 8), and not many surplus conditions. As within the market area, surpluses are seen in health and personal care stores, clothing stores, shoe stores, jewelry, luggage and leather goods stores, book, periodical and music stores, department stores, used merchandise stores, and other miscellaneous store retailers.

Even a small percent leakage represents a sizeable opportunity in a market as large as the one in which Central Park Avenue is located. As shown in Figure 8, even a leakage of less than 15 percent in home furnishings stores represents a market opportunity of over $800 million.

Thus the potential local, regional and metro opportunities are large enough so that Central Park Avenue can, and does, compete for virtually any type of retail opportunity. However some caution is advised. For example, it is important to note that, with New York City included in the regional and metropolitan market areas, the analysis shows continual leakage opportunities for autos and auto-related products. In fact, that leakage is most likely a statistical artifact. While New Yorkers show high levels of income, the existence of mass transit in the City itself means that there is less demand for autos and associated products than under normal circumstances. While the model shows substantial leakage it is only because it assumes New Yorkers would spend similar proportions of their income on such products as occurs elsewhere in the United States.

5. Key Findings

The results of the surplus/leakage analysis for the area within neighborhood, regional and metropolitan market areas for Central Park Avenue suggest that Greenburgh is positioned in the midst of a very attractive, competitive retail market. Indeed, the leakage of retail sales for key sectors (even for the metropolitan market area) suggests that Central Park Avenue could be a profitable location for several retail sectors. See Table 5 for an identification of those sectors. More detailed information on the results of the surplus/leakage analysis can be found in the appendices to this report.

For the most part, the selected retail opportunities have been selected because they show leakage at all four drive-times. There are several conditions attached to two of these industry groups. In the case of “building materials, garden equipment and supply stores (industry code 444 in the North American Industrial Classification System--NAICS),” the opportunities may
### Table 5. Potential Retail Opportunities for Central Park Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Group</th>
<th>Potential Retail Opportunities for Central Park Avenue</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail Gap</td>
<td>Leakage/Supplies Factor</td>
<td>Retail Gap</td>
<td>Leakage/Supplies Factor</td>
<td>Retail Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishings Stores (NAICS 4422)</strong></td>
<td>$151,484</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$134,121,157</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>$209,156,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Material &amp; Supplies Dealers (NAICS 4442)</strong></td>
<td>$27,304,094</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>$40,666,600</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>$40,904,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lawn &amp; Garden Equipment &amp; Supplies Stores (NAICS 4442)</strong></td>
<td>$2,131,745</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>$3,545,681</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>$23,957,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food &amp; Beverage Stores (NAICS 445)</strong></td>
<td>$61,795,819</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>$98,136,575</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>$149,869,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grocery Stores (NAICS 4451)</strong></td>
<td>$49,192,147</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$76,512,678</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>$1,442,774,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty Food Stores (NAICS 4453)</strong></td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>$17,428,545</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>$520,798,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beer, Wine, and Liquor Stores (NAICS 4453)</strong></td>
<td>$6,897,005</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>$13,490,055</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>$13,886,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 453)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florists (NAICS 4531)</strong></td>
<td>$1,594,176</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>$1,886,058</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>$32,968,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Supplies, Stationary, and Gift Stores (NAICS 4532)</strong></td>
<td>$2,974,040</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>$57,521,931</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>$433,797,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Services &amp; Drinking Places (NAICS 7229)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Service Restaurants (NAICS 7211)</strong></td>
<td>-$2,739,917</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>-$308,359,163</td>
<td>-81.0</td>
<td>-$2,608,315,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited-Service Eating Places (NAICS 7222)</strong></td>
<td>$10,784,568</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$1,164,277,591</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>$871,955,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Food Services (NAICS 7223)</strong></td>
<td>$42,410,108</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>$331,008,744</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>$33,500,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking Places - Alcoholic Beverages (NAICS 7224)</strong></td>
<td>$10,210,182</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>$312,514,483</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>$206,070,547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by Fairweather Consulting using data from ESRI, Inc.
not be as substantial as the analysis suggests. This is because each of the drive times considered contains substantial urbanized areas. In these locations, the households may not actually be purchasing such items as garden equipment and supplies. Thus, the actual leakage may be less. “Food services and drinking places (NAICS code 722)” is another special case. For that industry, the fact that for the neighborhood, local and regional market areas, surpluses exist (i.e., local restaurants are generating more in sales than local households are spending on dining) may make that industry group even more attractive for Central Park Avenue. This is because the restaurant sector is often strengthened when the local area begins to attract outsiders to dining establishments. The fact that the areas around Central Park Avenue are attracting diners makes the area more attractive to other restaurants, not less. Thus the critical issue for the corridor is to recognize that opportunities exist for the corridor to become more competitive.

5.1 The Opportunity: Making the Overall Corridor More Competitive

The key findings of this analysis do not depend upon the results for any particular type of retail activity. Rather, the analysis shows that Central Park Avenue can, and does, compete for a share of the overall regional retail market. Thus the critical issue for the corridor is not to define particular sectors for which it can compete but to assure that Town policy supports the general approach to commercial development that will enable Central Park Avenue to compete overall in that regional marketplace. The key issue moving forward will be defining Central Park Avenue’s position in this market as it competes for retail activity with these other major retail destinations.

6. Emerging Trends in Retailing

6.1 Market Polarization

In order to fully assess the situation facing the Town of Greenburgh with regard to Central Park Avenue, it is important to understand how the retail industry has changed since the last comprehensive review of Central Park Avenue in the 1970s.

One way to understand how retail has changed in the past three decades is to view it through the lens of the market polarization model. This model was developed by A.H. Pete Mathieu, an advertising and marketing consultant, as a means for helping clients understand what they need to do to compete in any market. The essential tenet of the model, as captured in Figure 9, is that, as markets mature, they polarize among competitors offering either superior quality or lower price. Those competitors in middle of the market have difficulty offering either, and consequently end up losing substantial market share.

6.2 Retail Polarization

Retail itself has undergone market polarization over the last 30 years. For example, approximately 100 years ago, Sears, JC Penney and Montgomery Ward were major national competitors in the general merchandise market. They remained industry leaders throughout the 20th Century. However, during the 1970s, the retail market began to polarize. Premium firms like Talbots and Macy’s entered the national market (followed shortly thereafter by Nordstrom’s and
6.3 The Move Toward “Experience-Based” Retail

Retail locations have undergone a similar polarization since the last study of Central Park Avenue in the 1970s. The “low cost” end of the pyramid features the big box discounters like K-mart, Wal-Mart and various dollar/discount stores. The superior quality offerings are changing the shape and size of retail location.

For example, research conducted by the International Council of Shopping Centers found that baby boomers (i.e., those born between 1945 and 1965) are the least likely to visit a generic mall and that, when they do, they spend less time there during each visit than teens or the elderly. This suggests that retailing and retail development opportunities in the future will be based upon niches and the replacement of obsolete formats and concepts.

---

Table 6 provides an overview of the trend toward “experience-based retail” as the model for premium retail locations.

These trends don’t simply apply to the baby boomers either. New generations of Gen Xs (people born in the 1960s and 70s, ending in the late 1970s to early 80s) and Ys (also known as the Millennial Generation) are shifting their views of shopping centers as well. As a result, retail locations will have to adapt and change to meet the needs of younger shoppers who, “…aren’t interested in just shopping, they want to be entertained.”

Table 6. The Transition to “Experience-based” Retail Future of Retail Property—Online Retailing: The Impact of Click on Brick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Access/popularity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalists</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times when we do</td>
<td>Moments when we might</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store as a warehouse</td>
<td>Store as showroom/theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store as transaction point</td>
<td>Store as an information point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailer power</td>
<td>Consumer/broker/distributor power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Relationship and trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>Value for time coupled with value for money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Excerpted and adapted from Yvonne Court, Future of Retail Property—Online Retailing: The Impact of Click on Brick. (London: British Council of Shopping Centres, 2006).

Thus, the United States approaches a momentous demographic event as the two biggest consumer cohorts, the Baby Boom generation and their children are both moving into a new life phase: Boomers into retirement, Gen Ys into full adulthood. The affect on the retail experience has been and will be profound. As summarized by Anita Kramer in Retail Development, the 2008 publication by the Urban Land Institute: “Centers will become the ‘third place’ in people’s lives, and customers will shop when they go out rather than go out to shop.”

---

Consumers now expect a social or cultural experience when they go out. In order to address these changes, those seeking to create a high-end retail location must change the retail experience. During the 1980s and 1990s, Boomers valued the traditional mall for the “time back” experience. The regional mall provided a mix of department and specialty stores and convenience food that gave harried two-career families an opportunity to accomplish a great deal in a single visit. Now, Boomers recognize that if they want a “time back” benefit, they can shop online. The retail environment must change to offer Boomers a new, and more appealing, experience. Thus the keys to success lie in remaking existing centers to create a stimulating and entertaining environment that people want to be a part of, and in building highly focused new centers targeted to niche and emerging market segments that fit consumer’s lifestyles or the lifestyles that they aspire to.\(^5\)

The shift toward a desire for experience-based retail hasn’t escaped the notice of retail developers (Figure 10). So-called “lifestyle” centers like the Grove in Los Angeles have become popular, while many malls like GCP’s Cumberland Mall in Atlanta have been redeveloped with a lifestyle component.\(^6\) The retail centers that are succeeding are those that are responding to consumers’ increased use of the Internet to select or even buy products by capitalizing on this aspect of shopping and continually adapting to the public’s taste in social settings, the need for community, and the search for entertainment. Examples of such environments are outdoor public spaces and clusters of restaurants and movie theatres that have become successful, established anchors in the last ten years.\(^7\)

Despite the current slowing in the pace of retail development as a result of unfavorable market conditions, the long-term prospects are for continued growth. Population growth, along with increasing density in existing urban areas outside of Greenburgh through redevelopment and infill, the urbanization of suburban communities, and further development of planned communities will increase.

As illustrated in Figure 11, this is the crux of the challenge now facing Central Park Avenue. Zoning for the corridor (the Central Park Avenue Mixed-use Impact—CA—District) has been in effect for over twenty years, including amendments in the 1980s and in 2005. At that

\(^5\)Kramer, Anita et al., *Retail Development*, Urban Land Institute, 2008.


\(^7\)Kramer, Anita et al., *Retail Development*, Urban Land Institute, 2008.
time, retail was dominated by the old large-scale general merchandise model. The preferred form was large, stand-alone buildings surrounded by a sea of parking. At that time, this was considered the essential formula for a successful retail district. As the review of industry trends illustrates, the emergence of “experience-based” retail has dramatically changed the requirements for premium retail real estate. But, as shown in Figure 11, Central Park Avenue is currently stuck in the old model. This does not mean that Central Park Avenue is suffering undue economic distress or plagued by vacancies (other than those attributable to the current hard economic times). It does mean that the corridor is underperforming economically. Policies for the corridor could be revised to make it a more conducive home for “experience-based” retail, thereby increasing both the property values and economic vitality of the corridor.

6.4 The Role of the Office Market along Central Park Avenue

This analysis does not consider the office market separate from the considerations given to mixed-used development and “experience-based retail.” This was done for two reasons:

1. Part of creating the nodes that would create the “experience-based” atmosphere in development would be to integrate office spaces within the overall development. Thus, the promotion of mixed-use development would involve creation of new office space along the corridor as an ancillary to the retail and residential uses also involved in this type of development.

