1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

BT Holdings proposes to construct 458 units of multifamily housing, of which 100 units will restricted to senior citizens, on a 68.4 acre parcel of largely undeveloped land in the Town and Village of Chester, Orange County, New York. In order to develop this project BT Holdings LLC proposes to annex a 60.6 acre parcel of land presently in the Town of Chester to the Village of Chester, and rezone that annexed property to a new Village zoning district, RM-N (Residential-Multiple Dwellings-Neighborhood). Additionally, three smaller existing Village parcels totaling 7.9 acres would be remapped from the Village's RS (Residential-Single-Family) and M-2 (Manufacturing) zoning to the new RM-N zoning district.

The proposed project conforms with the usage envisioned for the site in the Town of Chester 2003 Comprehensive Plan which specifically designated the project site as the future location for multi-family and/or senior housing. The site is one of only two parcels in the entire Town designated for such residential development.

Scope of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been prepared in accordance with Section 8-0101 et. seq. of Environmental Conservation Law and the regulations promulgated by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation thereunder which appear at 6 NYCRR Part 617 (the State Environmental Quality Review Act or "SEQRA"). The Village of Chester Village Board acting as Lead Agency made a positive declaration on April 14, 2008. The DEIS is based on a Final Scoping Document adopted by resolution of the Village Board on July 14, 2008.

Although the submitted plan is a conceptual site plan, the SEQRA review is not a Generic DEIS in which thresholds for future review would be established. Instead the applicant has provided a conceptual site plan including sufficient detail to conduct a through review of the impacts related to the project as a whole, including but not limited to; land use & zoning, demographics, fiscal implications, traffic, wetland impacts, community services, etc. The conceptual plan represents the maximum amount of development anticipated by the applicant, and as such represents the maximum impact scenario.

1.1 Project Description

1.1.1 Project Purpose, Needs and Benefits

This project is being proposed to address the need for quality market-rate townhouse dwellings and market-rate and affordable senior rental apartments in a location that is accessible to water and sewer services and has access to major transportation routes of the region. The intent of the applicant is to provide this housing while minimizing potential impacts to the greatest extent possible.

This proposal directly responds to community growth goals as set forth in the Town of Chester Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2003:

- ".. channel future residential growth into suburban residential areas where central water and sewer services can be expanded efficiently to accommodate growth." (page 24)
- ".. coordinate planning with the surrounding communities and the county, but most importantly with the Village of Chester and the Town of Monroe." (page 24)
- ".. provide for a mixture of housing types that will help to promote a diverse population base." (page 24)

The Comprehensive Plan specifically referenced the project site by indicating that there was "land to the rear (of the Chester Mall) with access to the Mall and Route 17M that could be developed for senior, adult or a combination of higher density uses with access to shopping or transportation" (page 38).

Through a series of meetings and presentations to the various Village and Town officials over the course of several years, the project sponsor formulated a project that incorporates a blend of (i) age-restricted (senior) market-rate and affordable rental units and (ii) non-age-restricted market-rate townhouses. This proposed low-impact "maintenance-free" housing is specifically targeted toward local seniors seeking affordable housing options, empty nesters who wish to downsize from larger, maintenance-intensive single-family homes, and young professionals who are not yet ready or able to invest in more expensive single-family options.

To accomplish the goals above, the project sponsor proposes an annexation of a large portion of the site into the Village of Chester in order to create a mixed residential development incorporating 358 townhouse dwellings and 100 senior rental apartments. The proposed medium- to high-density development is consistent with the density of the existing Town of Chester zoning as well as the Village's RM zoning. However, in order to create these homes at the density currently permitted in the Town's zoning, there must be access to municipal water service which can only be provided by the Village of Chester.

It is the applicant's intent that the BT Holdings site, when developed, will be compatible with the blend of existing nearby intensive commercial, industrial and medium to high density residential land uses. The project will also create a transition from highway commercial uses on the west side of the site to hamlet-style downtown and neighborhood development to the east and south of the site.

Project Benefits

The BT Holdings development has been designed to meet the planning objectives expressed by the Town of Chester and Orange County by:

- Providing a mix of market-rate housing in various sizes and styles including the availability of Master Down units;
- Including senior rental apartments, which will contain affordable units per the applicable zoning; and
- Utilizing a location near shopping and work along Route 17M and within the Village of Chester, near the community's center in the Chester and East Chester hamlet areas.

In addition to providing necessary low-impact housing, some of the direct benefits of the proposed project include:

- Net tax revenues over costs to both the Village and the Town for municipal services
- Net tax revenues over costs to the Chester Union Free School District
- Provision of an extension and upgrade of the Village water system in the area
- Installation of a 10 inch water main in Route 17M
- Upgrade of Sanitary Sewer Pump Station Number 5
- Potential funding of an increase in the Village's wastewater allocation from the Harriman Sewage Treatment plant; and
- Provision of on-site recreation facilities for its residents.

As part of the future land development review process, the proposed plans, details, specifications and reports would be reviewed by local, regional, county, state and federal agencies to assure it conforms to pertinent approval and permitting regulations, standards, requirements and specifications.

1.1.2 Site Location

The project site is located in two municipalities, partly in the northwestern portion of the Town of Chester, Orange County, New York and partly in the northwestern area of the Village of Chester. As shown in Figure 2-2, the project site lies east of NYS Route 17M and North of NYS Route 94. The project site has road frontage on Route 17M. Access to the site would be via Route 17M in the Village.

The subject property consists of four tax parcels. The lot in the Town of Chester (to be annexed to the Village) has a Section-Block-Lot number of 2-1-39 and is 60.6 acres. The two existing tax lots in the Village are 107-3-4 and 108-1-1 and total 4.0 acres. An approximately 3.9-acre portion of Village lot 120-1-1, known as the Nexans property, is under contract to the Applicant and would be subdivided from the parent lot as part of this action. The entire assembled parcel would be approximately 68.4 acres comprising four tax lots or portions as summarized below.

Table 1-1
Project Site Parcels and Existing Zoning Districts

Municipality	Section, Block and Lot	Existing Zoning District	Lot Area (Acres)
Town of Chester	2-1-39	SR-6 and LB	60.6
Village of Chester	107-3-4	RS	3.4
Village of Chester	108-1-1	RS	0.6
Village of Chester	120-1-1	M2	3.9
Total			**68.4***

*Individual lot areas are approximate and do not result in a correct total site area due to rounding.

1.1.3 Description of Action

The project sponsor specifically conceived of a residential development intended to have a relatively low impact on the school district. Rather than propose detached single-family homes, the applicant proposed attached townhome and multi-family units to be built at a higher price range thereby limiting school child generation. For instance, 'Master Down' townhouses—units

with the master bedroom on the first floor—were specifically conceived of and included in the proposal in order to appeal more directly to senior and empty nesters.

The BT Holdings development would include 100 senior rental apartments housed in two buildings with 50 apartments in each building in the northwestern area of the site near NYS Route 17M adjacent to the entrance boulevard. The remainder of the site will be a blend of 358 townhouses in at least three primary styles with three to twelve units per multi-unit structure situated along interconnected loop roads that traverse the site, including:

- Traditional townhouses, or side-to-side units (at least 75 dwelling units);
- Master down townhouses, also referred to as side-to-side units (up to 131 units); and
- Interlocking townhouses, or back-to-back units (152 units).

The senior housing units will include 75 one-bedroom apartments and 25 two-bedroom apartments. Within the blend of townhouse styles, there will be 76 two-bedroom dwellings and 282 three-bedroom units. The project does not include any four-bedroom townhouses. All 458 proposed senior apartment and townhouse units will be developed on the resulting 68.4-acre site. The 100 senior apartments will be rental units. The townhouses will be owned individually. Commonly held land, improvements (roads, stormwater management systems, etc.), amenities and facilities will be governed by a Homeowners' Association (HOA).

It is the applicant's intent to construct the senior housing rental apartments on one lot with a single owner to be managed by a rental management company and to develop the townhouse portion of the project on a second single lot with the common areas to be owned by a Homeowners' Association (HOA).

The Applicant has proposed 100 units of Senior Citizen Housing. To remain consistent with the applicable zoning regulations, this assumes that a minimum of 20% of these units would be provided as affordable units.

If during the Site Plan Approval phase, the Applicant were to propose fewer than 20% affordable units then the total number of units proposed would be reduced to 90 to remain consistent with the applicable zoning. This DEIS was intended to evaluate the maximum threshold for proposed development, which would be 100 senior units, and thus require 20% of affordable units. Under any and all circumstances, the proposal for senior housing will be in compliance with the regulations stipulated in the applicable senior housing overlay district zoning.

On-Site Recreation

The central recreational facilities, which are located along the entry boulevard on the western side of the site, include a clubhouse, swimming pool, outdoor play area, and a picnic area with a gazebo. An extensive sidewalk and walking trail network runs through the development connecting the senior apartments to the townhouse neighborhood as well as the clubhouse and other recreation amenities.

Pedestrian Access

The applicant believes that sidewalks leading from the site to the adjacent Chester Mall, as well as from the site to Main Street via Oakland Avenue, would be a benefit to the project and its residents. To that end, the applicant proposes to construct, subject to NYS DOT's review and

approval, a sidewalk within the existing Route 17M right-of-way on the east side of Route 17M from the project's main driveway to the Chester Mall's northernmost driveway entrance. The applicant has approached the owner of the Chester Mall to make arrangements to continue the sidewalk along the Mall's driveway and to connect to the Mall storefronts on Mall property. This portion of the sidewalk would be on property that the applicant does not own or control, therefore its construction is subject to the approval and consent of the Mall owner. A pedestrian connection from the site to Main Street and the historic Village center via Oakland Avenue is also being investigated.

Access

All primary access to the BT Holdings development would be provided from the proposed road entry boulevard, a private road which would gain access directly from NYS Route 17M, approximately 1,800 feet north of the main entrance to the Chester Mall and approximately 800 feet from the mall's secondary northern entrance. Secondary emergency access to the BT Holding's site would be available from the corner of Oakland Avenue and Woodland Terrace located east of the site, which is a Village road. This road will provide emergency access only and is not proposed for use by the future residents of the BT Holdings development.

Roads

The proposed private roads have been designed to provide a safe and efficient on-site road system. The entry boulevard provides 24'-wide lanes in both directions and sidewalks on both sides with a planted median. The rest of the on-site roads and the driveway to the senior apartments consist of 24'-wide two-lane (12'-wide lanes) roads. The development's private road system would be owned by a Homeowners' Association that would be responsible for the maintenance of other common facilities.

Parking

Parking for all residents is provided in close proximity to residential buildings. For the seniors, two parking areas providing a total of 125 parking spaces are located directly adjacent to the senior apartment buildings.

Each of the townhouse units has a one- or two-car garage and/or a single- or double-width driveway depending on the type of dwelling. Therefore, each unit has potentially 2, 3 or 4 dedicated parking spaces. Guest parking lots are distributed evenly along the internal roads so that parking is available within close proximity to each multi-unit building. Overall, 812 spaces are provided in garages and driveways and 179 spaces are provided in guest parking lots. A separate 41-space parking area is located at the clubhouse. A total of 1,032 parking spaces are provided for the townhouse aspect of the development and a total of 1,157 are provided on the entire site (including the seniors).

Utilities

Wastewater

The Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant is an Orange County facility that handles wastewater for a number of the municipalities located within the county. The plant receives wastewater flow from the "Moodna Group" which consists of seven municipalities or parts thereof: The villages of Chester, Woodbury and South Blooming Grove and the towns of Chester, Monroe, Blooming Grove and Woodbury. The Moodna Basin Joint Operation and Maintenance Commission ("Moodna Basin Commission") operates as an intra-municipal agency that manages the public wastewater treatment of three of the Moodna Group municipalities or parts thereof: the Village of Chester, the Town of Chester and the Town of Monroe. The commission operates and maintains a network of pipes and pump stations (owned by the municipalities in which they lie) within the service area of the Moodna Basin Commission. All of the wastewater within that service area is collected and eventually transported to the Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant for treatment before being discharged to the Ramapo River.

The project site lies entirely within the service area of the Moodna Basin Commission. The entire Village of Chester, where three of the project parcels are currently located, is within thatservice area. The site parcel presently located within the Town of Chester is within the Town's Consolidated Sewer District No. 1, which also lies entirely within the service area. All of the parcels have been assessed appropriate sewer fees for the duration of their existence within the service area of the Moodna Basin Commission.

In 2006, the Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant expanded its treatment capacity from approximately 4 million gallons per day (mgd) to 6 mgd. According to usage reports provided by the Moodna Basin Commission (see Appendix J), as of September 2008 the Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant was processing approximately 4.5 mgd, meaning the Treatment Plant has approximately 1.5 mgd of excess wastewater capacity.

The Moodna Basin Commission operates and maintains an extensive sewer network within the town and village, including 8-inch diameter gravity sewer in Route 17M along the site frontage. The 8-inch sewer runs northerly to a pump station (Moodna Pump Station No. 5), from where it is pumped back up to the intersection of Route 17M and West Avenue via a 4-inch force main into a gravity sewer that runs to the south.

The Moodna Group has a total allocation of 2.015 mgd to the Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant of which 347,000 gallons per day (gpd) and 410,000 gpd are allocated to the Village of Chester and Town of Chester, respectively. According to the usage report, the Moodna Group discharged approximately 1.775 mgd to the Harriman Plant with the Village of Chester discharging approximately 363,600 gpd of wastewater to the plant (16,600 gpd over the Village's allocated amount) and the Town of Chester discharging approximately 262,000 gpd (148,000 gpd under the Town's allocated amount). The net combined available and remaining allocation for the Village and Town of Chester is 131,400 gpd.

