

H. VISUAL, AESTHETICS AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Comment H-1

p. 34— para. —3—It is not clear that all backyards buffer any view of the Center. The yards to the south of Driveway D were treated with fencing and landscaping as a result of development of the Stop & Shop and are significantly shielded from views of the Center. The homes to the north did not receive this treatment. Is this statement true for these homes to the North of Driveway D as well? Describe the relationship of what appears to be three Kimball Avenue homes north of Driveway D to the existing site parking lot in terms of elevation, distance of spaces to property line and buffering treatment.

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-1

It is the Applicant's understanding that as part of the previous Stop & Shop mitigation the existing homes north of Drive D did not receive a buffer treatment similar to the homes south of Drive D. Currently the Applicant is not proposing to enlarge the parking area or adjust the elevation of the existing parking lot. So these existing views will remain unchanged with the exception of re-paving, re-striping, and providing some additional landscaping in the area.

An 8' high solid wood fence was installed between the three homes along Kimball Avenue, north of Driveway 'D' and Shopping Center as a requirement of the Stop & Shop approval. The rear of the homes are at a similar elevation to the Shopping Center lot and in the Applicant's opinion are adequately screened by the existing solid fence and mature evergreen trees between the homes and the parking lot.

However, the applicant is willing to extend the wood fence to Kimball Avenue to screen the homes from the new northeasterly site driveway configuration.

Comment H-2

p. 61. Lighting — While it is stated that new light fixtures with better light focus will be installed, there will be additional new buildings with building lighting that will add to the overall lighting on the site. Identify how this additional lighting will be treated and the impact it may have on adjacent residences.

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-2

As part of the Applicant's submission several buildings are proposed for new construction and several are to be razed and rebuilt. All of these buildings will have new exterior lighting (i.e., storefront, signage, ingress/egress, service, security, etc.) the majority of which are required by today's building codes. All lighting will be installed and guided per the local applicable codes. All of the proposed buildings, with the exception of the "Sizzler" Building (approximately 100 yards away from Kimball Avenue residences), will not be erected in close proximity to any adjacent residences. All new lighting will be directed to focus on its immediate area or shielded from broadcasting light outward and thus minimizing impacts to any adjacent uses. It is important to note that except for the aforementioned Sizzler, all of the new building work will be several hundred yards from any adjacent residential uses.

Comment H-3

p. 86 - Cumulative Impacts and Community Character- While the land use will remain the same, the character of the center will change to a more upgraded center and one that is more intense and dense with additional stores and significant new multistory parking garages. The opportunity to soften this increase in density and garage exists through improving the surface parking landscaping and possibly the landscaping of the periphery facing homes on Vredenburgh Avenue and the rear yards of homes on Kimball Avenue not previously improved due to construction for the Stop & Shop supermarket. Do the existing pylon signs currently go dark during nighttime hours? If so, what are the "dark"

hours? Are these hours deemed to be adequate or have surrounding residents registered complaints with regard to pylon sign light impacts?

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-3

Currently, the Applicant's submission is proposing a significant surface parking and perimeter landscaping program for the majority of the Center. Significant new landscaping along Kimball Avenue is not currently proposed, while some additional landscaping is proposed along Vredenburg. The three existing pylon signs do not currently go dark during the nighttime hours. The Applicant proposes that the illumination levels of the pylon signs along Vredenburg and Kimball Avenues be reduced by 50% between the hours of midnight and 6:00 am and the pylon sign on Central Park Avenue remain on 24 hours a day along this commercial corridor.

Comment H-4

p. 124—The Landscape Plan does not seem to provide a significant amount of new plantings along the Vredenburg Avenue frontage. Provide a plan that does not show a thick property line so proposed plantings can be determined. Also, additional buffer plantings for the three Kimball Avenue homes north of Driveway D should be presented.

p. 233 - para. 1 & 3- As previously indicated, it does not appear that landscaping as proposed significantly enhances the Vredenburg or Kimball Avenue neighborhoods.

