

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses the potential direct and indirect social and economic impacts that could occur as a result of the Proposed Action. Included in this analysis is a discussion of the potential for the planned redevelopment and density bonuses to cause the direct displacement of residents and businesses as well as secondary or indirect displacement.

Primary, or direct, displacement is that resulting from the replacement of existing land uses and structures with proposed development and is therefore limited to the downtown study area (see Figure 5-1). The issue of secondary, or indirect, displacement arises when a particular development or public action has the potential to significantly affect real estate market trends and values in a particular area to the extent that property owners, attempting to capitalize on the increasing economic value of their land, may institute a variety of actions (e.g., rent increases, co-op conversions, site assemblage for development) that place certain groups (e.g., low- and moderate-income residents, retail and service businesses, and wholesale and manufacturing tenants) “at risk” of being displaced. To understand the potential for secondary displacement, the analysis must disclose both demographic trends and the character of a particular neighborhood or neighborhoods. The analysis for this secondary displacement relies on the data gathered for census tracts included within the study area as well as those tracts in close proximity to the study area.

In establishing a secondary study area for analyzing potential displacement impacts, three factors are important: first, the size of a project, with larger projects tending to exert an influence over a wider area; second, actual physical barriers or clearly delineated neighborhood boundaries; and third, other influences on development including the influence of any other projects and development trends surpassing that of the proposed action. The purpose of creating a secondary study area is to analyze demographic trends of the downtown area and adjacent neighborhoods. Therefore, the secondary study area for this project includes the census tracts within and adjacent to the downtown area. It contains Census Tracts 58, 59.01, 59.02, 60, 61, 63, and 65 (see Figure 5-1). These census tract boundaries often extend well beyond ¼-mile mile from the downtown area so it is important to note that demographic data for these census tracts is not specific to the downtown and its immediate surroundings, but it does provide a general indication of demographic trends in the downtown and neighborhoods surrounding the downtown.

The potential socioeconomic effects of the Proposed Action are largely similar to the socioeconomic effects of the initial DDB Overlay District. While the Proposed Action would result in larger increases in the number of new residents in the downtown area when compared to the increases projected for the initial DDB Overlay District (which increase is included in this analysis), this increase alone would not trigger any new impact from direct or indirect displacement of protected populations. Environmental impact assessment of potential projects that seek to benefit from the Proposed Action would include a more detailed, site-specific study

identifying potential displacement and effects on socioeconomic conditions within the downtown.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS

As described in Chapter 2. “Land Use, Community Character, Zoning, and Public Policy,” the study area is in a mixed-use downtown setting. A range of land uses including large apartment buildings, office buildings, and smaller buildings with a mix of commercial and residential uses all exist with the downtown. This mix of uses creates a vibrant downtown which is home to numerous residents and economic activity. The discussion below provides a detailed analysis of demographic conditions within the study area.

TOTAL POPULATION

According to the 2000 Census Figures (see Table 5-1), there were 30,449 residents living within the study area. This represents a 9.2 percent increase in total study area population from 1990 which contrasts to New Rochelle as whole which saw a 14.7 percent total population increase. With the exception of tracts 59.02 and 61 which saw a small decline and small gain respectively, all of the tracts within the study area saw population increases of nearly 10 percent or more. These figures indicate that the populations of New Rochelle and the study area generally steadily increased, even prior to the major developments that have recently occurred in the downtown.

**Table 5-1
Population**

Census Tract	1990	2000	Change 1990 - 2000	
			Number	Percent
58	3,478	3,891	413	11.9
59.01	3,822	4,209	387	10.1
59.02	5,666	5,509	-157	-2.8
60	2,850	3,112	262	9.2
61	2,382	2,409	27	1.1
63	5,033	5,905	872	17.3
65	4,655	5,414	759	16.3
Study Area	27,886	30,449	2,563	9.2
New Rochelle	67,265	77,182	9,917	14.7
Sources: US Census, 1990 and 2000, Summary Tape File 3.				

HOUSEHOLDS AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The number of households in the study area also rose during the period between 1990 and 2000 (see Table 5-2). This change is proportional to the total increase in population, thereby indicating growth in the downtown. Consistent with the minimal population increase in Tract 61, the number of households in Tract 61 fell by two percent.