2. All indications are that, for the foreseeable future, the demand for office space is likely to remain modest at best. Some of this is due to the increasing productivity in the service sector. As information technology allows more and more work to be done by offices with smaller and smaller staffs, the demand for office space will remain modest, even as the economy recovers. This, coupled with an aging population and increasing retirements among service workers, should dampen long-term demand for office space.

Even if the office market should rebound robustly, it would create even greater opportunities for mixed use development along Central Park Avenue. Thus, whether demand for office space remains modest or even surprisingly picks up, it is best treated as part of this larger mixed-used approach.

---

The type of built form that is currently encouraged along Central Park Avenue in the CA zoning district.

The type of built form required for “experience-based” retail.
7. Recommendations

Central Park Avenue is in the midst of a sizeable high-end market, suggesting (one might say, even requiring) that Greenburgh should seek to position the corridor to compete on the high end of the retail market as a premium location for “experience-based” retail. By positioning Central Park Avenue as a premium location, Greenburgh should be able to maximize the economic vitality of the corridor, contributing to the community’s quality of life while generating property and sales taxes to help support the costs of providing Town services. This analysis has focused almost exclusively on retail potential. But, as has been discussed, positioning Central Park Avenue as a premium retail location will involve creating a mix of uses as part of a compelling experience.

7.1 How Central Park Avenue Can Accommodate and Compete for “Pedestrian Oriented and Experience-based” Retail

Based upon the market analysis and tracking emerging trends in the retail market, this section outlines specific steps Unincorporated Greenburgh can take in order to compete on the high-end of the retail market. To provide opportunities for pedestrian oriented and experience-based retail, Unincorporated Greenburgh should promote a higher quality of mixed-uses along Central Park Avenue. A neo-traditional “downtown-style” development pattern supporting a variety of smaller footprint uses in close proximity, fosters greater interaction among uses (and patrons of those uses) that creates the consumer experience essential for successful high-end retail. The primary component of facilitating compact, pedestrian oriented development in this corridor will be through innovative zoning regulations. Based upon the market analysis and tracking emerging trends in the retail market, this section outlines specific steps Unincorporated Greenburgh can take in order to compete on the high-end of the retail market.

1. **Mixed-Use Development:** Current regulations in the Central Park Avenue corridor promote single-use, non integrated, and pedestrian unfriendly environments which separate businesses from their customers. Mixed-use development on a single site, containing residential, commercial and office components, is not currently allowed in the CA District. Restrictive controls such as these hinder the development and redevelopment of parcels in the corridor. Residential units require a minimum of two (2) acres per site and cannot be combined with commercial and/or office uses. In several sections of Central Park Avenue, existing buildings with apartments above retail at the street line in the traditional main street model are deemed non-conforming. The expansion of mixed-use buildings of this variety can complement those that already exist by creating a higher quality of consistent architectural frontages, providing a built in customer base, and fostering a greater range of housing type.

**Recommendation:** Identify areas in the Central Avenue Corridor that have the potential for a better mix of uses.
2. **Mixed-Use Development Standards and Design Principles:** Generally, mixed-use development incorporates the following principles:

- Develop according to a coherent mixed-use concept plan that physically integrates different uses, including retail space, residential uses, hotels, offices, or civic and cultural facilities;

- Incorporate a mix of land uses that is either “vertical” (where components are mixed within a single building or block such as homes on top floors with retail on bottom), or “horizontal” (where different activities on the site are in separate buildings, but linked through a cohesive design).

- Provide internal connected streets and sidewalks that allow safe and direct access between buildings, and accommodate pedestrians in a safe manner.

- Locate and orient development around a central public space, such as a plaza or park.

- Develop detailed plans that address transportation issues, vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and funding for public improvements that support mixed-use development.

**Recommendation:** Develop a comprehensive set of Mixed-Use Development Standards and Design Principles to guide zoning regulations on Central Park Avenue commercial corridors.

3. **Density:** Greenburgh defines Floor Area Ratio (FAR) as the gross floor area divided by the lot area. Along Central Park Avenue the FAR for existing uses within the CA Mixed Use Impact zone varies from .10 to .45 (10 percent to 45 percent). For example, a 100,000 sq. ft. property used for retail would have a .1 FAR and the allow for a 10,000 sq. ft. building on the property. FARs for neo-traditional style of development, which promotes walkable neighborhoods that contain a range of housing and job types, can run twice as high as currently allowed (0.3). However, if density were increased along all of Central Park Avenue, it would likely overwhelm existing infrastructure and diminish the high quality consumer experience that is the basis of this approach. In addition, simply allowing increased density will not foster pedestrian oriented development. Selectively utilizing recommendations from this report will be a key component to realizing the potential of the corridor.

**Recommendation:** Consider reconstituting Central Park Avenue as a series of more intense nodes. Overlay zones at key identified nodes could build a stronger sense of place and provide an enhanced retail experience. These zones could include mixed-use buildings of residential units, commercial and office space and contain amenities currently lacking in the corridor such as public plaza space, enhanced pedestrian connections and better concealed parking facilities.

**Recommendation:** In other portions of Central Park Avenue, review allowable density...
(Floor Area Ratio) to evaluate if existing requirements hinder redevelopment and enhanced site design.

4. **Parking:** Experience-based retail is impossible in settings where each individual building is surrounded by a sea of parking (cf. Figure 11). Greenburgh’s current parking requirements may be preventing restaurants and smaller footprint retail uses from being included in new development along Central Park Avenue.

   **Recommendation:** Review current parking requirements to evaluate if more flexible standards (shared parking, parking maximums) are feasible.

5. **Access Management:** As a retail destination, Greenburgh is competing with locations in Connecticut and New Jersey, not just Westchester County. Therefore it is essential that shoppers seeking to come to Central Park Avenue can traverse it with maximum ease. Consequently, the Town should ensure that it adopts state of the art access management measures for Central Park Avenue. Access management measures include the promotion of internal secondary access roads in and among parcels, shared curb cuts among adjacent parcels, increased use of transit along the corridor and other similar measures.

   **Recommendation:** Promote access management along the Central Park Avenue Corridor.

6. **Generic Environmental Impact Statements (GEIS):** Under the State Environment Quality Review (SEQR) process, GEIS can be used to encourage development that a municipality prefers.

Under SEQR, the Town can use the GEIS to identify and, if necessary, mitigate any environmental concerns regarding redevelopment of the Central Park Avenue corridor proactively, rather than waiting for a proposal from a private developer. This has two benefits: It reduces the development costs for the applicant since to comply with SEQR, they need only demonstrate that their project is in compliance with the already completed GEIS. Second, by completing the GEIS in advance, the Town can set the terms and conditions for projects to win SEQR approval throughout the corridor. In that sense, the GEIS provides for a single comprehensive review, and a public process to address community concerns with specific types of development without unduly delaying
individual projects.

**Recommendation:** Use Generic Environmental Impact Statements (GEIS) to encourage redevelopment along commercial corridors in areas targeted through the Town’s Comprehensive Plan.

7. **Specific Area Plans:** Mixing land uses often means developing commercial uses next to or within residential areas. It can also mean developing housing at low to high densities. This can be difficult when neighbors’ concerns about traffic, parking, noise, building design, and other compatibility issues, outweigh the merits of the proposal. A specific area plan can help in addressing neighborhood issues, particularly those related to redevelopment or increased development densities. Specific area plans provide a policy framework for land use, transportation, and public improvements, and may include design guidelines, overlay zones, and public amenity requirements. They are developed through a public planning process that involves property owners, neighbors, and the local government.

**Recommendation:** Develop “Specific Area Plans” that provide a policy framework for land use, transportation, and public improvements, and may include design guidelines, overlay zones, and public amenity requirements.

8. **Non Land-Use Considerations:** In addition to land-use policies there are other steps the Town can take to reposition Central Park Avenue. It is important that merchants and property owners along Central Park Avenue have a vehicle to make their needs known to Town government. It is therefore recommended that the Town promote the creation of a Central Park Avenue Association of merchants and property owners to support this effort. If the Central Park Avenue Association proves to be valuable to the corridor’s stakeholders, it may be possible to create a Central Park Avenue Business Improvement District.

As part of this analysis, an inventory has been created of local organizations outside Town government that have economic development and/or planning responsibilities that may relate to Central Park Avenue. That inventory is included as an appendix to this report. While it identifies several agencies that have important roles to play in the overall development of Westchester County and the Town of Greenburgh, there is no one agency or organization specifically intended to foster development of the Central Park Avenue commercial corridor. Thus, creating the Central Park Avenue Association and finding a funding source for an ombudsman office should be considered as part of the implementation plan for Central Park Avenue. It may be possible to create such an office through cooperation with the County’s Small Business Development Center or the Senior Core of Retire Executives (SCORE) program. It is recommended that as part of overall implementation of these recommendations, the Town Board appoint a Central Park Avenue task force to oversee both the changes in land-use regulations and other steps needed to reposition Central Park Avenue.

**Recommendation:** Promote the creation of a Central Park Avenue Association of
merchants and property owners to support any redevelopment effort along the corridor.

8. Implementation Plan

Market demand and sustainable planning practices have coincided in Greenburgh, creating a tremendous opportunity. In order to respond to market trends and reinvigorate Central Park Avenue, the Town of Greenburgh must put in place policies and regulations that promote a higher quality of mixed uses. This will require an implementation plan that assigns specific tasks to stakeholders. These are detailed below in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Time Frame for Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a Central Park Avenue Task Force consisting of stakeholders and other volunteers interested in implementing recommendations (includes subcommittees for zoning review and for capacity-building)</td>
<td>Town Board &amp; Department of Community Development and Conservation</td>
<td>Within six months of adoption of Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore creation of Central Park Avenue Association</td>
<td>Capacity building subcommittee</td>
<td>Within 12 months of adoption of Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Central Park Avenue zoning regulations &amp; recommendation of new “experience-based” zoning regulations and design guidelines</td>
<td>Zoning review subcommittee &amp; Department of Community Development and Conservation</td>
<td>Within 24 months of adoption of Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enactment of new zoning for Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>Town Board</td>
<td>Within 24 months of adoption of Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of ombudsman office or other advocacy capacity for Central Park Avenue corridor</td>
<td>Capacity building subcommittee (possibly in cooperation with the SBDC or SCORE)</td>
<td>Within 24 months of adoption of Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create GEIS for key locations along Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>Town Board</td>
<td>Within 12 months of adoption of new zoning for corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report Appendices
Appendix A. List of Economic and Planning Related Organizations

Senior Core of Retired Executives (SCORE)

Chapter 306, the Westchester, New York chapter of SCORE with some 40 men and women counselors each with many years of business experience. All our counselors are volunteers and there is never a fee for our consultations. Clients may return for further consultations as often as they feel that the meetings are useful. SCORE is a resource partner of the Small Business Administration of the United States Government. There are 389 Chapters totaling 10,500 members throughout the country. The Westchester chapter was chosen Chapter of the Year in 2001.

Westchester SCORE can also provide executive volunteers to speak to any size group on any business related subject, starting or growing a business, how to take a concept to successful fruition. Tell us your need and we will supply an executive volunteer who can address that need.

Hours and locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Office</td>
<td>Mon-Fri</td>
<td>9-12N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rochelle Library</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>6-8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Plains Library</td>
<td>Tues-Wed</td>
<td>6:30-8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonkers Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Tues</td>
<td>2-5pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.scorewestchester.com/

New York State Small Business Development Center (SBDC)

If you or your business reside in New York, the SBDC can maneuver you around the obstacles to success. Through direct counseling, we provide a range of management and technical assistance services.

