

Town of Ghent Planning Board Meeting – Wednesday, October 26, 2011

Board Members Present: French, Groom, Machiz, Silver and Walters

Also Present: Town Attorney Ted Guterman and Town Board Member Linda Hess

Old Business

Nature Institute

Special Use Permit and Revised Site Plan
Tax Parcel ID# 104-1-30

(Planning Board member Machiz recused himself from this part of the meeting.)

Cheryl Roberts, Esq. – her understanding that tonight will be a SEQRA Part 2 review, not a decision on the special use permit and revised site plan. Applicant wrote a response to comments made at Public Hearing held earlier this month. A decision can't be based on neighborhood opposition. Nature Institute has engaged Crawford & Associates to review environmental impacts. Columbia County Planning Board has reviewed and recommended approval. They have said they would like to see signs on the road when an event is taking place in order to help direct traffic. There is no reason to deny this application and applicant is asking that a full EIS not be required. Traffic count has been completed. Applicant has proposed a parking area for 29 cars in a field, with a total of 48 spots on the property. As to the intensity of use – the applicant has voluntarily agreed to limit the number of events.

Chair Walters asked what the number of large events on the property will be each year.

Mike Sullivan answered a maximum number of eight.

Mike Sullivan, Crawford & Associates –

Visual impacts – trying to minimize. Will regulate landscaping as needed.

Noise impacts – town has no noise ordinance. Submitted "Assessing and Mitigating Noise Impact" from NYSDEC.

Parking – overflow parking on May Hill Road in the past. Application adds more parking spots on the property and no overflow parking will be necessary. Submitted samples of signs that be posted on the Road when an event is taking place.

Most comments received during the public hearing held earlier this month seemed positive.

Chair Walters – received SEQRA Part 2 finding from Town Engineer Ray Jurkowski.

Motion made by Groom, seconded by French to adopt written comments on SEQRA Part 2 as prepared by Town Engineer Ray Jurkowski, with a revision to question # 7 (change to "yes") and issue a NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

French: NEGATIVE DECLARATION based on Town Engineer comments. Small to moderate impacts.

Walters: NEGATIVE DECLARATION. Applicant has done good work to help keep lights minimal to neighbors.

Groom: NEGATIVE DECLARATION. Concur with Walters. The location of the parking and screening helps minimize effect of head lights.

Silver: NEGATIVE DECLARATION based on Ray Jurkowski's comments. Nature Institute is trying to mitigate lights.

Decision on applications will be made at next meeting – November 2, 2011.

Public Hearing

Price Chopper

Chatham Associates of Albany, L.P., on behalf of Price Chopper Supermarkets Tax Parcel 76.0-1-1 and 76.0-1-3

Present from Village of Chatham: Tom Curran, Mayor; Lael Locke, Trustee; Stephen Piazza, Planning Board; Leo Ponter, Planning Board; Pat Prendergrast, Village Engineer; and Cheryl Roberts, Town Attorney.

Present from Town of Chatham: Wendy Carrol, Planning Board

Ted Guterman – Public hearing held on October 5: negative declaration issued for SEQRA Part 2. Prepared a resolution.

Motion made by Silver, seconded by Machiz, to approve resolution as prepared by Ted Guterman. All approved.

Motion made by Groom, seconded by French, to approve findings for SEQRA Part 3. All approved.

Chair Walters discussed rules of conduct for this public hearing.

Mike Tucker, Infinigy Engineering

Gave a brief review of the proposed project. Showed drawings and maps. Going to ZBA for a variance on an area variance for waste-water treatment plant setbacks. Only 211 parking spots at the proposed new store, which is less than required, so trying to get variance for that as well. Rail Trail will go through the front of the property. Heavy landscaping has been planned.

Single access/exit on to property. Flooding issues – storm water run off is expected to be 30-50% less than it is today with the new drainage system they will be installing. Explained drainage system that will be installed. Lighting – only using 20' light poles. Little light will spill off site. Site is located in a commercial zone.

Board member Silver asked how the lighting on the new site will compare to lighting on the existing site.

Mr. Tucker answered that he didn't know the height of the poles on the existing site, but would look into it.

Board member Machiz thinks light poles on existing site are 24'.

Chuck Chism, Director of Real Estate for Price Chopper

Showed drawings of proposed store. Described all four sides.

Motion made by Silver, seconded by French to open public hearing. All approved.

Clark Olsen – asked what design elements are.

Chuck Chism answered they are design elements that give a better appearance.

Lael Locke, lives in Village of Chatham – Upset by Town of Ghent dismissal of Villagers comments. Concerned because so many people object to a new Price Chopper in Chatham. Commented that not all letters from community were read at the last meeting.

Chair Walters stated that the Planning Board did receive more letters, not all were read. Asked Lael to review Plaza history.

Lael Locke – when the existing Plaza was built, the Village updated their comprehensive plan because of so much objection to building the new Plaza. Also worked with Town of Ghent on a corridor study.

Chair Walters asked if there were any zoning changes made at the time.

Lael answered no, with the exception of expanding the senior housing zone.

Chair Walters asked Stephen Piazza if zoning was approved.

Mr. Piazza said it was not approved, and the Village got sued and lost. The Plaza was built.

Gary Phelps – asked how large the holding pond will be/

Mr. Tucker answered that it will be between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ of one acre. It will be about 6' deep.

Mr. Phelps asked if water drains in there, then is released.

Mr. Tucker answered yes. The water is held there, then drains out slowly.

Judy Grunberg – asked what caused the Planning Board to issue a negative declaration.

Chair Walters answered that the Board is not answering any questions, just listening to public comments.

Judy Grunberg – showed EIS she did on a project at PS21 in the Town of Chatham. She does not understand why a full EIS has not been required for this project. Chatham and Ghent should have requirements that are quite similar. Asked why a full EIS is not being conducted.