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-4

Ten additional trees have been added to the buffer along Vredenburgh Avenue between Driveways E and F to further screen the site from the residences along Vredenburgh Avenue. The additional trees are depicted in Figures D-21.1 and D-21.2.

An eight foot high solid wood fence exists and will remain between the three homes along Kimball Avenue, north of Driveway D, and the Shopping Center. It is the Applicant's opinion that the existing eight foot tall fence, in conjunction with the existing dense evergreen tree screening, provides an adequate buffer between the residences and the Shopping Center.

However, the applicant is willing to extend the wood fence to Kimball Avenue to screen the homes from the new northeasterly site driveway configuration.

Comment H-5

Figure IV.F-16 shows the available planting areas to the rear and side of homes to the north of Driveway D. These opportunities for additional screening plantings should be shown on the proposed landscape plan.

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-5

Please see Response H-4.

Comment H-6

p. 229 - Identify on a figure the location, height and depth of the referred to berms along Vredenburgh Avenue. How do these relate to the first and/or second floor elevation of facing homes along Vredenburgh Avenue?

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-6

A concrete wall, approximately four feet in height, exists along the south edge of the Cross County Cinemas parking lot, adjacent to Vredenburgh Avenue. The wall supports a three to four foot high berm which is planted with evergreen shrubs and deciduous trees. As depicted in Figures D-21.1 and D-21.2, ten additional trees are proposed to be added to the buffer along Vredenburgh Avenue to further screen the site from the residences along Vredenburgh Avenue. The existing buffer between Vredenburgh Avenue and the Stop & Shop parking area is sloped and planted with a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees as approved by the City of Yonkers during the approval process for the Stop & Shop store. The existing and proposed buffer features along Vredenburgh Avenue are depicted in Figure H-6.

The first and/or second floor elevations of the homes facing the Shopping Center along Vredenburgh Avenue are higher than the berm and slope between the Shopping Center and Vredenburgh Avenue. However, the mature trees along Vredenburgh Avenue and throughout the Shopping Center parking lot provide screening for the residences.

Comment H-7

After page 229 - Figure IV.I-1 1

The view from Vredenburgh Avenue homes looking north will be significantly changed. What was a view of a collection of smaller stores in addition to Macy's will now be of a

taller walled structure. How will this wall be treated? It is not clear if the existing buffer represents the planted berm. A larger scale photo should be provided and additional plantings added to shield the view from homes. The view with additional plantings should be simulated incorporating revisions to the proposed landscape plan where proposed treatment along Vredenburgh Avenue seems to be sparse.

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-7

As part of the Applicant's submission there is no development proposed on the south end of the site adjacent to Vredenburgh Avenue. The nearest new structure to the Vredenburgh neighborhood is over several hundred yards away. The proposed parking structure will be 5-stories standing approximately 52'-6" high. The materials will be a combination of concrete, masonry, metal and glass (reference drawings A-101 through A-104 and A-201 and A-203 submitted as part of the DEIS for additional information). The side elevation of the parking structure facing the Vredenburgh neighborhood will be approximately 50% open. This will allow for increased air and light infiltration. Additional plantings are proposed at the base of the parking structure to buffer the lower levels. The Applicant is not proposing significant additional plantings along Vredenburgh, but is planning supplemental planting to enhance the already established/mature plantings (Figure H-6) along Vredenburgh Avenue.

Comment H-8

Figure IV.I-13 - The view from Central Park Avenue looking south is what appears to be a high walled enclosed mall, even though they are separate buildings. Show what type of façade treatments will be utilized for exterior walls as well as other design elements that will help to define the view as distinct buildings.