A new sewage treatment plant (the "Black Meadow Creek plant") has been contemplated on Town of Chester-owned land to handle some of the sewage from the service area of the Moodna Basin Commission. The treatment plant would be located on Route 94 along Black Meadow Creek which would receive the treated effluent. The contemplated Black Meadow Creek Plant would be owned and operated by the Town and/or Village of Chester and would serve properties in the respective municipalities. If the Black Meadow Creek Plant were to be

developed, the Town and/or Village could choose to reallocate some of their existing wastewater flow that currently goes to the Harriman plant to the new Black Meadow plant.

Based on the project engineer's estimates, the development of 458 dwelling units consisting of 100 senior apartments and 358 multifamily townhomes would generate an average daily wastewater flow of 125,160 gallons per day (gpd). The calculations per NYSDEC standards are provided in the Wastewater Report prepared by the Project Engineer, Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, in Appendix J.

By virtue of the project site's location within the Town's sewer district and within the Village, the project will remain entitled to sewer service from both the Town and the Village. According to usage reports provided by the Moodna Basin Commission, the Village of Chester discharged approximately 363,600 gpd of wastewater to the plant which is 16,600 gpd over the Village's allocated amount. The Town of Chester discharged approximately 262,000 gpd which is 148,000 gpd under the Town's allocated amount. The net combined available and remaining allocation for the Village and Town is 131,400 gpd. The estimated 125,160 gpd of wastewater the proposed project is expected to generate is 22,840 gpd below the Town's available and remaining allocation and 6,240 gpd below the net combined available and remaining allocation between the Town and Village of Chester. As such, there presently exists available capacity in the wastewater system to handle the proposed project.

If the pending or approved projects should come on line prior to the BT Holdings project and additional capacitywas needed to service the project, the Town and/or Village canrequest additional capacity from the Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant which, as mentioned above, has approximately 1.5 mgd of available capacity. The project sponsor would reimburse the appropriate municipality for any fees related to the increase in allocation necessary to service the proposed project. At present, a Court ordered injunction prohibits the County from allocating any additional amounts to the Moodna Group municipalities. However, it is anticipated that the legal proceedings will be brought to conclusion prior to construction of the BT Holdings project and, depending upon the results of those legal proceedings, additional allocation may become available from the Harriman Treatment Plant source. Should wastewater disposal via the contemplated Black Meadow Wastewater Treatment Facility become available, that would provide an additional potential source of wastewater capacity for the Project. If the pending or approved projects came on line prior to the BT Holdings project and additional allocation to service the BT Holdings project was needed but unavailable from the alternate sources described above, construction of units beyond available capacity would be prohibited until such capacity became available.

Water Supply

The BT Holding development site is located partially (60.6 acres) within the Town of Chester with the rest of the project site in the Village of Chester. The Village of Chester public water supply system provides safe potable water for Village residents and is operated by the Village's Water Department. The Village's total permitted maximum daily water-taking from their two sources is 1.1 million gallons per day (mgd). The current demand on this water supply system, according to the Water Commissioner, Mr. Thomas Becker, is approximately 0.45 mgd. Therefore, available excess capacity of approximately 0.65 mgd exists in the Village water supply system.

Based on the project engineer's estimates, the project's water supply demand, including the pool and clubhouse demand, would be 137,676 gallons per day (gpd). In addition to the

domestic water demand, approximately 123,500 gpd may be required for irrigation of the site's lawn and landscaped areas during the summer months. The combined domestic and irrigation demand results in a total seasonal average water demand of 261,180 gpd for the BT Holdings development. When combined with potential demand from other pending or approved projects, the total is approximately 341,750 gpd. Since this is well below the 650,000 gpd available excess capacity in the Village water supply system, it is anticipated that there is sufficient water available to serve BT Holdings. The cost of the necessary water supply improvements, on-site and in NYS Route 17M, including the design, permitting and installation, would be borne by the project developer.

Lighting

The proposed lighting on the site is provided on the Conceptual Landscape and Lighting Plan (see Figure 2-11). The proposed roadway light fixtures are pole mounted lights at heights of 20 to 25 feet. The proposed pedestrian light fixtures are pole mounted lights at lower heights of 10 to 12 feet.

Sustainable Design and Construction

The proposed project will reinforce the smart growth concept of locating higher density development near existing areas of developed village and hamlet centers, a goal specifically discussed in the Town of Chester Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2003. The provision of diverse housing (market rate and affordable, senior and non-senior of various sizes) brings a mixed residential community close to: necessary shopping and services; possible workplaces; recreational, community and health services; schools; major transportation routes and entertainment and cultural amenities. Locating high-density residential development near these uses shortens travel time for future residents to use needed services and amenities and also adds a population to the community that will use and support nearby businesses, services and amenities.

The site's developed areas will be used for compact multi-unit residences, which are more energy efficient than single-family detached structures. Multi-unit design also allows for shorter roads, driveways and utility transmission lines than would be found in a conventional single-family layout and shared parking areas for guests and recreational facilities. Water conservation devices will be incorporated in the design of dwelling units, multi-unit structures and shared amenities (clubhouse and pool) during site plan review.

The project's utilization of municipal water and wastewater systems, as opposed to individual on-site water wells and septic systems, promotes efficient and environmentally-sound planning practices.

The site's compact design leaves larger expanses available for open land and retained wooded areas, lawns and landscaped green spaces. Landscaped and lawn areas would take up nearly half of the site (approximately 32 acres of the 68-acre site) and undisturbed areas will cover an additional approximately 12 acres. So about 44 acres of the developed site would be open or vegetated.

The proposed stormwater management basins will also be vegetated and will serve to prevent increases in the volume of off-site runoff and improve the quality of stormwater before it is discharged into existing drainageways. The undeveloped open spaces will provide natural buffer lands around the perimeter of the site and preserve on-site wetlands with the exception of less than .1 acres disturbance for roadway construction. The Conceptual Landscape and Lighting Plan (see Figure 2-11) for the project illustrates revegetation and reclamation of areas of disturbance.

Landscaping

The site's developed lands will be used for residences, recreational areas, roads, driveways and parking areas, lawns and landscaping, and stormwater management improvements. The undeveloped open spaces will provide natural buffer lands and preserve site wetlands and portions of the present wooded areas. The Conceptual Landscape and Lighting Plan for the project provides plans to revegetate and reclaim any areas cleared by construction within the area of disturbance around buildings or other structures. Landscaped and lawn areas would take up nearly half of the site (approximately 32 acres of the 68-acre site) and undisturbed areas will cover an additional approximately 12 acres. Approximately 44 acres of the developed site would be open or vegetated.

The conceptual landscaping plan illustrates the project's tree-lined streets and plantings in the entry boulevard as well as trees and shrubs near parking areas. Clusters of shade and evergreen trees and shrubs are distributed along graded slopes to break up views of expansive open hillsides. Linear clusters of shade and evergreen trees provide screening between lines of multi-unit structures to soften internal views of the development and provide shade for future residents. The proposed site plantings will stabilize the site, prevent erosion, soften the visual effect of the project as seen from surrounding areas, and provide shade and insulation from heat and cold.

1.2 Potential Environmental Impacts and Proposed Mitigation Measures

1.2.1 Geology, Soils and Topography

Potential Soil Impacts

A Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation was completed for the project site by Langan Engineers and Environmental Services (August 20, 2009). The Langan Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation indicates no major impediments for the proposed site layout and grading. The report concluded that the site soils appear to be generally suitable for supporting the proposed buildings and related infrastructure.

Impacts to slopes are directly related to the potential for soil erosion during construction. More than 80 percent of grading (45.4 acres) for the BT Holdings project will occur in areas with slopes of less than 15 percent. Impacts to slopes of 15 percent or greater are mostly limited to the western portion of the site for the construction of the proposed senior citizen rental apartment sites. Exposing soils on steep slopes during construction increases the potential for erosion in the short term. This potential impact will be mitigated by adherence to the soil erosion and sedimentation control practices described below. Following construction, soil erosion from the property is expected to be minimal since developed areas will be stabilized with lawn and landscaping, and stormwater management features will be fully functional.

Grading and recontouring of soils is required for the construction of roads, townhomes, apartment buildings and the stormwater detention basins. The total area of grading or site disturbance is estimated to be approximately 56.6 acres of the site. Therefore, approximately 11.8 acres of the site will remain undisturbed in woodland, wetland, field, brush and meadow areas.

The potential for soil erosion resulting from grading is temporary in nature, as all areas will be ultimately stabilized by impervious cover or landscaping. Soils that will be covered with impervious surfaces (totaling 24.6 acres) are considered to be permanently disturbed. All of the disturbed area that does not become impervious will be graded, seeded and landscaped, including the stormwater management basins.

Total earthwork is estimated to involve approximately 330,000 cubic yards (cy) of soil cut and 365,000 cy of fill needed. While the preliminary estimates indicate that there would be a need to bring and additional 35,000 cy of imported fill onto the property, all efforts will be made to balance the earthwork before the final design of the project is completed so that no import or export of material is needed.

Soils Mitigation Measures

Erosion and sedimentation will be controlled during the construction period by temporary devices described in the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan. The methods of controlling soil erosion have been reviewed and proposed by the project engineer, Langan Engineering and Environmental Services. The erosion control plan will be developed in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines in the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges for Construction Activities (Permit No. GP-0-08-001), and the NYSDEC Stormwater Management Design Manual (April 2008).

1.2.2 Surface Water and Wetlands

Potential Impacts

Wetlands

The proposed internal access road would impact 0.098 acres of the ACOE jurisdictional wetland. Where the road crossing occurs, the Applicant proposes to install multiple open bottom culverts. The culverts will retain the existing wetland connection and flow characteristics and will allow for contiguous habitat throughout the wetland. The minor disturbance impact with the roadway crossing will have little effect on the functionality of the wetland.

Stormwater Management

The proposed development must comply with a New York State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) General Permit for stormwater discharges. The objective of a detailed Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is to present the means and methods to control erosion and sedimentation during construction and to reduce post-development stormwater pollutant loadings to that of pre-development levels to the greatest extent practicable. Project plans were developed in accordance with the requirements of the NYS General Permit. A Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan has been submitted with this DEIS to demonstrate that it is feasible to provide adequate stormwater pollution prevention based upon the conceptual plan. A fully detailed SWPPP will be prepared for review and comment by the Village during the Site Plan Approval process.

The primary means of treatment for runoff discharging from the project will be with the proposed stormwater management basins. Three basins will contain permanent ponds designed to maintain a minimum water level for the purposes of water quality treatment and aesthetics. Passively

controlled outlets to the basins will extend the discharge duration from the basins to 24 hours or more. The ponds were sized to meet the 90% treatment requirement of the NYSDEC for average runoff events. Based on accepted best management practices, combined with phasing of the construction and regular maintenance and monitoring of erosion control measures, it is expected that there will be no adverse environmental impacts to downgradient waters.

Throughout the construction phase, five basic principles of runoff management established under the SWPPP will be applied at the site to control stormwater runoff: 1) construction sequencing, 2) diversion of clean water around disturbed soils, 3) prompt stabilization of disturbed areas; 4) containment and treatment of sediment laden water; and 5) reduction of runoff velocities.

Groundwater

Groundwater recharge would continue to occur in the 44 acres that will not have impervious surface coverages which includes the stormwater basins that will serve to recharge the aquifer and the jurisdictional wetland area. The project is not expected to adversely affect local groundwater quality or quantity.

Surface Waters, Wetlands and Groundwater - Mitigation Measures

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)

The developer will be responsible for implementation of the stormwater monitoring program in accordance with NYSDEC requirements, in compliance with GP-0-08-001.

Soil Erosion Control Measures and Construction Phasing Plan

Both temporary and permanent erosion control facilities and activities will be implemented over the duration of construction-related activities on the site based on the latest New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control.

The Applicant will be responsible for ensuring all stormwater management practices are adhered to and stormwater controls are properly maintained for the duration of the construction process. Function of the permanent measures after completion of the project will be the responsibility of the Homeowners' Association. Responsible parties for the implementation and maintenance of each of the erosion control measures and stormwater facilities will be specifically identified in the SWPPP. The NYSDEC also requires, as part of the SWPPP, a maintenance program to ensure long term adherence to the SWPPP.

Groundwater

The project will not be relying on groundwater resources thus no mitigation measures are necessary or proposed.

1.2.3 Vegetation and Wildlife

Potential Impacts

As proposed, the development would result in the permanent elimination of vegetation from approximately 24.6 acres which would be covered by impervious surfaces. Disturbed areas that would not be covered by impervious surfaces would be re-vegetated.

Potential Impacts to Vegetation

The approximately 56.6 acres of the project site disturbed would no longer support the type of habitat as occurs under present conditions. The areas of proposed disturbance are generally conterminous with the previously disturbed farm field areas (successional old fields). Approximately 11.8 acres of existing vegetation would be retained on the property, with the addition of 32 acres of newly vegetated areas for lawns, landscaping, and plantings in stormwater management basins.

Since no significant trees were identified on the project site, development of the project would not impact the wildlife and aesthetic values typically associated with significant trees. While trees that exist on the site provide certain benefits to wildlife, no trees were identified as having qualities that merit preservation. However, blocks of existing vegetation that include hardwood forest community will be retained on the property after completion of the project. These tracts of hardwood forest will continue to function as wildlife and aesthetic resources on the property.

Potential Impacts to Wildlife

In general, as a site is developed, many wildlife species move out of the areas of disturbance. Upon project completion, the developed areas will function as a different habitat for some of the species of wildlife that previously used the site. Most species would relocate off site to areas of connected habitat. Bird species are pretty adaptable and can fly to new habitat. Terrestrial species would need to travel overland to new habitat.