Doug Clark, Clark Engineering – has tried to remain neutral and only focus on big issues. Knows Planning Board is probably tired of dealing with this project.

Storm water issue – lots of study done. Preeminent firm did extensive testing. Results: more testing should be done. Site is not well-suited to drainage/infiltration. This report has been submitted by the applicant.

Applicant conducted more geological testing. Depth of ground water and soil testing has not been completed.

Does not believe the design submitted can be called “conservative.”

Groundwater results will vary depending on what time of year they are being conducted. Explained DEC requirements. In his opinion, infiltration testing should be more extensive.

The fill on this site varies. Very little native soil on site.

Discussed wetland buffer zones.

All testing done so far has been contradictory and limited.

DEC storm water regulations – may not be able to meet these requirements.

All issues have not been adequately addressed. Applicant has not proved that proposed infiltration system will absolutely work.

There are two drainage areas. The area at the back of the site has good drainage. The area at the front of the site – have ignored hydrologic numbers and soils on site are not good enough. Maps call soil “A,” applicants call soil “C.” Contradiction should be explained.

Underground pipes almost level with ditches across front of property. Not very deep. Did site visit on Sept. 29 after a 1.2” rainfall to measure water in ditch. Pipes would have been ½ full at the time. Asked what would happen if you get a 100 year storm the very next day. Hurricanes Irene and Lee were rare and created huge problems with flooding in the area. The applicant has proposed to clean out the ditch, which may help. As the ditch fills up, the underground pipes can not discharge any water.

Applicants needs to do more work and all questions need to be answered.

Chair Walters asked Mr. Clark if he would put his findings in writing and submit to the Planning Board for review.

Mr. Clark will submit his findings after he receives the most recent drawings/plans.

Mr. Tucker answered that the most current plans are now available on the Town of Ghent website.

Mr. Tucker – have moved infiltration area on site. They did complete four geologic tests and two failed. Explained why soils on site are considered type “C.” No dredging or anything planned for ditch yet. That would require permission from US Army Corps of Engineers. Tail testing has been completed.

Board member Machiz asked if additional calculation are available online?

Mr. Tucker answered yes, and he will give them to the Planning Board as well.

Alice Wooderell – asked if two banks in the area were given negative declarations.

Board member French answered that the Bank of Green County was issued a negative declaration. TrustCo Bank is in the Village of Chatham.

Wendy Carroll, Town of Chatham Planning Board – sent a letter of opposition to this Planning Board. Concerned that water/catch basin and overflow will impact neighbors. It is her impression that this Planning Board seems to blame Chatham for water problems, while she believes most of the water is coming from the direction of Ghent. Asked why there are no set back requirements. Asked why no work is being done in the ditch at the front of the new property. Has concerns with traffic flow getting on to the site, going around the building, and the drive-thru pharmacy.

Cheryl Roberts – Village Trustees initiated an Article 78 against the Town of Ghent for issuing a negative declaration. Drainage and community character were not properly addressed. Asked if the Town Engineer read the Sterling report. Has not received a straight answer. Wonders if all Planning Board members have read all public comments. She thinks not. Asked if any permission was sought from the property owner to do this project. Some documents from the beginning of this project seem to be missing. NYSDEC said this parcel is too small to support this project. All documents need to be on hand. October 2011 site plan maps still originally bound – doesn’t look like anyone has looked at them.

Chair Walters stated that some of the original paperwork had been disposed of. Only work related to when the store faced a different direction.

Mark Milspaugh, Sterling Environmental – his report did point out discrepancies. Storm water basin – most of it is on Fairpoint property. Emergency access gate shown. No traffic flow study done on Fairpoint property in case of an emergency. Site is too small for what it is supposed to have to support this project. Asked if this Planning Board fully considered impacts to neighboring properties. He doesn't think so. Wants to see traffic analysis done at Fairpoint Communications "Y" driveway. Said this application almost warrants a site plan review of the Fairpoint property. A lot of impacts exist because site is too small. Wetlands on the property restrict a lot. Zoning variances needed because site is too small. Parking spots may be enough for Price Chopper, but it is 14 short. That could affect people in the future. There is no extra room if and when more spots are needed. Concerning the drainage feature at the front of the property – he has not seen a stream disturbance permit. Recommended this Planning Board get that if it is required, or get confirmation if it is not. SWPP and Infiltrators – in order to work, soil has to be appropriate. Hasn't seen test results that show the system will work. More testing is needed. Asked what will happen if it doesn't work. Asked how the system will be maintained when it is located on another property. Said this system is potentially creating a hardship for Fairpoint Communications.

Clark Olsen – asked who is responsible if the infiltration system doesn't work.

Board member Machiz reminded the audience that the Planning Board is here to listen to public comment, not answer any questions.

Stephen Piazza, Village of Chatham Planning Board – discussed the community character issue. The Village of Chatham will take a big hit if Price Chopper moves, and Ghent will benefit. He is surprised that not all public comments were read. He thinks they should have been.

Tom Curran, Mayor of Chatham – discussed storm water as it affects the Village. Explained the big watershed in the area. Discussed flooding in the area of Route 66/Hudson Avenue, Payne Avenue, and surroundings. The source of the flooding is not a Price Chopper problem, but it is a Town of Ghent problem. Hopes that the Village of Chatham and the Town of Ghent can work together to solve flooding issues. Hopes this Planning Board did read the Sterling report.

Rob Lagonia – Town of Ghent gave a negative declaration. Asked if that means that no EIS will be completed. Stated that even though lots of engineers have reviewed things, there are still water issues. Asked why a full EIS is not being planned. It could help solve all problems and would help to make all people feel more comfortable about moving ahead with this project.

Linda Massaone – asked if the building design is the same as the store recently built in Lenox. Asked why there is a design element on the rear of the building. Asked why there is a separate bottle return area. Stated she is concerned with the traffic flow if the two properties are not joined.