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-8

These buildings will likely be constructed by the tenants in the future as leases are executed. As part of the Applicant's submission, it has established a design consistency of aesthetics, materials, heights, mass, etc. (reference drawings A-201 through A-203 submitted as part of the DEIS for additional information) and the tenants will be required to adhere to these guidelines. In the future, as tenants submit individual packages to the Landlord and the City for their respective tenant work and building permits, the Landlord and the City will be able to confirm the tenant's compliance with exterior building criteria that has been approved as part of this submission.

Comment H-9

Figure IV.1-14 — Whereas this figure indicates new landscape treatment in the parking area surrounding the cinema as expressed by two trees at the end of each parking row, and significant new trees along Vredenburgh Avenue, the proposed landscape plan does not show this additional landscape treatment. What is the proposed plan and, if no additional landscape in these areas is proposed, why isn't it?

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-9

Figure IV.1-14 within the DEIS is intended to describe Master Planning Principles and is not a Landscaping Plan. Figure IV.C-1 included in the DEIS is the Preliminary Landscaping Plan which depicts the landscaping proposed in conjunction with redevelopment of the Shopping Center. Mature trees exist throughout the Cross County Cinemas parking area in accordance with the Landscaping Plan approved by the City of Yonkers when the Cinema was developed. Ten additional trees have been added to the buffer along Vredenburg Avenue, adjacent to the Cinema parking lot, as depicted in Figures D-21.1 and D-21.2.

Comment H-10

Figure IV.I-16 — What is the height in feet of the P-1 garage? Figure IV.I-18 indicates that the ceiling height of each level is 12 feet; how do these heights compare to traditional structured parking garages? Other than the increased height of the first level, apparently needed for service and deliveries, could the upper levels be reduced in height to reduce the overall height of the structure? What would be the resulting height versus the proposed height?

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-10

The proposed height of parking structure P-1 is approximately 52'-6". The proposed floor to floor height of levels two through four is 12'-0". Typical floor to floor heights are 10'-6". The additional proposed 18" per level is to allow for increased natural air and light infiltration. It is the Applicant's opinion that 10'-6" is too low and produces an uncomfortable "cave" like feeling for the customer. If the 18" per level is removed, the resulting height difference will be 4'-6" and the parking structure will be approximately 48'-0" (reference drawings A-201 through A-203 submitted as part of the DEIS for additional information). It is the Applicant's opinion that since the

Vredenburg residents are almost an eighth of a mile away that reducing the parking structure's height by 54" will have little effect on their view while adversely impacting the customer's experience.

Comment H-11

Figure IV.1-22 - Describe the guidelines considered for management of light levels, times and usage. Identify where tenant lighting is to face outward, particularly toward residential uses. Identify distances to residential uses and lighting plan.

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-11

The Applicant currently does not have a lighting criteria for existing tenants in the center. As part of the proposed management of the Center, the Applicant intends to create a lighting guideline. This will be part of a comprehensive design overview for the entire Center. The new guidelines will reconcile existing tenants, code requirements and future proposed lighting. The Applicant will not be providing guidelines as part of this submission. All of the buildings at the Center will have exterior lighting (i.e., storefront, signage, ingress/egress, service, security, etc.) the majority of which are required by today's building codes. All lighting will be installed and guided per the local applicable codes. All of the proposed buildings, with the exception of the "Sizzler" Building (approximately 100 yards away from Kimball Avenue residences), will not be erected in close proximity to any adjacent residences. All new lighting will be directed to focus on its immediate area or shielded from broadcasting light outward and thus minimizing impacts to any adjacent uses. It is important to note that except for the aforementioned Sizzler, all of the new building work will be several hundred yards from any adjacent residential uses.

Comment H-12

Figure IV.I – 26 - Be more specific regarding the look and lighting level of the pylon signs. What are the lighting levels and times of operation today? What is proposed for the renovated center?

