

TOWN OF MARBLETOWN PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Date: July 20, 2016
Rondout Municipal Center, 1915-1925 Lucas Avenue
Meeting Room M-1
Cottekill, New York 12419

Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Present
Steve Wood (Vice-Chairman)	Absent
Sylvia Ricci	Present
Todd Natale	Absent
Kristopher Lovelett	Present
Kathleen Hawk	Present
Larry Ricci	Absent
Mary Collins	Absent

Also present was Planning Board Consultant Bonnie Franson,

Chairman Richard Lanzarone called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 7:03 p.m.

Pending Application - Public Hearing

Applicant- Member De		Application	Location	Zoning District	SBL	Status
Schneller Subd.	Kathleen Hawk	2 Lot Minor Subdivision	75 Bowden Road	A-3	54.3- 1- 28.100	Application Review; revised maps submitted

Applicant Austin Schneller and Surveyor Terry Ringler were present on the application.

The Public Hearing was commenced at 7:08 p.m. and Chairman Lanzarone called upon persons present who wished to be heard relative to the application. Hearing none, **Chairman Lanzarone** called for a motion to close the Public Hearing relative to the Schneller application. Upon Motion of Member Kris Lovelett, seconded by Member Kathleen Hawk and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

Conditions of approval were discussed which included the issue of grading and the request of the Fire Department to provide two pull offs with a distance of approximately 500' between each. Chairman Lanzarone directed that the June 2, 2016 letter of the Vly Atwood Fire Department be provided to the applicant so that a revised map could be drawn up and the matter was to be placed on the Agenda for a special meeting of the Planning Board to take place on Thursday, July 28, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

Member Kris Lovelett inquired as to the grading issue (slopes and section of driveway) to which the applicant responded that it was at 13 percent maximum grading. Although Planning doesn't regulate, they needed to determine that it was reasonable. Additionally, the applicant indicated that Board of Health approval had been requested relative to Lot 1 and the Board determined that the approval would be a condition of the approval. The Board through Chairman Lanzarone concluded indicating that the day of the meeting was acceptable to submit revised map, but the earlier in the day would be best.

Pending Application - Public Hearing

Applicant – Board	Application	Location	Zoning	SBL	Status
Member Delegate			District		

Reynolds,	Mary	Subdivision &	88 Cherry	A-3	61.3-3-	Public
Bash &	Collins	Lot Line	Hill Road /72		37.100 &	Hearing
Gorn		Adjustment	Cherry Hill		61.3-3-	
			Road		37.200	

Surveyor William Eggers and Michael Moriello, Esq. were present on the application.

Chairman Lanzarone called the Public Hearing to order and called upon persons present who wished to be heard relative to the application. Hearing none, **Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion to** close the Public Hearing relative to the Reynolds, Bash & Gorn Lot Line Adjustment and Subdivision application. Upon Motion of Member Sylvia Ricci, seconded by Member Kris Lovelett and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

A Resolution had been drafted relative to the approval and the Board reviewed (annexed hereto and made a part hereof as "Reynolds Resolution") – corrections to the acreage were made during the review per indications made by Surveyor Eggers. Confirmation that the correct bat note was to be placed on the maps which pertained only to the Northern Long-eared Bat which also was not overly restrictive relative to tree cutting and the area of disturbance.

Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion to approve the application for a subdivision and lotline adjustment with conditions. Upon Motion of Kathleen Hawk, seconded by Member Kris Lovelett and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye

Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

Conditions:

- 1. A Mylar and 6 paper sets of the final subdivision plat shall be submitted for signature.
- 2. Submission of new legal descriptions.
- 3. Evidence of filing CPS-7
- 4. Bat note to read: "Trees shall only be cut, removed, or lopped during the time period after October 31st through March 31st to avoid any potential impact to roosting Northern Long-Eared bats."
- 5. Ulster County Department of Health approval on proposed wells and septic.
- 6. Compliance with comments of Fire District dated 7/20/16
- 7. Compliance with comments of Highway Superintendent and any modifications requested therein, if any.