Patty Matheny, Ghent resident – asked why a full EIS is not being completed, especially since it looks like the Town will now have to defend a lawsuit. Stated that it is unfortunate that Chatham is suing Ghent.

Noreen Bowes, Ghent resident – discussed swamp and wetlands in the area. She lives on Roxbury Road. Never had a flooding problem on her property until 1995. Now her basement floods quite often.

Dan Tuczinsky – submitted a FOIL request to the Town of Ghent. Spent most of yesterday reviewing documents here. There was no Dente report with the documents. He read from page 9 of infiltration testing report. Stated that not enough testing has been done since the failure results. This Planning Board has the right to rescind the negative declaration that was issued. The Village of Chatham and the Town of Ghent need to work together and review all documents. Documents and reviewed and resubmitted quickly. Asked the Planning Board to please slow down their review. Issues on the Fairpoint property need to be reviewed. They will be largely affected by this project. More information of emergency access/exit is needed. Traffic flow information is needed. Please slow down and study project thoroughly.

Robert Adams, Village of Chatham resident – has a dry basement on Houseman Avenue. Thinks this new building could affect a large area. Thinks the swamp on fairground property could get bigger. Asked who is liable if he starts to have flooding issues on his property.

Paul Calcagno, local developer – former manager of LaBellas. Thinks the new building layout will affect flooding on Fairpoint and current plaza. The parcel is too small to support this new building. He owns the parcel across the street. Schuyler and Golub are causing a fight between Chatham and Ghent. Asked how mad consumers will be when grocery prices increase when a new store is built. Recommends that Price Chopper buy Fairpoint property, tear it down and build store there.

Bill Parker, Columbia County Scoop – a video of the September 19 public hearing is available on the CC Scoop website.

Deirdra Henderson, Town of Chatham resident – the impact of this project affects many people. Has lived here for 21 years and doesn't remember a larger project happening in this area. Application affects and issue have been raised.

A lot of questions have been created. Doesn't understand how a negative declaration was issued. Would like Planning Board to take a closer look at this project and get all the information needed.

Clark Olsen – modifying the old building has been deemed too expensive and inconvenient. He doesn't think it would be a problem. Thinks renovation could be completed quickly and smoothly.

Dan Tuczinsky – submitted the latest report from Clark Engineering for the record.

Carla Cavanaugh – asked why a small town needs a huge grocery store. She doesn't think it is needed. Hated when the original plaza was built.

Cheryl Roberts – asked the Planning Board to please rescind the negative declaration. The Village of Chatham would withdraw the article 78 if the negative declaration is rescinded. Lawsuit would be avoided. May know someone who would complete an EIS if the lawsuit could be avoided.

Clark Olsen – go to Hudson or Pittsfield if you want to see what an abandoned mall looks like.

Chair Walters – good point raised by all present. The Planning Board will take into consideration everything that was said.

Co-Chair Groom explained that the Town Engineer is out sick.

Cheryl Roberts – asked to put this issue (whether or not to rescind the negative declaration) on the November 2 agenda.

Motion made by Machiz, seconded by Silver to keep public hearing open until November 2. Yes – Walters, Groom, Machiz, Silver. No – French.

Minutes

Motion made by French, seconded by Machiz to accept September 7 minutes with noted changes. All approved.

Motion made by Groom, seconded by French to accept September 19 minutes with noted changes. All approved.

New Business

Motion made by French, seconded by Groom for Planning Board to enter into Executive session. All approved.

#

APPENDIX A

Nature Institute SEQRA Part 2

PART 2 – PROJECT IMPACTS AND THEIR MAGNITUDE

Responsibility of Lead Agency

General Information (Read Carefully)

- In completing the form the reviewer should be guided by the question: Have my responses and determinations been **reasonable**? The reviewer is not expected to be an expert environmental analyst.
- The **Examples** provided are to assist the reviewer by showing types of impacts and whenever possible the threshold of magnitude that would trigger a response in column 2. The examples are generally applicable throughout the State and for most situations. But, for any specific project or site other examples and/or lower thresholds may be appropriate for a Potential Large Impact response, thus requiring evaluation in Part 3.
- The impacts of each project, on each site, in each locality, will vary. Therefore, the examples are illustrative and have been offered as guidance. They do not constitute an exhaustive list of impacts and thresholds to answer each question.
- The number of examples per question does not indicate the importance of each question.
- In identifying impacts, consider long term, short term and cumulative effects.

Instructions (Read carefully)

- a. Answer each of the 20 questions in PART2. Answer **Yes** if there will be **any** impact.
- b. **Maybe** answers should be considered as **Yes** answers.
- c. If answering **Yes** to a question then check the appropriate box (column 1 or 2) to indicate the potential size of the impact. If impact threshold equals or exceeds any example provided, check column 2. If impact will occur by threshold is lower than example, check column 1.
- d. Identifying that an Impact will be potentially large (column 2) does not mean that it is also necessarily **significant**. Any large impact must be evaluated in PART 3 to determine significance. Identifying an impact in column 2 simply asks that it be further looked at.
- e. If reviewer has doubt about size of the impact then consider the impact as potentially large and proceed to PART 3.
- f. If a potentially large impact checked in column 2 can be mitigated by change(s) in the project to a small to moderate impact, also check the **Yes** box in column 3. A **No** response indicates that such a reduction is not possible. This must be explained in Part 3.

NATURE INSTITUE

SITE PLAN & SPECIAL USE PERMIT

This is a modified form for Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF). All information presented as non-italicized are the questions and potential responses from the original New York State Department of Environmental Conservation FEAF. This modified form is being utilized to present known information regarding the project in general terms and in specific terms as it relates to each question in the FEAF. This has been done to provide information and reasoning used for the response to each of the 20 questions in the FEAF. The information presented in italics is information and notations that are additions to the original FEAF. The modified form has been laid out to provide known and/or background information regarding the question being asked and the reasoning behind the responses based upon the known information. The order of information, for responding to each of the 20 environmental questions is as follows; Basic question from the FEAF, known information and, if appropriate, discussion summary of the Planning Board during their review process, the response to the basic question, reasoning regarding the response, examples that apply to column 2 and reasoning regarding the response to the column 2 example questions. For completeness, prior to responding to questions, a description of the project information obtained and/or requested from the Project Sponsor and some general information is given.