While not as valuable as the existing forested habitat, the proposed landscaping would be planted with species of trees and shrubs that provide wildlife benefits such as forage and nesting sites for birds, and denning sites for small mammals. The preserved habitat areas of the wetlands, watercourses and open field along with the re-vegetated open space areas would still be used by deer and other wildlife that are human-subsidized species.

The project site does not currently function as a significant wildlife corridor to off-site habitat areas due to the surrounding roadways and existing developed commercial and residential areas. Therefore, the project would not fragment an existing wildlife corridor between off-site habitat areas.

Potential Impacts to Rare and Endangered Species

No federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species of wildlife or vegetation were observed on the project site during ecological surveys in 2008.

Potential Wetland Impacts

The ACOE jurisdictional wetland is isolated from most site activities but would be disturbed to install a road to access the southern portion of the property. Access to this section of the site would result in approximately 4,256 square feet (0.098 acres) of wetland disturbance to install open-bottom culverts to construct Road A. This activity would be authorized under ACOE Nationwide Permits 14 and 29.

As a result of 4,256 square feet of disturbance related to the installation of open-bottom culverts for Road A, wetland vegetation within this disturbance would ultimately be eliminated from the project site. The loss of this vegetation would be mitigated by the addition of native wetland vegetation that would be planted within appropriate areas of the 31.96 acres of landscaping and stormwater management practices proposed for the site.

Vegetation Mitigation Measures

Approximately 12 acres of the property would remain as undisturbed, primarily within the wetlands and wooded area in the central portion of the property and wooded areas along the site's parameter. In addition, the Applicant proposes to create an additional 32 acres of new vegetation in lawn and landscaped areas, as well as new pond habitat in stormwater management basins. In consideration of this and the following aspects of the other actions proposed to offset potential effects of the development, significant adverse impacts to natural resources are not anticipated to result from the completed project.

Native species and a naturalistic style where possible would be used for landscaping purposes at the entry, around the residences, at the property boundaries, and for revegetating portions of the proposed water quality and stormwater detention basins. Native plants would be preferred because of their adaptability to local climatic conditions, including temperature, precipitation and length of the growing season and the landscape design would use naturalistic arrangements of plantings to achieve the integration of the proposed development into the existing setting. In addition, many native species selected for landscape use may also be beneficial to indigenous wildlife--especially birds--by providing wildlife benefits such as nesting, cover and food.

The landscaping plans for the project schematically present the major evergreen and deciduous tree plantings to be installed throughout the project site. This naturalistic Landscape Plan proposes to add screening and soften the visibility of buildings from off-site locations.

Typical landscape plantings that may be chosen for their hardiness to the local climate and to the proposed settings on the site include the native regional landscaping species and supplemented with other minor shrubs and plants that would provide a variety of foraging, nesting and shelter benefits for the wildlife that repopulates the site.

Wildlife Mitigation Measures

While the existing woodland and successional field vegetation would be replaced by native ornamental plants, lawns, and landscaped plots within the developed areas, the introduced plantings could still be used as forage by deer and other wildlife and shrub species chosen for landscaping would provide immediate habitat for songbirds and other avian species. Trees that are planted would mature in the long-term and would provide some roosting and nesting opportunities for birds that are adaptable to suburban conditions. Coniferous trees and shrubs such as pines, spruces, firs, arborvitae, and junipers provide spring and summer nest sites as well as year-around shelter. Unmown grasses, meadows and stormwater berm plantings provide cover for ground-nesting birds. In addition to their value as hardy plantings, some of the native plant species which are berry and seed-bearing trees and shrubs would offer songbirds seasonal food sources incidental to their use as landscape plantings.

1.2.4 Cultural Resources

Potential Cultural Impacts

There are no standing structures on the project site and no structures within its viewshed that meet the requirements for inclusion on the National or State Register of Historical Places. In addition, a field investigation of the APE yielded no artifacts of importance.

A search of the site files maintained by the New York State OPRHP in Albany indicated that there are reported historic resources located within a mile of the project area, the First Presbyterian Church of Chester, located at 106-108 Main St., Chester was added to the National Register in 1998 for its Greek Revival architecture. The Yelverton Inn and Store, located at 112 Main St., Chester was also added to the National Register in 1979 based upon its architecture. However, due to distance and topography, neither of these reported resources will be impacted by the proposed project.

Stonewalls, with the exception of those located within defined historic districts, or those identified as contributing factors to a National Register Listing, are not considered to be historic features. Stonewalls generally indicate a division of property and/or agricultural or pastoral fields. They are not considered to be structures, very rarely are they datable and are considered to be lacking archaeological integrity. The stone walls located along the perimeter of the site will remain undisturbed. The stone walls located in the interior of the site will be dismantled and the stone may be used in construction of the entryway or other aesthetic features on the BT Holdings project site.

Cultural Resource Mitigation Measures

The cultural resource investigation for this site yielded no significant findings in the archives in Albany nor through systematic field investigation which are expected to be affected by development of the BT Holdings site. No further archeological investigation is warranted therefore no mitigation is proposed.

1.2.5 Traffic and Transportation

Access to the proposed development will be provided through a single access road off NYS Route 17M, located north of the entrance to the Chester Mall. The entrance is two 24 foot-wide one-way roadways and sidewalks on both sides with a planted median. The remaining on-site roads and the driveway to the senior apartments consist of 24 foot-wide two-lane (12 foot-wide lanes) roads. The site is designed with all buildings accessible from either loop roads or loops through the parking lots making truck access easier within the site. The BT Holdings development private road system would be owned by a Homeowners' Association that would be responsible for the maintenance of other common facilities including the on-site walking trails and sidewalks.

Pedestrian Access

Pedestrian access is provided internally between buildings with sidewalks. Sidewalks are also provided along the site access. Trails are provided to gazebos, along basins 'A', 'B', and 'C', along much of the properties boundary and within the central road loop formed by Roads 'A', 'B', and 'C'.

As discussed earlier, the Applicant is exploring the possibility of a pedestrian connection between the BT Holdings development and the Chester Mall along NYS Route 17M, in addition to a pedestrian connection via Oakland Avenue to the Historic Downtown area of the Village of Chester.

Emergency Access

At the discretion of the Village of Chester and its emergency service responders, a gated emergency access would be proposed at the rear of the site from the corner of Oakland Avenue and Woodland Terrace which would provide fire, ambulance, and police access from Main Street. This road will be restricted to emergency access only and is not proposed for use by the future residents of the BT Holdings development. The specific mechanism to permit access to emergency service vehicles will be determined during site plan review in consultation with local fire, ambulance, and police agencies.

NYS DOT typically recommends 12 wide travel lanes. The primary site access is designed in a boulevard style, with 24' road widths such that a single lane would be sufficiently wide enough to allow two way traffic on either side should one side be closed. Only Buildings 1 and 2 (senior apartments) cannot be accessed from two directions by vehicle. The parking areas or roads allow vehicle to loop around the buildings hence there are no cul-de-sacs, hammer-heads or similar dead-end treatments on-site.

Vehicle Trip Generation

The project trip generation rates utilized are based upon data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers and were discussed with the Village's traffic consultant and found to be acceptable. The proposed action is expected to generate 215 and 245 external trips during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively, and 218 external trips at the Saturday peak hour. The trips exiting and entering the development are shown in Table 1-2.

Table 1-2
Site Trips Generated

Land Uses	A.M. Weekday Peak Hour Trips			P.M. Weekday Peak Hour Trips			Saturday Peak Hour Trips		
	IN (Trips)	OUT (Trips)	Total Trips	IN (Trips)	OUT (Trips)	Total Trips	IN (Trips)	OUT (Trips)	Total Trips
Senior attached 100 dwelling units	10	17	27	19	12	31	15	15	30
Townhouses, 76 two-bedroom dwelling units	5	25	30	24	12	36	17	14	31
Townhouses, 282 three-bedroom dwelling units	36	122	158	112	66	178	85	72	157
Site Total	**51**	**164**	**215**	**155**	**90**	**245**	**117**	**101**	**218**

Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 8th edition, Washington, DC, 2008.

Parking

Table 1-3 below indicates the number of parking spaces, parking spaces per unit, and code requirements. To estimate actual demand, Parking Generation[1] was reviewed. Surveys indicate the proposed parking would meet the on-site demand for parking. The Town of Chester recently adopted revised parking requirements that in some ways are more stringent than previous standards. The parking spaces meet projected parking demand and town requirements for multiple dwellings but not senior units. Based on the unit types, the project's overall 2.53 parking spaces per unit exceeds the overall Town parking requirement of 2.059 spaces per unit. The proposed 2.53 parking spaces per unit does not meet Village requirements of 3.338 spaces per unit.

Table 1-3
Parking Summary

Land Uses	Proposed Parking Spaces	Parking Rate (Spaces per Dwelling Unit)	Zoning Requirement (Spaces per Dwelling Unit)		Parking Generation[1] (includes guests)
			TOWN	VILLAGE	
SENIORS					
75 1-Bedroom Affordable/Market-rate units	125	1.25	1.25/1.50	2.25*	0.50 per dwelling unit[2] (1.20 spaces per unit average peak demand for low/mid rise suburban apartments)
25 2-Bedroom Affordable/Market-rate units			1.50/1.75		
TOWNHOUSE					
76 2-Bedroom Townhouse units	812	2.77***	2.00**	3.25*	1.68 per dwelling unit (95th percentile rate)
282 3-Bedroom Townhouse units			2.25**	3.75*	
Guest Parking	179		included above	included above	included above
CLUBHOUSE					
Clubhouse	41	0.09****	none	none	included above
TOTAL					
Total [3]	**1157**	**2.53****	**2.059**	**3.338**	**1.576**

* Includes 0.75 spaces per unit for guests.
** Includes 0.25 spaces per unit for guests.
*** Total spaces for all dwelling units including guest parking (991 spaces / 358 townhouses).
**** 41 spaces over 458 units.
[1] Parking Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 3rd edition, 2004.
[2] Peak rate based on only two samples includes guests.
[3] Based on proposed units.

[1] Parking Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 3rd edition, 2004.

Level of Service Summary

Tables 1-4 and 1-5 summarize level of service for all conditions. Levels of service at the NYS Route 17M and NYS Route 94 intersection are shown improving in the No Build Condition as a result of the signal improvements installed as part of the Lowe's improvement store development.

The only lane groups to have a reduced level of service between the No Build Condition and the Build Condition were as follows:

- In the weekday p.m. and Saturday peak hours for the NYS Route 94 at NYS Route 17M eastbound left turn movement from level of service C to D;
- In the a.m. peak hour for the NYS Route 17M southbound right and through movements at NYS Route 94 from level of service C to D;
- In the p.m. peak hour for West Avenue eastbound left and through movements at NYS Route 17M from level of service B to C; and
- In the p.m. peak hour for the Chester Mall westbound left at NYS Route 17M from level of service C to D.

Table 1-4
Level of Service Summary All Conditions
NYS Route 94 Signalized Intersections

Intersection Road	Lane Group Approach Direction - Movement	A.M. Weekday Peak Hour			P.M. Weekday Peak Hour			Saturday Peak Hour		
		Existing	No Build	Build	Existing	No Build	Build	Existing	No Build	Build
NYS Route 94 and NYS Route 17 Southbound ramps										
NYS Route 94	EB - T	C	C	C	C	C	C	B	C	C
	EB - R	C	C	C	B	C	C	B	C	C
NYS Route 94	WB - L	B	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B
	WB - T	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
NYS Route 17 Southbound ramps	SB - L	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
	SB - T, R	C	D	D	B	B	B	B	B	B
	Overall	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B
NYS Route 94 and NYS Route 17 Northbound ramps										
NYS Route 94	EB - L	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	B
	EB - T	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
NYS Route 94	WB - T	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
	WB - R	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
NYS Route 17 Northbound ramps	NB - L, T	C	C	C	C	D	D	C	C	C
	NB - R	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
	Overall	B	B	B	B	C	C	B	B	B
NYS Route 94 and NYS Route 17M										
NYS Route 94	EB - L	D	C	C	D	C	D	D	C	D
	EB - T	D*	B	B	D*	B	B	C*	B	B
	EB - R	D	B	B	D	B	B	D	B	B
NYS Route 94	WB - L	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
	WB - T, R	D	C	C	D	D	D	D	D	D
NYS Route 17M	NB - L	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
	NB - T, R	C	C	C	C	C	C	D	D	D
NYS Route 17M	SB - L	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D
	SB - T, R	C	C	D	D	D	D	C	D	D
	Overall	D	C	C	D	C	D	D	D	D

NB = Northbound, SB = Southbound, EB = Eastbound, WB = Westbound.
L = left, R= right, T = through, (e.g. WB-L = Westbound left).

*Combined left and through lane group was changed as part of Lowe's development mitigation.

Table 1-5
Level of Service Summary All Conditions
Unsignalized and Signalized Intersections

Intersection Road	Lane Group Approach Direction - Movement	Levels of Service								
		A.M. Weekday Peak Hour			P.M. Weekday Peak Hour			Saturday Peak Hour		
		Existing	No Build	Build	Existing	No Build	Build	Existing	No Build	Build
Hambletonian Avenue and High Street										
High Street	NB - L, T	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Hambletonian Ave.	EB - L, R	C	E	E	B	B	B	B	B	B
Ward Road and NYS Route 17M										
NYS Route 17M	EB - L, T	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Ward Road	EB - L, R	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Main Street and NYS Route 17M										
NYS Route 17M	EB - L	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Main Street	SB - L, R	B	C	C	C	D	D	B	C	C
Arcadia Road and NYS Route 17M										
Arcadia Road	EB - L, R	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
NYS Route 17M	NB - L, T	A	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
NYS Route 17M	SB - T, R	A	A	A	B	B	B	A	B	B
	Overall	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
West Avenue, NYS Route 17M, and Chester Mall										
West Avenue	EB - L, T EB - R	B B	B B	B B	B B	B B	C B	B B	B B	B B
Chester Mall	WB - L WB - T, R	B B	B B	B B	B B	C B	D B	C B	D B	D B
NYS Route 17M	NB - L NB - T NB - R	A A A	A A A	A A A	A A A	A A A	A A A	A A A	A A A	A A A
NYS Route 17M	SB - L SB - T, R	A A	A A	A A	A A	A A	A A	A A	A A	A A
	Overall	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
Site Access and NYS Route 17M										
NYS Route 17M	SB - L, T	--	--	A	--	--	A	--	--	A
Site Access	WB - L, R	--	--	C	--	--	C	--	--	C

NB = Northbound, SB = Southbound, EB = Eastbound, WB = Westbound.
L = left, R= right, T = through, (e.g. WB-L = Westbound left).