At this point of the meeting, Alternate Member Mary Collins called in to join the conversation.

Pending Applications:

Applicant- I Delegate	Board Member	Application	Location	Zoning District	SBL	Status
Rite Aid	Richard	Site Plan	3852 Main	B-1	69.2-5-	Application
#10704	Lanzarone	Amendment	Street		3.200	Review

Dan Nikolich was present on the application.

Most recent plan submitted was brought up for review. Chairman Lanzarone noted that revisions reflected that there was now a gable end clad in cedar shakes, a sign similar to the KeyBank sign with a woodgrain background with white raised letters and a white boarder to distinguish itself. The trim was to be cedar to match surrounding material used which would age and blend in with the existing structures. The pharmacy sign would be hanging and similar in construction as the main sign with the building to remain brown in color. Exterior lighting as depicted on the cut sheets (gooseneck) was to be used for illumination (cut sheet part of the file on record).

Question was raised as to the size on the monument sign to which the applicant responded that it was the same.

Application not subject to SEQRA since it was a Type II action.

Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion to approve the application. Upon Motion of Member Kris Lovelett, seconded by Member Sylvia Ricci and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

Pending Application:

Applicant- Member De		Application	Location	Zoning District	SBL	Status
Stone Gate	Larry Ricci	4 Lot Minor	Atwood	A-3	54.1-1-	Conclude
Subdivision		Subdivision	Road		21.200	SEQRA

Applicant Mark Usvolk and Engineer Andrew Willingham were present on the application.

Chairman Lanzarone recounted that the Public Hearing was held and closed on July 20, 2016 with an extension granted for 10 days for written comments to be submitted relative to engineering issues and stormwater and drainage patterns on the site. The Town's Engineer consulted with the Applicant's Engineer, a number of modifications were agreed to addressing the neighbor's concerns and reflected on a revised map which was then reviewed by the DPW and the Town's Engineer who indicated that the issues raised by the adjoiner had been satisfactorily addressed and the Board was ready to take action. The attorney for the adjoiners was not aware of the meeting and was not present. Chairman Lanzarone indicated that he had consulted with the Board's Attorney Wolinsky who had reviewed the adjoiners' attorney's

comments, the Applicant's Engineers comments and the Boards' Engineer's comments. Attorney Wolinsky had indicated that the Board had "done a good job" in addressing the concerns of the neighbor and the Board was in a position to take action on the application.

Chairman Lanzarone requested that the Resolution (annexed hereto as "Stonegate Resolution) be projected for review and suggested an additional "whereas" clause to reflect that the Brinnier & Larios July 19, 2016 recommendation had been received wherein it was indicated that "all issues raised by the adjoiners' engineer and attorney had been addressed." Conditions to the approval were then reviewed including the requirements of the CPS7 which needed to include provisions for a road maintenance escrow fund and annual assessments. Condition for health department approval for well and septic was added although it was indicated that it had been obtained. All other conditions to approval were reviewed and made a part of the Resolution attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion to approve the application. Upon Motion of Members Sylvia Ricci, seconded by Member Kris Lovelett and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

Pending Application:

Applicant- Boa Member Delega		Application	Location	Zoning District	SBL	Status
Barking Dog	Mary	Lot Line	5 & 7	B-1	70.46-	Application
Antiques, LLA	Collins	Adjustment –	Second		2-26 &	review
		Different	Street		27	
		owners				

Chairman Lanzarone requested overview from Planner Franson.

Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion confirming determination that the action met the requirements of a lot line adjustment under the Town Code. Upon Motion of Member Kris Lovelett, seconded by Member Kathleen Hawk and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion confirming determination that the proposed application was to be classified as a Type I action under SEQRA due to its location in a historical district. Upon Motion of Member Kris Lovelett, seconded by Member Sylvia Ricci and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

The Full EAF Part II was reviewed by the Board (annexed hereto as "Barking Dog EAF Part II). It was noted under item 10(c) that "no or small impact should occur" with the explanation being

that no physical disturbance was part of the action. Based on the foregoing, Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion to issue a negative declaration. Upon motion of Member Kris Lovelett, seconded by Member Sylvia Ricci and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

Chairman Lanzarone called for a motion to approve the application. Upon Motion of Member Kris Lovelett seconded by Member Kathleen Hawk and the affirmative vote of 4 members, 0 Alternate Member, the negative vote of 0 Members, the abstention of 0 members and 3 Members being absent, a motion was carried unanimously by the following vote:

Vote:	All Aye
Richard Lanzarone (Chairman)	Aye
Steve Wood (Vice Chairman)	Absent
Kris Lovelett	Aye
Sylvia Ricci	Aye
Kathy Hawk	Aye
Larry Ricci	Absent
Todd Natale	Absent
Mary Collins (Alternate)	Absent

Pending Application:

Applicant Member		Application	Location	Zoning District	SBL	Status
Stone	Kris Lovelett	Site Plan	3885 Main	B-1	69.2-5-	Site Plan Review
Ridge			Street		4	
Clock						
Tower						

Shoppe			

Member Kris Lovelett was required to leave the meeting and a quorum was no longer present but he had provided a 4- page written email comment which had been forwarded to the members of the Board and Nadine Carney of Peak engineering. The Board indicated that it was willing to review the comments but that a special meeting was taking place on July 28, 2016 at which a quorum would be present, and that it was the option of the applicant if she wished to discuss presently or be placed on the upcoming Agenda. Chairman Lanzarone indicated that he would contact all members to encourage written comments to be submitted prior to the next meeting.

It was determined that escrow in the Schneller application needed to be set at \$400.00 and escrow in the Reynolds application needed to be set at \$500.00.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa K. Mance, Secretary Dated this 6th Day of September, 2016 Minutes Approved on: October 19, 2016

MARBLETOWN PLANNING BOARD JULY 20, 2016 PUBLIC HEARING & REGULAR MEETING

	_		_
N	Δ	NΛ	F

RE: APPLICATION

TITLE/E-MAIL ADDRESS

NAIVIE	RE. APPLICATION	TITLE/E-IVIAIL ADDRESS
Artin Schill	Schnellen	APP.
Aut Schill Ferry Pyl	Schnellen	
1 0		
	`	
		<u> </u>
	-	

0				

Full Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 - Identification of Potential Project Impacts

	Agency Use Only [If applicabl
Project	BARKING DOG ANTIQUES
Date:	JULY 20, 2016

Part 2 is to be completed by the lead agency. Part 2 is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be affected by a proposed project or action. We recognize that the lead agency's reviewer(s) will not necessarily be environmental professionals. So, the questions are designed to walk a reviewer through the assessment process by providing a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part 1. To further assist the lead agency in completing Part 2, the form identifies the most relevant questions in Part 1 that will provide the information needed to answer the Part 2 question. When Part 2 is completed, the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

If the lead agency is a state agency and the action is in any Coastal Area, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment.

Tips for completing Part 2:

- Review all of the information provided in Part 1.
- Review any application, maps, supporting materials and the Full EAF Workbook.
- Answer each of the 18 questions in Part 2.
- If you answer "Yes" to a numbered question, please complete all the questions that follow in that section.
- If you answer "No" to a numbered question, move on to the next numbered question.
- Check appropriate column to indicate the anticipated size of the impact.
- Proposed projects that would exceed a numeric threshold contained in a question should result in the reviewing agency
 checking the box "Moderate to large impact may occur."
- The reviewer is not expected to be an expert in environmental analysis.
- If you are not sure or undecided about the size of an impact, it may help to review the sub-questions for the general question and consult the workbook.
- When answering a question consider all components of the proposed activity, that is, the "whole action".
- Consider the possibility for long-term and cumulative impacts as well as direct impacts.
- Answer the question in a reasonable manner considering the scale and context of the project.