Table 5-2
Housholds and Household Size

Census Tract	1990		2000 *		Change in No. of Households 1990-2000	
	Number	Persons Per Household	Number	Persons Per Household	Number	Percent
58	1,476	2.36	1,516	2.55	40	2.7
59.01	1,713	2.16	1,756	2.39	43	2.5
59.02	2,407	2.33	2,433	2.26	26	1.1
60	1,022	2.77	1,049	3.01	27	2.6
61	802	2.97	786	3.00	-16	-2.0
63	1,846	2.43	2,026	2.72	180	9.8
65	1,431	3.16	1,612	3.25	181	12.6
Study Area	10,697	2.53	1,178	2.74	481	4.5
New Rochelle	25,263	2.58	26,235	2.68	972	3.8

Sources: US Census, 1990 and 2000, Summary Tape File 3

The number of persons per household also slightly rose between 1990 and 2000 as shown in Table 5-2. Each tract in the study area saw an increase in household size which led to a study area wide change from 2.53 to 2.74. This change is consistent with increases Citywide.

INCOME

An analysis of income trends in the study area reveals that the median household income for the tracts in the study area rose 5.7 percent between 1989 and 1999 which is similar to the increase of 5.0 percent for the City as a whole (see Table 5-3). Although the median household income for the study area rose 5.7 percent, two tracts were major outliers. These include Tract 59.02 which saw a 19.9 percent increase and Tract 60 which saw a 12.6 percent decrease.

While income in the study area and throughout New Rochelle has risen, the number of residents below the poverty level has also seen a significant increase between 1990 and 2000. Table 5-4 shows that every census tract in the study area has seen an increase in poverty. The most significant increase in poverty within the study area is seen in Tract 59.01 which occupies the area to the south and east of Main and Church Streets. Tracts 61 and 65 are also marked by relatively significant increases in poverty.

**Table 5-3
Median Household Income**

Census Tract	1989 Median Household Income*	1999 Median Household Income*	Change 1989 - 1999	
			Dollars	Percent
58	\$26,010	\$41,529	\$87	0.2
59.01	\$29,265	\$47,600	-\$776	-1.7
59.02	\$48,725	\$62,455	\$15,505	19.9
60	\$31,985	\$57,560	-\$6,424	-12.6
61	\$30,192	\$46,708	\$1,560	3.3
63	\$23,413	\$32,826	\$4,635	12.4
65	\$44,028	\$63,805	\$6,639	9.4
Study Area	\$33,374	\$50,360	\$3,038	5.7
New Rochelle	\$43,482	\$66,060	\$3,511	5.0

Notes: * Adjusted to 2005 dollars using Consumer Price Index (CPI) Inflation Calculator
Sources: US Census, 1990 and 2000, Summary Tape File 3

**Table 5-4
Persons Below the Poverty Levels**

Census Tract	1990	2000	Change 1990 - 2000	
			Number	Percent
58	414	574	160	38.6
59.01	260	570	310	119.2
59.02	313	378	65	20.8
60	335	36	1	0.3
61	251	426	175	69.7
63	864	1,031	167	19.3
65	450	748	298	66.2
Study Area	2,887	4,063	1,176	40.7
New Rochelle	4,564	7,367	2,803	61.4

Sources: US Census, 1990 and 2000, Summary Tape File 3

HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

The study area saw a slight rise in the number of housing units between 1990 and 2000, but this 2.7 percent rise in housing was lower than the 13.6 percent rise in New Rochelle (see Table 5-5). This is likely a reflection of the limited redevelopment activity and lack of undeveloped land in the areas surrounding the downtown. Furthermore, tracts 58 and 61, which are located at the western end of the downtown area, actually saw decreases in the number of housing units.

Table 5-5
Housing Units

Census Tract	1990	2000	Change 1990 - 2000	
			Number	Percent
58	1,579	1,562	-17	-1.1
59.01	1,815	1,832	17	0.9
59.02	2,506	2,492	-14	-0.6
60	984	1,042	58	5.9
61	893	838	-55	-6.2
63	1,909	2,077	168	8.8
65	1,525	1,667	142	9.3
Study Area	11,211	11,510	299	2.7
New Rochelle	26,398	29,995	3,597	13.6
Sources: US Census, 1990 and 2000, Summary Tape File 3				

In an analysis of housing tenure, it becomes apparent that the number of housing units occupied by renters has increased. Housing tenure is particularly relevant to an analysis of potential secondary displacement, since residents who own their units are not subject to the same displacement pressures as tenants. Census figures indicate that some tracts, such as 60 and 65, located at the eastern end of the study area have seen a 12.4 and 24.3 percent increase in the number of renters, respectively. Similarly, the number of owner occupied units has decreased (see Table 5-6).

