

## 1.5 Summary of Project Alternatives Considered

**Comment 1.5-1-GP12:** On Page 1-27, the applicant states "...this alternative [the Reduced Scale Alternative] substantially reduces the visual impact of the development", however there is no analysis provided in the DEIS which substantiates this statement. Given the visually sensitivity of this area including the noted importance of protecting the Town's most important viewshed (i.e. the views from the top of DeLavernge Hill in relationship to large scale development) in the Town's Comprehensive Plan Update, the Planning Board should consider whether the applicant should prepare this analysis for your review. We believe it would be appropriate so that the alternatives can be compared to each other in terms of visual impact. At the moment, the Planning Board can only compare the proposed action, which we know the applicant has no interest in building and the preferred alternative. [Greenplan, Inc., Letter, April 6, 2008, Comment #12, pages 3-4]

**Response 1.5-1-GP12:** The Applicant's representatives had a discussion with Planning Board Chairman George Fenn and Town Planning Consultant Ted Fink on August 21, 2007 about the visual analysis of the Reduced Scale Alternative. Because the number of units within the development was reduced in the alternative plan, the loop road was eliminated, and none of the building heights were being increased, it was agreed that the visual impacts of the alternative would be reduced compared to the Proposed Action because there was significantly less development and disturbance. It was also decided that there was no need to prepare a full visual analysis of photosimulations for the Reduced Scale Alternative because the plan would obviously have less of a visual impact than the proposed action. The Applicant has also advised the Planning Board that the Reduced Scale Alternative is not a financially feasible development option, considering the objectives and capabilities of the Applicant.

**Comment 1.5-2-GP13:** On page 1-28, the applicant states "Despite reductions in impacts to steep slopes and visual resources, the Reduced Scale Alternative does not incorporate as many elements of the traditional neighborhood concept and is not as focused on walkability or compact development..." The applicant needs to explain why the reduced scale cannot accommodate elements of traditional neighborhood design. We point out to the Planning Board that both the Traditional Neighborhood and the Reduced Scale propose the same number of hotel units. Further, the Traditional Neighborhood clusters 215 additional units within ¼ mile of the "core" area, a key component of compact design. That configuration of 215 units represents 36 more units than proposed in the Reduced Scale (179 units). [Greenplan, Inc., Letter, April 6, 2008, Comment #13, page 4]

**Response 1.5-2-GP13:** This comment appears to indicate a desire for a reduced scale alternative that has more units in the core similar to the number of units in the core associated with the TNA plan. While the reduced scale alternative could include some elements of TNA, it would still not make it financially viable considering the capabilities and objectives of the project sponsor. The plan would still require extensive infrastructure elements in the “core” area of the hotel that are associated with the preferred alternative, including the underground parking, golf course, water and wastewater treatment facilities, yet would result in significantly fewer units to offset these costs. This results in a project which is not financially feasible considering the capabilities and objectives of the project sponsor. The Errata section of this FEIS (Section 2.0) notes that the above-quoted sentence regarding “walkability” is stricken from the record.

---