Here are some examples of the types of assistance provided:
- business plan development or redesign
- accounting
- exporting for small business
- marketing
- financial planning
- cost-analysis
- workshops and seminars
- legal business structures
- construction management
- loan packaging
• management reorganization
• Internet commerce
• entering international markets
• employee management

Address:
Rockland Community College
Brucker Hall #6101
Suffern, NY 10901-3699

Phone: (845)356-6065
Fax: (845)356-6117
Hrs. of Operation: M - F 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM

Outreach Offices:
White Plains Outreach
White Plains Outreach SBDC
108 Corporate Park Drive/Ste 101
White Plains, NY 10604
Phone: (914)948-2110

Source: http://www.nyssbdc.org/centers/centers.cfm?centid=16

Westchester County Office of Economic Development

The Office of Economic Development and Team Westchester, a partnership of public and private professionals, offers business resources, financial assistance, and a wide range of related services and incentives to help businesses prosper in Westchester County. They played a major role in:
Working with companies who will create over 600 new jobs across all industries — particularly in targeted clusters — in Westchester County

Keeping businesses in Westchester County, resulting in the retention of 900 jobs
Constructing, leasing, or sub-leasing more than 900,000 square feet of commercial/industrial space in Westchester County

Source: http://www.westchestergov.com/business.htm

Westchester County Industrial Development Agency

The Westchester County Industrial Development Agency (IDA) can be an important source of financial assistance to both existing businesses and those relocating. A variety of incentives are available to corporations and small companies, as well as educational institutions, libraries, affordable housing developments, and other non-profit organizations.
More than 100 organizations and companies have sought and received benefits totaling more than $200 million in the past 25 years. While large corporations have certainly been represented, many of the benefits have gone to firms with fewer than 25 employees.

Depending upon an organization’s growth needs, the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, equipping and/or furnishing of certain manufacturing, commercial, R&D and not-for-profit projects can be funded from the proceeds of taxable and tax-exempt securities issued by the IDA. The agency can also provide exemptions from use and sales taxes for certain pre-approved expenditures related to construction, furnishings, business equipment and related capital improvements.

In accordance with the 2005 Public Authorities Accountability Act, the Agency has adopted By-laws, a Code of Ethics, Whistle Blower Policy, Investment Policy, and Property Disposition Policy. The IDA follows the County's Procurement Policy, when applicable. The IDA files an annual report to the Office of the New York State Comptroller, as well as semi-annual reports to the New York State Authority Budget Office. Click here to review the 2008 Budget Report to the Authority Budget Office. A complete roster of our Annual and Budget Reports of the New York State Authority Budget Office as well as our most recent Independent Financial Audits may be found here.

Source: http://www.westchester.gov/economic/IDASite/index.html

**The Westchester Rockland Revolving Loan Fund**

The Fund is geared specifically for small businesses who have been denied traditional bank loans. Businesses may borrow from $2,500 up to a maximum amount of $30,000. Technical assistance and counseling from a related agency, NYSBDC, or SCORE, is required. For more information, please contact the Office of Economic Development at (914)995-2988. Click here to download a copy of the Westchester Rockland Revolving Loan Fund Application. All submissions should include a copy of the SBA Form 413 - Personal Financial Statement.

Source: http://www.westchester.gov/economic/doing_business/bus_assist-loan.asp

**Community Capital Resources (CCR)**

CCR is a not-for-profit Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) established in 1989 to bring financial, technical and educational resources to affordable housing and community and economic development initiatives in the lower Hudson Valley. We achieve these objectives through a variety of programs including: affordable housing lending; support for micro-businesses including grants, loans and technical assistance; and the encouragement of asset building for low-income families and communities through our financial literacy education program, our support of Volunteer Income Tax Assistance and our Individual Development
Account program.

Formerly known as the Westchester Housing Fund, we have recently changed our name to reflect our growing menu of programs and our expanded service area that now includes Dutchess, Orange, Putnam, Rockland, Sullivan and Ulster counties in the lower Hudson Valley.

Community Capital Resources is an SBA Microlender. Through its Enterprise Fund, Community Capital Resources offers small business loans, with competitive rates that are perfect for new and emerging businesses, that have difficulty meeting the credit or collateral requirements of a conventional lender. Typical Loans range from $500 to $25,000 at affordable interest rates.

Loan uses include:

• Materials • Inventory • Equipment • Marketing • Licensing • Working Capital

Eligibility Requirements:

• Borrowers must complete a business plan
• Be the principal owner of the business
• Be at least 21 years of age
• Own a business based in Dutchess, Putnam, Rockland or Westchester Counties.

Source: http://www.ccrhv.org/

Westchester County Planning Department

The Planning Department conducts a comprehensive work program and shapes and influences growth and development in Westchester County in order to improve quality of life and protect the environment, resulting in more livable and sustainable communities.

Three of the five specialized sections of the department – Land Use and Development, Housing and Environmental Planning – focus on the initiatives that carry out this mission. They utilize the technical expertise of the department’s two other sections – Design and Administration – to produce quality products and plans in the most cost-effective manner for county residents.

Activities within each section focus on the pattern of development, the natural environment and ways in which buildings, transportation and open space can be shaped or utilized to achieve a physical environment that fosters smart growth for Westchester County. The department staff works closely with other county departments, elected and appointed officials and staff of the 45 municipalities and private and non-profit businesses and organizations.

The work program includes activities that are mandated by the county charter, New York State and the federal governments. These include the review of certain proposed land use and zoning actions by municipalities, review of county capital projects and the environmental review (SEQR
or NEPA) of all county projects and legislative actions.

Appendix B. Detailed Data from Surplus/Leakage Analysis

SURPLUS/LEAKAGE AT 5-MINUTE DRIVE TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Group</th>
<th>Demand (Retail Potential)</th>
<th>Supply (Retail Sales)</th>
<th>Leakagae/Surplus (Demand - Supply)</th>
<th>Number of Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle &amp; Parts Dealers (NAICS 4411)</td>
<td>$1,297,540</td>
<td>$1,185,097</td>
<td>$12,443</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Motor Vehicle Dealers (NAICS 4412)</td>
<td>$1,297,540</td>
<td>$1,185,097</td>
<td>$12,443</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parts, Accessories, and Tire Stores (NAICS 4413)</td>
<td>$1,297,540</td>
<td>$1,185,097</td>
<td>$12,443</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishings Stores (NAICS 4421)</td>
<td>$42,570,849</td>
<td>$51,932,737</td>
<td>$9,361,888</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Stores (NAICS 4422)</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$12,500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings Stores (NAICS 4422)</td>
<td>$19,870,000</td>
<td>$19,396,000</td>
<td>$484,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliance Stores (NAICS 4431/NAICS 4431)</td>
<td>$49,271,261</td>
<td>$39,754,234</td>
<td>$9,517,027</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Box Stores, Market, &amp; Super Supply Stores (NAICS 4441)</td>
<td>$37,631,250</td>
<td>$8,327,511</td>
<td>$29,496,739</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material and Suppliers Dealers (NAICS 4411)</td>
<td>$33,874,281</td>
<td>$6,509,287</td>
<td>$27,364,994</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn and Garden Equipment and Supplies Stores (NAICS 4442)</td>
<td>$3,749,969</td>
<td>$1,618,224</td>
<td>$2,131,745</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage Stores (NAICS 4451)</td>
<td>$184,253,618</td>
<td>$122,547,800</td>
<td>$61,705,818</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores (NAICS 4452)</td>
<td>$150,786,363</td>
<td>$119,586,216</td>
<td>$31,200,147</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Food Stores (NAICS 4451)</td>
<td>$7,943,500</td>
<td>$3,607,250</td>
<td>$4,336,250</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer, Wine, &amp; Liquor Stores (NAICS 4453)</td>
<td>$15,261,098</td>
<td>$8,344,091</td>
<td>$6,917,007</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal Care Stores (NAICS 4461/NAICS 4461)</td>
<td>$42,574,532</td>
<td>$26,247,074</td>
<td>$16,326,458</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Stations (NAICS 4471/NAICS 4471)</td>
<td>$58,396,172</td>
<td>$29,658,026</td>
<td>$28,738,146</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Accessories Stores (NAICS 4481)</td>
<td>$64,390,184</td>
<td>$111,658,877</td>
<td>$47,605,093</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Stores (NAICS 4481)</td>
<td>$53,940,250</td>
<td>$82,422,511</td>
<td>$28,482,261</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Stores (NAICS 4482)</td>
<td>$8,353,440</td>
<td>$2,777,695</td>
<td>$5,575,745</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry, Luggage, &amp; Leather Goods Stores (NAICS 4483)</td>
<td>$9,455,937</td>
<td>$3,857,061</td>
<td>$5,602,876</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores (NAICS 4451)</td>
<td>$14,010,850</td>
<td>$18,769,651</td>
<td>$4,758,793</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods/Hobby/Musical Instrument Stores (NAICS 4511)</td>
<td>$9,291,102</td>
<td>$12,914,933</td>
<td>$3,623,831</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book, Periodical, and Music Stores (NAICS 4512)</td>
<td>$4,276,756</td>
<td>$5,856,718</td>
<td>$1,580,962</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 4442)</td>
<td>$57,910,768</td>
<td>$38,263,538</td>
<td>$19,647,230</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Stores Excluding Leased Dept. (NAICS 4521)</td>
<td>$29,457,157</td>
<td>$28,195,766</td>
<td>$1,261,391</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 4529)</td>
<td>$37,453,629</td>
<td>$19,659,742</td>
<td>$17,833,887</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 453)</td>
<td>$18,849,383</td>
<td>$19,176,439</td>
<td>$8,673,944</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florists (NAICS 453)</td>
<td>$2,571,131</td>
<td>$709,555</td>
<td>$1,861,576</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies, Stationery, and Gift Stores (NAICS 4532)</td>
<td>$8,190,990</td>
<td>$5,219,970</td>
<td>$2,971,020</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Merchandise Stores (NAICS 4535)</td>
<td>$1,092,160</td>
<td>$421,361</td>
<td>$670,799</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 4539)</td>
<td>$6,865,112</td>
<td>$3,747,153</td>
<td>$3,117,959</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore Retailers (NAICS 454)</td>
<td>$53,612,053</td>
<td>$9,614,197</td>
<td>$43,997,856</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Shopping &amp; Mail-Order Houses (NAICS 4541)</td>
<td>$30,198,117</td>
<td>$59,191</td>
<td>$30,099,926</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machine Operators (NAICS 4542)</td>
<td>$5,112,374</td>
<td>$1,421,231</td>
<td>$3,691,143</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Selling Establishments (NAICS 4533)</td>
<td>$21,711,562</td>
<td>$9,517,916</td>
<td>$12,193,646</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services &amp; Drinking Places (NAICS 7221)</td>
<td>$139,737,521</td>
<td>$108,682,180</td>
<td>$41,055,341</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Service Restaurants (NAICS 7221)</td>
<td>$57,268,494</td>
<td>$49,934,614</td>
<td>$7,333,880</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited-Service Eating Places (NAICS 7222)</td>
<td>$53,568,564</td>
<td>$51,803,996</td>
<td>$1,764,568</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Food Services (NAICS 7223)</td>
<td>$50,626,974</td>
<td>$7,816,866</td>
<td>$42,809,108</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Places - Alcoholic Beverages (NAICS 7224)</td>
<td>$10,317,286</td>
<td>$10,734</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Note: Supply (retail sales) estimates sales to consumers by establishments. Sales to businesses are excluded. Demand (retail potential) estimates the expected amount spent by consumers at retail establishments. Supply and demand estimates are in current dollars. The Leaksage/Surplus Factor presents a snapshot of the retail opportunity. It is a measure of the relationship between supply and demand that ranges from +100 (total surplus) to -100 (total surplus). A positive value represents a surplus of retail sales, a market where consumers are drawn from outside the trade area. The Retail Gap represents the difference between Retail Potential and Retail Sales. ESRI uses the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) to classify businesses by their primary type of economic activity. Retail establishments are classified into 27 industry groups in the Retail Trade sector, as well as four industry groups within the Food Services & Drinking Establishments subsector.
## SURPLUS/LEAKAGE AT 15-MINUTE DRIVE TIME