Project Sponsor Provided Information

The project sponsor has submitted to the Ghent Planning Board various materials for review and consideration on this project. This information has included original documents from the project sponsor and additional materials resulting from requests by the Ghent Planning Board or its professional consultants. The information supplied, in no specific order, is listed below:

- ❖ *Application for Site Plan*
- ❖ *Application for Special Use Permit*
- ❖ *Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) – Part 1 - - Project Information*
- ❖ *Traffic Assessment Study*
- ❖ *Site Lighting Narrative*
- ❖ *Site Drainage Analysis narrative and report*
- ❖ *Potable Water Usage and Wastewater Estimates, including correspondence from the Columbia County Department of Health*
- ❖ *Correspondence regarding Natural Heritage Report on Rare species and Ecological Communities*

- ❖ *Modified Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment*
- ❖ *Mapping from New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation web site pertaining to Archeo-Sensitive and State, Federal, and National Register of Historic Places*
- ❖ *Agricultural Data Statement*

- ❖ *Site Plan Drawing showing the features of the site. This includes:*
 - *Existing Conditions*
 - *Notes & Legend Sheet*
 - *Site Plan*
 - *Grading & Drainage Plan*
 - *Erosion Control Plan*
 - *Sediment & Erosion Control Notes and Details*
 - *Details*
 - *Illumination Intensity*
 - *Landscaping Plan*

All materials submitted by the Project Sponsor were used in reviewing how the project; meets the code of the Town of Ghent; meets requirements of the Town of Ghent Planning Board, relates with sound development practice, meets with review by any and all Town of Ghent Town Engineer; and, may or may not cause environmental impact. The project was also identified to be reviewed and/or to obtain input from various agencies outside of the Town of Ghent. It is noted that through various meetings of the Town of Ghent Planning Board along with input from various County agencies, the Town Attorney and the Town Engineer, the site plan was revised and refined, and additional information was requested of and obtained from the Project Sponsor. A public hearing was held where comments were heard from the public and either answered by the Project Sponsor or deemed of no significance by the Planning Board.

This application is an unlisted action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). The project has undergone an uncoordinated SEQRA review. The Town of Ghent Planning Board assumed Lead Agency status and no objections were received from the other agencies.

This project, as proposed, will redevelop and expand upon an existing educational facility within the Town's RA-2 Zoning District at 20 May Hill Road, Ghent, New York.

IMPACT ON LAND

1. Will the Proposed Action result in a physical change to the project site?

The project involves construction associated with the proposed building addition and parking area, therefore the proposed action will result in a physical change to the project site.

The proposed action will involve the construction of a 2,200 square foot building addition, with associated parking to serve the patrons of the facility. In all, approximately 0.7 of the 5.4 acres will be modified in some way.

NO YES

	1	2	3
	Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Any construction on slopes of 15% or greater, (15 foot No rise per 100 foot of length), or where the general slopes in the project area exceeded 10%.

There are no slopes on this site that exceed the 10% limitation set by this example. Construction on significant slopes is not applicable to the site and this action.

- Construction on land where the depth to the water table No is less than 3 feet.

Based upon information from the Project Sponsor and from local knowledge of the Planning Board, there is no exposed bedrock on the site.

- Construction of paved parking area for 1,000 or more No vehicles.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

The proposed project will construct for 48 cars. As this level of parking is not near the level of parking that would be considered meeting a potential large impact, it is the opinion of the Ghent Planning Board that this level of parking is at a small to moderate impact level for a residential area (See Other Below).

- Construction on land where bedrock is exposed or No Yes
generally within 3 feet of existing ground surface.

Based upon information from the Project Sponsor and from local knowledge of the Planning Board, there is no exposed bedrock on the site.

- Construction that will continue for more than 1 year or No Yes
involve more than one phase or stage.

Based upon information submitted by the Project Sponsor the project is not anticipated to extend beyond one year.

- Excavation for mining purposes that would remove No Yes
more than 1,000 tons of natural material (i.e., rock or soil) per year.

This is not a mining project, nor has the Project Sponsor indicated a desire to sell soil spoil. This example question is not applicable.

- Construction or expansion of a sanitary landfill. No Yes

There is nothing related to a sanitary landfill proposed for this project. This example question is not applicable.

- Construction in a designated floodway. No Yes

Available mapping and local knowledge of the area indicates there are no designated floodways on or near the site. This example question is not applicable.

- Other impacts: No Yes

The project includes the creation of 48 parking spaces within a residential area.

2. Will there be an effect to any unique or unusual land forms found on the site? (i.e., cliffs, dunes, geological formations, etc.)

The site is one that has no unique or unusual land forms. There is simply meadow and brushland, woods, and existing developed area consisting of a building and parking. No examples listed below apply to this action.

NO YES

1	2	3
Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

- Specific land forms. Yes
 No

IMPACT ON WATER

3. Will Proposed Action affect any water body designated as protected?
 (Under Articles 15, 24, 25 of the Environmental Conservation Law, ECL)

Articles 15, 24 and 25 refer to the following items respectively; streams that are designated by the State as C(T) or higher in classification are protected, State freshwater wetlands are protected, and, State tidal wetlands are protected. There are no C(T) or higher designated streams that run through or near the site. There are no State freshwater wetlands on or near the site. There are no State tidal wetlands on or near the site. Therefore the answer to the base/basic question is no.