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-12

As part of this submission the Applicant will be proposing a revised typical pylon sign design for Vredenburg, Kimball and Central Park Avenues. See Figure H-12. Currently, the existing pylons do not go dark during the nighttime hours. The Applicant proposes maintaining the existing illumination levels and adjusting the hours of operation to be as follows:

- *the pylon signs on Vredenburg, Kimball and Central Park Avenues will remain illuminated 24-hours a day.*
- *the illumination levels of the pylon signs along Vredenburg and Kimball Avenues will be reduced 50% between the hours of midnight and 6:00 am.*
- *the pylon sign on Central Park Avenue will remain at 100% for 24-hours a day within this commercial corridor.*

Comment H-13

p. 232 — Identify the locations where raised parapets do not hide views of rooftop equipment and where the screens identified will be erected. Why won't the rooftop equipment on existing buildings be better screened as indicated in one of the notes on Figure IV.I-27?

(Memorandum from Saccardi & Schiff, Inc., dated 11/01/2005)

Response H-13

Currently, a majority of the existing buildings at the Center do not have raised parapets. As part of the Applicant's submission the existing one and two-story mall buildings and new buildings will receive new raised parapets (reference drawings A-201 through A-203 submitted as part of the DEIS for additional information). It is the Applicant's intention to screen the existing and new roof top equipment on these one and two-story buildings from the internal streets, pedestrian spaces, parking fields and most of the adjoining residential neighborhoods. The Applicant cannot anticipate all impacted sight lines and acknowledges that some pieces of existing roof top equipment due to their size, location and/or the location of the viewer may not be completely out of sight.

Comment H-14

Bulk of proposed parking structures. The draft EIS states that the applicant is requesting a height variance for the construction of the 5-story parking structure so as to permit a 56.5-foot building height where only 24 feet is permitted. The proposed height would make the parking structure one of the tallest structures on the site, comparable to the 5-story office building and the existing Macy's. The footprint of the proposed garage would also be one of the largest on the site.

The bulk of this proposed structure will be massive in relation to other buildings in the Center. However, due to site constraints, structured parking appears to be a necessity. The draft EIS states that the parking structure could be built to a lower building height but that the applicant prefers to provide increased ceiling heights on each garage level so as to permit additional natural light and air to penetrate to the middle of the garage. In addition, the lower level is designed with additional height to permit access to that level by emergency vehicles.

We recommend that the City carefully consider the potential impacts of the garage's proposed building height, mass and functionality. It may be reasonable to request the applicant to consider alternatives. For example, since many of the retail buildings are one-story, access from parking on the fifth floor of the garage to storefronts on the pedestrian

mall will not be easy. Further, placement of approximately 33% of the site's total parking in one structure may encourage the practice of "destination parking" where people would move their cars during a shopping trip to get closer to individual stores.

One possible alternative that would warrant analysis would relocate some of the parking from the 5-story garage to an additional level on the proposed 1-story parking deck at the north end of the site. Another, perhaps less desirable, alternative would place one or more floors of the 5-story garage underground.

Further, the height and bulk of proposed five-story parking structure in the southwest quadrant of the shopping center, although designed to maximize natural air and light exposure within the structure, will likely impede sight lines from southern portion of the site and dominate the existing buildings on the mall. The 15 foot wide access road between the one and two-story walls of the stores and the parking structure will create an imposing and unwelcoming pedestrian space, and it is unclear what purpose it will serve. To create a more seamless connection between the two, it may be preferable to place the structure directly adjacent to the stores for a more direct connection.

(Letter from Westchester County Planning Board, dated 11/15/2005)

Response H-14

The parking structure by the City of Yonkers Zoning Code is permitted to be five-levels and built to a height of 24' above average grade. As indicated in Figure H-14, the proposed parking structure is seeking a variance of approximately 17'-0" above the site's average grade of 169.5'. With the additional requested height, the top of the proposed parking structure will be considerably lower than the existing office tower, Macy's and the adjoining retail center - The Mall at Cross County. This will also permit the entire parking structure to be above grade (no buried parking) and to have an increased floor to floor height to provide a less "cave" like feeling. As part of the Applicant's submission a sky bridge to connect the upper levels of the parking structure to Building A has been proposed (reference drawings A-101 through A-104 and A-201 through A-203 submitted as part of the DEIS for additional information). It is the