**Table 5-6
Housing Tenure**

Census Tract	1990			2000 *			Change in No. of Rental Units 1990-2000	
	Total Housing Units	No. of Rental Units	Percent Rental Units	Total Housing Units	No. of Rental Units	Percent Rental Units	Number	Percent
58	1,579	1,011	64.0	1,523	1,080	70.9	69	6.8
59.01	1,815	1,259	69.4	1,762	1,213	68.8	-46	-3.7
59.02	2,506	1,309	52.2	2,428	1,412	58.2	103	7.9
60	984	532	54.1	1,033	598	57.9	66	12.4
61	893	597	66.9	803	575	71.6	-22	-3.7
63	1,909	1,512	79.2	2,023	1,649	81.5	137	9.1
65	1,525	588	38.6	1,605	731	45.6	143	24.3
Study Area	11,211	6,808	60.7	11,177	7,258	64.9	450	6.6
New Rochelle	25,317	12,247	48.4	26,189	13,016	49.7	769	6.3

Sources: US Census, 1990 and 2000, Summary Tape File 3

PROTECTION OF CURRENT RESIDENTS

Whether or not residents are potentially vulnerable to involuntary displacement is largely a consequence of several factors, including market conditions and trends, and public policy decisions. Within the downtown area, these policy decisions include the presence of a number of subsidized housing developments where the selection of tenants and rents are typically controlled by government regulations and therefore are not as subject to outside market forces, or state legislation that regulate the rents paid by tenants and the process by which buildings may be converted to cooperative and condominium use.

RENT CONTROL/RENT STABILIZATION

Two of the most important measures protecting tenants in New Rochelle are rent control and rent stabilization. Both regulation systems are administered and enforced by the Department of Housing and Community Renewal (DHCR). The year a structure was built and the number of units it contains affects the type of rent protection afforded to occupants in New York State. In Westchester, approximately 31,000 apartments—housing 10 percent of the County’s population in 18 communities—are covered by the Emergency Tenant Protection Act (ETPA).

Rent control is the older of the two systems of rent regulation. It dates back to the housing shortage immediately following World War II and generally applies to buildings constructed before 1947. Rent stabilization generally covers buildings built after 1947 and before 1974, and

apartments removed from rent control. Outside New York City rent stabilization is also known as ETPA, for the Emergency Tenant Protection Act.

The greatest protection afforded to rent-controlled and rent-stabilized tenants is the limitation of rent increases landlords can charge when leases are renewed. The amount of rent increases for both rent-controlled and rent-stabilized tenants is determined yearly by the Westchester County Rent Guidelines Board. The amount of the increases for rent-stabilized apartments varies from year to year according to what is deemed a fair reflection of the year's inflation and increase in landlords' maintenance costs (particularly heating fuel prices and certain major capital improvements on the building). Also, the State's new rent law signed by Governor George Pataki in June 1997 limits increases on vacant apartments to 20 percent of the former rent. Thus, landlords can raise the rent to the highest comparable level or charge 20 percent more.

Under the ETPA, tenants in rent-controlled units are provided certain relocation protections and compensation should displacement resulting from proposed demolition be involved. The primary protections include notification requirements and the ability to remain in the protected unit pending review of demolition applications by DHCR. Displaced tenants would have compensation under the ETPA including moving expenses, relocation to a comparable new housing accommodation, and/or a stipend equal to the difference in rent.

ANTI-HARASSMENT PROVISION

Despite the protections afforded tenants under rent control and rent stabilization, tenants can be forced out of their apartments through illegal activities, such as harassment by landlords. The New York State Rent Law and Regulations include anti-harassment provisions. The Enforcement Bureau of the State's Office of Rent Administration, a component of DHCR, is responsible for enforcing the anti-harassment regulations. Tenants must file a formal harassment complaint with DHCR, which first attempts to attain a voluntary agreement between tenant and landlord.

If this fails, DHCR can take legal action in housing court on behalf of the tenant to compel services and repairs. In more severe cases, an administrator may be appointed for the building or criminal proceedings may be undertaken.