1. Impact on Land Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1) If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 2.	NC		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.	E2d		
b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.	E2f		0
c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.	E2a		
d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.	D2a	П	
e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.	Dle		П
f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).	D2e, D2q		П
g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.	Bli		
h. Other impacts:			П

2. Impact on Geological Features The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhi			
access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g)	NO		YES
If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", move on to Section 3.	Relevant Part I	No, or small	Moderate to large
	Question(s)	impact may occur	impact may occur
a. Identify the specific land form(s) attached:	E2g		
b. The proposed action may affect or is adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark. Specific feature:	E3c	D	
c. Other impacts:		П	. 0
3. Impacts on Surface Water The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h) If "Yes", answer questions a - l. If "No", move on to Section 4.	NO		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may create a new water body.	D2b, D1h		
b. The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.	D2b		
c. The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.	D2a		
d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.	E2h		
e. The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.	D2a, D2h		
f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.	D2c		
g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).	D2d		D
n. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.	D2e		
. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.	E2h		П
The proposed action may involve the application of pesticides or herbicides in or around any water body.	D2q, E2h	0	
The proposed action may require the construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment facilities.	D1a, D2d		

1. Other impacts:			
A)			
4. Impact on groundwater The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquife (See Part 1. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t) If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 5.	√ NO		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may require new water supply wells, or create additional demand on supplies from existing water supply wells.	D2c	ib(0
b. Water supply demand from the proposed action may exceed safe and sustainable withdrawal capacity rate of the local supply or aquifer. Cite Source:	D2c		
c. The proposed action may allow or result in residential uses in areas without water and sewer services.	D1a, D2c		
d. The proposed action may include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater.	D2d, E21		
e. The proposed action may result in the construction of water supply wells in locations where groundwater is, or is suspected to be, contaminated.	D2c, E1f, E1g, E1h		ю
f. The proposed action may require the bulk storage of petroleum or chemical products over ground water or an aquifer.	D2p, E2l	D	
g. The proposed action may involve the commercial application of pesticides within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.	E2h, D2q, E2l, D2c		
h. Other impacts:			
 5. Impact on Flooding The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. (See Part 1. E.2) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", move on to Section 6. 	☑ NO		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in development in a designated floodway.	E2i	0	
b. The proposed action may result in development within a 100 year floodplain.	E2j		
c. The proposed action may result in development within a 500 year floodplain.	E2k	П	0
d. The proposed action may result in, or require, modification of existing drainage patterns.	D2b, D2e		
e. The proposed action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding.	D2b, E2i, E2j, E2k		
f. If there is a dam located on the site of the proposed action, is the dam in need of repair,	Ele		

g. Other impacts:			
6. Impacts on Air The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. (See Part 1. D.2.f., D,2,h, D.2.g) If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", move on to Section 7.	∑ NC		YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
 a. If the proposed action requires federal or state air emission permits, the action may also emit one or more greenhouse gases at or above the following levels: i. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO₂) ii. More than 3.5 tons/year of nitrous oxide (N₂O) iii. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon equivalent of perfluorocarbons (PFCs) iv. More than .045 tons/year of sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) v. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalent of hydrochloroflourocarbons (HFCs) emissions vi. 43 tons/year or more of methane b. The proposed action may generate 10 tons/year or more of any one designated hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons/year or more of any combination of such hazardous 	D2g D2g D2g D2g D2g D2g D2h	0	
air pollutants. c. The proposed action may require a state air registration, or may produce an emissions rate of total contaminants that may exceed 5 lbs. per hour, or may include a heat source capable of producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour.	D2f, D2g	D	
d. The proposed action may reach 50% of any of the thresholds in "a" through "c", above.	D2g		П
e. The proposed action may result in the combustion or thermal treatment of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour.	D2s	О	
f. Other impacts:			
7. Impact on Plants and Animals The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2.: If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 8.	mq.)	NO	YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2o		
. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.	E2o	0	
The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2p	0	D
The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.	Е2р		