Applicant's opinion that the proposed parking structure (P-1) is sited in the best location. It will be centrally located within the center; it will not be near any adjoining residential uses; it will be hidden by the much higher office tower, Macy's and The Mall at Cross County; and, it will be closest to the majority of the non-anchor retail square footage. It is the Applicant's further opinion that customers will not practice "destination parking" as the proposed parking structure is centrally located and easily assessable on all four sides through pedestrian on-grade Vias and Walkways. The Applicant has previously studied shifting parking from P-1 to the north deck. The Applicant has determined that a larger north deck would harm the sight lines of the Center from the north and create a greater "cavernous" feeling of large parking structures throughout. Instead, the north parking structure has been proposed as a one-level deck which has its top level at the same elevation of the pedestrian walkways (+/-163' above sea level). The Applicant has also studied below grade parking and has determined that it is not a viable solution for customer friendly and economic reasons.

Comment H-15

In addition, it may be beneficial to the office building tenants for additional signage to be placed on the shopping center site, perhaps as part of a larger directory for the entire center. Currently, tenant information is limited to a directory in the office building lobby.

(Letter from Westchester County Planning Board, dated 11/15/2005)

Response H-15

It is the Applicant's opinion that this is a mixed use center that is predominately retail, and, therefore, the three primary pylon signs will be limited to the name of the Center and the retail tenants; the site directories will list the individual retail tenants and identify the office tower. Individual office tenants will be identified in the office tower lobby and not on the exterior project directories.

Comment H-16

VISUAL IMPACTS

The draft EIS includes a comprehensive landscaping, signage and lighting plan for the new center. The project will entail the planting of 354 new trees on the site, with many to be placed around the proposed parking structures. In addition, 192 existing trees will be kept, many of which are mature and located along the pedestrian promenade. The redesigned parking areas will also include both deciduous and evergreen trees, shrubs and plantings on the various islands placed throughout the lots.

The draft EIS states that architectural guidelines for building facades will be devised. However, while it appears that most structures are to be renovated, the EIS is not clear about the full extent of the improvements for all existing buildings. The EIS also does not specifically state what will be done with some of the smaller retail structures along the pedestrian mall which exist today and are not shown on the proposed renovation plans.

While new signage will be added to provide guidance and direction to all entrances and exits, it is the applicant's intent to maintain the existing pylon signs at the site's three primary entrances. However, the colors, materials and illumination will be redesigned to be more mindful of the adjoining residential neighborhoods. The street lighting will also be updated using modern and efficient fixtures that simulate a more natural light.

The attention proposed to be given to design details is commendable, particularly the use of colors and textures to upgrade the center's image. However, we recommend that the visual upgrade be expanded to include all of the elements on site to create a truly uniform design vocabulary. For example, since the bus stops serve as a gateway to the shopping center for a large portion of shoppers and employees, it is suggested that the bus stop shelters and street furniture be upgraded to reflect the entire rehabilitation of the center.

(Letter from Westchester County Planning Board, dated 11/15/2005)

Response H-16

As part of the Applicant's submission, the smaller free standing and attached retail structures (i.e., kiosks) that are currently within the pedestrian mall will be razed and new facilities will be erected. The new structures will be designed utilizing the same design standards of materials, colors, signage, etc. as is being developed through the Center (reference drawings A-101 through A-104 and A-201 through A-203 submitted as part of the DEIS for additional information). It is the Applicant's intention to make these new structures an integral part of the exterior pedestrian mall area. A key part of the Applicant's submission is a site amenities package. It is the Applicant's opinion that the site (specifically the streetscape) is a critical part of a successful retail project. Included within the design package will be such items as benches, lampposts, trash receptacles, plant pots, tree grates, directories, artwork, bus shelters, etc. As part of the Applicant's submission the new five-story parking structure is 40' from the existing one and two-story buildings that are to its north and east. It is the Applicant's opinion that 40' is sufficient distance between buildings to allow air and light to penetrate to the pedestrian level. This distance will also allow for service and emergency vehicles to access the adjoining buildings. It is the Applicant's opinion that a detached parking structure, which allows natural air and light to infiltrate the parking structure and to penetrate to the pedestrian level that also provides service and emergency vehicles access and gives the customer a greater perception of "openness", outweighs attaching the parking structure to the existing buildings.