All studied signalized intersections are projected to perform at level of service D or better which is the minimum level of service recommended by NYSDOT for signalized intersections. All studied unsignalized intersections are also anticipated to perform at level of service D or better. The only exception is Hambletonian Avenue and High Street in the a.m. peak hour, which should perform at level of service E as is anticipated in the No-Build Condition. This condition reflects a short period when schools open in conjunction with peak a.m. commuter traffic. Therefore, the additional traffic from the proposed development (Build Condition) will not result in the studied intersections performing at an unsatisfactory level of service.

Proposed Transportation Mitigation Measures

As NYS Route 17 is brought up to interstate standards the frequency of incidents may decline and the incident removal may occur more quickly. The Quickway corridor is not designed for the local network to handle peak hour Quickway traffic expeditiously. The increasing availability of near real-time incident information through the communication and tracking technology improvements will lead to drivers avoiding backups earlier. The earlier the drivers receive information, the more alternative routing choices are available, thus increasing the area effected and decreasing the intensity.

Based on the traffic and parking analysis, the Applicant has proposed no additional external traffic improvements and no additional parking beyond the 1,157 spaces shown on the plan.

1.2.6 Land Use and Zoning

Potential Land Use and Zoning Impacts

The BT Holdings development involves annexation and a zone change to develop the proposed 458-unit residential project. The proposed zoning amendment will involve:

- Creation of the RM-N (Residential - Multiple Dwellings-Neighborhood) zoning district with mixed residential uses consistent with existing residential zoning uses and densities in the Village and the Town; and
- Amendment of existing related supplemental requirements to enhance flexibility of design for uses in existing zoning requirements.

The 458-unit project would include 100 Senior apartments in two 3-story buildings and 358 market-rate townhouses in buildings of various sizes placed along an interior road network. Of the 100 proposed Senior apartments, the applicable percentage in accordance with the zoning regulations will be designated as affordable housing units.

Land Use

The proposed BT Holdings development has been designed to be compatible with the land use in proximity to the project site since it places medium- to high-density residential development near shopping, services, transportation routes and potential places of employment. The project provides a transition between the commercial uses to the west and the hamlet and neighborhood uses to the east. Therefore, the project is not expected to have an impact on uses in three directions from the site (west, south and east).

Although the project is a higher density development than the areas to the north and northeast of the site (lower-density residential and agricultural uses), it is the applicant's opinion that the proposed residential use is more compatible with agricultural uses than the nearby commercial uses. The project serves as a transition between the intensive commercial area to the west-southwest of the site and the more rural areas to the north of the site. The retention of existing trees and the proposed buffer plantings along the developments northern perimeter will soften the limited view of the development from the adjacent farm to the north. Therefore, significant adverse impacts to the uses to the north of the site are not anticipated.

Agricultural Resources

The proposed development will not result in any disturbance on any adjacent agricultural property or farm use. Land clearing will occur near the perimeter of the project site, however, trees will be preserved along the northern property boundary (near Brookview Farm) within the project site. The closest residential structures to the Brookview Farm property boundary would be the northernmost townhouse units. Between the site boundary and the adjacent farm fields is a buffer of existing trees which are to be preserved, thus providing adequate noise, dust and visual separation between the adjacent agricultural and residential uses. Therefore, no direct impact on agricultural uses will occur as a result of the proposed action.

Zoning

The BT Holdings development, including the proposed zoning amendment, is consistent with the density, use and bulk regulations of the Town SR-6 existing zoning on the site and the Village RM zoning regulations which are most comparable to the underlying Town SR-6 zoning district. The Town's SR-6 and the Village's RM zoning district requirements were used as guideposts in the proposed conceptual design.

In accordance with Table 1-6, the pertinent SR-6 lot area and bulk requirements are met or exceeded by the proposed BT Holdings development. Although the proposed development does not include proposed individual lots for the townhouses, land area exists to provide lots that would be likely to conform with the lot requirements in the related supplemental requirements. However, the creation of lots would not enhance the design of the proposed development as the provision of lots reduces the flexibility necessary to follow site contours and the related layout of roads, additional parking, recreation and open areas and other amenities.

The proposed RM-N zoning amendments include adjustments to the parking requirements in the proposed zoning table and related text amendments consistent with the number of spaces provided on the plans. As shown in Table 1-3, this will result in a reduced number of parking spaces on the site resulting in a reduction of impervious surface area on the site. The number of proposed parking spaces meets the projected parking demand and is consistent with the Institute of Transportation Engineers data relative to parking utilization for this type of land use.

Since the proposed RM-N zoning is in compliance with the permitted densities of the SR-6 (Town) and RM (Village) zoning districts and the Village's related supplemental requirements, there is no anticipated impact related to conformity with existing zoning. The reduction in bulk and parking requirements will allow for greater sustainablility of the completed project and will allow design to create a project with increased open space compared to existing zoning regulations.

Table 1-6 Townhouses
Lot and Bulk Comparison of SR-6, RM and proposed RM-N Requirements for Townhouses

Zoning District *Zoning Bulk Standard*	Town SR-6*** *Required per 98-29U*	Village RM *Required*	Proposed RM-N *Required*	BT Holding Proposal *Proposed*
Minimum total lot area*	10 acres	80,000 square feet	5 acres	58.4 acres
Minimum total lot width*	300 feet	150 feet	200 feet	610 feet (consistent with frontage)
Minimum Townhouse lot size**	2,000 square feet	2,000 square feet	Not specified	Lots not proposed (2,000 sq. ft. on-site available per unit)
Minimum Townhouse lot width**	20 feet	Not specified	200 feet	610 feet (lots not proposed)
Minimum front setback**	15 feet	40 feet (may be reduced to 20 on minor streets for townhouses by PB)	20 feet	Townhouse lots not proposed (>20 feet)
Minimum side setback, if provided**	15 feet	25 feet (no side yards required for interior lots)	15 feet (no side yards required for interior lots)	Townhouse lots not proposed (>25 feet)
Minimum rear setback**	30 feet	35 feet	35 feet	Townhouse lots not proposed (>35 feet)
Combined yard setback	As required in 98-20	50 feet	30 feet (no side yards required for interior lots)	Townhouse lots not proposed (>30 feet)
Usable open space	700 square foot per dwelling unit	700 square foot per dwelling unit	700 square foot per dwelling unit	700+ square foot per dwelling unit
Outdoor play area (as part of usable open space)	100 square foot per 3+ room dwelling unit	100 square foot per 3+ room dwelling unit	100 square foot per 3+ room dwelling unit	100+ square foot per dwelling unit
Maximum Density	6 units per acre	For 1BR & 2BR units, 8 units per acre. For 3+BR, 6 units per acre	For 1BR & 2BR units, 8 units per acre. For 3+BR, 6 units per acre	For 1BR & 2BR units, 8 units per acre. For 3+BR, 6 units per acre
Maximum units per building	8 units per building	Not specified	Not Specified	12 units per building
Bedroom Mix	Maximum 20% 3BR units	Not specified	Not Specified	21% 2BR 79% 3BR
Minimum habitable dwelling area	Not specified	Efficiency - 400 sf 1BR - 600 sf 2BR - 800 sf 3+BR - 1,000sf	Efficiency - 400 sf 1BR - 600 sf 2BR - 800 sf 3+BR - 1,000sf	2BR > 800 sf 3BR > 1,000 sf
Minimum Building Separation	Not less than the average height of the opposite bounding wall	Not less than the average height of the opposite bounding wall	Not less than 25 feet	> 25 feet
Maximum building lot coverage	As required in 98-20	20%	35%	15.70%
Maximum building height	As required in 98-20	35 feet & 3 stories	40 feet & 3 stories	35 feet & 3 stories
Parking	Refer to Table 3.6-4 below			

Source: Town of Chester Zoning Law; Village of Chestering Zoning Law
*** Requirement that applies to overall development site**
**** Requirement that applies to individual townhouse lot**
***** Condominium ownership is prohibited in the SR-6 District, ownership of single-family attached and detached dwelling units must be in fee simple.**

Table 1-6 Seniors
Lot and Bulk Comparison of SR-6, RM and proposed RM-N Requirements for Senior Housing

Zoning District *Zoning Bulk Standard*	Town SR-6 *Required per 98-29W*	Village RM** *Required*	Proposed RM-N *Required*	BT Holding Proposal *Proposed*
Minimum lot area	10 acres**	3 acres	2 acres	10 acres
Minimum lot width	Not specified	100 feet	100 feet	610 feet (consistent with frontage)
Minimum lot depth	Not specified	150 feet	150 feet	838 Provided
Minimum front setback	75	For sites of 5+ acres, 75 feet	For sites of 5+ acres, 75 feet	>75 feet
Minimum side setback, if provided	75	For sites of 5+ acres, 50 feet	For sites of 5+ acres, 50 feet	>50 feet
Minimum rear setback	75	For sites of 5+ acres, 50 feet	For sites of 5+ acres, 50 feet	>50 feet
Usable open space	Not specified	As required by Planning Board	As required by Planning Board	As required by Planning Board
Outdoor play area (as part of usable open space)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Maximum Density (Market-Rate)	10 units/acre minimum 10% affordable units	9 units/acre 10 units/acre with a minimum 20% affordable units	9 units/acre 10 units/acre with a minimum 20% affordable units	10 units/acre
Maximum Density (Affordable)	18 Studio units/acre 12 1BR units/acre 10 2BR units/acre			
Maximum units per building	Not specified	24 units/building	50 units/building	50 units/building
Bedroom Mix	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	75% 1BR 25% 2BR
Habitable dwelling area****	Studio - 450 sq. ft. MAX 1BR - 700 sq. ft. MAX 2BR - 900 sq. ft. MAX	Studio - 400 sq. ft. MIN 1BR - 500 sq. ft. MIN 2BR - 650 sq. ft. MIN	Studio - 400 sq. ft. MIN 1BR - 500 sq. ft. MIN 2BR - 650 sq. ft. MIN	Studio - 400 sq. ft. MIN 1BR - 500 sq. ft. MIN 2BR - 650 sq. ft. MIN
Maximum building lot coverage	25%**	75% (incl. all impervious surface)	35%	22%
Maximum building height	40 feet	35 feet & 3 stories	40 feet & 4 stories	35 feet & 4 stories
Parking	Refer to Table 3.6-4 below			

Source: Town of Chester zoning law; Village of Chestering zoning law
* Senior Housing as per §98-29(T) (Affordable Senior Housing) of the Town Zoning law
** Senior Housing as per §98-29(W) (Market-Rate Senior Housing) of the Town Zoning law
*** Senior Housing as per §98-23.1 of the Village Zoning law re Senior Citizen Housing Special Use Permit
**** Specified for Affordable Senior Citizen Dwelling units Section 98-29T?

Compatibility with Town of Chester Comprehensive Plan

The BT Holdings development, including the proposed zoning amendment, was specifically conceived and designed to fulfill the objectives of the *Town of Chester Comprehensive Plan of 2003.* The plan accomplishes this by including a mix of higher-density housing - senior and non-age-restricted - with both rental and ownership opportunities for future residents. A variety of dwelling styles are offered from lower priced one-bedroom rental units to larger three-bedroom ownership units.

The proposed annexation to the Village of Chester will address inclusion in a water service area and sewer services available in the service area of the Moodna Basin Commission with the construction and costs for related water and sewer improvements covered by the developer of the site. The project promotes the plan's objective of utilizing environmentally-friendly municipal water and sewer systems to service development as opposed to costly and inefficient individual options such as water wells and septic systems.

The site's location adjacent to an intensive highway commercial area places the proposed development with maximum access to major transportation routes and shopping, another objective of the plan. In addition, the site is close to downtown Chester shops, community, cultural and recreational amenities as well as potential places of employment in the Chester Industrial Park.

Therefore, no impacts are anticipated in relation to the Town Comprehensive Plan.

Land Use and Zoning Mitigation Measures

Land Use

No impacts are anticipated to land use, therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Agricultural Resources

No impacts are anticipated to agricultural uses, therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed. DEIS Section 3.11 discusses the proposed landscaping, buffering and screening shown on the project plans that will provide mitigation to potential visual effects, and compatibility of land uses with the adjacent Brookview Farm.

Zoning

A zoning amendment has been proposed to create a new RM-N zone which provides for multifamily housing, including a diversity of housing unit types, allowing flexibility in design, and reduced parking requirements, which limit site disturbance and reduce impervious areas, thus creating a more sustainable project. The proposed zone amendment is based upon the use, density and bulk requirements of the existing Town SR-6 zoning and the similar Village RM zoning regulations, Thus, the proposed development is not anticipated to have an impact on zoning, therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed.

1.2.7 Noise

Potential Noise Impacts

The BT Holdings proposed project would introduce residential uses that are compatible with the residential uses to the northeast, east and south of the site, and would not introduce any major stationary source of noise. The development's residences would introduce a new source of noise within the project vicinity although this noise source would have similar characteristics to adjoining residential neighborhoods and would be less of a noise impact than the commercial or industrial properties that are directly to the west, southwest and east of the site.