### Retail MarketPlace Profile

**Prepared by: Fairweather Consulting**  
**Latitude:** 41.042626  
**Longitude:** -73.855411  
**Drive Time:** 15 minutes

### Industry Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Demand (Retail Potential)</th>
<th>Supply (Retail Sales)</th>
<th>Retail Gap (Supply - Demand)</th>
<th>Leakage/Leakage Factor</th>
<th>Number of Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail and Food &amp; Drink (NAICS 44-72)</td>
<td>$13,145,121,101</td>
<td>$8,982,658,466</td>
<td>$4,162,562,635</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail (NAICS 44-45)</td>
<td>$12,656,986,803</td>
<td>$8,982,658,466</td>
<td>$3,674,328,337</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture &amp; Home Furnishings Stores (NAICS 4442)</td>
<td>$903,862,865</td>
<td>$386,869,344</td>
<td>$516,993,521</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Stores (NAICS 44421)</td>
<td>$381,251,765</td>
<td>$220,473,403</td>
<td>$160,818,548</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings Stores (NAICS 44422)</td>
<td>$727,517,089</td>
<td>$148,395,541</td>
<td>$579,121,547</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliance Stores (NAICS 4431/4433)</td>
<td>$587,218,833</td>
<td>$653,919,550</td>
<td>$66,700,717</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials, Garden Equip. &amp; Supplies Stores (NAICS 4441)</td>
<td>$514,781,389</td>
<td>$362,535,728</td>
<td>$152,245,661</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material and Supplies Dealers (NAICS 44411)</td>
<td>$489,153,195</td>
<td>$336,454,399</td>
<td>$152,698,800</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber and Garden Equipment and Supplies Stores (NAICS 4442)</td>
<td>$45,625,187</td>
<td>$36,001,329</td>
<td>$9,624,806</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parts, Accessories, and Tire Stores (NAICS 4414)</td>
<td>$218,794,375</td>
<td>$193,023,362</td>
<td>$25,770,013</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage Stores (NAICS 445)</td>
<td>$2,905,726,089</td>
<td>$1,910,500,513</td>
<td>$995,225,576</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores (NAICS 4451)</td>
<td>$2,485,695,651</td>
<td>$1,726,179,823</td>
<td>$759,515,828</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Food Stores (NAICS 4452)</td>
<td>$161,945,742</td>
<td>$63,236,948</td>
<td>$98,708,794</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer, Wine, and Liquor Stores (NAICS 4453)</td>
<td>$228,684,495</td>
<td>$115,185,932</td>
<td>$113,499,003</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal Care Stores (NAICS 446/445)</td>
<td>$644,671,570</td>
<td>$386,014,595</td>
<td>$258,657,075</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Stations (NAICS 447/444)</td>
<td>$1,485,114,060</td>
<td>$725,054,616</td>
<td>$760,059,444</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores (NAICS 448)</td>
<td>$1,015,588,630</td>
<td>$719,011,416</td>
<td>$296,577,214</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Stores (NAICS 4481)</td>
<td>$799,659,200</td>
<td>$555,801,128</td>
<td>$243,858,072</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Stores (NAICS 4482)</td>
<td>$136,716,150</td>
<td>$106,663,237</td>
<td>$30,052,913</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry, Luggage, and Leather Goods Stores (NAICS 4483)</td>
<td>$79,219,521</td>
<td>$58,487,051</td>
<td>$20,732,470</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores (NAICS 451)</td>
<td>$213,716,444</td>
<td>$159,275,573</td>
<td>$54,440,871</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting and Outdoor Equipment Stores (NAICS 4511)</td>
<td>$141,081,660</td>
<td>$81,571,642</td>
<td>$59,509,813</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book, Periodical, and Music Stores (NAICS 4512)</td>
<td>$723,737,823</td>
<td>$777,510,731</td>
<td>$5,772,908</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 452)</td>
<td>$1,931,908,320</td>
<td>$1,700,730,050</td>
<td>$231,178,270</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Stores Excluding Lumber (NAICS 4521)</td>
<td>$329,186,347</td>
<td>$300,772,945</td>
<td>$28,413,402</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 4529)</td>
<td>$589,825,579</td>
<td>$259,957,905</td>
<td>$330,867,745</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 453)</td>
<td>$269,239,201</td>
<td>$202,271,827</td>
<td>$66,967,374</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florists (NAICS 4531)</td>
<td>$32,981,365</td>
<td>$14,054,816</td>
<td>$18,926,549</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies, Stationery, and Gift Stores (NAICS 4532)</td>
<td>$119,844,150</td>
<td>$61,852,809</td>
<td>$57,991,341</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used Merchandise Stores (NAICS 4533)</td>
<td>$26,235,106</td>
<td>$17,004,301</td>
<td>$9,230,805</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 4539)</td>
<td>$26,925,063</td>
<td>$109,359,501</td>
<td>$82,434,438</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Stores Retailers (NAICS 454)</td>
<td>$714,496,437</td>
<td>$409,279,463</td>
<td>$305,216,974</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Shopping and Mail-Order Houses (NAICS 4541)</td>
<td>$378,816,405</td>
<td>$151,077,153</td>
<td>$227,739,252</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machine Operators (NAICS 4542)</td>
<td>$27,138,984</td>
<td>$12,809,906</td>
<td>$14,329,078</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Selling Establishments (NAICS 4543)</td>
<td>$311,535,046</td>
<td>$235,392,404</td>
<td>$76,142,642</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data Notes:
- Supply (retail sales) estimates sales to consumers by establishments. Sales to businesses are excluded. Demand (retail potential) estimates the expected amount spent by consumers at retail establishments. Supply and demand estimates are in current dollars. The Leakage/Leakage Factor presents a snapshot of retail opportunity. This is a measure of the relationship between supply and demand that ranges from +100 (total leakage) to -100 (total surplus). A positive value represents leakage of retail opportunity outside the trade area. A negative value represents a surplus of retail sales, a market where customers are drawn from outside the trade area. The Retail Gap represents the difference between Retail Potential and Retail Sales. ESPR uses the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) to classify businesses by their primary type of economic activity. Retail establishments are classified into 27 industry groups in the Retail Trade sector, as well as four industry groups within the Food Services & Drinking Establishment sector.
## SURPLUS/LEAKAGE AT 30-MINUTE DRIVE TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Group</th>
<th>Demand (Retail Potential)</th>
<th>Supply (Retail Sales)</th>
<th>Retail Gap</th>
<th>Leakage/Leakage Factor</th>
<th>Number of Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Trade and Food &amp; Drink (NAICS 44-45, 722)</td>
<td>$10,341,220,257</td>
<td>$8,084,220,257</td>
<td>$2,257,000,000</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Trade (NAICS 44-45)</td>
<td>$8,084,220,257</td>
<td>$5,826,220,257</td>
<td>$2,257,000,000</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Food &amp; Drink (NAICS 722)</td>
<td>$16,076,320,257</td>
<td>$16,076,320,257</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industry Summary

- **Motor Vehicle & Parts Dealers (NAICS 441):**
  - Demand: $20,901,477,464
  - Supply: $31,021,722,469
  - Retail Gap: $2,920,400,000
- **Automobile Dealers (NAICS 4431):**
  - Demand: $16,198,993,017
  - Supply: $17,124,993,017
  - Retail Gap: $925,993,017

### Retail MarketPlace Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Drive Time</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Drive Time</th>
<th>30 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Park Ave AT Healy Ave</td>
<td>7,529,244</td>
<td>41.01256</td>
<td>-73.85191</td>
<td>41.01256</td>
<td>73.85191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary Demographics

- **2008 Population:** 7,529,244
- **2008 Households:** 2,858,240
- **2008 Median Disposable Income:** $47,020
- **2008 Per Capita Income:** $36,742

### Industry Summary

- **Total Retail Trade and Food & Drink (NAICS 44-45, 722):**
  - Demand: $10,341,220,257
  - Supply: $8,084,220,257
  - Retail Gap: $2,257,000,000
  - Leakage/Leakage Factor: 22.5
  - Number of Businesses: 2,000
- **Total Food & Drink (NAICS 722):**
  - Demand: $16,076,320,257
  - Supply: $16,076,320,257
  - Retail Gap: $0
  - Leakage/Leakage Factor: 0
  - Number of Businesses: 0

### Greenburgh Comprehensive Plan:

- Central Park Avenue Market Positioning Analysis
- DRAFT

### SURPLUS/LEAKAGE AT 30-MINUTE DRIVE TIME

- **Motor Vehicle & Parts Dealers (NAICS 441):**
  - Demand: $20,901,477,464
  - Supply: $31,021,722,469
  - Retail Gap: $2,920,400,000
- **Automobile Dealers (NAICS 4431):**
  - Demand: $16,198,993,017
  - Supply: $17,124,993,017
  - Retail Gap: $925,993,017

### Data Note:

Supply (retail sales) estimates sales to consumers by establishments. Sales to businesses are excluded. Demand (retail potential) estimates the expected amount spent by consumers at retail establishments. Supply and demand estimates are in current dollars. The Leakage/Leakage Factor presents a snapshot of retail opportunity. This is a measure of the relationship between supply and demand that ranges from 100 (total leakage) to 100 (total surplus). A positive value represents leakage of retail opportunity outside the trade area. A negative value represents a surplus of retail sales, a market where customers are drawn in from outside the trade area.
## SURPLUS/LEAKAGE AT 60-MINUTE DRIVE TIME

### Retail MarketPlace Profile

**Central Avenue**

**Hartsdale, NY 10530**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type:</th>
<th>Drivetime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Summary Demographics

- **2008 Population:** 17,439
- **2008 Households:** 6,316
- **2008 Median Disposable Income:** $50,031
- **2008 Per Capita Income:** $34,564

### Industry Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Group</th>
<th>Demand (Retail Potential)</th>
<th>Supply (Retail Sales)</th>
<th>Retail Gap</th>
<th>Leaks</th>
<th>Number of Businesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Trade and Food &amp; Drink (NAICS 444-45, 722)</td>
<td>$220,144,484,421</td>
<td>$96,153,848,277</td>
<td>$123,990,636</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>135,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Trade (NAICS 444-45)</td>
<td>$198,010,793,203</td>
<td>$166,352,941,120</td>
<td>$31,659,852,083</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>112,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Food &amp; Drink (NAICS 722)</td>
<td>$33,356,687,218</td>
<td>$29,801,843,107</td>
<td>$3,554,844,111</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>46,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Industry Group Demand