Comment H-17

“GREEN BUILDING” TECHNIQUES

The draft EIS does not mention the use of “green building” techniques such as “green roofs” and other sustainable building practices as part of the proposed redevelopment and new construction. We encourage the City to require the applicant to consider such techniques as a means to reduce the impacts of impervious surfaces on the site, increase energy efficiency and improve the aesthetic quality of the rooftops. While green technology should certainly be explored for all new buildings, it should also be considered as retro-fit for some of the existing buildings. Currently, the draft EIS proposes raising parapet height as a way of further screening existing rooftop equipment. Perhaps by using green building techniques, other ways of screening and beautification can be identified.

Response H-17

As part of the Applicant’s submission it will not be exploring alternate forms of green technology. The magnitude of the Applicant’s proposed action will, by its nature, be upgrading many of the old existing systems and construction methods, and, therefore, will be employing more energy efficient technologies.

Comment H-18

Page 16

“Pylons signage will be improved in appearance” — show “improved” signage.

Are there alternative signage plans for signs at the outside of the center?

Are there plans to lessen sign impact on community?

Are there impediments to reducing size and impact of the signs?

Please explain why the center can undergo a retrofit but the signs remain frozen in size and quality.

(Memorandum from City of Yonkers Planning Bureau, dated 11/18/2005)

Response H-18

As part of this submission the Applicant is proposing a revised typical pylon sign design for Vredenburg, Kimball and Central Park Avenues. See Figure H-12. In addition, the Applicant is proposing that the illumination levels of the pylon signs along Vredenburg and Kimball Avenues be reduced 50% between the hours of midnight and 6:00 am and the pylon sign on Central Park Avenue remains on 24 hours a day within this commercial corridor. The overall existing size, height and illumination levels of the pylon signs are proposed to remain as they are today. It is the Applicant's opinion that a Center of this size (± 71 acres), especially in this competitive market, requires a "presence" to locate the project and identify it for the customer. Additionally, the Center's pylon size is considerably smaller than its neighbor directly to the south (The Mall at Cross County).

Comment H-19

No discussion is offered about the wireless communications use of the office building roof. Due to the buildings height and location numerous wireless providers have antennae on the roof. A separate use of the building should be taken into account with other communication uses. The City's primary concern is the "stealth" of the antennae and the other communication equipment on the roof. Aesthetic rehab of the existing equipment and provision for future installation needs to be thought out and discussed.

Renovation of office building should include the "stealth" of all existing wireless communication antennae and provision for stealth of any future antennae.

(Memorandum from City of Yonkers Planning Bureau, dated 11/18/2005)

Response H-19

As part of the Applicant's submission it will not be screening the existing wireless antennae on the office tower. Screening may cause interference with the quality of the

service and thus be in violation of the Applicant's leases with its tenants. Additionally, it is the Applicant's opinion that there are not sufficiently significant visual impacts to warrant screening the antennae.

Comment H-20

Central Park Avenue view # 6 looking south.

Macys has approached the city to discuss a potential addition to the second floor of their existing building. This should be shown as an amendment to view #6 in the FEIS.

(Memorandum from City of Yonkers Planning Bureau, dated 11/18/2005)

Response H-20

Please refer to Figure H-20 for the amendment to the noted view #6.

Comment H-21

In relation to garage lighting, the light color and intensity should be discussed. Will the lights cast white or yellow/orange light? Discuss brightness of interior illumination in relation to other parking structures (e.g. The Westchester's garage is notably "white light").

(Memorandum from City of Yonkers Planning Bureau, dated 11/18/2005)

Response H-21

As part of the overall design of the parking structure, please note:

- *The lighting will be a "white light" utilizing metal halide fixtures, and in the range of 8 to 10 footcandles. This is similar to "The Westchester" although a bit brighter.*
- *The lighting will remain on 24 hours a day, however, between the hours of midnight and 6:00 am the illumination levels will be reduced 50%.*
- *The structure may not be used by customers after business hours; however, it will not be closed. Maintaining access allows the Center's 24-hour security force to patrol the garage to ensure safety.*
- *It is the Applicant's opinion that the proposed location of the primary parking structure is in the most ideal location. It is centrally located; it is at its maximum distance from the surrounding property lines; and it is enclosed by existing and proposed buildings which will hide the structure from outside the site looking in. Hiding the parking structure within the site along with reducing the lighting levels during the overnight hours will be sufficient to minimize the parking structure's impacts on the adjoining areas.*
- *It is the Applicant's intent to illuminate the roof deck with poles.*
- *It is the Applicant's opinion that providing nighttime graphic simulations are not necessary due to the Applicant proposing reducing the lighting levels by 50% during the overnight hours and that the parking structure is hidden within the site.*

Comment H-22

The garage and other structured parking presents a particular lighting challenge:

- 1) Will lighting need to remain on overnight for security reasons?
- 2) Can structures be closed after business hours and lighting reduced to lower security levels?
- 3) Structured parking will present a significantly different element to the Central Park Avenue visual character. The structures will present themselves as a major new element at night with five “bands” of light, along with the lighted stair tower. Is there any way to minimize these impacts?
- 4) There is no indication of how the roof of the structures will be illuminated. Will luminaries on poles extend above the deck?
- 5) Provide a simulation showing how garage structures will appear normally and with reduced lighting during the night?

Mitigation Measures

- 1) Site lighting - as noted earlier about height of lighting on garage roof and appearance of garage lighting.

(Memorandum from City of Yonkers Planning Bureau, dated 11/18/2005)

Response H-22

As part of this submission, the Applicant proposes illuminating the parking structure roof deck with poles. These poles will be lit during the evening and nighttime hours for

security reasons. However, from the hours of midnight to 6:00 am, the illumination levels will be reduced by 50%. The lighted garage is illustrated on Figure H-22.

Comment H-23

There should be affirmative statements about compliance with City of Yonkers lighting standards.

(Memorandum from City of Yonkers Planning Bureau, dated 11/18/2005)

Response H-23

The applicant will comply with all relevant City of Yonkers lighting standards and regulations.

Comment H-24

Signage

The existing pylon signs are too big and reflect a “prehistoric” aesthetic in shopping design. If the interior of the center is being rehabilitated and brought up to a more modern design, doesn't the applicant owe the same to the community? There is no need for signs as large as those that exist because:

- 1) Cross County Center is an iconic location and does not require the same level of place identification as a lesser center.
- 2) The height is not necessary to be seen from the adjacent highways since there are no exits that can see the signs and allow drivers to safely exit.

Provide the Lead Agency with alternative sign layouts and sizes. Discuss any impediments to changing the sign.

Response H-24

As part of this submission the Applicant will be proposing a revised typical pylon sign design of Vredenburg, Kimball and Central Park Avenues. See Figure H-12. The new pylon signs will be designed with the same overall design intent and character that is being proposed for the new work and renovation work at the Center. It is the Applicant's opinion that the overall existing size, height and illumination levels of the pylon signs will remain the same, and, that, for a Center of this size (± 71 acres), especially in this market, it requires a "presence" to locate the project and identify it for the customer. Additionally, the Center's pylon size and height is considerably smaller and lower than its neighbor directly to the south (The Mall at Cross County). Figure H-24 provides a relative size comparison of these two signs.