Local daytime ambient noise levels in the immediate vicinity of the site will increase during construction of the proposed subdivision. Construction activities and the operation of construction equipment are an expected and required consequence of any new construction project and cannot be avoided. Thus, some noise impacts would be expected. It is important to note that noise resulting from construction activities is a temporary impact and will cease upon completion of the project.

Construction Noise Mitigation

The anticipated duration of the construction period is approximately 36 months. Construction will occur during normal working hours, approximately 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM Monday through Saturday. No work will be permitted on Sunday or on holidays. All construction vehicles and equipment would be expected to be well maintained and operated in an efficient manner, thereby minimizing noise to the greatest extent practicable.

1.2.8 Economic and Demographic

When conceiving of the project concept, the applicant was keenly aware of the concerns that the local community would have with any new development and how it would impact Chester, especially with regard to fiscal impacts. As such, the applicant deliberately proposed a residential project that would not only fulfill the community smart growth goals as outlined in the Town of Chester's Comprehensive Plan but would also have a relatively low impact on the community.

The proposed project would introduce 76 two-bedroom townhomes, 282 three-bedroom townhomes, and 100 age-restricted rental apartment units (75 one-bedroom units and 25 two-bedroom units). Refer to Table 1-7 for the breakdown of proposed unit and project population. The anticipated selling price is projected to be $333,333 and $455,455 for the two- and three-bedroom townhouse units, respectively.

Residential demographic multipliers are used by community planners to project population and school-age child generation. The expected number of people and school children generated in any residential development is primarily affected by two principal variables: 1) Housing type and 2) Market price. Detached, single-family homes are geared towards families and accordingly generate an expected higher number of people and school-age children per unit. Smaller, attached townhome and multi-family housing units are primarily targeted towards empty-nesters and young professionals and, as such, generate fewer people and school-age children. Additionally, the lower the market price for any unit, the greater the expected number of people and school children generated while the higher-priced units generate fewer people and school children.

Knowing this, the project sponsor specifically conceived of a residential development intended to have a relatively low impact on the school district. Rather than propose detached single-family homes, the applicant proposed attached townhome and multi-family units to be built at a higher price range thereby limiting school child generation. For instance, 'Master Down' townhouses—units with the master bedroom on the first floor—were specifically conceived of and included in the proposal in order to appeal more directly to senior and empty nesters. Additionally, the senior rental aspect of the project is expected to generate no children at all.

In order to insure the proposed senior housing would be restricted to seniors, A covenant will be placed on the property in a form satisfactory to the Village attorney that restricts the property for age-restricted use in accordance with Federal and State requirements.

As a result of the proposed action, the Village of Chester is expected to grow by 1,137 persons over the expected five-year build period. This expected increase in population from the proposed development would include 121 school age children. The senior rental community alone would be expected to generate 180 senior citizens. The townhouse community would also be expected to produce a substantial amount of additional seniors, especially considering the availability of Master Down units.

Table 1-7
Unit Type, Bedroom Count, Population Projections

Unit Type	Number of Units	Population Multiplier	Population Estimate	School-age Multiplier	School-age Children Estimate
1-bedroom Senior Apartments	75	1.80	135	0	0
2-bedroom Senior Apartments	25	1.80	45	0	0
2-bedroom Townhouses	76	2.09	159	0.14	11
3-bedroom Townhouses	282	2.83	798	0.39	110
Total	**458**	**TOTAL POPULATION**	**1,137 (includes 180 seniors)**	**TOTAL SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN**	**121**

Source: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, Residential Demographic Multipliers (June 2006); Senior housing multipliers from Tim Miller Associates from various senior housing studies conducted in Putnam and Rockland Counties, New York.

The Village's population is estimated to be 3,575 persons in 2007. The 1,137 persons expected to reside at the proposed development would represent a 32 percent increase in the Village of Chester's 2007 estimated population. However, in the context of the Town of Chester 2007 population of 13,402, which includes the Village, the 1,137 new residents would represent an 8 percent increase.

Local comparable residential developments have also been surveyed to examine local trends for schoolchild generation. The Meadow Glen townhouse development in the Town of Monroe located several miles down Rte 17 at the junction of Rte 87 in Harriman is a residential development built approximately five years ago consisting of 198 three-bedroom attached townhouses. The townhouse component of the BT Holdings project was largely modeled on this development. The units are priced at the same approximate price range, are at comparable densities and offer similar amenities. Using the demographic multipliers above, Meadow Glen would be expected to generate 77 school-age children. Instead a total of 68 school-age children

was generated, which translates to a rate of 0.34 school-age children generated per unit. This rate is ***less than*** the 0.39 rate used above to project school-age children for the BT Holdings project.

The analysis of school-age child generation above is a deliberately conservative estimate given that it measures *all* school-age children that will be generated by this project, not just *public* school-age children. If the expected public school-age children multiplier was used, only 87 public school-age children would be expected from the project, nearly 30% fewer than the 121 total. The demographic analysis provides a conservative assessment in that it is based on 100% of the school-age population attending the public schools.

The introduction of these students into various grade levels over a multi-year period due to project phasing would ameliorate the effect of the increase in school district enrollment associated with this project. The phased construction period of this project provides time to allow the Chester UFSD to implement measures for the introduction of new students from this and other area projects.

Potential Fiscal Impacts

Projected Assessed Value

In order to project the property tax revenues that would be generated by the proposed project, the market value and the assessed value for the proposed development must be estimated. Consistent with fiscal impact methodology[2], property tax revenues are determined by considering the amount of property tax revenues would be generated if the development were completed and occupied today. The proposed project would convert vacant land to a residential development that would include 358 (two- and three-bedroom) townhomes and 100 (one- and two-bedroom) age-restricted apartment type units. All units proposed would be in condominium ownership. Upon completion, the assessed value of the proposed project is projected to be $48,608,438. Table 1-8 below shows the projected tax revenue at project completion.

Table 1-8
Projected Property Tax Revenues and Fees

Taxing Jurisdiction	Tax Rate (per $1,000 AV*)	Total Assessed Value	Property Tax Revenues
Village of Chester	$12.0000	$48,608,438	$583,301
Town of Chester	$4.6069	$48,608,438	$223,934
Chester UFSD	$33.0587	$48,608,438	$1,606,933
Chester Fire District	$1.3865	$48,608,438	$67,396
Orange County	$5.9243	$48,608,438	$287,971
Village of Chester Sewer Fees	$325 per unit	458 units	$148,850
Total			**$2,918,385**

Source: Village of Chester Assessor's Office; Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2009. Property tax revenues rounded to the nearest dollar. Discrepancies between the total and individual line items due to rounding.

[2] The Fiscal Impact Handbook, Robert Burchell and David Listokin, 1978.

As shown in the Table 1-8, total project-generated tax revenues are estimated to be $2,918,385 annually. By far the largest portion of the total, 55 percent would accrue to the Chester Union Free School District (Chester UFSD), which would receive $1,606,933 annually. The Village would gain $583,301 annually. Even though the proposed development would reside entirely in the Village due to annexation, the Town would receive significant Town tax revenue ($223,934 annually). Orange County would receive approximately $287,971 annually and the Chester Fire District would receive approximately $67,396 annually. Billing for sewer services is allocated on a per unit basis to Village consumers. Each residential home is counted as its own unit with a standard charge per unit. Thus, as proposed, the project would generate annual fees to the Village of Chester Sewer District of $148,850 ($325 per unit).

Table 1-9 summarizes the municipal costs and anticipated tax revenue in the Village, the Town and the Chester School District for the proposed BT Holdings Project. The methodologies used to derive these numbers are described in Section 3.8.

Table 1-9
Summary of Revenue and Cost Analysis
BT Holdings Multifamily Proposal

Jurisdiction	Tax Revenue	Service Cost	Net Benefit / (Deficit)
Town of Chester	$223,934	$166,002	$57,932
Village of Chester	$583,301	$249,002	$334,298
Chester UFSD	$1,606,933	$1,599,620	$7,313
Chester Fire District	$67,396	$49,580	$17,816

Source: TMA 2009.

Village of Chester

Since the proposed development would include the annexation of land from the Town into the Village, increased costs would be expected to be incurred by the Village. The Per Capita Multiplier Method of estimating future municipal residential costs was utilized to determine these costs. The method estimates the average cost per person of municipal residential expenses to project an annual cost assignable to a population change. Per capita costs are multiplied by the estimated project population and are the incremental costs attributable to the project.

The total 2009 operating budget for the Village of Chester was $4,170,621 and the total amount to be raised by tax levy derived is $2,879,021. The per capita cost is determined by dividing the population into the total residentially induced cost. The estimated per capita municipal cost is $219. In other words, for each additional person, the Village can be expected to incur $219 in additional expense to be raised by residential tax revenue.

The proposed development is projected to increase the Village's population by 1,137 persons at full build-out. As noted above, the estimated annual per capita expense for general municipal services is $219. Using this as a basis for projections, additional costs are projected to total $249,003 annually.

As shown in Table 1-9, overall revenues from the proposed development for general municipal services associated with the Village are projected to be $583,301 annually. Therefore, ***after*** covering the anticipated municipal cost to the Village of $249,003, a ***net benefit*** in the amount

of $334,298 annually would be projected to the Village of Chester as a result of the proposed project.

The project as proposed includes private roads and self-contained recreational facilities which will serve to reduce the demand for public services to be provided by the Village. The self-sufficient nature of the proposed community results in a development that the Applicant expects will more than cover its costs.

Town of Chester

Upon annexation, the residents of the BT Holdings project would be entitled to services provided by both the Village and the Town of Chester. Utilizing the Per Capita Multiplier methodology discussed above, the total 2009 General Fund and Highway budget for the Town of Chester was $4,638,382 and the total amount to be raised by tax levy for these expenses is estimated to be $3,569,867

Dividing the 2009 residentially induced costs by the 2007 estimated population of the Town of 13,402, would result in an estimated per capita municipal cost to the Town of $146. In other words, for each additional Village resident, the Town can be expected to incur $146 in additional expense to be raised by residential tax revenue.

The proposed development is projected to increase the Town's population by 1,137 persons at full build-out. As noted above, the estimated annual per capita expense for general municipal services to the Town of a Village resident is $146. Based upon the Per Capita Multiplier Method costs are projected to total $166,002 annually.

As shown in Table 1-9, overall tax revenues from the proposed development to the Town of Chester are projected to be $223,934 annually. Therefore, ***after*** covering the anticipated total municipal cost to the Town of $166,002, an annual ***net benefit*** in the amount of $57,932 would be projected to the Town of Chester as a result of the proposed project.

Chester Union Free School District

The Chester UFSD 2008-2009 School Tax Levy was $13,682,558 with a total school enrollment of 1,035 children. As a result, the cost assumed to be raised through the property tax for the proposed development in 2009 would be $13,220 per student.[3] Since 121 school age children are expected to reside at the proposed development, as shown in Table 1-9, this would result in an overall annual cost to the school district of $1,599,620 annually.

Upon full build-out expected in 2014, the proposed development would generate annual property tax revenues of $1,606,933 directly to the Chester UFSD as shown in Table 1-9.

This would result in a nominal ***net benefit*** to the school district of $7,313 annually. Once again, the low-impact nature of the proposed community, especially with regard to school children,

[3] Source: "Property Tax Report Card Data - Part 1 - Budget, Levy, and Enrollment." Elementary, Middle, Secondary and Continuing Education (EMSC). 2008 . New York State Education Department (NYSED). 13, February 2009 <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov>; Notes and Calculations: Chester UFSD 2008/2009 budget: $21,874,089; Chester USFD 2008-2009 School Tax Levy: $13,682,558; Chester 2008-2009 School Enrollment: 1035; Per-student cost: ($13,682,558/1,035)=$13,220.

results in a development that is expected to cover its costs. The $1,606,933 in annual revenues for the Chester UFSD could be used to cover the additional expenses , as necessary.

The proposed development is expected to be completed by 2014. As such, the population of school age children (121) would be added to the Chester UFSD over a five-year period, as homes are built, marketed, sold and occupied, resulting in an annual school age population increase of approximately 25 new children.

Chester Fire District

The residents of the BT Holdings project would be entitled to Fire protection services provided by the Chester Fire Department. Utilizing the Per Capita Multiplier methodology discussed above, the estimated per capita cost to the Fire District is $44. The proposed development is projected to increase the Town's population by 1,137 persons at full build-out, thus costs are projected to total $49,580 annually.

As shown in Table 1-9, overall tax revenues from the proposed development to the Chester Fire District are projected to be *$67,396.* Thus, an annual ***net benefit*** in the amount of $17,816 would be projected to the Chester Fire District as a result of the proposed project.

Economic and Demographic Mitigation Measures

The implications of increasing the Village 's population by 1,137 persons over a five-year period would result in an increased demand for community services and facilities that would be provided to the project site. As shown in Table 1-9, ***after*** covering the costs of municipal services, it is anticipated that the proposed project will result in a ***net benefit*** to the Village, the Chester Fire District, the Town and the School district, thus no additional mitigation is proposed.

1.2.9 Community Services

Potential Community Service Impacts

Chester UFSD

As a result of the proposed action, the Village of Chester is expected to grow by 1,137 persons over the expected five year build period. This increase in population from the proposed development would include 121 school age children. As shown in Table 1-10 there is available capacity in the Chester UFSD to accommodate this projected growth.

Table 1-10
Chester Union Free School District Capacity

Building	NYSED Capacity	Chester UFSD Operational Capacity	Enrollment Projections Fall 2009	Available Operational Capacity
Chester Elementary School	783 students	550 to 600 students	485 students	115 students
Chester Academy	1,038 students	850 to 900 students	625 students*	275 students

Source; Chester UFSD Superintendent, Helen Livingston, August 2009.
* Includes 75 BOCES Students

A representative of the transportation office of the Chester UFSD indicated that students could be accommodated on existing bus routes, however, one or two additional buses may be necessary to accommodate the students who reside at BT Holdings.[4]

The Chester UFSD would benefit from an increase in revenues of approximately $1,606,933 annually, funds which could be used to cover the expense of additional equipment as necessary.

Police Protection

The increase of approximately 1,137 residents to the Village's population is likely to increase the need for police services in the Village. According to Village Police Chief Graziano the proposed project may create a need for up to three additional officers, an administrative person and a patrol vehicle. Current station facilities are crowded, with 20 persons utilizing 1,560 square feet of office space. It is anticipated that, after covering costs, an additional $334,298 in tax revenue will be available in the Village General Fund to help meet this need. Based on standards contained in the Development Impact Assessment Handbook (Urban Land Institute, 1994), two police officers and 0.6 police vehicles are required per 1,000 population. This is consistent with the Police Chief Graziano's recommendation.

It is important to note that the Village of Chester maintains its own police department. The Town of Chester Police Department operates separately and generally only responds into the Village at their request. With the BT Holdings 60.6-acre parcel proposed to be annexed from the Town to the Village, the impact of this project on the Town of Chester Police Department should be very minimal.

Fire Protection

The BT Holdings development located wholly within the service area of the Chester Fire Department the population of which is currently approximately 15,000 persons and has a service ratio of 1 firefighter for each 125 persons in the district. Based on planning standards contained in the Urban Land Institute's Development Impact Handbook, it is estimated that 1.65 fire personnel per 1,000 population is required to serve a new population. The anticipated increase in population of 1,137 persons within the fire district would be expected to generate a demand for 1.88 additional fire personnel. However, the Department's current personnel level of 120 fire personnel exceeds the ULI standard even after the proposed development's population increase. This is a conservative value, as the ULI multipliers assume no existing services, thus the actual demand for personnel is expected to be somewhat lower.

The BT Holding's development would generate property tax revenues to the Chester Fire District of approximately $67,396 annually. This additional revenue can be used to augment the Department's capabilities, as necessary.

The Village of Chester public water supply system, operated by the Village's Water Department, provides potable water for Village residents. The Village has adequate water capacity to meet the water needs of the proposed project including fire protection. A new on-site water distribution network would be provided on the site consisting of pipes, valves, hydrants, tees, elbows and other components for fire protection for the proposed development. A private water storage tank is not anticipated to be required for the proposed development. However, a booster

[4] Phone conversation with Cathy Brown, August 17, 2009.

station, which would be housed in a small structure, may be needed to maintain adequate pressure in the system at higher elevations in the system during events when there is demand for fire flow.

The primary access to the site would be from Route 17M with an emergency access on Oakland Avenue. The proposed internal roads A, B and C will be 24 feet wide and have been sized to accommodate fire engines and truck traffic. Emergency access is provided around all residential buildings on the project site. Buildings on the site would be required to meet applicable standards of the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code, and would also adhere to applicable regulations of Chapter, 108, Building Construction and Fire Prevention, of the Code of the Village of Chester. A new public water main is proposed as part of the BT Holdings development with hydrants every 400.

Ambulance Protection

The standard for Emergency Medical Services, according to the Urban Land Institute's 1994 Development Impact Handbook, is 4.1 full-time personnel and 1 vehicle per population of 30,000. The introduction of 1,137 persons in the Village of Chester results in potential added demand for 0.16 full-time health care personnel and less than three-hundredths (0.03) of a vehicle.

The ULI Development Impact Handbook indicates that 36.5 Emergency Medical Service (EMS) calls are generated per year per 1,000 population which would result in the generation of approximately five calls by the proposed project annually. Based on the ULI multipliers, the proposed project would result in an additional 41.5 EMS calls per year.

Additionally, the ULI indicates that four (4.0) hospital beds should be provided per 1,000 persons. Based on this standard, the projected population increase associated with the BT Holdings Development (1,137 persons) has a potential to increase the need for beds in hospitals serving the Village of Chester by 4.5 beds.

As the project will be developed and occupied over a period of years, there is expected to be a gradual increase in population that would not create significant demands on health care resources.

Parks and Recreation Facilities

The project's proposed on-site central clubhouse and pool; outdoor play area, picnic and gazebo areas; trails and sidewalks will provide recreational amenities for future residents. Impacts to the Town, County, and Village recreational facilities will be reduced due to these on-site recreational facilities.

According to the Village Building Inspector[5], recreational fees are paid to the Village for new construction. These fees will be paid to the appropriate municipal government as required. Village recreation fees are currently estimated at $500 per unit.

[5] Phone conversation with Village of Chester Building Inspector John Orr, August 24, 2009.

Solid Waste Facilities

Based on data published by the Urban Land Institute, residents generate approximately four (4) pounds of solid waste per person per day. The projected 1,137 persons would generate approximately 68.22 tons per month of solid waste. Assuming that solid waste generated by future residents at the project site has a typical three to one ratio of non-recyclable to recyclable materials, the project will generate 51.17 tons per month of non-recyclable solid wastes and 17.05 tons per month of recyclable materials.

Residents of the Town and Village are billed on a per unit basis as part of their property taxes to cover the services provided by the Town of Chester Garbage District. Future residents of the BT Holdings townhouses would be billed on their individual property taxes. Since the senior units are rental apartments, it is assumed that the owner of the apartment buildings would pay a property tax bill that would include a per unit refuse fee for the Town of Chester Garbage District. The per unit refuse fee would be incorporated to rent or other fees collected by the property owner from tenants.

Community Service Mitigation Measures

Education Facilities

The increase in student population would be offset by the tax revenues generated by the proposed project to the District and result in a net annual increase in revenues of $1,606,933. No further mitigation measures are proposed.

Police Protection

The potential increase in Village Police staffing would be funded by the tax revenue included in the Village's budget. In addition to covering anticipated cost increases, the additional tax revenue of $334,298 generated by the B T Holdings project would be available to meet this need. No further mitigation measures relating to police protection services are proposed.

Fire Protection

The BT Holdings project as designed includes emergency access roads and sprinkler systems to facilitate Fire Protection services.

Ambulance Protection

No mitigation measures specific to ambulance protection facilities are proposed.

Parks and Recreation Facilities

The BT Holdings project has been designed to provide on-site recreational facilities to address the needs of the future residents. In addition the Applicant will pay the appropriate recreational payment in lieu of parkland fees as required. No further mitigation measures to parks and recreation facilities are proposed at this time.

Solid Waste Facilities

Since no impacts relative to solid waste disposal are anticipated, no mitigation measures are proposed. However, during actual site plan review, central locations would be designated for collection of garbage, recyclable and bulk throughout the townhouse and condominium development and for each senior apartment building. Central facilities for solid waste collection would be properly fenced and landscaped to blend with the residential development and screen receptacles from view by residents and visitors.

1.2.10 Utilities

Potential Utility Impacts

Wastewater

Based on the project engineer's estimates, development of 458 dwelling units consisting of 100 senior apartments and 358 multifamily townhomes would create demand for average daily wastewater of 125,160 gallons per day (gpd).

By virtue of the project's present location in the service area of the Moodna Basin Commission, the project will remain entitled to sewer service from both the Town and Village of Chester.

According to usage reports provided by the Moodna Basin Commission, the Village of Chester discharged approximately 363,600 gpd of wastewater to the plant (16,600 gpd over the Village's allocated amount) and the Town of Chester discharged approximately 262,000 gpd (148,000 gpd under the Town's allocated amount. As such, the net combined available and remaining wastewater allocation between the Town of Chester and the Village of Chester is approximately 131,400 gpd. The estimated 125,160 gpd of wastewater the project is expected to generate is 22,840 gpd below the Town's available and remaining allocation and 6,240 gpd below the combined available and remaining allocation between the Town and Village. As such, there presently exists available capacity in the wastewater system to handle the proposed project. If the pending or approved projects should come on line prior to the BT Holdings project, the Village and/or Town can request additional allocation from the Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant which, as mentioned above, has approximately 1.5 mgd of available capacity. The project sponsor would reimburse the appropriate municipality for any fees related to the increase in allocation necessary to service the proposed project. At present, a Court ordered injunction prohibits the County from allocating any additional amounts to the Moodna Group municipalities. However, it is anticipated that the legal proceedings will be brought to conclusion prior to construction of the BT Holdings project and, depending upon the results of those legal proceedings, additional allocation may become available from the Harriman Treatment Plant source.

Should wastewater disposal via the contemplated Black Meadow Wastewater Treatment Facility become available, that would provide an additional potential source of wastewater capacity for the Project.

If the pending or approved projects came on line prior to the BT Holdings project and additional capacity to service the BT Holdings project was needed but unavailable from the alternate sources described above, construction of units beyond available capacity would be prohibited until such capacity became available.

The proposed BT Holdings development would require construction of an on-site wastewater collection system and some off-site improvements as described below:

- An on-site gravity sewer system would be constructed to convey wastewater to the existing 8-inch sewer main in Rte 17M;

- Moodna Pump Station No. 5 would be assessed for its ability to handle the additional flow from the developed site; and upgraded to SPS 5

- If the project's flow were to be directed to the contemplated Black Meadow Plant, new infrastructure would be needed to convey sewage from the intersection of Rte 17M and West Avenue (the end of Pump Station No. 5's force main) to the proposed Black Meadow Plant.

- The proposed water main running through the site from Route 17M to Oakland Avenue via Road 'A' and the emergency egress driveway to Oakland Avenue, including any associated hydrants, is proposed to be a village-owned public water supply main. An easement will be provided for this main and the associated hydrants. The applicant intends to run this main within the proposed paved site roads. All other water mains onsite, including any booster stations, are proposed to be privately owned and maintained.

The construction and costs for the above-described improvements would be borne by the developer of the site. The proposed water and wastewater infrastructure will benefit both the project and the surrounding community. The proposed water infrastructure includes the replacement of a 4-inch water main in Route 17M with a new, larger 10-inch main, and the installation of a new 10-inch main through the property that will interconnect the new 10-inch main in Route 17M and the existing 8-inch main in Oakland Terrace. This new 10-inch main will not only service the project site, but it will also strengthen the water service in the surrounding area by providing a redundant source of water to 17M from the tank on Oakland Terrace. In addition, the project will include the assessment of Sanitary Pump Station No. 5, and will likely include upgrades to the pump station that will in turn benefit the project as well as the other contributors to the sanitary sewers in the immediate area. The construction and costs for the above-described improvements would be borne by the developer of the site, thus benefiting the Moodna Basin Commission, Town of Chester and Village of Chester. Design, permitting and construction of these improvements will be in accordance with Village, Moodna Basin Commission, Orange County and NYSDEC standards and requirements.

Wastewater Mitigation Measures

The estimated 125,160 gpd of wastewater that the project is expected to generate is below the Town's available and remaining allocation of 148,000 gpd and below the net combined available and remaining wastewater allocation between the Town of Chester and the Village of Chester of 131,400 gpd. As such, there presently exists available capacity in the wastewater system to handle the proposed project.

If the pending or approved projects should come on line prior to the BT Holdings project, the Village and/or Town can request additional capacity from the Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant which, as mentioned above, has approximately 1.5 mgd of available capacity. The project sponsor would reimburse the appropriate municipality for any fees related to the increase in allocation necessary to service the proposed project. At present, a Court ordered injunction prohibits the County from allocating any additional amounts to the Moodna Group municipalities. However, it is anticipated that the legal proceedings will be brought to conclusion prior to

construction of the BT Holdings project and, depending upon the results of those legal proceedings, additional allocation may become available from the Harriman Treatment Plant source.

Should wastewater disposal via the proposed Black Meadow Wastewater Treatment Facility become available, that would provide an additional potential source of wastewater capacity for the Project.

If the pending or approved projects came on line prior to the BT Holdings project and additional allocation to service the BT Holdings project was needed but unavailable from the alternate sources described above, construction of units beyond available capacity would be prohibited until such capacity became available.

As part of the proposed action, the project developer would construct the on-site wastewater collection system and off-site improvements necessary to convey the site-generated sewage to Harriman Sewage Treatment Plant. The cost of this construction would be borne by the developer.

Water Supply

Based on the project engineer's estimates, development of 458 dwelling units including 100 senior apartments and 358 multifamily townhomes would require a water supply demand of 137,676 gallons per day (gpd). In addition to the domestic water demand, approximately 123,500 gpd may be required for irrigation of the site's lawn and landscaped areas during the summer months. As a result, the combined domestic and irrigation demand results in a total seasonal average water demand of approximately 261,180 gpd for the BT Holdings development.

The combination of the domestic demand and irrigation demand for the proposed BT Holdings project in addition to the other pending or approved projects is approximately 341,750 gpd which is significantly below the reported 650,000 gpd available excess capacity of the system. There is also ample storage capacity in the existing municipal tanks (2 million gallons) to store the average daily demand of the system once the BT Holdings project and the pending or approved projects are added to the existing water supply system.

Water Supply Mitigation Measures

In order to gain access to the Village's municipal water supply system, annexation of the Town of Chester lot is being pursued. The following improvements, to be made by the project applicant, would require approvals by the Village of Chester Water Department and the Orange County Department of Health:

- The existing 4-inch main along the site's frontage on Rte 17M would be replaced with a 10-inch main to connect with the existing 10-inch main located along the frontage for the Chester Mall.
- A new public water main trunk line with hydrants every 400 feet would be constructed through the site from the new 10-inch main in Rte 17M to the existing 8-inch main in Oakland Avenue.

- A new on-site water distribution network would be provided on the site consisting of pipes, valves, hydrants, tees, elbows and other components for domestic and irrigation needs and fire protection for the proposed development.