SRO UNITS

SRO units are of concern in an analysis of housing conditions for several reasons: SRO units have traditionally been and are still a source of housing for low- and moderate-income residents, particularly elderly and minority residents; and second, for neighborhoods attracting substantial amounts of new investment, buildings with SRO units may be vulnerable to upgrading or demolition as part of development assemblages with a related displacement of their tenants.

SRO units are subject to the same rent control/rent stabilization provisions that apply to all rental units within New York State. With regard to evictions of SRO tenants, an occupant who has lived in a room for 30 days or longer, even though he has not requested a lease and is not a permanent tenant, may be evicted only pursuant to an action or proceeding instituted in Civil Court. Tenants who have lived in their units for fewer than 30 days and who have not requested a lease can be evicted without court process. Certain eviction proceedings require the approval of DHCR and others do not. Tenants may be evicted by Court Order without approval by DHCR for certain wrongful acts, such as non-payment of rents or other charges, illegally using or occupying the housing accommodation, unlawfully refusing the owner access, etc. No approval

Downtown Density Bonus DSGEIS

for DHCR is required in circumstances where the owner wants to use the housing unit for personal use or for the personal use of his/her immediate family or in those instances where the unit is owned by an institution such as a hospital, college, or not-for-profit charitable organization, and that institution requires the unit for its charitable or educational purpose.

DHCR approval of an eviction is required where the landlord seeks to withdraw a unit from the rental market, demolish the housing accommodations for the purpose of constructing a new building or eliminate inadequate, unsafe, or unsanitary conditions. To withdraw a unit from the rental market, the owner must demonstrate that he/she does not intend to sell all or any part of the land or structure and that the units required for his/her own use in connection with a business that he/she owns and operates or there are violations that cannot be economically removed. To demolish a building, the owner must demonstrate that he/she has either filed or approved plans for a new building and has the financial ability to construct the new building. In the case of demolition, the owner is responsible for the relocation of the tenants to suitable housing at the same or lower regulated rent in a closely proximate area and for paying moving expenses. An additional stipend is required to be paid to the tenant whether the relocation housing is at a rent in excess of the subject apartment. Where a tenant is moved because of inadequate, unsafe, or unsanitary conditions, the owner must agree to offer the tenant the right of first occupancy following any rehabilitation of the unit at a rent as determined by applicable laws.

SENIOR CITIZEN RENT INCREASE EXEMPTION (SCRIE)

This program, administered by the DHCR in conjunction with the City of New Rochelle, provides added rent regulation for senior citizens. SCRIE applies to tenants who are 62 years old and over and are eligible if their incomes are below a maximum limit set by local law and they are paying at least one-third of their income for rent.

PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING

The study area contains several public and publicly subsidized housing establishments. As shown in Table 5-7, 450 housing units in the study area use some form of public assistance. The discussion below describes subsidized housing programs in effect in the study area.

Table 5-7
Subsidized Housing Projects in Downtown New Rochelle

Name	Address	Type	Programs	Units
Peter B. Bracey Apartments	361 Main Street	Family	NRMHA	100
Maple Terrace	55-63 Maple Avenue	Senior	Section 202, Section 8	90
Maple center	35 Maple Avenue	Senior	Mitchell-Lama, Section 8	108
Huguenot Houses	16 Locust Avenue	Family/Senior	Section 8	152
Total				450
Sources: New Rochelle Department of Development				

Subsidized housing in New Rochelle is both public (owned and operated by the government) and private (owned and/or operated by private individuals with the help of government funds). Other forms of assisted housing are administered by City, State and federal programs as described

below. Over 3,400 units of assisted housing exist in New Rochelle through a wide variety of state and federal programs. These units are currently administered by a variety of organizations including the New Rochelle Municipal Housing Authority (NRMHA), New Rochelle Public Housing Agency (NRPHA), and New Rochelle Neighborhood Revitalization Corporation. Since these units and housing projects are generally administered by public or quasi-public agencies, pressures for displacement would be minimal. Subsidized housing units outside the downtown area are scattered throughout the City but are generally located in close proximity to business, employment, and transportation centers in downtown New Rochelle. The following discussion describes subsidized housing programs currently in effect in the downtown area.