- **Motor Vehicle & Parts Dealers (NAICS 441):** $28,436,051,360
- **Automobile Dealers (NAICS 441):** $42,538,322,586
- **Other Motor Vehicle Dealers (NAICS 4412):** $3,041,245,488
- **Auto Parts, Accessories, and Tire Stores (NAICS 4414):** $2,811,620,309
- **Furniture & Home Furnishings Stores (NAICS 442):** $8,608,048,277
- **Furniture Stores (NAICS 4421):** $4,595,545,286
- **Home Furnishings Stores (NAICS 4442):** $4,012,498,019
- **Electronics & Appliance Stores (NAICS 4443/NAICS 4445):** $8,251,692,034
- **Building Materials, Garden Equip. & Supply Stores (NAICS 444):** $7,080,894,661
- **Lawn and Garden Equipment and Supplies Stores (NAICS 4442):** $4,677,019,042
- **Food & Beverage Stores (NAICS 445):** $38,845,535,997
- **Grocery Stores (NAICS 444):** $32,473,991,026
- **Specialty Food Stores (NAICS 4445):** $1,125,670,286
- **Beer, Wine, and Liquor Stores (NAICS 4445):** $3,239,994,529
- **Health & Personal Care Stores (NAICS 4445):** $9,052,696,918
- **Gasoline Stations (NAICS 4447):** $21,434,930,226
- **Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores (NAICS 444):** $15,326,988,600
- **Shoe Stores (NAICS 4442):** $1,744,844,117
- **Jewelry, Luggage, and Leather Goods Stores (NAICS 4443):** $1,334,773,796
- **Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores (NAICS 445):** $3,180,154,946
- **General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 444):** $279,354,503
- **Department Stores (Excluding Leased Dept's) (NAICS 4451):** $4,596,924,561
- **Other General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 4452):** $17,191,430,422
- **Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 445):** $3,890,875,224
- **Florists (NAICS 4452):** $474,991,296
- **Used Merchandise Stores (NAICS 4453):** $275,797,136
- **Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 4453):** $1,412,847,053
- **Nonstore Retailers (NAICS 445):** $1,109,644,219
- **Electronic Shopping and Mail-Order Houses (NAICS 4451):** $6,472,130,041
- **Direct Selling Establishments (NAICS 4453):** $3,899,450,733
- **Food Services & Drinking Places (NAICS 722):** $34,353,897,218
- **Full-Service Restaurants (NAICS 722):** $14,373,473,641
- **Limited-Service Eats (NAICS 72323):** $12,478,230,734
- **Dining Places - Alcoholic Beverages (NAICS 7224):** $2,019,002,022

### Data Notes

- **Supply (Retail Sales):** Estimates sales to consumers by establishments. Sales to businesses are excluded.
- **Demand (Retail Potential):** Estimates the expected amount spent by consumers at retail establishments. Supply and demand estimates are in current dollars. The Leakage/Supply Factor presents a snapshot of retail opportunity. This is a measure of the relationship between supply and demand that ranges from +100 (total leakage) to -100 (total surplus). A positive value represents ‘leakage’ of retail opportunity outside the trade area. A negative value represents a surplus of retail sales, a market where customers are drawn from outside the trade area. The Retail Gap represents the difference between Retail Potential and Retail Sales. ESRI uses the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) to classify businesses by their primary type of economic activity. Retail establishments are classified into 27 industry groups in the Retail Trade Sector, as well as four industry groups within the Food Services & Drinking Establishments subsector.
APPENDIX E

Zoning Map Rezoning Spreadsheet

Appendix E contains 95 separate cut sheets of recommended zoning map amendments covering over 250 individual parcels in unincorporated Greenburgh. Appendix E is referenced on Page 12-7 of the draft Comprehensive Plan and contains recommended zoning map amendments that exhibit conformance with the Comprehensive Plan’s draft future land use Plan. A majority of the recommended zoning changes are the result of zoning boundaries that segment existing lots.
Over the course of 2014, Town Staff coordinated meetings with each school district to provide an overview of the draft Plan. Appendix F includes basic information such as the school district’s name, address, phone number, website address link and school district report card link. As stated on the State Education Department website, the New York State Report Cards provide enrollment, demographic, attendance, suspension, dropout, teacher, assessment, accountability, graduation rate, post-graduate plan, and fiscal data for public and charter schools, districts, and the State.
Ardsley Union Free School District
500 Farm Road, Ardsley, NY 10502
Phone: 914-295-5500 | Fax: 914-295-5976
http://www.ardsleyschools.org/pd/ardsley/index.html

Edgemont Union Free School District
300 White Oak Lane, Scarsdale, NY 10582
Phone: 914-295-5500 | Fax: 914-295-5976
http://www.edgemont.org/www/edgemont/site/hosting/premierdesign/index.html

Elmsford Union Free School District
98 South Goodwin Avenue, Elmsford, NY 10523
Phone: 914-592-8440 | Fax: 914-592-2181
http://eufsd.org/site/default.aspx?PageID=1

Greenburgh Central School District
475 West Hartsdale Avenue, Hartsdale, NY 10530
Phone: 914-761-6000 | Fax: 914-592-2181
http://www.greenburghcsd.org/pages/greenburghcsd

Hastings-on-Hudson Union Free School District
27 Farragut Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, NY 10706
Phone: 914-478-2900
http://www.hohschools.org/site/default.aspx?PageID=1
Irvington Union Free School District
40 North Broadway, Irvington, NY 10533
Phone: 914-591-8500 / Fax: 914-591-6714

http://www.edline.net/pages/Irvington_High_School

Pocantico Hills Central School District
599 Bedford Road
Sleepy Hollow, NY 10591
Phone: 914-631-2440 / Fax: 914-631-3280

http://pocantico.pocantichills.org

Union Free School District of the Tarrytowns
200 N. Broadway
Sleepy Hollow, NY 10591
Phone: 914-631-9404 / Fax: 914-332-6283

http://www.tufsd.org/pages/TUFSD/Schools

Valhalla Union Free School District
316 Columbus Avenue, Valhalla, NY 10595
Phone: 914-683-5040 / Fax: 914-683-5075

http://valhallaschools.org/
APPENDIX G

Tax Rates Per $1,000 of Assessed Value

Appendix G provides information on 2014-2015 School District, 2014 Westchester County, 2014 Greenburgh Town Outside Villages and 2014 Fire/Fire Protection District tax rates per $1,000 of assessed value. All of these taxes are collected by the Town of Greenburgh Tax Receiver.

School Tax Exemptions
The New York State School Tax Relief (STAR) program provides an exemption for owner-occupied, primary residences where the combined income of resident owners and their spouses is $500,000 or less. Basic STAR reduces the assessed value for school tax purposes. This helps the homeowner but doesn’t harm the school district, which is reimbursed by the state.

Senior Citizens with combined incomes that do not exceed $83,300 may qualify for a larger (Enhanced STAR) exemption. The definition of income is the adjusted gross income for federal income tax purposes less any taxable distribution from an Individual Retirement Account.

County and Town Tax Exemptions
County and Town tax exemptions are available to property owners with limited incomes who are senior citizens and/or disabled, to veterans, and to volunteer fire department and ambulance company members.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley UFSD</td>
<td>$735.2926</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgemont UFSD</td>
<td>$668.3601</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmsford UFSD</td>
<td>$578.4639</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh CSD</td>
<td>$493.6167</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings UFSD</td>
<td>$783.3089</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington UFSD</td>
<td>$665.3506</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocantico CSD</td>
<td>$279.1709</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrytown UFSD</td>
<td>$722.3833</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valhalla UFSD</td>
<td>$585.5840</td>
<td>$105.2094</td>
<td>$194.8981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approximately $26 per $1,000 is added to the County Tax for refuse and sewer

**An additional $5.5472 per $1,000 (Consolidated Sewer Maintenance District) is added to the Town Tax Outside Villages
## Appendix G: Tax Rates Per $1,000 of Assessed Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Districts - Greenburgh</th>
<th>Fire District Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>$152.2074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>$114.8317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale</td>
<td>$167.0481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Protection Districts</th>
<th>Fire District Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chauncey</td>
<td>$153.5561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Park</td>
<td>$49.3876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Irvington</td>
<td>$19.6409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville</td>
<td>$38.1636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Elmsford</td>
<td>$24.1643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ardsley</td>
<td>$34.9991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Elmsford</td>
<td>$23.8907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

Parcel Use Breakdown by School District

Appendix H includes a breakdown of parcels by use type (residential, utility, vacant, commercial, etc.) within each of the nine school districts. This information is based on Town of Greenburgh assessment data for the year 2014.

The counts of apartments may include units that are tax exempt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>9,316</td>
<td>9,316</td>
<td>$166,641,896</td>
<td>$162,606,113</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>$2,977,205</td>
<td>$2,872,725</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>3,012</td>
<td>$42,737,519</td>
<td>$39,424,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments (4 Family +)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>$42,737,519</td>
<td>$39,424,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,588,097</td>
<td>$2,588,097</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$67,106,201</td>
<td>$65,477,039</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$19,082,207</td>
<td>$18,450,757</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$66,076,389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,643</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,919</strong></td>
<td><strong>$367,209,514</strong></td>
<td><strong>$291,419,594</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ardsley Union Free School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>$20,738,929</td>
<td>$20,181,594</td>
<td>70.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,450</td>
<td>$15,450</td>
<td>0.054%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>$3,814,732</td>
<td>$3,791,751</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$8,300,411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$275,800</td>
<td>$275,800</td>
<td>0.965%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,348,685</td>
<td>$2,348,685</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,951,055</td>
<td>$1,951,055</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,300,411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,544</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>$37,445,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,564,335</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Edgemont Union Free School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>$52,173,530</td>
<td>$51,704,692</td>
<td>73.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$105,750</td>
<td>$102,753</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>$4,279,633 Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $4,196,926</td>
<td>$4,196,926</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td>$613,432</td>
<td>$613,432</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,644,606</td>
<td>$10,644,606</td>
<td>15.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,705,431</td>
<td>$2,705,431</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,388,606</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,517</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,784</strong></td>
<td><strong>$74,910,988</strong></td>
<td><strong>$69,967,840</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Elmsford Union Free School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>$15,214,418</td>
<td>$14,647,817</td>
<td>54.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$645,370</td>
<td>$614,299</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$307,949</td>
<td>$307,949</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,423,905</td>
<td>$6,381,055</td>
<td>23.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,540,653</td>
<td>$1,540,653</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,025,407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,464</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,772</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,375,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,709,823</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Total # Parcels</td>
<td>Total # Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>Town Taxable</td>
<td>Percentage of Town Taxable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>$55,548,337</td>
<td>$53,674,244</td>
<td>51.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>$1,510,815</td>
<td>$1,462,500</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $25,290,057</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $22,228,576</td>
<td>21.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$794,371</td>
<td>$794,371</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,721,106</td>
<td>$20,562,144</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,238,779</td>
<td>$6,238,779</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22,643,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>$132,746,574</strong></td>
<td><strong>$104,960,614</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hastings-on-Hudson Union Free School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>$2,199,432</td>
<td>$2,164,039</td>
<td>55.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$27,150</td>
<td>$27,150</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,185,265</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,154,504</td>
<td>29.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$75,140</td>
<td>$75,140</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$299,570</td>
<td>$299,570</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$183,002</td>
<td>$183,002</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,676,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>321</strong></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,646,309</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,903,405</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Irvington Union Free School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>$5,346,655</td>
<td>$5,260,837</td>
<td>44.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$364,730</td>
<td>$356,482</td>
<td>3.014%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $40,150</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $40,150</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$118,400</td>
<td>$118,400</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,659,570</td>
<td>$5,659,570</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$389,255</td>
<td>$389,255</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,033,226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>377</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>$13,951,986</td>
<td>$11,824,694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Pocantico Central School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>$3,271,739</td>
<td>$3,179,214</td>
<td>12.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$63,150</td>
<td>$60,150</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 Family +)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$366,250</td>
<td>$366,250</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$18,550,814</td>
<td>$17,123,464</td>
<td>64.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,546,743</td>
<td>$4,343,143</td>
<td>16.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,030,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>554</strong></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,245,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,448,840</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Union Free School District of the Tarrytowns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$569,434</td>
<td>$528,927</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$116,690</td>
<td>$113,690</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments (4 Family +)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $2,145,772</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $2,107,652</td>
<td>41.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,129,525</td>
<td>$2,129,525</td>
<td>42.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$615,599</td>
<td>$187,749</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$256,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
<td><strong>387</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,834,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,068,893</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Valhalla Union Free School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total # Parcels</th>
<th>Total # Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Town Taxable</th>
<th>Percentage of Town Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>$11,579,422</td>
<td>$11,264,749</td>
<td>80.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (2 &amp; 3 Family)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$128,100</td>
<td>$117,251</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,347,160</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,310,635</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,347,160</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,310,635</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,347,160</td>
<td>Coops, Condos, Apartments Combined $1,310,635</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$35,405</td>
<td>$35,405</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$328,420</td>
<td>$328,420</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$911,690</td>
<td>$911,690</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20,721,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>795</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,052,147</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,968,150</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