NO YES

	1 Small to Moderate Impact	2 Potential Large Impact	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change
Examples that would apply to column 2			
• Developable area of site contains a protected water body. <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
• Dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from channel <input type="checkbox"/> No of a protected stream.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
• Extension of utility distribution facilities through a protected <input type="checkbox"/> No water body.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
• Construction in a designated freshwater or tidal wetland. <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
• Other impacts: <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

4. Will Proposed Action affect any non-protected existing or new body of water?

There are no non-protected existing or new body of water located on the site or associated with the action. Therefore the answer to the base/basic question is no.

NO YES

1 Small to Moderate	2 Potential Large	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by
---------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

Examples that would apply to column 2

- A 10% increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease.
 No
- Construction of a body of water that exceeds 10 acres of surface area.
 No
- Other impacts:
 No

Impact Impact Project Change

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

5. Will the Proposed Action affect surface or groundwater quality or quantity?

The Project Sponsor, as verified by the Town Engineer, has noted that the anticipated construction disturbance is less than 1 acre of disturbance during the construction of the proposed action. As a result, a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) does not need to be prepared. However, pursuant to the request of the Town Engineer the Project Sponsor has submitted a Drainage Analysis of the pre and post construction activities. While the effects are minimal, they do represent a change based on the existing conditions. These effects will be very minimal because of the implementation of the use of grass parking areas, as well as the proposed sedimentation basin that is to be utilized as a surface runoff control structure. The answer to the basic question is therefore yes.

NO YES

1	2	3
Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Proposed Action will require a discharge permit.
 No

New York State Regulations require that a SWPPP be developed and implemented for non residential actions resulting in a disturbance of 1 acre or greater. The proposed action only results in a disturbance of approximately 0.7 acres, Therefore a SWPPP does not need to be prepared, and no discharge permit is required.

- Proposed Action requires use of a source of water that does not have approval to serve proposed (project action).
 No

The source of water for the project is from an existing on-site drilled well. The project Sponsor has submitted information to the Planning Board and the Columbia County Department of Health. While the Columbia County Department of Health has jurisdiction of the water supply no comments regarding the water system no concerns regarding the water supply have been raised by the CCDOH.

- Proposed Action requires water supply from wells with greater than 45 gallons per minute pumping capacity.
 No

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

The proposed action does not result in the need for a water supply greater than 45 gallons per minute.

- Construction or operation causing any contamination of a water supply system. No Yes

The proposed construction associated with the action does not occur within the general proximity of the onsite well, or within 100 feet of existing offsite wells.

- Proposed Action will adversely affect groundwater. No Yes

The action will result in an anticipated increase in the volume of wastewater generated at the site. The Project Sponsor has submitted information to the CCDOH and has received comments back from the CCDOH pertaining to the continued use of the existing subsurface wastewater disposal system. These comments have been addressed by the Project Sponsor's engineer. In addressing the CCDOH's comments the Health department concurs with the proposed expansion of the operation. Because of this, it is the opinion of the Ghent Planning Board that there will be little affect to groundwater. It is appropriate to indicate a small to moderate impact.

- Liquid effluent will be conveyed off the site to facilities which presently do not exist or have inadequate capacity. No Yes

No liquid effluent will be conveyed off the site to facilities that do not exist or have inadequate capacity. This example question does not apply.

- Proposed Action would use water in excess of 20,000 gallons per day. No Yes

The anticipated water use is anticipated to be approximately 420 gallons per day. This use is significantly less than 20,000 gallon per day and it is the opinion of the Ghent Planning Board that this example does not apply.

- Proposed Action will likely cause siltation or other discharge into an existing body of water to the extent that there will be an obvious visual contrast to natural conditions. No Yes

This would be potentially true if there were no proposed erosion control measures or stormwater siltation basin proposed for the action. As the Project Sponsor has proposed both, and understanding that they are to be put in place prior to construction activities, per regulations, siltation or other discharge is not expected into an existing body of water causing obvious visual contrast to natural conditions. This example question does not apply.

- Proposed Action will require the storage of petroleum or chemical products greater than 1,100 gallons. No Yes

The proposed action will not result in storage or production of 1,100 gallons of petroleum, therefore this example does not apply.

- Proposed Action will allow residential uses in areas without water and/or sewer services. No Yes

This is a non residential action, therefore, this example question does not apply.

- Proposed Action locates commercial and/or industrial uses Yes
 No
 which may require new or expansion of existing waste treatment and/or storage facilities.

This action will not require the expansion of existing waste treatment or storage facilities. However, a future Subsurface Sewage Disposal replacement area has been identified on the site plan, as per comments received by the CCDOH> The expected flows from this action do not require further expansion or improvements. This example question does not apply.

- Other impacts: Yes
 No

6. Will Proposed Action alter drainage flow patterns, or surface water runoff?

As is the nature of any land development project, there will be an alteration of drainage flow patterns. The project Sponsor has prepared, and the Town has reviewed, the Drainage Analysis that has been prepared. The Project Sponsor has developed the site regrading and drainage improvements to resemble as closely as is practical, the existing general drainage pattern of the site. The Ghent Planning Boards believes it appropriate to answer yes to this question, however, based upon review, the impact associated with this is minor.

NO YES

	1	2	3
	Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Proposed Action would change flood water flows. Yes
 No

Through the development and review of the drainage analysis, drainage flow leaving the site will not be adversely different in the built condition as it was in the existing condition. The project sponsor has proposed improvement on the site plan including a sedimentation basin that will be utilized as a stormwater outlet control devise to mitigate any increase on offsite runoff. Therefore the resulting post development runoff will decrease when compared to the existing off site runoff.

- Proposed Action may cause substantial erosion. Yes
 No

The erosion control measures developed and shown on the site plan will ensure that erosion is controlled on site. This example question does not apply.

- Proposed Action is incompatible with existing drainage patterns Yes
 No

As in the first example of this question, the drainage analysis that has been performed, replicates to the best practical extent the existing drainage patterns. This example question does not apply.