SECTION 8 HOUSING

This program was created by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. Under the program a lower income tenant pays either 30 percent of his/her adjusted income, 10 percent of gross income, or the portion of welfare assistance designated for rent, and HUD makes up the difference between what a lower income household can afford and the fair market rent for an adequate housing unit. Income limits are 80 percent of the median income for the area in which the project is located. There are several programs under Section 8 housing, however, the most common is the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program.

The HCV Program provides rental assistance and home ownership options to very low-income households. The program also provides assistance to senior citizens and disabled persons on fixed incomes, displaced families, and homeless individuals with disabilities. Housing choice vouchers allow very low-income households to choose and lease or purchase safe, decent, and affordable housing. There are a variety of types of vouchers available including: Conversion Vouchers, Family Unification Vouchers, Homeownership Vouchers, Project Based Vouchers, Tenant Based Vouchers, Vouchers for People with Disabilities, and Welfare-to-Work Vouchers. The most commonly used voucher is the Tenant Based Voucher which allows a family to choose and rent a privately owned residence.

SECTION 202 HOUSING

The Section 202 program is intended to provide housing and support services for the elderly. The program provides very low-income elderly with options that allow them to live independently in an environment that provides support services such as cleaning, cooking, and transportation.

MITCHELL-LAMA HOUSING

New York State was the first state to implement a state-subsidized public housing program, of which Mitchell-Lama was one. This program was designed to meet the serious need for housing by families with incomes too high for public housing, but not high enough to encourage private developers to build housing for them. The State Legislature passed the Limited Profit Housing Companies Law of 1955. Through a combination of below-market financing and local tax exemption, rents could be reduced so that they could be afforded by families of moderate income.

NEW ROCHELLE MUNICIPAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The New Rochelle Municipal Housing Authority (NRMHA) owns and manages the City's public housing stock. Of the 543 family and senior housing units owned by NRMHA, 100 are in

the downtown in the Peter B. Bracey Apartments. The NRMHA is also responsible for administering the Section 8 Housing Program in New Rochelle and currently holds 201 vouchers.

SUMMARY OF POPULATION AT RISK OF DISPLACEMENT

POPULATION AND HOUSING TRENDS

The study area does not exhibit significant population and housing trends that tend to identify neighborhoods where displacement pressures currently exist, such as increases in population and housing units as a result of private market activity; small and declining household sizes, with a preponderance of one- and two-person households; and rising incomes. Although some of these trends exist in certain census tracts in and around the downtown, they are consistent with trends in New Rochelle as a whole. Furthermore, the trends indicated by census data are consistent with the goals and recommendations of the City's Comprehensive Plan which calls for the revitalization of the downtown by bringing in a critical mass of new residents and promoting economic activity as discussed in Chapter 2.

The trends that provide indications of potential displacement pressures are also matched by the study area experiencing a substantial overall increase in household size, a modest increase in real income less than that for New Rochelle as a whole, and an increase in the number of study area residents with incomes below the poverty level. These trends substantially offset indications that displacement pressures exist.

UNPROTECTED UNITS

Housing units built in 1974 or later are not protected from rent control or rent stabilization. According to Census 2000 figures, the census tracts comprising the study area include 11,177 total housing units. Census data also provides the age a structure was built. Although 1974 was not a break point for the 2000 census, the number of housing units built after 1970 can be determined to provide a more conservative estimate of the number of housing units not protected from rent control or rent stabilization. Table 5-8 shows a summary of the number of renter occupied housing units built in each tract after 1970 in the study area. As shown in the table, 2000 Census data show that 1,206 renter-occupied units within the study area were built in 1970 or later, which would typically indicate that they are not subject to rent control/stabilization laws. These 1,206 units represent approximately 11 percent of the study areas total housing stock.

Residents of Unprotected Units

Based on the 2000 census, the study area average household size is 2.74 persons. Based on this figure and the approximately 1,206 housing units likely to be unprotected from rent increase, an estimated 3,300 residents occupy the unprotected units identified above. While it is likely that not all of these residents are of low or moderate income, the groups most susceptible to rent-related displacement pressures, it represents a worst-case universe of renters most susceptible to displacement. It should be noted that all assisted housing units within the study area would be protected from rent increases in the future.