Tax Exempt in acreage by School and Fire Districts

Appendix I includes maps and related tables indicating the location and percentages of tax exempt properties in unincorporated Greenburgh. The information is based on Town of Greenburgh assessment data for the year 2014.
## Appendix I: Tax Exempt Acreage by School Districts in Unincorporated Greenburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Approx. Total Acreage in unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Approx. Total Acreage of Tax Exempt Properties in unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Percentage of unincorporated Greenburgh Tax Exempt Property Acreage (within District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley School District</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgemont School District</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmsford School District</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenburgh Central School District</td>
<td>3,759</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings School District</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington School District</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocantico School District</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrytown School District</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valhalla School District</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I: Tax Exempt Acreage by Combination Fire Districts and Volunteer Fire Districts in Unincorporated Greenburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Approx. Total Acreage in unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Approx. Total Acreage of Tax Exempt Properties in unincorporated Greenburgh</th>
<th>Percentage of Tax Exempt Property Acreage (within District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Combination Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Fire District</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Fire District</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartsdale Fire District</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteer Fire Protection Districts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Elmsford &amp; North Elmsford (Elmsford Fire District)</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Irvington (Irvington Fire District)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Park (Hastings-on-Hudson Fire District)</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauncey and South Ardsley (Ardsley Fire Department)</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville (Tarrytown Fire Department)</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Sales/Rental price by School District Supplement

Appendix J lists average sales and rental price information by school district. The sales information is based on 2014 Town of Greenburgh Tax Assessment data. Rental information is based on 2014-2015 local multiple listing service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix J: Sales/Rental by School District (Unincorporated Greenburgh) - 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ardsley Union Free School District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edgemont Union Free School District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elmsford Union Free School District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenburgh Central School District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hastings-on-Hudson Union Free School District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irvington Union Free School District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rental Figures are for a combination of one-family and multi-family uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Average Sales Price</th>
<th>Median Sales Price</th>
<th>Range of Rent Paid*</th>
<th>Median Rent Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$1,400 - $2,600</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative Unit</td>
<td>$269,786</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Average Sales Price</th>
<th>Median Sales Price</th>
<th>Range of Rent Paid*</th>
<th>Median Rent Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
<td>$383,000</td>
<td>$383,000</td>
<td>$1,400 - $7,500</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative Unit</td>
<td>$337,056</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Use</th>
<th>Average Sales Price</th>
<th>Median Sales Price</th>
<th>Range of Rent Paid*</th>
<th>Median Rent Paid*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Residence</td>
<td>$554,543</td>
<td>$554,500</td>
<td>$1,450 - $5,900</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Condominium/Co-operative Unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At least 50 percent of residential rental prices fall within the specified range.
APPENDIX K

Existing CA District Multi-Family Build-out

Appendix K of the Plan lists parcels in the CA District in excess of two acres (the minimum acreage needed to propose multi-family development) that are vacant or not currently developed with multi-family residential uses. A full build-out of all of these parcels is not likely, however, the appendix highlights the residential development potential of individual lots. Page 12-14, Section 12.6.5 Multi-Family Residence Build-out Under Existing Zoning and Section 12.6.6 Multi-Family Residence (Future Land-use) contain discussion relevant to this build-out analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Multifamily Buildout (Bedrooms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.150-96-5</td>
<td>401-425 Central Park Ave. North (T.J. Maxx)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.150-96-4</td>
<td>381-393 Central Park Ave. North (Dalewood Shopping Center - Mrs. Green’s)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.150-96-3</td>
<td>355-371 Central Ave. North (Dalewood Shopping Center - H Mart)</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.150-96-1</td>
<td>319-333 Central Park Ave. North (Michaels)</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.150-98-2</td>
<td>324 Central Park Ave. North (Petco)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.210-151-3</td>
<td>215-299 Central Park Ave. North (Westchester Square)</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.300-227-3</td>
<td>141 Central Park Ave. South (Office Building)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.300-227-1</td>
<td>161 Central Park Ave. North (Hartsdale Plaza)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.290-220-14</td>
<td>Central Park Ave. South (Vacant)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total (Greenburgh Central School District)</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Multifamily Buildout (Bedrooms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.350-253-1</td>
<td>365 Central Park Ave. South (Archway Plaza)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.350-252-5</td>
<td>423 Central Park Ave. South (The Tile Shop)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.471-346-1</td>
<td>450-460 Central Park Ave. South (Scarsdale Plaza)</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.471-346-17 &amp; 18</td>
<td>520 - 540 Central Park Ave. South (Dilmaghani)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.470-332-32</td>
<td>668 Central Park Ave. South (A&amp;P Plaza)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.460-329-2</td>
<td>728 Central Park Ave. South (Curry Chevrolet)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.460-328-1</td>
<td>799-855 Central Park Ave. South (Greenville Shopping Center)</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.530-363-2</td>
<td>1001 Central Park Ave. South (Midway Shopping Center)</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.590-405-4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>1019-1059 Central Park Ave (Buy Buy Baby)</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.590-405-1</td>
<td>1111-1123 Central Park Ave (Pet Goods)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total (Edgemont School District)</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.84</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,885</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Acreage (All of CA District)** | **94.67**  
**Total number of Bedrooms** | **3,312**
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, CA

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.7.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.530-363-2</td>
<td>1001 Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>575,863</td>
<td>CA, R-20</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - **Red**
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - **Blue**

**Parcels involved:** Two (2)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-20, R-30

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

### New Sprain Road – Underhill Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.330-242-7</td>
<td>109 New Sprain Road</td>
<td>19,166</td>
<td>R-20, R-30</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.330-242-8</td>
<td>111 New Sprain Road</td>
<td>17,424</td>
<td>R-20, R-30</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-40

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

### Windom Street - Saw Mill River Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-311-1</td>
<td>1880 Saw Mill Road</td>
<td>91,476</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.520-316-25</td>
<td>Windom Street</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

Parcels involved: Three (3)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-40

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts. Place parcels on common cul-de-sac in the same zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rosa Drive</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-316-29</td>
<td>5 Rosa Drive</td>
<td>20,909</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.520-316-30</td>
<td>7 Rosa Drive</td>
<td>20,038</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.520-316-31</td>
<td>9 Rosa Drive</td>
<td>20,038</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Four (4)
Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-40

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Avenue</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-316-26</td>
<td>118 Park Avenue West</td>
<td>27,007</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.30-22-5</td>
<td>103 Park Avenue</td>
<td>26,572</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.30-22-4</td>
<td>101 Park Avenue</td>
<td>24,829</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.30-22-6</td>
<td>40 Bradley Avenue</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-10, R-40</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcels involved: Three (3)
Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.450-261-4</td>
<td>182 Finmore Drive</td>
<td>24,829</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.450-261-2.1</td>
<td>Worthington Road</td>
<td>41,382</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.450-261-2.2</td>
<td>Worthington Road</td>
<td>48,787</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -  
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-20

Recommendation Summaries: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place parcels on common cul-de-sac in the same zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-314-11</td>
<td>3 Jeffrey Way</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.520-314-12</td>
<td>5 Jeffrey Way</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unincorporated Greenburgh Comprehensive Plan - Appendix E

Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - Proprietary Color
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

Parcels involved: Four (4)
Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

TWIN POND LANE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Twin Pond Lane</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-314-7</td>
<td>28 Twin Pond Lane</td>
<td>33,541</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.520-314-6</td>
<td>36 Twin Pond Lane</td>
<td>20,909</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.520-314-5</td>
<td>35 Twin Pond Lane</td>
<td>13,504</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.520-314-4</td>
<td>27 Twin Pond Lane</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: DS, M-14

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.7.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.120-19-25</td>
<td>320 Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>457,380</td>
<td>DS, M-14</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation Summary: Rezone three (3) properties currently in the DS District, to the R-5 One-Family Residence District, to be consistent with future Land-Use Plan (Figure 12.4.2).

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: DS

### Orchard Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.190-60-22</td>
<td>13 Orchard Lane</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>R-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.190-60-11</td>
<td>300 Orchard Lane</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>R-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, IB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.7.2).
Parcels involved: Three (3)

Existing Zone Districts: DS, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Rezone three (3) properties in the DS District, to the R-7.5 One-Family Residence District, to be consistent with the Future Land-Use Plan (Figure 12.4.2).
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, M-25

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary -
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.4.2).
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

**Parcels involved:** One (1)

**Existing Zone Districts:** M-14, IB

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.7.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.80-50-1</td>
<td>99 Fieldstone Drive</td>
<td>40,075</td>
<td>M-14, IB</td>
<td>IB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-14
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)
Existing Zone Districts: M-14, M-25, IB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into three (3) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.5.2).

Highpoint Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.80-50-10</td>
<td>400-500 Highpoint Drive</td>
<td>216,929</td>
<td>M-14, M-25, IB, R-10</td>
<td>M-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-14 and E-15
Parcels involved: Four (4)

Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, M-174

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.5.2).

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary -
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.250-191-35</td>
<td>12 Wilson Street</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>R-7.5, M-174</td>
<td>M-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.250-191-37</td>
<td>35 East Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>28,314</td>
<td>R-7.5, M-174</td>
<td>M-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.250-191-38</td>
<td>45 East Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>54,014</td>
<td>R-7.5, M-174</td>
<td>M-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.250-191-1</td>
<td>11 Columbia Avenue</td>
<td>26,136</td>
<td>R-7.5, M-174</td>
<td>M-174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Legend:**

- Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

**Parcels involved:** One (1)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-20, M-174

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.5.2).