- Proposed Action will allow development in a designated floodway. No Yes

Based upon a review of available mapping/data along with information from the Project Sponsor, the site for this action is not within a designated floodway. This example question does not apply.

- Other impacts: No Yes

IMPACT ON AIR

7. Will Proposed Action affect air quality?

With the type and level of construction anticipated in addition to the increased traffic that will be generated by the action, air quality will be affected. The basic response to this question is therefore yes.

NO YES

1	2	3
Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Proposed Action will induce 1,000 or more vehicle trips in any given hour. No Yes

The Project sponsor has submitted a traffic analysis for the action. That study has been reviewed by the Ghent Planning board and the Town Engineer. It is expected that this action will generate far less than the 1,000 vehicle trips per hour. Therefore this example does not apply.

- Proposed Action will result in the incineration of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour. No Yes

This action does not involve the incineration of any refuse. This example question does not apply.

- Emission rate of total contaminants will exceed 5 lbs. per hour or a heat source producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour. No Yes

The nature of this action is such that it will not produce significant contaminant levels or heat. As such, this example question does not apply.

- Proposed Action will allow an increase in the amount of land committed to industrial use. No Yes

This action is not an industrial use so this example question does not apply.

- Proposed Action will allow an increase in the density of industrial development within existing industrial areas. No Yes

As this is not an industrial use, this example question does not apply.

- Other impacts: No Yes

IMPACT ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS

8. Will Proposed Action affect any threatened or endangered species?

The site for this action is located in a rural setting. The site is not known to have threatened or endangered species. The NYSDEC interactive map for environmental resources shows that the site is not within a general area where threatened and endangered species have been found. The NYSDEC has provided correspondence to the Project Sponsor confirming that no known forms of threatened or endangered species area located on the site. Answering No is therefore appropriate.

NO YES

	1	2	3
	Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Reduction of one or more species listed on the New York or Federal list, using the site, over or near the site, or found on the site. No Yes
- Removal of any portion of a critical or significant wildlife habitat. No Yes
- Application of pesticide or herbicide more than twice a year, other than for agricultural purposes. No Yes
- Other impacts: No Yes

9. Will Proposed Action substantially affect non-threatened or non-endangered species?

As with question 8, the site for this action is located in a rural setting. The site is not known to have any significant non- threatened or non-endangered species. Based upon local knowledge of the site and the intensity of the uses of the surrounding lands, the Ghent Planning Board believes that there are no non-threatened or non-endangered species that will be affected on the site. Answering No is therefore appropriate.

NO YES

	1 Small to Moderate Impact	2 Potential Large Impact	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change
--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Examples that would apply to column 2

- | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| • Proposed Action would substantially interfere with any resident
<input type="checkbox"/> No
or migratory fish, shellfish or wildlife species. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Proposed Action requires the removal of more than 10 acres of
<input type="checkbox"/> No
mature forest (over 100 years of age) or other locally important
vegetation. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Other impacts:
<input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

10. Will Proposed Action affect agricultural land resources?

Based upon Agricultural Data Statement submitted by the Project Sponsor, the parcel is located within Agricultural District #8, however the lands have not recently been used or are currently being use for agricultural purposes. In addition the use of the proposed action will not adversely affect the continued agricultural uses within the area. Based upon this, the Ghent Planning Board believes that no agricultural land is affected by this action.

NO YES

	1 Small to Moderate Impact	2 Potential Large Impact	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change
--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Examples that would apply to column 2

- | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| • The Proposed Action would sever, cross or limit access to
<input type="checkbox"/> No
agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard,
orchard, etc.). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • Construction activity would excavate or compact the soil profile of
<input type="checkbox"/> No
agricultural land. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| • The Proposed Action would irreversibly convert more than 10
<input type="checkbox"/> No
acres of agricultural land, or if located in an Agricultural District, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |

more than 2.5 acres of agricultural land.

- The Proposed Action would disrupt or prevent installation of No Yes Yes
 agricultural land management systems (e.g., subsurface drain lines, outlet ditches, strip cropping); or create a need for such measures (e.g., cause a farm field to drain poorly due to increases runoff).
- Other impacts: No Yes Yes

IMPACT ON AESTHETIC RESOURCES

11. Will Proposed Action affect aesthetic resources? (If necessary, use the Visual EAF Addendum in Section 617.20, Appendix B.)

The site is an existing education facility that has been continuously operating at this site since 2002. The proposed action will result in a building addition of approximately 2,200 square feet, and provide for additional parking for patrons of the facility. The proposal continues to utilize the existing structure that was converted from a residential structure in 2002. And the proposed structure does not create an eye sore and is in keeping with the buildings in the general vicinity. It will not be markedly taller or significantly larger than other buildings in the area and its appearance, in the opinion of the Ghent Planning Board will suit the vicinity. In addition the site is not near any State scenic and aesthetic resources (properties eligible for inclusion in the National or State Register of Historic Places; State Parks; Urban Cultural Parks; the State Forest Preserve; National Wildlife Refuges; National Natural Landmarks; The National Park System, Recreation Areas, Seashores, Forests; Rivers designated as National or State Wild, Scenic or Recreational; a site, area, lake reservoir or highway designated for designation as scenic; Scenic Area of Statewide significance; a State or federally designated trail or one proposed for designation; Adirondack Park Scenic Vistas; State Natural and Historic Preserve Areas; Palisades Park; and, Bond Act properties purchased under Exceptional Scenic Beauty or Open Space category). As the proposed action is not near or in the greater vicinity of National, Statewide or local aesthetic resources, the Ghent Planning Board believes there to be minimal impact to visual resources.

NO YES

1	2	3
Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Proposed land uses, or project components obviously different No Yes Yes
 No
 from or in sharp contrast to current surrounding land use patterns, whether man-made or natural.