**Table 5-8
Housing Units Built 1970-March 2000**

Tract	Units built 1970-March 2000
58	265
59.01	182
59.02	143
60	0
61	61
63	509
65	46
Study Area	1,206
Sources: US Census, 2000, Summary Tape File 3	

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

There are a range of businesses in downtown New Rochelle typical of many downtowns. With the exception of some larger businesses and attractions in downtown New Rochelle such as those found in the newly constructed New Roc City, most businesses generally appear to serve the local community by providing goods and services. Typical examples of businesses include:

- Restaurants
- Fast-food restaurants
- Grocery stores
- Travel agencies
- Furniture stores
- Hair salons
- Delicatessens
- Florists
- Bars/Clubs
- Banks
- Professional offices
- Fitness/health centers
- Clothing/apparel stores
- Miscellaneous goods

Several other businesses in the downtown are likely to attract patrons from throughout the region. Examples of these businesses include the entertainment facilities at New Roc City, public storage facilities, and car dealerships. Another major source of economic activity is in the office buildings located throughout the downtown, but primarily in the outer core as defined in Chapter 2, "Land Use, Community Character, Zoning, and Public Policy."

During field surveys conducted in July and October of 2005, the businesses generally appeared to be operating successfully with a number of patrons and clients visible in the range of storefronts. The field surveys did, however, identify four storefronts that were vacant, and two additional buildings with vacant upper stories.

C. POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

DIRECT DISPLACEMENT

Since the Proposed Action does not involve a specific development proposal on a defined site, it is not possible to determine whether any direct displacement will occur as a result of the Proposed Action. Any potential future development projects that utilize the proposed density

bonus would be required to provide a detailed analysis of direct displacement resulting from the specific project.

PROJECTED POPULATION

Under the Proposed Action, it is estimated that approximately 1,842 new residential units could be constructed in the downtown. Given the average household size within the study area of 2.74, this could potentially increase population within the study area by 5,047 people. This total population growth of approximately 16.6 percent would be spread over several years, and nearly twice the growth rate of the study area from 1990 to 2000. It is however, consistent with the overall growth rate of New Rochelle.

EFFECTS ON POPULATION VULNERABLE TO DISPLACEMENT

The potential addition of approximately 5,047 new residents to the study area represents an approximately 16.6 percent increase in the study area population. Future tenants living in the larger high-rise towers that would be permitted by the Proposed Action are expected to be relatively affluent and predominantly in the 25- to 44-year-old age group, and comprise a preponderance of one- and two-person households. The population characteristics of new residents would likely differ from those of residents of the surrounding study area. The approximately 3,300 tenants living in the existing residential units in the study area that are not protected by rent control, rent stabilization, or housing subsidies would potentially be subjected to increased displacement pressures as a result of the Proposed Action. By examining the number of renter occupied housing units before 1970, it can be determined that approximately 16,600 residents that could potentially be displaced either directly or through secondary displacement live in the study area. These residents would have the potential benefit of certain statutory and programmatic relocation subsidies or other protections as described above. Bringing a critical mass of new residents to the downtown and stimulating additional activity has, however, been expressed as a goal of the City through the 1996 Comprehensive Plan.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

The Proposed Action would not result in the direct displacement of any businesses, but it may make certain locations in the downtown more attractive for future development. Any future development that occurs at locations with existing businesses may result in their relocation.

The most significant changes resulting from the Proposed Action would affect assemblages of parcels where entire blocks or large portions of those blocks could potentially be redeveloped. The two blocks most likely to be affected by the Proposed Action are on either side of North Avenue on the south side of Huguenot Street. If redevelopment were to occur on these blocks, some existing businesses would be displaced. Any businesses that are displaced could potentially relocate into storefronts of the new development, but this would require temporary closure of the business. Specific site plans for redevelopment of these blocks using the proposed density bonus would require a detailed analysis of specific businesses that would be displaced. Significant changes are less likely to occur elsewhere in the downtown since the density bonus would only apply to parcels of less than 10,000 square feet. In most cases, a property owner would simply add floors to existing buildings and retain existing businesses. Even where demolition of existing structures would be required, only a few businesses would be displaced.

The Proposed Action is also expected to result in a general increase in the amount of economic activity taking place in downtown New Rochelle. Proposals for redevelopment of the

LeCount/Anderson block and Church/Division parking facility (as discussed in Chapter 2, “Land Use, Community Character, Zoning, and Public Policy”) would substantially increase the amount of retail space in the downtown and reintroduce anchor tenants through some large retail spaces. The proposals would also provide new office and hotel space in the downtown. *