**East Hartsdale Avenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.250-195-3</td>
<td>East Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>175,111</td>
<td>R-20, M-174</td>
<td>M-174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, M-174

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.5.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.300-229-16</td>
<td>80 East Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>57,499</td>
<td>R-20, M-174</td>
<td>M-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.300-229-15</td>
<td>100 East Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>81,457</td>
<td>R-20, M-174</td>
<td>M-174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East Hartsdale Avenue
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-30

Recommendation Summary: Correcting existing zoning boundary that bisects parcels in common ownership into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.400-281-36</td>
<td>Sheridan Road</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>R-30</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.400-281-39</td>
<td>41 Sheridan Road</td>
<td>16,988</td>
<td>R-10, R-30</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Two (2)
Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Stoneybrook Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.400-281-20</td>
<td>5 Stoneybrook Lane</td>
<td>21,344</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.400-281-16</td>
<td>6 Stoneybrook Lane</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-20
Exisiting and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-10

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underhill Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-21

9-28-16
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Place adjacent parcels on the same fronting street, in the same zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.450-315-32</td>
<td>160 Longview Drive</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.450-315-31</td>
<td>120 Inwood Road</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -  
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Six (6)

Existing Zone Districts: OB-1, CB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.4.2).

### Mendham Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.550-381-9</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>23,087</td>
<td>OB-1, CB</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.550-381-10</td>
<td>11 Mendham Avenue</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>OB-1</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.550-381-11</td>
<td>9 Mendham Avenue</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>OB-1</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.550-381-12</td>
<td>5 Mendham Avenue</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>OB-1</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.550-381-13</td>
<td>1 Mendham Avenue</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>OB-1</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.550-381-15</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>OB-1, CB</td>
<td>CB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - _______________________  
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - _______________________  

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: LI, OB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.10.2).
Parcels involved: Six (6)

Existing Zone Districts: LI, CB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.4.2).

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Heath Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.610-421-66</td>
<td>91 Heath Place</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>R-7.5, LOB</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.610-421-64</td>
<td>93 Heath Place</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>LOB</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.610-421-63</td>
<td>97 Heath Place</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>LOB</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.610-421-62</td>
<td>111 Heath Place</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.610-421-61</td>
<td>115 Heath Place</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.610-421-60</td>
<td>119 Heath Place</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary

Parcels involved: Seven (7)

Existing Zone Districts: LI, R-10

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.4.2).

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

Heath Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.610-421-59</td>
<td>123 Heath Place</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.610-421-58</td>
<td>127 Heath Place</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.610-421-57</td>
<td>131 Heath Place</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.610-421-56</td>
<td>Heath Place</td>
<td>7,841</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.610-421-88</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.610-421-55</td>
<td>Heath Place</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8.610-421-87</td>
<td>138 Heath Place</td>
<td>8,276</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Ten (10)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place parcels on common cul-de-sac in the same zoning district. Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

Donald Drive - Hastings Close

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.610-421-2</td>
<td>34 Donald Drive</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.610-421-3</td>
<td>36 Donald Drive</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.610-421-4</td>
<td>38 Donald Drive</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.610-421-30</td>
<td>7 Hastings Close</td>
<td>11,325</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.610-421-31</td>
<td>5 Hastings Close</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.610-421-32</td>
<td>3 Hastings Close</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8.610-421-33</td>
<td>41 Donald Drive</td>
<td>13,068</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8.610-421-34</td>
<td>39 Donald Drive</td>
<td>11,325</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8.610-421-35</td>
<td>37 Donald Drive</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.610-421-36</td>
<td>35 Donald Drive</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-29
Exisiting and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Six (6)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts. Place parcels on common cul-de-sac in the same zoning district.

Donald Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.610-421-26</td>
<td>82 Donald Drive</td>
<td>23,958</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.610-421-27</td>
<td>77 Donald Drive</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.610-421-28</td>
<td>81 Donald Drive</td>
<td>13,068</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.610-421-29</td>
<td>9 Hastings Close</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.610-421-20</td>
<td>70 Donald Drive</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.610-421-17</td>
<td>Donald Drive</td>
<td>148,540</td>
<td>R-10, R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts**

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - **[Red Line]**
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - **[Blue Line]**

**Parcels involved:** Six (6)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-20

**Recommendation Summary:** Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.610-421-5</td>
<td>40 Donald Drive</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.610-421-6</td>
<td>42 Donald Drive</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.610-421-7</td>
<td>44 Donald Drive</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.610-421-8</td>
<td>46 Donald Drive</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.610-421-9</td>
<td>48 Donald Drive</td>
<td>15,682</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.610-421-10</td>
<td>50 Donald Drive</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-31
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcels involved: Fourteen (14)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20

Recommendation Summary: Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

---

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcel | Parcel ID | Address | Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.) | Existing Zoning | Proposed Zoning
---|---|---|---|---|---
A | 8.610-422-1 | 55 Donald Drive | 12,197 | R-20 | R-10
B | 8.610-422-2 | 49 Donald Drive | 13,068 | R-20 | R-10
C | 8.610-422-3 | 47 Donald Drive | 10,454 | R-20 | R-10
D | 8.610-422-4 | 45 Donald Drive | 16,552 | R-20 | R-10
E | 8.610-422-5 | 2 Hastings Close | 11,761 | R-20 | R-10
F | 8.610-422-6 | 4 Hastings Close | 10,890 | R-20 | R-10
G | 8.610-422-7 | 6 Hastings Close | 11,326 | R-20 | R-10
H | 8.610-422-8 | 8 Hastings Close | 12,197 | R-20 | R-10
I | 8.610-422-9 | 10 Hastings Close | 10,890 | R-20 | R-10
J | 8.610-422-10 | 65 Donald Drive | 10,890 | R-20 | R-10
K | 8.610-422-11 | 63 Donald Drive | 17,424 | R-20 | R-10
L | 8.610-422-12 | 61 Donald Drive | 12,197 | R-20 | R-10
M | 8.610-422-13 | 59 Donald Drive | 13,503 | R-20 | R-10
N | 8.610-422-14 | 57 Donald Drive | 13,503 | R-20 | R-10

9-28-16 E-31
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Eight (8)
Existing Zone Districts: R-20

Recommendation Summary: Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

Donald Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.610-421-11</td>
<td>52 Donald Drive</td>
<td>13,068</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.610-421-12</td>
<td>54 Donald Drive</td>
<td>18,925</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.610-421-13</td>
<td>56 Donald Drive</td>
<td>14,810</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.610-421-14</td>
<td>58 Donald Drive</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.610-421-15</td>
<td>60 Donald Drive</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.610-421-16</td>
<td>62 Donald Drive</td>
<td>14,810</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8.610-421-18</td>
<td>66 Donald Drive</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8.610-421-19</td>
<td>68 Donald Drive</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Four (4)

Existing Zone Districts: R-5, R-10

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

### Pine Street–Secor Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.160-100-16</td>
<td>39 Pine Street</td>
<td>19,602</td>
<td>R-5, R-10</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.160-100-17</td>
<td>41 Pine Street</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>R-5, R-10</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.160-100-3</td>
<td>Secor Road</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>R-5, R-10</td>
<td>R-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.160-100-2</td>
<td>15 Secor Road</td>
<td>17,860</td>
<td>R-5, R-10</td>
<td>R-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: M-22, DS

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.5.2).
Unincorporated Greenburgh Comprehensive Plan - Appendix E

Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

**Parcels involved:** Two (2)

**Existing Zone Districts:** DS, R-7.5

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.4.2).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.20-19-13</td>
<td>175 Tarrytown Road</td>
<td>43,996</td>
<td>DS, R-7.5</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.20-19-14</td>
<td>1 Prospect Avenue</td>
<td>40,946</td>
<td>DS, R-7.5</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

9-28-16
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Six (6)
Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.210-165-2</td>
<td>4 Andover Road</td>
<td>22,216</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.210-165-3</td>
<td>6 Andover Road</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.210-165-4</td>
<td>8 Andover Road</td>
<td>10,454</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.210-165-5</td>
<td>10 Andover Road</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.260-198-2</td>
<td>12 Andover Road</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.260-198-3</td>
<td>16 Andover Road</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-37
Parcels involved: Five (5)

Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place parcels on common cul-de-sac in the same zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.260-198-68</td>
<td>Andover Road</td>
<td>22,651</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.260-198-11</td>
<td>30 Andover Road</td>
<td>20,473</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.260-198-12</td>
<td>32 Andover Road</td>
<td>20,473</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.260-198-13</td>
<td>34 Andover Road</td>
<td>26,136</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.260-198-14</td>
<td>36 Andover Road</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - [Red]
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - [Blue]

Parcels involved: Seven (7)
Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

Lakeview Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.260-198-51</td>
<td>144 Lakeview Avenue</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.260-198-50</td>
<td>146 Lakeview Avenue</td>
<td>26,136</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.260-198-49</td>
<td>147 Lakeview Avenue</td>
<td>23,087</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.260-198-48</td>
<td>145 Lakeview Avenue</td>
<td>24,394</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.260-198-47</td>
<td>143 Lakeview Avenue</td>
<td>30,492</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.260-198-46</td>
<td>141 Lakeview Avenue</td>
<td>34,412</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8.260-198-40</td>
<td>144 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>57,499</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels Involved: Ten (10)

Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.260-198-54</td>
<td>106 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>40,075</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.260-198-55</td>
<td>100 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>30,492</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.260-198-56</td>
<td>98 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>27,878</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.260-198-57</td>
<td>94 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>29,185</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.260-198-58</td>
<td>90 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>27,007</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.260-198-59</td>
<td>88 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>8.260-198-60</td>
<td>80 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8.260-198-61</td>
<td>72 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>26,136</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>8.260-198-62</td>
<td>68 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>27,007</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.260-198-63</td>
<td>64 Mercer Avenue</td>
<td>28,314</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Three (3)
Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.310-235-2</td>
<td>Findlay Avenue</td>
<td>70,567</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.310-235-11</td>
<td>79 Charlotte Place</td>
<td>60,548</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.310-235-12</td>
<td>80 Charlotte Place</td>
<td>39,640</td>
<td>R-7.5, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-7.5, M-14

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.5.2).
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-40
Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Sprain Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.440-309-22</td>
<td>Sprain Road</td>
<td>435,600</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See connector sheet E-43

9-28-16
Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, PUD R-40

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
**Parcels involved:** Two (2)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-10, R-20

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
**Legend:**
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

**Parcels involved:** One (1)

**Existing Zone Districts:** CA, R-20

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.3.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>8.590-407-1</td>
<td>Inverness Road</td>
<td>34,848</td>
<td>CA, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Parcel is part of Cotswold Park District
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-15

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Hillcrest Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.400-213-21</td>
<td>45 Hillcrest Avenue</td>
<td>20,473</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Five (5)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, M-14

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.4.2).

Dalewood Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.140-93-4</td>
<td>31 Dalewood Drive</td>
<td>16,117</td>
<td>M-14</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.140-93-6</td>
<td>29 Dalewood Drive</td>
<td>38,333</td>
<td>R-10, M-14</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.140-93-2</td>
<td>25 Dalewood Drive</td>
<td>21,344</td>
<td>M-14</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.150-96-8</td>
<td>25 Dalewood Drive</td>
<td>33,106</td>
<td>R-10, M-14</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8.150-96-9</td>
<td>23 Dalewood Drive</td>
<td>31,799</td>
<td>R-10, M-14</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.4.2).
Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-5, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -  
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -  

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-5, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: R-5, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
Exisiting and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.400-285-5</td>
<td>236 North Clayton Road</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Three (3)
Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Maple Avenue - Grayrock Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.250-187-9</td>
<td>2 Maple Avenue</td>
<td>27,878</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.250-187-2</td>
<td>15 Grayrock Avenue</td>
<td>16,117</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.250-188-3</td>
<td>8 Grayrock Avenue</td>
<td>27,878</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -  
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Four (4)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.250-193-19</td>
<td>18 Clark Avenue</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.250-193-11</td>
<td>21 South Washington Avenue</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.250-193-20</td>
<td>24 Clark Avenue</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8.250-193-21</td>
<td>30 Clark Avenue</td>
<td>5,227</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: PUD R-10, PUD R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. The recommended change also exhibits consistency with policy 12.2.1.3 of the Plan. Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.