The action is an expansion of a previously permitted special use that has been in operation at the site since 2002. While the action will require an updated special use permit from the Ghent Planning Board, the proposed educational use is an allowed use, with a special use permit, as outlined in the Town of Ghent Zoning Ordinance. As the proposed use of the action is a continued use of a previously approved action, the Ghent Planning Board believes there to be small to moderate impact aesthetic resources.

- Proposed land uses, or project components visible to users of aesthetic resources which will eliminate or significantly reduce their enjoyment of the aesthetic qualities of that resource. No Yes

No significant public aesthetic resources have been identified therefore, the action will not result in the elimination of significant reduction to users of visible aesthetic resources. Therefore this example does not apply.

- Project components that will result in the elimination or significant screening of scenic views known to be important to the area. No Yes

The majority of the construction is to take place within an meadow area, therefore the action will not result in the elimination of significant screenings. Furthermore, the vegetation along the site perimeter will be affected by the action. As such this example does not apply.

- Other impacts: No Yes

IMPACT ON HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

12. Will Proposed Action impact any site or structure of historic, prehistoric or paleontological importance?

In reviewing available online interactive mapping from the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation, there are no site or structures of historic, prehistoric or paleontological importance in the general vicinity of the proposed site. Therefore there can be no impact to same.

NO YES

	1 Small to Moderate Impact	2 Potential Large Impact	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change
Examples that would apply to column 2			
Proposed action occurring wholly or partially within or substantially contiguous to any facility or site listed on the State or National Register of historic places. <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Any impact to an archaeological site or fossil bed located within the project site. <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Proposed Action will occur in an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NYS Site Inventory. <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Other impacts: <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

IMPACT ON OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

13. Will Proposed Action affect the quantity of existing or future open spaces or recreational opportunities?

The project site is in an area of residential development under private ownership. The action will not result in the increase or decrease the quantity of open space or recreational opportunities

NO YES

	1 Small to Moderate Impact	2 Potential Large Impact	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change
Examples that would apply to column 2			
• The permanent foreclosure of a future recreational opportunity. <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
• A major reduction of an open space important to the community. <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
• Other impacts: <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

IMPACT ON CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS

14. Will Proposed Action impact the exceptional or unique characteristics of a critical environmental area (CEA) established pursuant to subdivision 6NYCRR 617.14(g)?

The action is not located in the general proximity of a CEA. The proposed action will not impact the exceptional or unique characteristics of a CEA.

NO YES

List the environmental characteristics that caused the designation of The CEA.

	Moderate Impact	Large Impact	Mitigated by Project Change
Examples that would apply to column 2			
• Proposed Action to locate within the CEA? <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

- Proposed Action will result in a reduction in the quantity of the No Yes
resource?
- Proposed Action will result in a reduction in the quality of the No Yes
resource?
- Proposed Action will impact the use, function or enjoyment of the No Yes
resource?
- Other impacts: No Yes
 No

15. Will there be an effect to existing transportation systems?

Without doubt there during larger events there will be an impact to the existing transportation system. The Project sponsor has submitted a traffic analysis for the action. The study was reviewed by both the Ghent Planning Board and the Town Engineer. It is expected that this action will generate an average of 6 trips per day with an additional 48 trips immediately before and after a large event (+/- 75 people). It is anticipated that a number of large events will be limited to 8 large events e during any twelve month period. The existing private roadway and intersection onto Columbia County Route 21C were evaluated by the Project Sponsor. Based on the anticipated daily use and the impact to the traffic will be minimal. The worst impact to the unsignalised intersections is immediately before and after a large event of approximately 75 people. This will result in approximately 48 vehicle trips that will occur within a half hour and may result in a slight additional delay at the intersection during this half hour period.

NO YES

	1	2	3
	Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Alteration of present patterns of movement or people and/or Yes
 No goods.

It is anticipated that during larger events a moderate number of vehicles during a short time duration will affect the non-signalized intersection and the first few hundred feet of the private roadway. While this is anticipated during large events, the frequency of this occurrence will be limited to a maximum of eight times per year. Because of that potential, although infrequent, the Ghent Planning Board feels that this may result in a small to moderate impact.

- Proposed Action will result in major traffic problems. Yes
 No

Given the slight delays that may occur, at the non-signalized intersection, will be limited to a maximum of eight times per year, and is anticipated to occur within the half hour immediately before and after a large event, the Ghent Planning Board does not believe that a major traffic problem will result. The delays are sufficient to deem them to be a small to moderate impact.

- Other impacts: No Yes

IMPACT ON ENERGY

16. Will Proposed Action affect the community's sources of fuel or energy supply?

The proposed action will not affect the community's sources of fuel and energy. As it is not an industrial or a manufacturing action, the draw on those sources will not be extreme or beyond any limits associated with those fuel and energy sources.

NO YES

	1 Small to Moderate Impact	2 Potential Large Impact	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change
Examples that would apply to column 2			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Action will cause a greater than 5% increase in the use of any form of energy in the municipality. <input type="checkbox"/> No 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 major commercial or industrial use. <input type="checkbox"/> No 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other impacts: <input type="checkbox"/> No 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

There are no other related impacts to the community's source of fuel or energy.

NOISE AND ODOR IMPACT

17. Will there be objectionable odors, noise, or vibration as a result of the Proposed Action?

The proposed action will result in the expansion of an existing educational facility. This use, traditionally, does not create objectionable odors, noise or vibration. As previously noted, the site is located in a section of the Town that is rural in nature. Periodically during moderate and large events numerous vehicles will enter and exit from the site. The number of moderate to large events is infrequent, and limited in duration, and as such introduction of the proposed action should not cause an adverse increase in odors, noise or vibration above current ambient levels. The Ghent Planning Board believes there to be limited impact in this regard.

NO YES

1	2	3
Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Blasting within 1,500 feet of a hospital, school or other sensitive facility.
 No

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

No Blasting is anticipated during construction or as a result of the action, therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Odors will occur routinely (more than one hour per day).
 No

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

The action is not a commercial or industrial action that normally is associated with producing odors. Daily odors occurring more than one hour per day are not anticipated. Therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Proposed Action will produce operating noise exceeding the local ambient noise levels for noise outside of structures.
 No

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

During moderate and large events moderate numbers of vehicles will enter and exit the site. However, the frequency and duration of these events is limited. The Ghent Planning Board believes there to be limited impact in this regard.

- Proposed Action will remove natural barriers that would act as a noise screen.
 No

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

The action does not require, nor is it proposed to remove natural barriers, therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Other impacts:
 No

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

IMPACT ON PUBLIC HEALTH

18. Will Proposed Action affect public health and safety?

The proposed action is an expansion of an existing educational facility. No known public health and/or safety issues pertaining to day to day normal operations associated with this action have been identified. The Ghent Planning Board believes that there is no impact to public health and safety.

NO YES

1	2	3
Small to Moderate Impact	Potential Large Impact	Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change

Examples that would apply to column 2

- Proposed Action may cause a risk of explosion or release of
 No

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

hazardous substances (i.e., oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation etc.) in the event of accident or upset conditions, or there may be a chronic low level discharge or emission.

- Proposed Action may result in the burial of "hazardous wastes" Yes
 No
in any form (i.e., toxic, poisonous, highly reactive, radioactive, irritating, infections, etc.).
- Storage facilities for one million or more gallons of liquefied Yes
 No
natural gas or other flammable liquids.
- Proposed Action may result in the excavation or other Yes
 No
disturbance within 2,000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.
- Other impacts: Yes
 No

IMPACT ON GROWTH AND CHARACTER OF COMMUNITY OR NEIGHBORHOOD

19. Will Proposed Action affect the character of the existing community?

Although the proposed action is the expansion of an existing special use located within a residential area that has previously been permitted since 2002. The proposed action will: not result in a permanent increase in the population of the Town; that it will not cause significant capital budget expenditures for the Town; that it is an appropriate redevelopment action; and, that it will not create a significant increase in community services; there is a small to moderate affect on the character of the neighborhood or Town.

NO YES

	1 Small to Moderate Impact	2 Potential Large Impact	3 Can Impact Be Mitigated by Project Change
--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

Examples that would apply to column 2

- The permanent population of the city, town or village in which the Yes
 No
project is located is likely to grow by more than 5%.

The action will not increase the population of the Town of Ghent by more than 5%

- The municipal budget for capital expenditures or operating Yes
 No
services will increase by more than 5% per year as a result of this project.

The action is a educational facility that will not require an increase in municipal services, and therefore not increase the municipal budget by more than 5% per year. Therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Proposed Action will conflict with officially adopted plans or goals. No Yes

The action is an expansion of a pre-existing approved educational facility and is an allowed use, with special permit, within the local RA-2 zoning. Therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Proposed Action will cause a change in the density of land use. No Yes

The proposed action will not result in the increase in density of land use. Therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Proposed Action will replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures or areas of historic importance to the community. No Yes

Based on information obtained from the NYS office of parks, recreation and historic preservation web site, The site does not contain any know facilities or structures of historic importance. Therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Development will create a demand for additional community services (e.g., schools, police and fire, etc.) No Yes

The action is not anticipated to create a demand for additional community service, therefore this example is not applicable to this action.

- Proposed Action will set an important precedent for future projects. No Yes

The existing use and facility is an existing use with a previously approved special use permit since 2002. it is the opinion of the Town of Ghent Planning Board that the proposed action, while an expansion of the previously approved use, will not set an important precedent for the future. Therefore it is the opinion of the Ghent Planning Board that this example is not applicable to this action.

- Proposed Action will create or eliminate employment. No Yes

The Project Sponsor has indicated within the FEAF that as many as 5 jobs will be created during construction, and 2-3 full time jobs may be generated upon its completion., with no jobs being eliminated. Therefore it is the opinion of the Ghent Planning board that this potential job growth is a small to moderate impact.

- Other impacts: No Yes

The action results in the continued and expanded use of an educational facility within a predominant rural residential area.

20. Is there, or is there likely to be public controversy related to potential adverse environmental impacts?

The Town of Ghent Planning Board has advertised and held a Public Hearing on this action along with various public meetings of the Planning Board questioning the Project Sponsor, requesting additional information and deliberating the action. Public turn out for the Public Hearing was nominal with there being questions on the

action and verbal or written objection by the immediate neighbor and neighbors along May Hill. Based upon what is known about the action and the response from the public, the Ghent Planning Board has heard strong objections to the project from individuals including the immediate neighbor and therefore believes that "Yes" is the appropriate response.

NO YES

If Any Action in Part 2 Is Identified as a Potential Large Impact or if you Cannot Determine the Magnitude of Impact, Proceed to Part 3

SUMMARY

The above responses are based upon the careful consideration of the Ghent Planning Board in reviewing the information and application submitted by the Applicant, local area knowledge, information and comments submitted by the public (both opposing and supporting the action), input from the Town Attorney and Town Engineer, their own experience, and the actions required and/or suggested by the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

The Nature Institute application for site plan and special use permit will have environmental impacts. The Ghent Planning Board has determined that these identified impacts are small to moderate. Some of those impacts will be mitigated and others will not. Based upon the review of the significant amount of information and analysis prepared and presented by the applicant, individuals and agency comments, consultation with the Town's Attorney and Town Engineer, available and existing environmental information, and knowledge of the site and surrounds, the proposed action does not pose, nor will create, a significant environmental impact. This is based upon the Ghent Planning Board evaluating both individual and cumulative impacts from above.

Based on the above a finding of no significant impact impact is in order.

APPENDIX B

Price Chopper – Resolution

(available at Town Hall if needed.)