Although a private water-storage tank is not anticipated to be required for the proposed development, a booster station, which would be housed in a small structure on the project site, may be needed to maintain adequate pressure in the system at higher elevations in the system during events when there is demand for fire flow. The booster station structure would be about the size of a small garage.

The cost of the necessary water supply improvements, on-site and in Rte 17M, including the design, permitting and installation, would be borne by the project developer. The plans and specifications for these improvements would be presented during future actual site plan review. As part of the future review process, the proposed water supply system would be reviewed by the Village Engineer and Village of Chester Water Department to assure it conforms to pertinent local and department requirements and specifications. It is not anticipated that there would be any adverse impacts associated with the construction of the water supply system.

As per the discussions with the Village Water Superintendent, upon completion of the water system improvements listed above, it is not anticipated that the proposed project would have a negative impact on the Village's water distribution system. As noted above, the cost of all improvements necessary to serve the project would be borne by the developer of the project. As such, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Energy Resources

Potential Energy Impacts

Both short-term and long-term energy consumption effects are associated with all residential construction projects. Short-term energy consumption impacts would occur during construction of the proposed development, primarily due to the consumption of fossil fuels through the operation of power equipment and construction vehicles.

Once constructed, the 458 dwelling units would be occupied by households that would place long-term demands on various energy sources. In all residential dwellings, energy will be consumed for space heating, air-conditioning, water heating, lighting, refrigerators and other appliances. It is expected then that the 458 households proposed for this project would consume 29.3 billion BTU of energy annually.

Electrical and gas service, provided by Orange and Rockland Utilities, would be extended to the project site via buried utility connections. Orange and Rockland Utilities does not anticipate any problems accommodating the projected electrical and gas demands created by the proposed development (phone call and letter on February 13, 2009, with Mr. Michael Popoloski, Senior Project Manager, New Construction Services, Orange and Rockland Utilities). All underground utility connections will meet Village Code and industry specifications.

Energy Mitigation Measures

Since no impacts relative to energy resources are anticipated, no mitigation measures are proposed.

1.2.10 Visual

Potential Visual Impacts

Views of the existing BT Holdings site from locations on the Brookview Farm are limited in many locations by the steep topography of the Brookview Farm fields. After construction, portions of the proposed development close to the north property line would be visible from some locations on the lower elevations of Brookview Farm. From locations at the higher elevations on Brookview Farm, closer to the proposed development, views of much of the development would be possible soon after the end of construction. However, evergreen and deciduous tree buffers are proposed for the property boundary and between the senior mid rise buildings and the group of townhouses to the east of them. These buffers would be expected to obscure views of the development substantially over time, as the trees grow larger.

Existing trees to be preserved along the easterly portion of the north property line would be expected to provide screening of views of the project on the highest elevations on the site, adjacent to the property boundary.

Potential Effects on Scenic Views

The subject property is not part of the ridgeline protected in the Town zoning law within the RPOD but as mentioned previously it is adjacent to the Brookview Farm, a property that is included in the District. The northern portion of the property is currently rolling farmland similar to the Brookview farm. The southern portions of the property abut the Chester Mall. The views of the property in association with the Brookview farm from several nearby locations along 17M and from several publicly accessible locations within the Whispering Hill condominiums may be considered scenic though the Chester Mall is unavoidably visible from most vantage points included in this analysis. The proposed development would change the character of these views from rural to suburban residential.

Visual Mitigation Measures

The conceptual architecture, landscaping and lighting for the proposed development have been developed to comply with the standards that apply to these in the Village of Chester Code. The Guiding Principles and Standards in Section 98-24 states:

The location and height of buildings, the location, nature and height of walls and fences and the nature and extent of landscaping on the site shall be such that the use will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings or impair the value thereof.

Section 98.23-1 concerning Senior Housing requires "appropriate landscaping, lighting, and sidewalks" and that the "architectural style of the proposed project, exterior materials, finish and color shall be consistent with existing community and neighborhood character."

The proposed site design, architecture, lighting, landscape plantings and other features would comply with the specific dimensional requirements, achieve the aesthetic goals stated in these standards and mitigate potential adverse impacts on visual resources from the proposed development.

1.2.13 Thresholds of Development

Although the submitted plan is a conceptual site plan, the SEQRA review is not a Generic DEIS in which thresholds for future review would be established. Instead the applicant has provided a conceptual site plan including sufficient detail to conduct a through review of the impacts related to the project as a whole, including but not limited to; land use & zoning, demographics, fiscal implications, traffic, wetland impacts, community services, etc. The conceptual plan represents the maximum amount of development anticipated by the applicant, and as such represents the maximum impact scenario. More detailed plans will be provided and reviewed as part of site plan review following this DEIS and FEIS review process.

According to the project engineer, the total impervious surface area of the BT Holdings development would be 24.6 acres, which includes 14.3 acres of roads, parking areas, driveways and walkways and 10.4 acres of building footprints. Lawn and landscaped area would cover 31.9 acres of the developed site. Therefore the total area of disturbance would be 56.6 acres and 11.8 acres would remain undisturbed.

The site includes 6.3 acres of proposed usable open space areas in accordance with zoning requirements, which include the common recreation facility and areas around the wetland and stormwater ponds. Outdoor play areas total 1.1 acres.

Of the 46 acres of existing field, meadow and brushy areas on the site, approximately 40.5 acres will be disturbed. And of the 19 acres of wooded area, approximately 15.9 acres will be disturbed. As noted above, the site contains 3.68 acres of federally-regulated freshwater wetlands of which less than one tenth (0.1) acre will be disturbed.

The total area of grading or site disturbance is estimated to be 56.5 acres of the site. Total earthwork is estimated to involve approximately 330,000 cubic yards (cy) of cut generated and 365,000 cy of fill needed. The preliminary estimates indicate that there would be a net requirement of 35,000 cy of material imported to the site, which is based on conceptual plans. Efforts will be made to minimize the volume of fill needed for this project.

1.2.14 Alternatives

Section 617.9(b)(5) of the regulations implementing the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) requires that a DEIS include a description and evaluation of the range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action that are feasible, considering the objectives and capabilities of the project sponsor. The range of alternatives must include the “No Action” alternative. As per these regulations, alternatives should be limited to those for which no discretionary approval is needed. The Scoping Document for this DEIS requires an evaluation of seven (7) alternatives as follows:

1. Development with No Annexation - Single Family Homes
2. Alternate Density Multifamily Buildings
3. Alternate Use
    a. All Senior Housing: Active Adult Community
    b. 200 Senior Units out of the 458 unit total
4. Alternate Layout - Fee simple layout (subdivision; each Townhouse unit has a small lot)

5. Alternate Utilities - create a central water system at proposed development site
6. Alternative Green Technology and Sustainable Building Construction- reduce power load on grid through self-sustainable system and possible solar array technology. Consider water collection system to irrigate lawns and replenish water table
7. No Action - No Development

A summary matrix of the estimated impacts associated with each alternative as well as the proposed action is provided as Table 1-11. This table quantifies the variations between alternatives in regard to the mix of dwelling units; building, impervious, disturbed and undisturbed areas; water and wastewater demand; traffic volume; and population

Development with no Annexation - Single Family Homes

Based upon the importance of this specific Alternative and its economic implications to the Village Board's evaluation of the merits of annexation, the economic analysis is included in its entirety in the Executive Summary for convenience.

The no-annexation alternative reviews the impacts that would occur if the project were to be developed without the proposed annexation. The project as proposed cannot be built as designed and remains within the Town, The Town SR-6 zoning regulations prohibit development of a multifamily neighborhood as a single condominium and stipulate that ownership must be fee simple. The project as proposed requires municipal water, which is not available in the Town, and thus requires annexation into the Village. Based upon these differences it is not possible to provide a direct comparison of the project to be built in the Village to the same project to be built in the Town. Annexation into the Village would relieve the Town of the cost of services funded by the part town and town highway tax costs. The result would be a single-family home (SFH) alternative consisting of 120 single-family detached dwelling units on individual subdivision lots as illustrated in Figure 5-1. This alternative would have a major negative fiscal impact on the school system. The no-annexation SFH alternative would not be consistent with the objectives of the applicant who wishes to create a low-impact multifamily and senior residential community on the site in accordance with the site's existing zoning and the Town of Chester's Comprehensive Plan. The only way to do this would be by tapping into the Village's easily accessible existing water system.

The unit mix for the SFH alternative would be 108 four-bedroom homes (based upon the existing Town SR-6 Zoning) and 12 three-bedroom single-family homes (based upon the existing Village RS zoning). The density as represented in the conceptual plan would be less than 2 dwelling units per acre with a more extensive on-site road network than the proposed action. This single-family housing is not in accordance with the senior and multifamily housing for which the property is intended as per the Town of Chester's Comprehensive Plan.

Tapping into the Village's existing municipal water system, which has both sufficient capacity and accessible infrastructure, would be prudent and efficient from both a cost and environmental perspective. If the site could not access the Village's water system, the developer would need to look for an existing water source onsite necessitating either the development of a central water system or the drilling of individual wells. There is no guarantee that enough water would be found onsite to provide the necessary supply for any intended development. It would make little sense to fund and create a private on-site central water system or dig individual wells when a municipal system with sufficient capacity exists in areas directly adjacent to the site. Because of the added cost of creating the water source and

treatment system, the burden of ownership and operation on future residents, and the reduction in the number of dwelling units, the project would be less economically viable.

The SFH alternative would also not be consistent with the Town of Chester's Comprehensive Plan objectives for the site. In accordance with the Comprehensive Plan's mandate for the property and consistent with "smart growth" planning practices, the intent of the applicant is to provide low-impact multi-family and senior housing on a centrally-located parcel appropriate for higher-density development. Single-family homes have significantly impacts per unit than the lower-impact multi-family and senior housing proposed, primarily due to the increased number of school-age children per unit. Under the SFH alternative, a number of impacts identified in this DEIS would vary, largely with negative effects.

The proposed site would be developed as a low- to medium-density neighborhood which is not as consistent with the pattern of intensive commercial and high-density residential development as the proposed action. The opportunity to place a demographically-mixed neighborhood (senior, affordable and non-senior units) in close proximity to shopping, services, workplaces and nearby community amenities would be lost. The SFH alternative would not be consistent with the intended density and zoning of the majority portion of the site as set forth in the Town of Chester Comprehensive Plan (2.5 to 6 units per acre and up to 8 senior units per acre).

The inefficiency of a SFH development relative to the proposed project is apparent in several ways. Building area would be only slightly lower at 9.56 acres even though there are far fewer dwelling units (120, rather than 458 units). Paved roads and driveway area per dwelling unit (d.u.) would be 0.1 acre per d.u. for the SFH alternative. By comparison, the proposed action would require much less paved roads, driveway and sidewalk area per unit at 0.03 acre per d.u., even including sidewalks and recreational amenities. The same is true when total disturbed area for 120 single-family homes (59.98 acres or 0.5 acre/d.u.) is compared with the total disturbed area for the 458 multi-family dwellings in the proposed action (56.61 acres or 0.12 acre/d.u.)

Economic and Demographic

Financial and demographic impacts to the community would change significantly under the SFH alternative. In many important ways, single-family homes are higher-impact relative to the units proposed under the BT Holdings plan.

Refer to Table 1-12 for the breakdown of proposed units and the projected population.

Table 1-12
Single Family Housing Population Projection

Unit Type	Number of Units	Municipality	Population Multiplier	Projected Population	School Children Multiplier	Projected School Children Population
3 BR Single Family	12	Village of Chester	2.95	35	0.58	7
4 BR Single Family	108	Town of Chester	3.67	396	1.05	114
TOTAL	**120**			**431**		**121**

Source: Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research, June 2006.
Zoning and Acreage Analysis for SFH Alternative included in Appendix O.

Projected Assessed Value

Under the SFH alternative, all units proposed would be in fee-simple ownership. The projection of future taxes for the SFH alternative is based on the average selling price of the homes. The proposed residential development will have 108 four-bedroom and 12 three-bedroom single-family detached dwellings with an estimated sales price of $500,000 and $400,000 respectively. Based on this information, the projected total market value of the SFH alternative would be $58,800,000. Using the current residential assessment ratio (RAR) of 0.50, the total assessed value of the SFH alternative would be $29,400,000.

Projected Property Tax Revenues and Other Fees

As shown in the Table 1-13 below, total project-generated tax revenues annually under the SFH alternative are estimated to be $1,433,014 annually. For comparison purposes, Table 1-13 presents the anticipated tax revenue from the proposed BT Holdings multifamily project which shows total project-generated tax revenues of $2,769,535 annually. Thus the SFH alternative represents a reduction of $1,336,521, or 48%, in total annual tax revenue.

By far the largest portion of the total revenue for the SFH alternative, 68 percent, would accrue to the Chester Union Free School District (Chester UFSD), which would receive $971,927. Under the proposed BT Holdings project, the Chester UFSD would receive $1,606,933. Thus the SFH alternative represents a reduction of $635,007, or 40%, in total annual Chester UFSD tax revenue.

Under the SFH alternative, the Town of Chester would receive $217,351 in total annual tax revenue which includes revenue from the Town general fund tax ($135,443), Part Town tax ($64,795) and Highway tax ($17,113). Under the proposed BT Holdings project, the Town would gain a total of $223,934 annually from the Town general fund tax alone. Thus the SFH alternative represents a reduction of $6,583, or 3%, in total tax revenue to the Town (including Part Town and Highway tax) and $88,491, or 40%, in Town general fund tax alone compared to the proposed BT Holdings project.

Under the SFH alternative, the Village would receive $28,800 in total annual tax revenue as opposed to $583,301 under the proposed BT Holdings project. Thus the SFH alternative represents a reduction of $554,501, or 95%, in total Village tax revenue.

Orange County would receive approximately $174,174 annually under the SFH alternative compared to $287,971 from the proposed BT Holdings project (a reduction of $113,797, or 40%) and the Chester Fire District would receive approximately $40,763 under the SFH alternative compared to $67,396 annually from the proposed BT Holdings project (a reduction of $26,632, or 40%).

Table 1-13
Single Family Housing Alternative
Projected Property Tax Revenues and Fees

Taxing Jurisdiction	Tax Rate (per $1,000 AV*)	Total Assessed Value	Property Tax Revenues to County	Property Tax Revenues to Village	Property Tax Revenues to Town	Property Tax Revenues to Fire	Property Tax Revenues to School
Orange County	$ 5.9243	$29,400,000	$174,174	--	--	--	--
Village of Chester	$12.0000	$ 2,400,000	--	$28,800	--		--
Town of Chester	$ 4.6069	$27,000,000	--	--	$135,443	--	--
Part Town	$ 2.3998	$27,000,000	--	--	$ 64,795	--	--
Highway	$ 0.6338	$27,000,000	--	--	$ 17,113	--	--
Fire	$ 1.3865	$29,400,000	--	--	--	$ 40,763	--
Chester UFSD	$33.0587	$29,400,000	--	--	--	--	$971,927
Total			$174,174	$28,800	$217,351	$ 40,763	$971,927
TOTAL TAX REVENUE			**$1,433,014**				

Source: Town of Chester/Village of Chester Assessor's Office; Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2009.
Property tax revenues rounded to the nearest dollar. Discrepancies between the total and individual line items due to rounding.

Table 1-14
BT Holdings Proposed Multifamily Project
Projected Property Tax Revenues and Fees

Taxing Jurisdiction	Tax Rate (per $1,000 AV*)	Total Assessed Value	Property Tax Revenues to County	Property Tax Revenues to Village	Property Tax Revenues to Town	Property Tax Revenues to Fire	Property Tax Revenues to School
Orange County	$ 5.9243	$48,608,438	$287,971	--	--	--	--
Village of Chester	$12.0000	$48,608,438	--	$583,301	--	--	--
Town of Chester	$ 4.6069	$48,608,438	--	--	$223,934	--	--
Part Town	$ 2.3998	$48,608,438	--	--	--	--	--
Highway	$ 0.6338	$48,608,438	--	--	--	--	--
Fire	$ 1.3865	$48,608,438	--	--	--	$67,396	--
Chester UFSD	$33.0587	$48,608,438	--	--	--	--	$1,606,933
Total			$287,971	$583,301	$223,934	$67,396	$1,606,933
TOTAL TAX REVENUE			**$2,769,535**				

Source: Town of Chester/Village of Chester Assessor's Office; Tim Miller Associates, Inc., 2009.
Property tax revenues rounded to the nearest dollar. Discrepancies between the total and individual line items due to rounding.

Associated Costs

Chester Union Free School District

As shown in Table 1-12, the community population would increase by 431 under the SFH alternative, a reduction of 62 percent compared to the 1,137 increase expected under the proposed action. However, single-family homes generate far more school children per unit than multifamily and senior housing. Based upon an increased student population per single family household, the expected 121 school-age children under the SFH alternative *is the same as the 121 students expected under the proposed action*. The heavy reduction in property tax revenue in conjunction with the same projected expense associated with school-age children has a major effect on the SFH alternative's financial impact to the school district. The decrease in revenue of approximately $635,007 in the SFH alternative as compared to the proposed BT Holdings project results in a net *deficit* to the school district of ($627,693) after covering the student costs (as opposed to a $7,330 expected benefit under the proposed BT Holdings project). This ($627,693) deficit would need to be covered by the households in the Chester UFSD, both Town and Village.

Town of Chester

Under the SFH alternative, all residents of the BT Holdings development would pay general fund taxes to the Town of Chester. Those residents in the Town portion of the development would also pay separate Part Town and Highway taxes.

The total 2009 budget for the Town of Chester (including part town and town highway) is $8,129,754, while the total tax levy is estimated to be $5,224,229. Dividing the 2009 residentially induced costs by the 2007 estimated population of the Town of 13,402 would result in an estimated per capita municipal cost to the Town of approximately $508. In other words, for each additional Town resident, the Town can be expected to incur $508 in additional expense to be raised by residential tax revenue.

Under the SFH alternative, the Town's population is projected to increase by 396 persons at full build-out. As noted above, the estimated annual per capita expense for general municipal services to the Town is $508 per capita, thus costs are projected to total $201,168 annually.

As shown in Table 1-9, overall revenues from the SFH alternative for general municipal services associated with the Town (including part town and highway) are projected to be $217,351. Therefore, after covering the anticipated municipal cost to the Town of $201,168, a net benefit in the amount of $16,183 would be projected to the Town of Chester as a result of the SFH alternative. The direct benefit to the Town, however, would be completely negated by the ($627,693) school-associated deficit to Town residents living in the UFSD.

Village of Chester

The SFH alternative includes a portion of development within the Village of Chester. As described in Section 3.8, the per capita cost is determined by dividing the population into the total residential cost. The estimated per capita municipal cost is approximately $219. In other words, for each additional Village resident, the Village can be expected to incur $219 in additional expense to be raised by residential tax revenue.

As shown in Table 1-12, the SFH alternative is projected to increase the Village's population by 35 persons at full build-out. As noted above, the estimated annual per capita expense for general municipal services is $219. Using this as a basis for projections, additional costs are projected to total $7,665 annually.

As shown in Table 1-15, overall revenues from the SFH alternative for general municipal services associated with the Village are projected to be $28,800. Therefore, after covering the anticipated municipal cost to the Village of $7,665, a net benefit in the amount of $21,135 would be projected to the Village of Chester as a result of the SFH alternative. This represents an annual reduction in the net benefit to the Village of $313,163, or 94%, compared to the $334,298 estimated net benefit under the proposed BT Holdings project. Additionally, the direct benefit to the Village under the SFH alternative would be completely negated by the ($627,693) school-associated deficit to Village residents living in the UFSD.

Table 1-14 shows the municipal cost and anticipated tax revenue in the Village, the Town and the Chester USFD for the SFH alternative. Table 1-16 provides a comparison of these same values for the proposed BT Holdings multifamily project.

Table 1-15
Summary of Revenue and Cost Analysis
Single Family Housing (SFH) Alternative

Jurisdiction	Tax Revenue	Service Cost	Net Benefit / (Deficit)
Town of Chester	$217,351	$201,168	$16,183
Village of Chester	$28,800	$7,665	$21,135
Chester USFD	$971,927	$1,599,620	($627,693)

Table 1-16
Summary of Revenue and Cost Analysis
BT Holdings Multifamily Proposal

Jurisdiction	Tax Revenue	Service Cost	Net Benefit / (Deficit)
Town of Chester	$223,934	$166,002	$57,932
Village of Chester	$583,301	$249,003	$334,298
Chester UFSD	$1,606,933	$1,599,620	$7,313

Total tax revenues would decline by nearly 50% from $2.8 million for the applicant's proposed multi-family and senior project to $1.4 million under the SFH alternative. Total school tax revenues would be reduced sharply by the SFH alternative *with no associated reduction in schoolchild expense*. This results in a significant financial drain on the community. Rather than producing an annual $7 thousand benefit for the school district as the proposed BT Holdings plan projects, the SFH alternative would produce an annual $627 thousand net deficit to the school district, the burden of which would fall on Chester residents, both Town and Village.

1.3 Approvals, Reviews and Permits

As the Lead Agency, the Village of Chester Village Board has primary responsibility for review of this annexation and, as part of DEIS review, for reviewing a zoning amendment and determining its conformance with the Village's requirements for the proposed Site Plan. The proposed action will require the following approvals by the listed agencies (involved agencies):

Involved Agencies

Village of Chester Board of Trustees (Lead Agency)	Annexation; Zoning Amendment; Water system improvements; Sewer System Improvements
Town of Chester Town Board	Annexation
Village of Chester Planning Board	Site Plan approval Special Use Permit
Village of Chester Zoning Board of Appeals	Possible variances*
Village of Chester Highway Department	Road opening for site entrance for emergency access
Village of Chester Building Department	Building Permit
Village of Chester Water Department	Water system improvements; Water Connection
Moodna Basin Joint Operation and Maintenance Commission	Black Meadow Treatment Plant construction; Sewer system improvements; Sewer connection
Orange County Department of Health	Approval of Water System Improvements
Orange County Department of Planning	Referral to Orange County Planning Board and review under 239 l, m and n
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)	Review of plans for wastewater treatment plant; Wastewater SPDES; Stormwater Discharge SPDES General Permit for site disturbance
New York State Department of Transportation	Highway access (curb cut) permit for construction of primary access on NYS Route 17M
New York State Office of the Attorney General	Filing of Home Owner's Association
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Review of wetlands disturbance and permitting

*Some variances would be required if the site would be developed under the existing RM district as shown on Figure 2-4, the Conceptual Site Plan with Zoning Tables, however, the RM-N zoning district proposes new bulk requirements which will eliminate the need for variances.

Item	Existing Condition (5.7-No Action)	Proposed Action	Table 1-10 Alternatives						
			1	2	3a	3b	4	5	6
			Proposed Action Layout with No Annexation to Village (5.1)	Proposed Action Layout with Multi-Family Buildings (5.2)	Proposed Action Layout with All Senior Housing (5.3.1)	Proposed Action Layout with 200 Senior Housing Units (5.3.2)	Proposed Action Layout with Fee Simple Lots (5.4)	Proposed Action Layout with Self-Sufficient Water System (5.5)	Proposed Action Layout with Green Technology and Sustainable Building Design (5.6)
Total Number of Dwelling Units	n/a	458	120	528	458	458	382	432	458
-Number of Senior Housing Units [1]	n/a	100	0	100	458	200	100	100	100
-One Bedroom Units	n/a	75	0	289	343	150	75	75	75
-Two Bedroom Units	n/a	101	0	183	115	105	25	94	101
-Three Bedroom Units	n/a	282	12	56	0	203	282	263	282
-Four Bedroom Units	n/a	0	108	0	0	0	0	0	0
Building Area, ground floor (sf)	0	452,282	416,500	226,840	452,282	452,282	452,282	411,504	452,282
Building Area, ground floor (acres)	0	10.38	9.56	5.21	10.38	10.38	10.38	9.45	10.38
Paved Roads/Driveways/Walkways (acres)	0	14.27	11.74	17.26	14.27	14.27	14.27	13.19	14.27
Total Impervious Surface Area (acres) [2]	0	24.65	21.30	22.47	24.65	24.65	24.65	22.64	24.65
Lawn/Landscaped Areas (acres) [3]	n/a	31.96	38.68	29.37	31.96	31.96	31.96	30.95	31.96
Total Area of Disturbance (acres)	n/a	56.61	59.98	51.84	56.61	56.61	56.61	53.59	56.61
Undisturbed Area (acres)	n/a	11.82	8.45	16.59	11.82	11.82	11.82	14.84	11.82
Total Property Acreage	68.43	68.43	68.43	68.43	68.43	68.43	68.43	68.43	68.43
Disturbance of Existing Slopes (acres)									
- 0 to 10%	n/a	28.42	31.79	26.79	28.42	28.42	28.42	25.68	28.42
- 10 to 15%	n/a	16.97	16.97	15.12	16.97	16.97	16.97	16.87	16.97
- 15% +	n/a	11.22	11.22	9.93	11.22	11.22	11.22	11.04	11.22
Undisturbed Land Cover to remain (acres)									
- Woodlands	19.16	3.22	2.81	5.39	3.22	3.22	3.22	5.67	3.22
- Wetlands	3.68	3.58	3.58	3.58	3.58	3.58	3.58	3.58	3.58
- Field, brush or meadow areas	45.59	5.02	2.06	7.62	5.02	5.02	5.02	5.02	5.02
Estimated Average Daily Water Demand (gpd) [4]	n/a	137,680	47,700	108,020	77,490	120,830	117,620	129,140	137,680
Estimated Average Daily Wastewater Generation (gpd) [4]	n/a	125,160	43,360	98,200	70,440	109,840	106,920	117,400	125,160
Estimated Average Daily Irrigation Water Demand (gpd) [5]	n/a	123,550	149,620	113,500	123,550	123,550	123,550	119,630	123,550
Community Resources									
Residential Trips (PM Peak Hour)	n/a	245	124	238	142	218	209	229	245
Population	n/a	1,137	432	1,061	825	1,049	978	1,069	1,137
School-age Children	n/a	121	121	104	0	87	110	112	121

Notes: Estimates are approximate.

Sources: Langan Engineering & Environmental Services, 2009; and Tim Miller Associates, Inc. 2009

[1] Senior Housing Units are estimated to be 75% One Bedroom units and 25% Two Bedroom units, which are included in the overall bedroom counts

[2] Total Impervious Surface Area = Ground Floor Building Area + paved roads/driveways/walkways

[3] Lawn/Landscaped Area calculated as disturbed areas that will ultimately be developed as lawn or manicured landscape areas and includes stormwater management basins

[4] Water Demand and Wastewater Generation estimates include the Clubhouse (6000 sf @ 0.1 gpd/sf) and the swimming pool (150 swimmers @ 10 gpd/ swimmer), where applicable, and have been reduced 20% from 10-State Standards rates as water conservation devices will be employed for the project

[5] Irrigation Water Demand estimates based on one inch per week over the Lawn/Landscaped Areas

Table 1-11: Site Calculations and Alternatives
BT Holdings - Chester Development
Village of Chester, Orange County, New York
Source: Langan Engineering based on conceptual plans as of 2/13/09
Date: 2/13/09

Tim Miller Associates, Inc.,10 North Street, Cold Spring, New York 10516 (845) 265-4400 Fax (845) 265-4418