Winding Ridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7-420-240-23</td>
<td>Old Tarrytown Road (Off)</td>
<td>2,692,008</td>
<td>PUD R-20, PUD R-10</td>
<td>PUD (R-10,R-20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)
Existing Zone Districts: PUD

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: PUD R-40

Recommendation Summary: Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.
**Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts**

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

**Parcels involved:** Two (2)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-30, R-40

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

---

**Proposed Zoning District Boundaries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.440-309-27</td>
<td>44 Winding Road Farm</td>
<td>43,560</td>
<td>R-30, R-40</td>
<td>R-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.380-271-6</td>
<td>66 Winding Road Farm</td>
<td>181,645</td>
<td>R-30, R-40</td>
<td>R-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: PUD R-7.5, PD

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Parcels involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.171-49-10</td>
<td>Wyldwood</td>
<td>883,397</td>
<td>PUD R-7.5, PD</td>
<td>PUD (R-7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.170-43-1..ST</td>
<td>511 Benedict Avenue</td>
<td>1,593,860</td>
<td>PUD R-7.5, PD</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-40

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.51-1-7..ST</td>
<td>Hackley</td>
<td>552,341</td>
<td>R-20, R-40</td>
<td>R-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary

See connector sheet E-62
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, OB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

### Saw Mill River Parkway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Parkway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R-20, OB</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, OB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Saw Mill River Parkway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Saw Mill River Parkway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R-20, OB</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: LI, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warehouse Lane</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>Parcel ID</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.180-52-20-SP</td>
<td>1-7 Warehouse Lane</td>
<td>1,417,878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Five (5)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, LI

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locust Street</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.51-2-2-.SP</td>
<td>Con Ed R.O.W</td>
<td>1,999,840</td>
<td>R-20, LI</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.180-52-23</td>
<td>Locust Street</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.180-52-24</td>
<td>Locust Street</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>R-20, LI</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.180-52-25</td>
<td>Locust Street</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>R-20, LI</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.180-52-26</td>
<td>Locust Street</td>
<td>15,682</td>
<td>R-20, LI</td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

Parcels involved: Eight (8)
Existing Zone Districts: M-14, CB

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Carlisle Avenue</td>
<td>478,724</td>
<td>M-14</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70 Virginia Road</td>
<td>364,162</td>
<td>M-14, CB</td>
<td>M-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>74-84 Virginia Road</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Rossmore—Carlisle</td>
<td>74,488</td>
<td>M-14</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Virginia Avenue</td>
<td>29,621</td>
<td>M-14, CB</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>88 Virginia Road</td>
<td>38,768</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>CB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2-30 Lawrence Drive</td>
<td>160,301</td>
<td>M-14</td>
<td>M-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Virginia Road</td>
<td>169,884</td>
<td>M-14</td>
<td>M-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Two (2)

Existing Zone Districts: IB, UR

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.480-296-8</td>
<td>436 Tarrytown Road</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>IB, UR</td>
<td>IB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.480-296-10</td>
<td>410-420 Tarrytown Road</td>
<td>89,734</td>
<td>IB, UR</td>
<td>UR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

**Parcels involved:** One (1)

**Existing Zone Districts:** OB, R-10

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: OB, R-20

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
**Unincorporated Greenburgh Comprehensive Plan - Appendix E**

## Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

**Parcels involved:** Three (3)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-10, R-7.5

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.100-59-5</td>
<td>85 Forest Boulevard</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.100-59-6</td>
<td>Forest Boulevard</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.100-59-7</td>
<td>Forest Boulevard</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Legend:**
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

**Parcels involved:** Two (2)

**Existing Zone Districts:** CA, R-7.5

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

**North Central Avenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.210-153-10</td>
<td>246 North Central Avenue</td>
<td>20,909</td>
<td>CA, R-7.5</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.210-153-13</td>
<td>Alexander Avenue</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homewood Road</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.200-142-24</td>
<td>4 Homewood Road</td>
<td>18,295</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: Three (3)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.200-142-4</td>
<td>3 Pinewood Road</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.200-142-8.1</td>
<td>43 Pinewood Road</td>
<td>17,860</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.200-142-29</td>
<td>8 Beechwood Road</td>
<td>16,553</td>
<td>R-10, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts**

- **Legend:**
  - Existing Zoning District Boundary -  
  - Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

- **Parcels involved:** One (1)

- **Existing Zone Districts:** R-20, R-7.5

- **Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts.

---

**Proposed Zoning District Boundaries**

**West Hartsdale Avenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.250-182-21</td>
<td>112 West Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>80,586</td>
<td>R-20, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

Parcels involved: Three (3)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-10

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Thomas Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.350-252-24</td>
<td>12 Thomas Street</td>
<td>22,651</td>
<td>R-20, R-10</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.350-252-25</td>
<td>6 Thomas Street</td>
<td>22,216</td>
<td>R-20, R-10</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.350-252-28</td>
<td>10 Thomas Street</td>
<td>75,794</td>
<td>R-20, R-10</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

Parcels involved: One (1)
Existing Zone Districts: R-20, CA

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.471-346-1</td>
<td>450-460 Central Park Avenue</td>
<td>190,357</td>
<td>R-20, CA</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-10

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two separate zoning districts.
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-10, R-30, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: R-30, R-7.5

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

See connector sheet E-78

See connector sheet E-80

Sprain Brook Parkway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Parkway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R-30, R-7.5</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

Parcels involved: One (1)
Existing Zone Districts: R-20, R-30

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

Sprain Brook Parkway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Parkway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R-30, R-20</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts**

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - Red
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - Blue

**Parcels involved:** One (1)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-20, R-30

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

**Proposed Zoning District Boundaries**

**Sprain Brook Parkway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Parkway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R-20, R-30</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9-28-16
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**Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts**

**Proposed Zoning District Boundaries**

**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary - 

**Parcels involved:** One (1)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-20, R-30

**Recommendation Summary:** Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sprain Brook Parkway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>R-20, R-30</td>
<td>R-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: PUD

Recommendation Summary: Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: PUD

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)
Existing Zone Districts: PUD

Recommendation Summary: Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: PUD

Recommendation Summary: Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.

Legend:
- Existing Zoning District Boundary
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary

Stone Oaks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.141-94-28</td>
<td>West Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD (R-10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Three (3)
Existing Zone Districts: PUD, R-30

Recommendation Summary: Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD. The recommended changes exhibit consistency with the Future Land-Use Plan (12.7.2).

Proposed Zoning District Boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Old Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD (R-20, R-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8.500-351-2</td>
<td>Old Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>84,506</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.500-351-1..SH</td>
<td>Old Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>50,530</td>
<td>R-30</td>
<td>PUD (R-20, R-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Legend:**
- Existing Zoning District Boundary -
- Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

**Parcels involved:** One (1)

**Existing Zone Districts:** PUD

**Recommendation Summary:** Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.

**Sprain Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.510-353-11</td>
<td>Sprain Road</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>PUD (R-10, R-20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: PUD

Recommendation Summary: Place informational, prior One-Family Residence District zoning designation with the PUD.
Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: OB, M-6

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two (2) separate zoning districts. Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

Old Saw Mill River Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.71-6-1</td>
<td>Old Saw Mill River Road</td>
<td>2,859,274</td>
<td>OB, M-6</td>
<td>OB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9-28-16
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -  
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: One (1)

Existing Zone Districts: M-14, HC

Recommendation Summary: Correct existing zoning boundary when it bisects a parcel into two 
(2) separate zoning districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.300-234-2</td>
<td>201 East Hartsdale Avenue</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>M-14, HC</td>
<td>HC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Old Saw Mill River Road
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -  
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Ten (10)
Existing Zone Districts: R-20

Recommendation Summary: Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

Parcels Involved:

- A 7.520-318-9 19 Lark Avenue 12,632 R-20 R-10
- B 7.520-318-8 17 Lark Avenue 18,295 R-20 R-10
- C 7.520-318-7 15 Lark Avenue 14,375 R-20 R-10
- D 7.520-318-6 11 Lark Avenue 14,810 R-20 R-10
- E 7.520-318-5 9 Lark Avenue 14,810 R-20 R-10
- F 7.520-318-4 7 Lark Avenue 14,375 R-20 R-10
- G 7.520-318-3 5 Lark Avenue 14,375 R-20 R-10
- H 7.520-318-2 3 Lark Avenue 14,810 R-20 R-10
- I 7.520-319-35 4 Lark Avenue 17,424 R-20 R-10
- J 7.520-319-34 6 Lark Avenue 16,552 R-20 R-10
**Parcels Involved:** Eleven (11)

**Existing Zone Districts:** R-20

**Recommendation Summary:** Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-318-10</td>
<td>21 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.520-319-31</td>
<td>12 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.520-319-32</td>
<td>10 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.520-319-33</td>
<td>8 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>16,117</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.520-318-11</td>
<td>23 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.520-319-30</td>
<td>20 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>10,019</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7.520-319-29</td>
<td>4 Piper Court</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7.520-319-28</td>
<td>5 Piper Court</td>
<td>13,504</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.520-318-12</td>
<td>25 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.520-319-26</td>
<td>24 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>7.520-319-27</td>
<td>3 Piper Court</td>
<td>15,682</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Existing and Proposed Zoning Districts

Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary -
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Fourteen (14)

Existing Zone Districts: R-20

Recommendation Summary: Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-318-13</td>
<td>27 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.520-319-25</td>
<td>26 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.520-319-24</td>
<td>4 Jay Court</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.520-319-13</td>
<td>29 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.520-319-22</td>
<td>28 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>11,761</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.520-319-23</td>
<td>3 Jay Court</td>
<td>17,424</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7.520-319-14</td>
<td>31 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>12,197</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7.520-319-21</td>
<td>30 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>13,939</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.520-319-20</td>
<td>34 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>15,862</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.520-319-19</td>
<td>36 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>16,988</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>7.520-319-15</td>
<td>33 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>15,862</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>7.520-319-16</td>
<td>35 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>7.520-319-17</td>
<td>37 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>13,503</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7.520-319-18</td>
<td>39 Lark Avenue</td>
<td>19,602</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend:
Existing Zoning District Boundary - 
Proposed Zoning District Boundary -

Parcels involved: Six (6)
Existing Zone Districts: R-20

Recommendation Summary: Place parcels into a zoning district consistent with parcel size and abutting zoning district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.520-319-37</td>
<td>Dobbs Ferry Road</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.520-319-38</td>
<td>900 Dobbs Ferry Road</td>
<td>152,460</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7.520-319-39</td>
<td>Dobbs Ferry Road</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7.520-319-40</td>
<td>Dobbs Ferry Road</td>
<td>61,420</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.520-319-1..SE</td>
<td>Dobbs Ferry Road</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.520-319-1..SG</td>
<td>Dobbs Ferry Road</td>
<td>36,155</td>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>R-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>