e. The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.	E3c	D	D
f. The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community. Source:	E2n		
g. The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.	E2m	Б	0
h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. Habitat type & information source:	E1b	П	
i. Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.	D2q	D	Б
j. Other impacts:		D	D
8. Impact on Agricultural Resources The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. a If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 9.	and b.)	✓ NO	YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.	Part I	small impact	to large impact may
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the	Part I Question(s)	small impact may occur	to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System. b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land.	Part I Question(s)	small impact may occur	to large impact may occur
 a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System. b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc). c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of 	Part I Question(s) E2c, E3b E1a, Elb	small impact may occur	to large impact may occur
 a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System. b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc). c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land. d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 	Part I Question(s) E2c, E3b E1a, Elb E3b	small impact may occur	to large impact may occur
 a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System. b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc). c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land. d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District. e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land 	Part I Question(s) E2c, E3b E1a, Elb E3b E1b, E3a	small impact may occur	to large impact may occur
 a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System. b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc). c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land. d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District. e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system. f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development 	Part I Question(s) E2c, E3b E1a, E1b E3b E1b, E3a El a, E1b C2c, C3,	small impact may occur	to large impact may occur
 a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System. b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc). c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land. d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District. e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system. f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland. g. The proposed project is not consistent with the adopted municipal Farmland 	Part I Question(s) E2c, E3b E1a, E1b E3b E1b, E3a E1 a, E1b C2c, C3, D2c, D2d	small impact may occur	to large impact may occur

13. Impact on Transportation The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems (See Part 1. D.2.j) If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 14.			YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.	D2j		
b. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.	D2j	0	
c. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.	D2j	0	
d. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.	D2j		
e. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.	D2j	0	
f. Other impacts:		О	
14. Impact on Energy The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. (See Part 1. D.2.k) He "Yes" appropriate to the Section 15	√ N	о 🔲	YES
If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 15.	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation.	D2k		
b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use.	D1f, D1q, D2k	0	
c. The proposed action may utilize more than 2,500 MWhrs per year of electricity.	D2k	D	0
d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.	D1g	D	0
e. Other Impacts:			
15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor light (See Part 1. D.2.m., n., and o.) If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 16.	nting. VN) [YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.	D2m		а
b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.	D2m, E1d	О	D
c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.	D2o		

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.	D2n		
e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.	D2n, E1a		
f. Other impacts:		D	
16. Impact on Human Health The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. at If "Yes", answer questions a - m. If "No", go to Section 17.		(====	YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No,or small impact may cccur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.	E1d	П	D
b. The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.	Elg, Elh	0	D
c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.	Elg, Elh	D	
d. The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).	Elg, Elh	П	
e. The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.	Elg, Elh	D	D
f. The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.	D2t	۵	ם
g. The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.	D2q, E1f	0	0
h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.	D2q, E1f		0
 The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste. 	D2r, D2s	П	D
j. The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.	Elf, Elg Elh	0	0
k. The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off site structures.	E1f, E1g	0	D
l. The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.	D2s, E1f, D2r		0
n. Other impacts:			

17. Consistency with Community Plans The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans. (See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.)	✓NO	Т	ES
If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", go to Section 18.	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action's land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).	C2, C3, D1a E1a, E1b		
b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.	C2	0	D
c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.	C2, C2, C3		
d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.	C2, C2	а	П
e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.	C3, D1c, D1d, D1f, D1d, Elb		
f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.	C4, D2c, D2d D2j		
g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)	C2a	0	
h. Other:			
h. Other:			
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3)	∑ NC) [7	YES
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3. a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas	Relevant Part I	No, or small impact	Moderate to large impact may
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3. a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community. b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g.	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3. a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.	Relevant Part I Question(s) E3e, E3f, E3g C4	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3. a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community. b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire) c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where	Relevant Part I Question(s) E3e, E3f, E3g C4 C2, C3, D1f	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3. a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community. b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire) c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing. d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized	Relevant Part I Question(s) E3e, E3f, E3g C4 C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
18. Consistency with Community Character The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3) If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", proceed to Part 3. a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community. b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire) c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing. d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources. e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and	Relevant Part I Question(s) E3e, E3f, E3g C4 C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a C2, E3	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur