

A. INTRODUCTION

The State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and its implementing regulations require the consideration of project alternatives, which are formulated in response to potential impacts of the proposed project. This chapter assesses eight residential development alternatives to the proposed project, including: (1) a No Action Alternative in which the project site remains undeveloped; (2) an As-of-Right Alternative (i.e., a development scenario that conforms to the site's zoning regulations without Special Permit approval); (3) an As-of-Right cluster subdivision development; (4) an alternative active-adult, age-restricted development that differs in scale and configuration; (5) an alternate site layout with primary entrance on Route 416; (6) an alternate site layout with 50 foot building separation; (7) an alternative locating the wastewater treatment plant on the main site; and (8) an alternate site layout without the five-unit cul-de-sac in the overlay district. Using the conclusions from the preceding chapters, the potential impacts of the proposed project are compared to those expected from each alternative. Each alternative is assessed qualitatively, except where impacts resulting from the proposed project have been identified.

B. DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES**ALTERNATIVE 1: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

The No Action Alternative presents future conditions if the proposed project is not built. It assumes that the project site would remain in its state at present as open meadows, wetlands, and forested areas. The No Action Alternative is essentially the condition described through the preceding chapters of this DEIS as the "future without the proposed project." As a future baseline for the comparison of impacts, this condition is compared to the future condition with the proposed project. In general, the No Action Alternative would avoid those adverse impacts identified for the proposed project, but it would also forgo the substantial benefits of the project.

Set forth below is a summary of the No Action conditions more fully described in each of the preceding chapters of this DEIS.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

Under the No Action Alternative, the site would remain as agricultural, woodlands, wetlands, surface waterbodies, and meadows. Unlike the proposed project, recommendations and goals established in several Town and County planning documents would not be fulfilled, particularly with respect to senior housing and open space preservation. In addition, the portions of the project site would not be placed under a conservation easement and preserved in perpetuity. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts on land use, zoning, or public policy.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

VISUAL CHARACTER

In the No Action Alternative, the visual character of the site would be unchanged from the existing condition and the site would remain undeveloped. Views to and from the project site, and views to visual resources in the study area would remain unchanged. Therefore, no significant adverse visual impacts would occur under the No Action Alternative.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

With the No Action Alternative, the site would remain undeveloped and the existing vegetative communities and wildlife habitat of the project site would not be affected or changed. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts to vegetation or wildlife.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

With the No Action Alternative, the site would remain undeveloped and the existing topography and soils of the project site would not be affected or changed. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts to topography and soils.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

With the No Action Alternative, the site would remain undeveloped and the existing groundwater resources of the project site would not be affected or changed. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts to groundwater resources.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

Under the No Action Alternative, no increase in the demand for water or energy would occur since the site would remain undeveloped. Further, there would be no increase in the generation of sewage if the proposed project is not built. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Under the No Action Alternative, no increase in the generation of traffic would occur since the site would remain undeveloped. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts to traffic and transportation systems.

NOISE

In the No Action Alternative, the project site would remain unchanged from the existing condition. No significant increase in noise levels would occur if the project were not built and the project site remained undeveloped. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse noise impacts.

AIR QUALITY

Under the No Action Alternative, as with the proposed project, there would be no air quality impacts since the project site would remain undeveloped.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Under the No Action Alternative, the site would remain undeveloped and no increase in the demand for community services would occur. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts to community facilities.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Under the No Action Alternative, the site would remain undeveloped and no change in the Town's population would occur. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not cause any significant adverse impacts to demographics.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Under the No Action Alternative, the project site would remain unchanged from the existing condition. As with the proposed project, there would be no fiscal impacts to since the project site would remain undeveloped. The parcels comprising the project site would continue to generate real property taxes for the Town of Hamptonburgh, Orange County, and the Valley Central School District at current levels.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Under the No Action Alternative, the project site would remain unchanged from the existing condition. As with the proposed project, there would be no impacts to cultural resources since the project site would remain undeveloped.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Under the No Action Alternative, the project site would remain unchanged from the existing condition. Farming operations would continue on site. However, development pressures on the land would remain, potentially threatening the farming operations in the future. There would be no impacts to the Agricultural Resources since the project site would remain undeveloped.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

Under the No Action Alternative the site would remain undeveloped and no construction activity would occur on the project site. Therefore, as with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in any significant adverse construction impacts.

ALTERNATIVE 2:

The As-of-Right Alternative assumes that a conventional, single-family residential subdivision of 65 detached houses would be developed in accordance with existing zoning regulations. This alternative is shown in Figure 5-1.

As discussed in Chapter 3.1: "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy," the project site is located within the Town's R4-A district, which permits the development of farms and agricultural operations and single-family dwellings. For the purposed of this analysis, it is assumed that single-family detached residences would be constructed on the site by 2008, the build year for full build-out of the proposed Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh. The 65 single-family residences would be constructed, assuming a lot size of at least four acres (the minimum lot size required by zoning). Due to the larger lot size, home sites are proposed to occur within the GROD district

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

along Route 416. The lot count reflects potential development constraints of the site, (e.g., regulated wetlands) that affect house site locations and building envelope configuration.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

Like the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would alter the existing land use by creating 65 new single-family residential units on the site. A residential development of single-family homes would generally result in a uniform level of land disturbance across much of the project site. Each lot would contain a house with attached or detached garage, paved areas (e.g., driveway, patio, etc.), and manicured lawn, garden, and landscaped areas, as well as potential swimming pools, and other amenities. In contrast, the proposed development would provide a limited area of disturbance. Since the project site is located in an area comprising land uses ranging from low-density residential, agricultural, and industrial, the As-of-Right Alternative, like the proposed project, is consistent with land uses in the surrounding area.

Under this alternative, Parcels A and B are subdivided into lots for single-family homes. Any other open space contained within the As-of-Right Alternative is confined to lawn and undevelopable areas of individual lots, and therefore is fragmented and discontinuous.

The residential subdivision presented in Figure 5-1 contains 65 single-family units on individual lots. With a minimum lot size of at least four acres, the As-of-Right Alternative complies with the base density of the existing R4-A zoning district. In addition, the As-of-Right Alternative would comply with the floor area ratio (FAR), setbacks, and building coverage permitted under the R4-A zoning district. The As-of-Right Alternative would therefore be consistent with existing zoning and no zoning changes would be required with the As-of-Right Alternative.

Zoning is a direct expression of public policy regarding land use and development in a community. Thus, the As-of-Right Alternative is consistent with the Town's public policy.

VISUAL CHARACTER

Under the As-of-Right Alternative, much of the site would be cleared and developed for single-family homes. A series of loop roads and cul-de-sacs would be created on Parcel A to service the homes. Parcel B would be serviced by multiple cul-de-sacs accessed off of Eager Road.

Many of these homes would be clearly visible from Route 416 and Eager Road. This plan does not meet the objectives of the scenic corridor overlay district in so far as many of the homes would be clearly visible from Route 416. This alternative would disturb a larger amount of the project site than the proposed project since development would be spread over a larger area and each lot would contain a mix of driveways, garages, buildings, and landscaped lawn area. Unlike the proposed project, this alternative would result in a smaller amount of contiguous open space

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

The As-of-Right Alternative, would disturb vegetative and wildlife habitat existing on the project site to create roadways within the subdivision and the landscaped and building areas within each residential lot. Unlike the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would not include a comprehensive landscaping plan and the landscaping for the residential subdivision would be primarily the responsibility of individual lot owners. The As-of-Right Alternative would result in a disturbance area potentially approximately 375 acres, whereas the limits of disturbance of the proposed project would be limited to approximately 125 acres. As a result, this alternative would result in more alteration of existing habitat areas. Further, this alternative

would fragment existing habitat areas, thereby disrupting wildlife movement. As a consequence of the subdivision of the project site into 65 individual house lots, this alternative would result in significant adverse impacts to vegetation and wildlife.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

In comparison with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would result in a more dispersed form of development but would create greater amounts of total impervious surface. The spatial separation of construction activities and the longer length of subdivision roadways could result in an area of disturbance and grading similar to that of the proposed project. This alternative would result in approximately 36 acres of impervious surface and approximately 375 acres of total disturbed area.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would generate fewer residents, and as a result there would be a corresponding decrease in residential water demand. As detailed in the groundwater studies in Chapter 3.6, "Groundwater Resources" the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes to groundwater resources; thus, there would also be no adverse groundwater resources associated with the As-of-Right Alternative due to its lower demand on water.

Stormwater Management and Subsurface Water

In comparison with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would be expected to result in similar amounts of impervious surface and as a consequence, this alternative would be expected to generate similar stormwater runoff flows and pollutant loadings. Similar to the proposed project, a storm water management plan would be developed for the As-of-Right Alternative, which would maintain current direction, quality and quantity of storm water flow into nearby wetlands and water courses. As with the proposed project, this alternative would not result in any significant stormwater impacts.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

In comparison with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would be expected to result in less water consumption and less wastewater generation. However, under County Health Department regulations a wastewater treatment plant and central wells would be required for the As-of-Right Alternative. As with the proposed project, the wastewater treatment plant would be located on Parcel C and groundwater wells would be located on Parcel A. Because the number of units served by the wastewater treatment plant under this alternative, the design capacity of the wastewater facility would be smaller than that required for the proposed project. As a result, outflow volumes into the Wallkill River would be lesser than expected in the proposed project.

As with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would result in no significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

In comparison with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would be expected to generate fewer vehicle trips on area roadways. However, as discussed below, the site design may cause potential hazardous conditions.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

Using Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation rates, it is estimated that 65 single-family residential homes in the As-of-Right Alternative would generate approximately 58 trips during the weekday AM peak hour of generation, and approximately 59 trips during the weekday PM peak hour of generation. For the Saturday peak hour of generation, the As-of-Right Alternative would generate an estimated 69 trips. In contrast, the proposed project is expected to generate approximately 214 trips during the weekday AM peak hour of generation, and approximately 279 trips during the weekday PM peak hour of generation. For the Saturday peak hour of generation, the proposed project would generate an estimated 257 trips.

**Table 5-1
Comparison of Trip Generation**

	Proposed Project	As-of-Right Alternative
Weekday AM Peak Hour	214	58
Weekday PM Peak Hour	279	59
Saturday Peak Hour	257	69

Sources: AKRF, Inc.

While the number of vehicle trips estimated for this alternative is less than that of the proposed project, it should be noted that the traffic analysis conducted for the proposed project was very conservative in that it overestimated the traffic generation (see Chapter 3.9, “Traffic and Transportation”). For the proposed project, the analysis used ITE “Single Family Detached Housing” and “Residential Condo/Townhouse” trip generation rates, even though the proposed project will be age-restricted. As such, the actual difference of traffic generation between the proposed project and the As-of-Right Alternative may not be as large as indicated in the analysis. An important difference between this Alternative and the proposed project is that this Alternative would generate morning and afternoon school-related trips since children would be expected to reside in this form of residential development.

As analyzed, the proposed project (see Chapter 3.9, “Traffic and Transportation”) conservatively predicted that the northbound Neelytown Road left-turn/through lane group at the intersection of Neelytown Road and Beaver Dam Road would decline from Level of Service E to Level of Service F during the PM peak hour. This impact would be lessened under the As-of-Right Alternative, as fewer trips would be generated.

Under the As-of-Right Alternative, numerous curb cuts from Route 416 and Eager Road would be necessary. The As-of-Right Alternative would require two new road curb cuts and at least three driveway curb cuts from Route 416. Five road curb cuts and at least two driveway curb cuts would be required from Eager Road. These curb cuts could cause hazardous conditions in regards to limited sight distance and potential conflict points.

NOISE

As with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts related to noise. The As-of-Right Alternative is expected to generate lower levels of noise than the proposed project in that it would generate less vehicular traffic (the primary source of noise generation). The detailed noise studies in Chapter 3.10, “Noise,” indicate that the

proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in noise levels; thus, there would also be no adverse noise impacts associated with the As-of-Right Alternative.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed project would create a greater number of vehicle trips than the As-of-Right Alternative. However, as detailed in Chapter 3.11, "Air Quality," the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. As with the proposed project, the As-of-Right Alternative would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The As-of-Right Alternative would yield approximately 65 new single-family residential units. These new residential units would generate a demand for community facilities such as police, fire, and public parks and recreational areas. As described in Chapter 3.12, "Community Facilities," the proposed project would not cause any significant adverse impacts to community facilities.

The As-of-Right Alternative differs from the proposed project in that the As-of-Right Alternative would likely generate school-age children, increasing the demands on the school system. Based on the 2000 Census, households within the Town of Hamptonburgh average 0.72 school children per household. As such, it is estimated that approximately 47 school-age children would be generated by the As-of-Right Alternative. As indicated in Chapter 3.12, "Community Facilities," the Valley Central School System is operating at or below capacity at the elementary level but above capacity at secondary level. As it is likely that a portion of the 47 school-age children generated by the As-of-Right Alternative would be at the secondary level, the school system would be further burdened.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The As-of-Right Alternative would create approximately 65 new single-family residential units. Based on 2000 Census data, the average household size in Hamptonburgh is 3.10 persons per household. As such, it is estimated As-of-Right Alternative would generate approximately 201 new residents, approximately 47 of whom would be school-age children.

The addition of new residents resulting from this alternative would not be considered a significant adverse impact to the Town's projected increase in population.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Under the As-of-Right Alternative, the project site would be subject to improvements to real property associated with the construction of 65 single-family residences. As discussed in Chapter 3.14, "Fiscal Impacts," the estimated assessed value of future residential development can be based upon the estimated total sales price realized.¹ According to the New York State Office of Real Property Services Data Management unit, which manages the Real Property Transfer Database, the median sales price of single family homes in Hamptonburgh during 2004

¹ Telephone communication, Town of Hamptonburgh Assessor, February 14, 2005.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

was \$395,000.¹ Applying this median value to the As-of-Right Alternative, the assessed value of the development would be approximately \$25.7 million. As shown in Table 5-2, the estimated total Town and County taxes generated by this alternative would be approximately \$127,364.

Table 5-2
Projected Property Taxes

Estimated Assessment	\$25.7 million	
Taxing Jurisdiction	Tax Rate Per \$1,000	Tax Amount
Town of Hamptonburgh ¹	\$1.2478	\$32,068
Hamptonburgh Fire District	\$0.6241	\$17,163
Orange County	\$3.0402	\$78,133
Total		\$127,364
Note:	Tax rates per 2005 Property Tax warrant Footnote #1: Includes Highway and Part Town.	
Sources:	Town of Hamptonburgh Receiver of Taxes, AKRF, Inc.	

In addition, the 2005 tax rate per \$1,000 valuation of the Valley Central School District is \$15.52. At this rate, the As-of-Right Alternative would generate approximately \$402,853 (including 1 percent collection fee) per year toward the Valley Central School District. As discussed in Chapter 3.12, "Community Facilities," the per student cost, excluding state and federal aid, is approximately \$6,595 for the 2004-2005 academic year. The As-of-Right Alternative is expected to generate 47 school-age children, representing a gross annual cost to the school district of approximately \$309,965, resulting in a net positive gain of approximately \$92,887 per year to the school district.

This apparent gain, however, could be offset by unforeseen expenses necessary to accommodate this additional enrollment load. These potential capital costs are not reflected in the current per student cost, which would increase as a result should capital expenses be necessary. Because the middle school level of the Valley Central School District is operating at capacity, increases in enrollment would likely necessitate capital improvements and other costs not reflected in the current per student cost. Therefore, to the extent that schools operating at capacity would have make capital investments to accommodate additional students, it is anticipated that the As-of-Right Alternative would negatively affect the Valley Central School District.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The As-of-Right Alternative would likely remove all buildings on the project site. However, as identified in Chapter 3.15, "Cultural Resources," the buildings on the project site do not appear to meet the criteria of eligibility for listing on the State or National Registers. As such, the As-of-Right Alternative will not produce a significant adverse impact to historic resources.

However, as described in the Phase 1B Cultural Resources Investigation, the project site has a potential low to high sensitivity for precontact- and historic-period archaeological resources.

¹ Phone interview with Ms. Anne Kost, New York State Office of Real Property Services, Data Management Unit, May 6, 2005.

Where the As-of-Right Alternative would involve excavation in sensitive areas, it could result in adverse effects to archaeological resources, should they exist on the project site.

Therefore, prior to completion of the FEIS, subsurface archaeological field testing will be conducted on all potentially sensitive areas of the project site in locations that would experience project construction, as described above.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The As-of-Right Alternative would eliminate all farmland on Parcels A and B, representing a total loss of all agricultural land on these parcels.

Based on the loss of agricultural resources, the As-of-Right Alternative would result in adverse impacts to agricultural resources in the Town of Hamptonburgh.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

The As-of-Right Alternative would result in a disturbance area of approximately 375 acres, whereas the limits of disturbance of the proposed project would be limited to approximately 125 acres. Therefore, the as-of-right alternative would potentially permit development of a significantly larger portion of the site. This alternative would likely be built by separate entities and not all at the same time, because individual homes would likely be constructed as lots were sold. As a result, the construction period would be unknown and possibly longer than that of the proposed project. A longer construction period could potentially result in greater traffic, noise, and air quality related construction impacts. Unlike the proposed project, it would not be possible to manage construction workers, equipment, and staging efficiently during the construction of the various buildings on site. In addition, preparation of large areas of the site for roadways within the subdivision and the landscaped and building areas within each residential lot would require extensive excavation and possibly a substantial amount of blasting.

ALTERNATIVE 3: CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION ALTERNATIVE

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative represents a residential subdivision of the project site in accordance with existing zoning regulations and conservation (cluster) subdivision provisions, as defined in §150-21(3)(b). For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that single-family detached residences would be constructed on the site by 2008, the build year for full build-out of the proposed Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh. As shown in Figure 5-2, 65 single-family residences would be constructed, with each house having a lot size of at least one acre (the minimum lot size required by zoning). The remaining lands would be set aside as open space. The development density accounts for potential development constraints of the site, including regulated wetlands. This Alternative is a cluster plan based on the conventional subdivision lot/unit count yield as developed under the scenario in Alternative 2. The proposed lots are clustered in a manner to preserve open space and minimize disturbance of wetlands. In addition, the cluster plan aims to maintain the scenic qualities of the Route 416 corridor. In contrast, to the proposed project, this cluster alternative is not age-restricted to residents 55-years or older.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

Under §150-21(3)(b) of the Town of Hamptonburgh Town Code, the Planning Board is authorized to modify the zoning regulations with respect to lot area and dimensions to allow subdivisions which cluster new development to preserve open space.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

Like the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would alter the existing land use by creating 65 new single-family residential units on approximately 125 acres of the 400 acre site. Though the limits of disturbance for the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would largely echo that of the proposed project, the levels of disturbance within that area would be similar to that of the proposed project, despite building fewer residential units in the Conservation Subdivision Alternative. A residential development of detached single-family homes would generally result in a uniform level of land disturbance across much of the area and each lot would contain a mix of driveways, garages, buildings, and landscaped lawn area.

Since the project site is located in an area comprising land uses ranging from low-density residential, agricultural, and industrial, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative, like the proposed project, is consistent with land uses in the surrounding area.

Under this alternative, as with the proposed action, much of the land, approximately 250 acres, would remain as open space, and restricted from further subdivision.

The clustered residential subdivision presented in Figure 5-2 contains 65 single-family units on individual lots. With a minimum lot size of at least one acre, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative complies with the base density of the existing R4-A zoning district. In addition, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would comply with the FAR, setbacks, and building coverage permitted under §150-21(3)(b). The Conservation Subdivision Alternative would therefore be consistent with existing zoning and no zoning changes would be required for the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative generally complies with the Gateway Road Overlay District in that most of the development would be screened from view from Route 416, the road designated in the Gateway Road Overlay District. The site plan indicates that the open meadow adjacent to Route 416 would remain open under the Conservation Subdivision Alternative. Pursuant to Section 150-21, the buildings are “sited and clustered on the tract in such a way as to avoid occupying or obstructing view of land” in the Gateway Road Overlay District.

Zoning expresses public policy regarding land use and development in a community. Thus, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative is consistent with the Town’s public policy.

VISUAL CHARACTER

Under the Conservation Subdivision Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered in manner to minimize impacts to the visual character of the area. The homes in the cluster alternative would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project.

As discussed in Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative generally complies with the Gateway Road Overlay District in that the majority of the development would be screened from view from Route 416, the road designated as the Gateway Road Overlay District. The site plan indicates that the large meadow adjacent to Route 416 would remain as open space under the Conservation Subdivision Alternative. Pursuant to Section 150-21, the buildings are “sited and clustered on the tract in such a way as to avoid occupying or obstructing view of land” in the Gateway Road Overlay District.

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative, as with the proposed project, would result in no significant adverse impacts to visual character.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Under the Conservation Subdivision Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered in a manner to minimize impacts on vegetation and wildlife. The homes in the cluster alternative would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.3, "Vegetation and Wildlife," the proposed project would not result in significant adverse impacts to vegetation and wildlife; thus, there would also be no adverse vegetation and wildlife impacts associated with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

In comparison with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would not include townhomes, and side yard setbacks would be greater. As a consequence, this alternative would result in a less concentrated, more sprawling development pattern. This alternative would result in the creation of similar amounts of total impervious surface. The spatial separation of construction activities and the longer length of subdivision roadways could result in an area of disturbance and grading similar to that of the proposed project. This alternative would be expected to add approximately 21 acres of impervious surface and approximately 125 acres of total disturbed land.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would create 65 new single family residential units. Based on 2000 Census data, the average household size in Hamptonburgh is 3.10 persons per household. As such, it can be assumed that the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would generate approximately 201 new residents. The Conservation Subdivision Alternative would generate fewer residents, and as a result less water consumption, however, water supply facilities similar to those of the proposed project would be required. Based on an average consumption of 400 gallons per day for the average household, the 64 home cluster plan would generate a demand for 26,000 gallons per day. As detailed in the groundwater analysis in Chapter 3.6, "Groundwater Resources" the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes to groundwater resources; thus, there would also be no adverse groundwater resources associated with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

STORMWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would be expected to result in the creation of similar amounts of impervious surface and similar stormwater runoff flows and pollutant loadings. As with to the proposed project, a storm water management plan would be developed for the Conservation Alternative, which would maintain current direction, quality and quantity of storm water flow into nearby wetlands and water courses. The stormwater management facilities would be maintained by a homeowners association. As with the proposed project, this alternative would result in no stormwater impacts.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

In comparison with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would be expected to result in less water consumption, as described in Groundwater Resources above, and therefore less wastewater generation. However, a wastewater treatment plant and central wells would be required for the Conservation Subdivision Alternative. A wastewater treatment plant

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

for the 65-lot Conservation Subdivision Alternative would be substantially smaller than the plant for the proposed project, therefore potential outfall volumes entering the Wallkill River would be smaller. As with the proposed project, the wastewater treatment plant would be located on Parcel C and groundwater wells would be located on Parcel A.

As with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would result in no significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

In comparison with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would be expected to generate lower traffic volumes. The traffic volumes generated by the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would be nearly identical to those described in the As-of-Right Alternative, above.

The analysis in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation" and discussed above identified one potential impact. This impact, were it to occur, would be lessened under the Conservation Subdivision Alternative, as fewer trips would be generated. However, school-related trips during morning and afternoon hours would be expected to occur due to the anticipated presence of children among the residents in this Alternative.

As shown in Figure 5-2, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would require two entrance roadways situated along Eager Road. The westerly roadway would use the existing alignment of Lazy Lane, and the easterly roadway would create a new curb cut on Eager Road. Neither of these subdivision roads present significant sight distance hazards.

NOISE

As with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts related to noise. The Conservation Subdivision Alternative is expected to generate lower noise levels than the proposed project in that it generates less vehicular traffic (the primary source of noise generation). The detailed noise analysis presented in Chapter 3.10, "Noise," indicate that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in noise levels and similar noise impacts would be expected under this Alternative scenario. Therefore, no adverse noise impacts would be anticipated to occur with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

AIR QUALITY

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative would create a lesser number of vehicle trips than the proposed project. As detailed in Chapter 3.11, "Air Quality," the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts, therefore, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative would yield approximately 65 new single-family residential units. These new residential units would generate a demand for community facilities.

As the Conservation Subdivision Alternative and the As-of-Right Alternative would create the same number of lots and generate the same population, any impacts caused by the Conservation

Subdivision Alternative on community facilities would be nearly identical to those described in the As-of-Right Alternative, above.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative would create approximately 65 new single-family residential units. Based on 2000 Census data, the average household size in Hamptonburgh is 3.10 persons per household. As such, it can be assumed that the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would generate approximately 201 new residents, approximately 47 of whom would be school-age children.

The addition of new residents resulting from this alternative would not be considered a significant adverse impact to the Town's projected increase in population.

FISCAL IMPACTS

The fiscal impacts of the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would be expected to be the same as those resulting from the As-of-Right Alternative, discussed above.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative would largely limit site disturbance to those portions of the site that will be disturbed due to the construction of the proposed project. As detailed in Chapter 3.15, "Cultural Resources," the proposed project would not block the view of or significantly alter any significant cultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The Conservation Subdivision Alternative would preserve approximately 275 of the 400 acres as open space, similar to that of the proposed project. Continuing agricultural practices on the remaining farmland remains a potential consideration of the homeowners association.

Under the Conservation Subdivision Alternative, as with the proposed project, the horse farm located on Parcel A would be removed.

The agricultural resource analysis presented in Chapter 3.16, "Agricultural Resources," indicate that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in agricultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse agricultural impacts associated with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

In comparison with the proposed project, the Conservation Subdivision Alternative would be expected to add approximately 21 acres of impervious surface and approximately 150 acres of total disturbed land. Therefore, this alternative would potentially permit development of a significantly larger portion of the site and would require additional clearing, grading, and excavation. As a result, the construction period would likely be longer than that of the proposed project and could potentially result in greater traffic, noise, and air quality impacts.

ALTERNATIVE 4: 340-UNIT PLAN ALTERNATIVE

This alternative is a variation of the proposed project, differing in that the total number of residential units is increased from 307 to 340, an addition of 33 residential units. As shown in Figure 5-3, this alternative's additional 33 units would be accommodated within a site design configuration nearly identical to that of the proposed project. Like the proposed project, the 340-unit Alternative would be an active adult, age-restricted residential community consisting of 269 detached single-family houses, and 71 attached townhomes sited on approximately 125 acres of the 400-acre site. Amenities and other site features discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," would be incorporated into this alternative, including a clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, putting greens, and walking trails. In all other respects, the site plan, infrastructure, and building program evaluated under this alternative are the same as that considered in the analyses of the proposed project. The build year analyzed for this alternative is 2008, and construction would occur within the timeframe anticipated for the proposed project.

Like the proposed project, this alternative has been designed to conform with Town of Hamptonburgh Town Law 2 of 2003, which created a new special permit use, active-adult, age-restricted housing. This alternative, therefore, would require a special permit from the Town Board. In addition, because the number of units included in this alternative exceeds the unit count allowed under the Town Code's formula (see Chapter 3.1, "Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy"). Therefore, this alternative would require that the Hamptonburgh Town Board grant a waiver of the density standards to permit the inclusion of the additional 33 units. Further, as with the proposed project, this alternative plan would require that the minimum side yard setback dimension requirement be waived to enable more a more closely spaced layout than the Code currently allows. The Code requires a 50 foot separation; the proposed project – and this Alternative – requests a waiver to allow 15 foot separation in order to achieve the benefits of a neo-traditional neighborhood.

This 340-unit Alternative is included in this analysis to evaluate whether an increase in the number of units would result in incremental impacts above those identified in the analyses of the proposed project that would result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

As discussed above, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative requires that the project be developed under a waiver of density standards and building separation standards by the Town Board in granting the Special Permit application. Though the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would require this waiver of density, the plan clusters the proposed units in a manner to conserve significant portions of the site as open space. Approximately 275 acres of the site would remain as open space.

Like the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative generally complies with the Gateway Road Overlay District in that the majority of the development would be screened from view from Route 416. The site plan indicates that the majority of large meadow adjacent to Route 416 would remain as open space under the 340-Unit Plan Alternative. Approximately 7 single-family homes would be sited at the far edge of the large open meadow, within the homes situated so that the front of the units would face Route 416. Pursuant to Section 150-21, the buildings are "sited and clustered on the tract in such a way as to avoid occupying or obstructing view of land" in the Gateway Road Overlay District.

This plan would comply with Town and County policies regarding open space and housing issues by preserving open space and creating age-restricted housing to the same degree as the proposed project.

VISUAL CHARACTER

Under the 340-Unit Plan Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered in manner to minimize impacts to the visual character of the area. The homes would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project.

The 340-Unit Plan Alternative, as with the proposed project, would result in no significant adverse impacts to visual character.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Under the 340-Unit Plan Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered to minimize impacts on vegetation and wildlife. The homes in the 340-Unit Alternative would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.3, "Vegetation and Wildlife," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to vegetation and wildlife; thus, there would also be no adverse vegetation and wildlife impacts associated with the 340-Unit Plan Alternative.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

In comparison with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and would create similar amounts of total impervious surface. The amount of the site grading required for this alternative is expected to be similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.5, "Topography and Soils," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to topography and soils; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts on topography and soils associated with the 340-Unit Plan Alternative.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

The 340-Unit Plan Alternative would likely generate a marginally increased demand for water supply over that of the Proposed Project, causing an increased demand on groundwater resources. Based on an average consumption of 400 gallons per day for the average household, the additional 33 units would consume approximately 13,200 additional gallons of water per day over that of the proposed project. This is not expected to result in an adverse impact on ground water supply resources.

STORMWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would be expected to result in similar amounts of impervious surface and similar stormwater runoff flows and pollutant loadings. Similar to the proposed project, a storm water management plan would be developed for the 340-Unit Plan Alternative, which would maintain current direction, quality and quantity of storm water flow into nearby wetlands and water courses. As with the proposed project, this alternative would result in no stormwater impacts.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

In comparison with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would be expected to result in slightly more water consumption and, as a result, slightly more wastewater generation. Similar to that provided for the proposed project, a wastewater treatment plant and central wells would be required for the 340-Unit Plan Alternative. The additional 13,200 gallons per day of water consumed by the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would require a slightly larger wastewater treatment plant. As with the proposed project, the wastewater treatment plant would be located on Parcel C and groundwater wells would be located on Parcel A.

As with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would result in no significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

The 340-Unit Plan Alternative would construct 33 more units than the 307 units proposed under the proposed project, discussed in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation." The 33-unit increase would generate slightly more traffic than the proposed project. Based on ITE "Single Family Detached Housing" and "Residential Condo/Townhouse" trip generation rates used throughout this analysis, the additional 33-unit increase would yield 35 additional trips during the Weekday, AM Peak Hour and 30 additional trips during the Weekday, PM Peak Hour. For the Saturday Peak Hour, the additional 33 units would generate 40 additional trips.

As noted in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation," the proposed project would create one impact requiring mitigation. It is important to note, however, that the traffic analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 "Traffic and Transportation" was conducted based on the proposed project being a conventional (e.g., non-age restricted) residential development. The results, therefore, overestimate the number of vehicle trips generated by the project, and therefore provides a very conservative evaluation of potential traffic impacts. Therefore, the incremental increase in the vehicle trips resulting from the addition 33 units in this alternative would not be expected to result in any more significant adverse impacts than the proposed 307-unit project.

NOISE

As with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts related to noise. Though the 340-Unit Plan would generate slightly more traffic (the primary source of noise generation) than the proposed project, the incremental increase is not significant. The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3.10, "Noise," indicates that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in noise levels. The incremental increase in the number of vehicle trips associated with the additional 33 units is not expected to result in any adverse noise impacts.

AIR QUALITY

The proposed project would create slightly fewer number of vehicle trips than the 340-Unit Plan Alternative. As detailed in Chapter 3.11, "Air Quality," the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. The incremental difference between the 340-Unit Plan Alternative and the proposed plan does not present a significant increase in regards to Air Quality. As with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

As with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would not present a significant adverse impact to community facilities.

The difference of 33 units between the 340-Unit Plan Alternative and the proposed project would cause a slight increase in the demand for community facilities such as Town Hall functions, police, fire, ambulance, and recreational services. However, such a marginal increase would not place a significant burden on the Town's community facilities.

Under the 340-Unit Plan Alternative, the units would be age-restricted and therefore would not increase the number of school-age children in the Town of Hamptonburgh. As such, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would not create an adverse impact on the school system.

DEMOGRAPHICS

In comparison to the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would provide an incremental increase in the number of households within the Town of Hamptonburgh. The 33 additional units would generate approximately 66 new residents in the Town of Hamptonburgh. However, this increase would be minor and would not significantly alter the demographics of the Town of Hamptonburgh.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Under the 340-unit Alternative, the project site would be subject to improvements associated with the development of 269 detached single-family houses, and 71 attached townhomes, as well as amenities and other site features, including a clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, trails, and infrastructure, such as the wastewater treatment facility. As discussed in Chapter 3.14, "Fiscal Impacts," the precise ownership configuration of the proposed project could either be in fee, in which case the individual residents would own their home and the land on which it sits, and a homeowners' association would own the "common" elements, such as the amenities and infrastructure, or the ownership could take the form of a condominium association, in which case the residents would own their unit, but the land and all common features would be owned by the association. The real property tax generated by these alternate ownership configurations is quite different, with the condominium form of ownership anticipated to generate fewer tax revenues than fee ownership.

To estimate the relative property tax generation of each ownership model, the Town of Hamptonburgh Assessor has suggested estimating a range of potential tax revenues. The lower end of the range would represent the low end of the anticipated tax revenues of the condominium form of ownership, and is based on a taxable assessed value of 25 percent of the anticipated sales revenues of the 340 units, or an estimated \$151.7 million. The higher end of the range would represent the anticipated upper end of the anticipated tax revenues generated by the fee ownership of the 340 units, and is based on a taxable assessed valuation of 70 percent of the total construction cost of the 340 units, or an estimated \$96.9 million. Based on this model, as shown in Table 5-3, the estimated total Town and County taxes generated by this alternative would be an estimated \$186,291 to \$298,934 per year.

Table 5-3
Projected Property Taxes

Estimated Taxable Assessed Value (TAV)		TAV at 25% of Estimated Gross Sales Revenues	TAV at 70% of Estimated Construction Cost
		“Low” \$37.925 million	“High” \$60.857 million
Taxing Jurisdiction	Tax Rate Per \$1,000	Est. Tax Amount	Est. Tax Amount
Town of Hamptonburgh	\$1.2478	\$115,300	\$185,016
Hamptonburgh Fire District	\$0.6241	\$21,375	\$75,937
Orange County	\$3.0402	\$104,127	\$37,981
Subtotal		\$186,291	\$298,934
Valley Central School District	\$15.5200	\$594,482	\$953,941
Total		\$780,773	\$1,252,875
<p>Notes: Taxes do not include reductions resulting from potential exemptions, nor do these taxes reflect additional taxes resulting from taxation of amenities or infrastructure. Tax rates per 2005 Property Tax warrants; rates are rounded.</p> <p>Sources: Town of Hamptonburgh Receiver of Taxes and Assessor; estimates developed by AKRF, Inc.</p>			

In addition, the 2005 tax rate per \$1,000 valuation of the Valley Central School District is \$15.52. At this rate, the 340-unit Alternative would generate approximately \$594,482 to \$953,941 million per year toward the Valley Central School District. As discussed above, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would consist of age-restricted units, and therefore would not increase the number of school-age children in the Town of Hamptonburgh. As a result, effect of the 340-Unit Plan Alternative on the Valley Central School District will be to provide real property tax revenues with no associated student-related costs.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The 340-Unit Plan Alternative would largely limit site disturbance to that of the proposed project. As detailed in Chapter 3.15, “Cultural Resources,” the proposed project would not block the view of or significantly alter any significant cultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with the 340-Unit Plan Alternative.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The 340-Unit Plan Alternative would preserve approximately 250 of the 400 acres as open space, similar to that of the proposed project. Continuing agricultural practices on the remaining farmland is being explored by the Applicant.

Under the 340-Unit Plan Alternative, as with the proposed project, the horse farm located on Parcel A would be removed.

The detailed agricultural resource studies in Chapter 3.16, “Agricultural Resources,” indicate that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in agricultural resources; thus,

there would also be no adverse agricultural impacts associated with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

In comparison with the proposed project, the 340-Unit Plan Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and a similar amount of site disturbance and grading. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would result approximately 11 percent more construction activity as a result of 33 additional residential units. Therefore, compared to the proposed project, this alternative would likely result in a slightly longer construction period. A longer construction period would potentially result in incremental increases to traffic, noise, and air quality related construction impacts.

ALTERNATIVE 5: ALTERNATE ACCESS - PRIMARY ENTRANCE ON ROUTE 416

This alternative is a variation of the proposed project, differing in that the proposed primary entrance would be from Route 416 instead of from Eager Road, as shown in Figure 5-4. This involves primary vehicular access to the project site from NYS Route 416, with secondary vehicular access from Eager Road. Two emergency access driveways would be provided: one on NYS Route 416; and one on Eager Road. The primary access driveway off of NYS Route 416 would be located directly opposite of Grove Street, forming a 4 leg intersection. The proposed project proposes that the main entrance to be located on Eager Road, with the emergency driveways be located on NYS Route 416 and Eager Road.

Like the proposed project, this Alternative proposes a 300 units which would be an active adult, age-restricted residential community consisting of 232 detached single-family houses, and 68 attached townhome units sited on approximately 118 acres of the approximately 370-acre site. Amenities and other site features discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," would be incorporated into this alternative, including a clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, putting greens, and walking trails. Except as noted below, the site plan, infrastructure, and building program evaluated under this alternative are the same as that considered in the analyses of the proposed project. The build year analyzed for this alternative is 2008, and construction would occur within the timeframe anticipated for the proposed project.

Like the proposed project, this alternative has been designed to conform with Town of Hamptonburgh Town Law 2 of 2003, which created a new special permit use, active-adult, age-restricted housing. This alternative, therefore, would require a special permit from the Town Board.

This alternative is included in this analysis to evaluate whether locating the main entrance on Route 416 on the main site would result in incremental impacts above or below those identified in the analyses of the proposed project that would result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

This Alternate Access Alternative may require an additional curb cut along NYS Route 416 as well as widening NYS Route 416 to provide a southbound left-turn lane to the project site driveway. The road widening, entrance driveway, and associated features, such as fencing, landscaping, and gatehouse, would be centrally located within the Gateway Overlay District. The Gateway Overlay District is a zoning district within the Town that has been identified as an

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

important scenic and agrarian corridor. Locating an entrance driveway and associated structures is not prohibited within this district, but has to be properly screened and landscaped.

Like the proposed project, the majority of the project site's large meadow within the Gateway Overlay District and adjacent to the eastern edge of Route 416 would remain as open space under the Alternative. However, this open space would be bisected by this Alternative's access roadway. As with the proposed project, 5 single-family homes would be sited at the far edge of the large open meadow, within the homes situated so that the front of the units would face Route 416. These units would be of an architectural style consistent with the area's traditional architecture, and would be located in a landscaped setting consistent with the meadow and forested character of the site. Pursuant to Section 150-21, the buildings are "sited and clustered on the tract in such a way as to avoid occupying or obstructing view of land" in the Gateway Road Overlay District. Unlike the proposed project, Eager Road would not require road-widening to accommodate a primary entrance roadway.

As with the proposed project, this Alternative requires that the project be developed under a waiver of building separation standards by the Town Board in granting the Special Permit application. The plan clusters the proposed units in a manner to conserve significant portions of the site as open space and to create a pedestrian-friendly and walkable community.

This plan would comply with Town and County policies regarding open space and housing matters by preserving approximately 252 acres of open space and creating age-restricted housing. The proposed project would result in the creation of 255 acres of open space, an additional 3 acres.

VISUAL CHARACTER

Under this Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered in a manner to minimize impacts to the visual character of the area. The homes would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. Like the proposed project, five homes would be located within the Gateway Overlay District. These homes would be partially visible, although their site would be landscaped and the individual homes would be visible through a filter of vegetation and trees. The architectural styles and details of the homes would be expected to be consistent with the area's traditional building styles.

This Alternative differs from the proposed project in that the main entrance to the community would be located along NYS Route 416, within the Gateway Overlay District. As mentioned above, this site access configuration may require an additional curb cut along NYS Route 416 as well as widening NYS Route 416 to provide a southbound left-turn lane to the project site driveway. These transportation features would alter the appearance of NYS Route 416 along this scenic stretch of roadway.

The entrance driveway and entrance features, including gatehouse and fencing, would be sited centrally within an open and scenic stretch of NYS Route 416 within the Gateway Overlay District. The entrance features would be plainly visible to passersby on the Route 416 and, along with the widening of NYS Route 416, would alter the character of this segment of this currently rural roadside. Entrance driveway features, including a gatehouse, would be set back approximately 100 feet from Route 416, and would be well landscaped and screened in compliance with the provisions of the Gateway Overlay District requirements, and to make the entrance to the residential community aesthetically pleasing. The architectural style and

treatment of the visible gatehouse would be consistent with traditional area architecture and will be designed to blend into the overall meadow-like landscape.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Under the Alternate Access Alternative, the meadow habitat composing the western edge of the project site, along NYS Route 416, would be bisected by the access drive, resulting in the fragmenting of this habitat unit and potentially affecting the migratory patterns of small wildlife species utilizing the site. As with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered to minimize impacts on vegetation and wildlife. The homes would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.3, "Vegetation and Wildlife," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to vegetation and wildlife; thus, there would also be no adverse vegetation and wildlife impacts associated with the Alternate Access Alternative.

WETLAND RESOURCES

Under the Alternate Access Alternative, the main entrance for the proposed project would be located along Route 416. Unlike the proposed project, the implementation of this Alternative would not involve widening of Eager Road, and would thus avoid the wetland impact associated with this public roadway widening. However, construction of an access roadway to NYS Route 416 would result in stream crossing, and would therefore result in a wetland area disturbance approximately equivalent to that of the proposed project. The entrance roadway under this Alternative would be expected to result in an impact to approximately 7,700 square feet of wetland area, and the anticipated impact to wetlands would be the same as with the proposed project.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

In comparison with the proposed project, the Alternate Access Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and would create similar amounts of total impervious surface. The amount of the site grading required for this alternative is expected to be similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.5, "Topography and Soils," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to topography and soils; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts on topography and soils associated with the Alternate Access Alternative.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

The Alternate Access Alternative would likely generate the same demand for water supply as the Proposed Project. As a result, this Alternative would not result in an adverse impact on ground water supply resources.

STORMWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, the Alternate Access Alternative would be expected to result in similar amounts of impervious surface and similar stormwater runoff flows and pollutant loadings. Similar to the proposed project, a storm water management plan would be developed for the Alternate Access Alternative, which would maintain current direction, quality and quantity of storm water flow into nearby wetlands and water courses. As with the proposed project, this alternative would result in no stormwater impacts.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

The Alternate Access Alternative would be expected to result in the same water consumption and wastewater generation as the proposed project. Similar to that provided for the proposed project, a wastewater treatment plant and central wells would be required for the Alternate Access Plan Alternative. Like the proposed project, groundwater wells would be located on Parcel A.

As with the proposed project, the Alternate Access Alternative would result in no significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

For this site access configuration alternative, four of the existing intersections near the project site were examined (Neelytown Road and Beaver Dam Road, NYS Route 416 and County Route 99, Neelytown Road and Eager Road, and NYS Route 416 and Eager Road). These intersections were selected since they would experience the greatest change in the traffic assignment. The same impacts would occur with this alternative as with the site access configuration of the proposed project, as well as one additional impact at the unsignalized intersection of NYS Route 416 and County Route 99 during the AM and PM peak hours. The intersection of the primary project site driveway/Grove Street and NYS Route 416 would operate acceptably at LOS D or better during all of the peak hours. The intersection of the secondary project site driveway and Eager Road would operate acceptably at LOS A or better during all of the peak hours. This site access configuration alternative may require an additional curb cut along NYS Route 416 as well as widening NYS Route 416 to provide a southbound left-turn lane to the project site driveway.

This Alternative, like the proposed project, would create one impact requiring mitigation. The analysis detailed in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation," identified that the northbound Neelytown Road left-turn/through lane group at the intersection of Neelytown Road and Beaver Dam Road would decline from LOS E to LOS F during the PM peak hour. As such, it is recommended that the existing flashing traffic signal be converted to a fully operational traffic signal, if warranted. As a result, the project is not expected to have any significant adverse impacts on the existing transportation network.

It is important to note, however, that the traffic analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 "Traffic and Transportation" was conducted based on the proposed project being a conventional (e.g., non-age restricted) residential development. Further, the analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 assumed the construction of 307 housing units, whereas the proposed project and this Alternative have been scaled back to 300 units. The results, therefore, overestimate the number of vehicle trips generated by the project, and therefore provide a very conservative evaluation of potential traffic impacts.

NOISE

As with the proposed project, the Alternate Access Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts related to noise. The Alternate Access Alternative would generate the same amount of traffic (the primary source of noise generation) as the proposed project. The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3.10, "Noise," indicates that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in noise levels. Therefore, the Alternate Access Alternative is not expected to result in any adverse noise impacts.

AIR QUALITY

As detailed in Chapter 3.11, "Air Quality," the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. The Alternate Access Alternative, which proposes the same number of units as the proposed project, and would generate the same amount of traffic, would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

As with the proposed project, the Alternate Access Alternative would not present a significant adverse impact to community facilities.

Under the Alternate Access Alternative, as with the proposed project, the units would be age-restricted and therefore would not increase the number of school-age children in the Town of Hamptonburgh. As such, the Alternate Access Alternative would not create an adverse impact on the school system.

DEMOGRAPHICS

In comparison to the proposed project, the Alternate Access Alternative would provide the same increase in the number of households within the Town of Hamptonburgh as the proposed project. This Alternative, as with the proposed project, would add approximately 600 new residents to the Town.

FISCAL IMPACTS

The fiscal impacts of the Alternate Access Alternative would be expected to be the same as those resulting from the Proposed Project, as discussed in Chapter 3.14, "Fiscal Impacts."

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Alternate Access Alternative would largely limit site disturbance to that of the proposed project. As detailed in Chapter 3.15, "Cultural Resources," the proposed project would not block the view of or significantly alter any significant cultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with the Alternate Access Alternative.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The Alternate Access Alternative would preserve approximately 252 of the 370 acres as open space, similar to that of the proposed project. Continuing agricultural practices on the remaining farmland is being explored by the Applicant.

Under the Alternate Access Alternative, as with the proposed project, the horse farm located on Parcel A would be removed.

The detailed agricultural resource studies in Chapter 3.16, "Agricultural Resources," indicate that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in agricultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse agricultural impacts associated with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

In comparison with the proposed project, the Alternate Access Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and a similar amount of site disturbance and grading. Therefore, compared to the proposed project, this alternative would likely result in a construction period similar to that of the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 6: 50-FOOT BUILDING SEPARATION SITE CONFIGURATION

This Alternative presents the site's development as a 300-unit age restricted residential community with a 50-foot separation between buildings. Under this Alternative, the 50-foot separation allows for the siting of approximately 230 of the single family and multi-unit residential units on approximately 140 acres of land. This Alternative would utilize a roadway network that is of the same layout as for the proposed project. However, because of the additional distance between houses and the presence of steep slopes and wetlands, not all houses would be sited on this roadway. Therefore, approximately 70 single family houses would be located elsewhere on the project site. Due to environmental considerations, including wetlands and steep slopes, these 70 single family houses would be most appropriately located along the eastern side of NYS Route 416, north and south of Eager Road. These houses would require the construction of an additional approximately 5,700 linear feet of roadway to provide access and egress.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

This Alternative involves a site plan layout reflecting the construction of 300 residential units with the 50-foot separation distance between each structure in conformance with the building separation provisions of Section 150-15K, "Active-Adult, age-restricted housing," a special permit use established by Local Law 2 of 2003. This alternate site layout accommodating a 50-foot building separation is shown in Figure 5-5.

This Alternative differs substantially from the proposed project in that the proposed project requests a deviation from the zoning code standard of a 50-foot separation in favor of a building separation distance of 15 feet. This narrower separation is necessary to accomplish the proposed project's neo-traditional layout that minimizes the need for residents to drive to locations within the community, and creates pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods. The proposed cluster design, allowed by permitting narrower than specified building separation distances, is intended to preserve significantly more open space than alternate plans of similar densities would permit.

The 50-foot building spacing presented in this Alternative would negatively affect the neo-traditional community characteristics and pedestrian-friendly nature of the development, rendering it more like a conventional single-family subdivision in which each house was situated on a separate lot along curvilinear roadway system. The increased 50-foot separation between homes would not create cohesive community of neighborhoods which attracts residents of similar ages to live in a close-knit, walkable community. The approximately 70 houses constructed along the westerly portion of the site would at significant distance from project amenities, and would not be related to the rest of the residential development in any meaningful way that contributed to a neighborhood or community character objective.

This plan would be in partial compliance with Town and County policies regarding open space and housing priorities by preserving some open space on the site, although to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Under this Alternative, approximately 230 acres of open space would be

set aside, in comparison to 255 acres of preserved open space under the proposed project. The open space is diminished because this Alternative requires a greater land area – approximately 25 acres – for siting the residential units due to the greater spacing between individual units.

This Alternative would require the placement of approximately 70 single-family housing units and new roadways within the Gateway Overlay District, on the east side of NYS Route 416, north and south of Eager Road. Approximately 38 of the residential units would be located within the open meadow to the east of NYS Route 416, south of Eager Road. Due to wetland site constraints, these units would be located approximately 300 feet from the edge of NYS Route 416. The remaining 32 units would be located north of Eager Road, with approximately 7 units in a cul-de-sac located on the site of the existing barn complex, and the remaining 25 units on a roadway running from Eager Road to NYS Route 416, set approximately 500-600 feet back from NYS Route 416. The Gateway Overlay District extends 1,000 feet on either side of NYS Route 416.

Three new curb cuts along NYS Route 416 would be necessary to access these residential units. These access roads would lie within the Gateway Overlay District, as well. Three additional access road entrances would require curb cuts off of Eager Road, two of which would fall within the Gateway Overlay District. The development of the residential units and access roads are not prohibited within the Gateway Overlay District provided that adequate landscaping and screening are provided.

Because this Alternative would require the placement of a substantial number of new residential units and roadways in a highly scenic and visible portion of the District, this Alternative would be expected to result in a significant negative alteration of the character of the Gateway Overlay District along this segment of NYS Route 416. This Alternative would therefore not be consistent with the public policy objectives of this zoning law.

VISUAL CHARACTER

The Gateway Overlay District is a zoning district within the Town that has been identified as an important scenic and agrarian corridor. As discussed above, this Alternative would require the placement of approximately 70 single family houses and associated roads within a highly scenic and visible section of the Gateway Overlay District. Although the architectural style of the units would be consistent with local architectural styles and traditions, and the site of the units would be landscaped, these units would all be plainly visible within the Gateway District from NYS Route 416. In addition, the access roadway serving these units would result in three new curb cuts along NYS Route 416, and two new cuts on Eager Road, all within the scenic area.

Because this Alternative would require the placement of a substantial number of new residential units and roadways in a highly scenic and visible portion of the Gateway Overlay District, this Alternative would be expected to result in a significant negative impact on the visual character and quality of the Gateway Overlay District along this segment of NYS Route 416.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

In the the proposed project, the residential homes would be clustered to minimize impacts on vegetation and wildlife. The houses in this Alternative would be spread more extensively over the project site, increasing the amount of site disturbance by approximately 25 acres. While approximately 230 houses would be located along a roadway network similar to that of the proposed project, an additional 70 houses would be sited on land proposed for preservation

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

under the proposed project. Approximately 38 of these houses would be sited in the meadow areas to the east of NYS Route 416, north of Eager Road. The location of these houses in this location would diminish the available wildlife habitat in this area, and result in a reduction in the number of resident wildlife species. The intrusion into this area for housing would fragment this open space habitat area, thereby interfering with the movement and migration patterns of wildlife species through the area.

However, despite greater impacts to wildlife habitat and vegetation than the proposed project, this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts to vegetation and wildlife.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

In comparison with the proposed project, the 50-foot Building Separation Alternative would result in the development of an additional 25 acres of land, 140 acres as compared to the proposed project's more compact 115 acre developed area. In addition, in comparison to the proposed project, this Alternative would create an additional 3 acres of permanent impervious surface areas, primarily resulting from the additional 5,700 linear feet of new roadway surfaces required to accommodate the more spread out site plan.

The amount of the site grading and site disturbance, and well as increased permanent impervious surface required for this Alternative is expected to result in a commensurately greater potential for increased erosion and sedimentation. Although this Alternative would result in greater and more extensive impacts to topographic and soil resources, it is anticipated that this Alternative would not result in significant adverse impacts on topography and soils, although the impacts would be greater than those of the proposed project.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

The 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would likely generate the same demand for water supply as the Proposed Project. As a result, this Alternative would not result in an adverse impact on ground water supply resources.

STORMWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, this Alternative would be expected to result greater site disturbance during construction, and in more extensive areas of permanent impervious surfaces due to the greater spacing between individual buildings and the increased roadway system. The calculated increase in impervious surface area is an additional 3 acres over that resulting from the proposed project. As discussed above, this increase is largely due to separation of the individual houses and the addition of approximately 5,700 linear feet of new roadway surface. As a result, there would be a greater likelihood for increased erosion and sedimentation during construction, and increased stormwater runoff flows and pollutant loadings on a permanent basis.

Similar to the proposed project, a storm water management plan would be developed for this Alternative, which would endeavor to maintain current direction, quality and quantity of storm water flow into nearby wetlands and water courses. Although the volumes and velocities of stormwater runoff from this Alternate plan would be expected to be greater than with the proposed project, it is expected that with the implementation of a stormwater management plan this Alternative would not result in significant adverse stormwater impacts.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

The 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would be expected to result in the same water consumption and wastewater generation as the proposed project. Similar to that provided for the proposed project, a wastewater treatment plant and central wells would be required for the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative. Like the proposed project, groundwater wells would be located on Parcel A.

As with the proposed project, the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would result in no significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

The 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative, as with the proposed project, would construct 300 units, as discussed in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation," and overall the impacts of this Alternative on the area's transportation network would be similar.

Under this Alternative, the 50-foot separation allows for the siting of approximately 230 of the single family and multi-unit residential units on a roadway network that is of the same layout as for the proposed project. However, because of the additional distance between houses, approximately 70 single family houses would be located on new roadways constructed on site. Due to site considerations, including wetlands and steep slopes, these 70 single family houses would be located along the eastern side of NYS Route 416, north and south of Eager Road. These houses would require the construction of an additional approximately 5,700 linear feet of roadway. In addition, 5 new curb cuts would be required to accommodate the roadways on which these 70 houses would be sited. Three new curb cuts along NYS Route 416 would be necessary to access these residential units, and three additional access road entrances would require curb cuts off of Eager Road. The three access roads entering NYS Route 416 would increase the number of places along this roadway where vehicles would make turns into and out of the residential development, thereby increasing the potential for accidents to occur along this roadway segment.

In comparison to the proposed project, in which the buildings are separated by a 15 feet, this Alternative's 50-foot separation between buildings would result in greater distances between residents and their neighbors, and greater distances between residents and site amenities. As a result, residents would be expected to use their cars more frequently for internal transportation purposes, and the pedestrian character of the project would be diminished.

This Alternative, like the proposed project, would create one impact requiring mitigation. The analysis detailed in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation," identified that the northbound Neelytown Road left-turn/through lane group at the intersection of Neelytown Road and Beaver Dam Road would decline from LOS E to LOS F during the PM peak hour. As such, it is recommended that the existing flashing traffic signal be converted to a fully operational traffic signal, if warranted. As a result, the project is not expected to have any significant adverse impacts on the existing transportation network.

It is important to note, however, that the traffic analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 "Traffic and Transportation" was conducted based on the proposed project being a conventional (e.g., non-age restricted) residential development. Further, the analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 assumed the construction of 307 housing units, whereas the proposed project and this Alternative have been scaled back to 300 units. The results, therefore, overestimate the number of vehicle trips

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

generated by the project, and therefore provide a very conservative evaluation of potential traffic impacts.

NOISE

As with the proposed project, the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts related to noise. The 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would generate the same amount of traffic (the primary source of noise generation) as the proposed project. The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3.10, "Noise," indicates that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in noise levels. Therefore, the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative is not expected to result in any adverse noise impacts.

AIR QUALITY

As detailed in Chapter 3.11, "Air Quality," the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. The 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative, which proposes the same number of units as the proposed project, and would generate the same amount of traffic, would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

As with the proposed project, the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would not present a significant adverse impact to community facilities. Under the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative, as with the proposed project, the units would be age-restricted and therefore would not increase the number of school-age children in the Town of Hamptonburgh. As such, the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would not create an adverse impact on the school system.

DEMOGRAPHICS

In comparison to the proposed project, the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would provide the same increase in the number of households within the Town of Hamptonburgh as the proposed project. This Alternative, as with the proposed project, would add approximately 600 new residents to the Town.

FISCAL IMPACTS

The fiscal impacts of the 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative would be expected to be the very similar to those resulting from the proposed project, as discussed in Chapter 3.14, "Fiscal Impacts."

CULTURAL RESOURCES

The 50-Foot Building Separation Alternative, as with the Proposed Project would not block the view of or significantly alter any significant cultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with the Alternate Access Alternative.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This Alternative would require the siting of approximately 38 single family houses on the meadowlands to the east of NYS Route 416 and south of Eager Road, and approximately 32 houses on the farmland east of NYS Route 416, to the north of Eager Road. The potential to use these land areas for agricultural purposes in the future would be foreclosed. Also, as with the

proposed project, the horse farm located on Parcel A would be removed. Whereas the proposed project would result in the creation of approximately 255 acres of open space, much of which would comprise agricultural landscape, this Alternative results in the setting aside of approximately 230 acres. The additional land removed from agricultural and open space uses under this Alternative would be approximately 25 acres.

As discussed in Chapter 3.16, "Agricultural Resources," the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in agricultural resources. Although this Alternative would remove one farm and the meadows east of NYS Route 416 from the agricultural land base, this Alternative is not expected to result in significant adverse agricultural impacts to the Town or County's agricultural base.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

In comparison with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in a more extensive area subject to site clearance, grading, and development as a result of the greater separation between buildings throughout the project site. The construction of the additional 5,700 linear feet of new roads accessing the single family houses would require additional construction materials to be transported to the site, and would create as many as five new construction entrances off of NYS Route 416 and Eager Road, thereby dispersing construction traffic and increasing the number of places where turning movements into and out of the site during the construction period occur. This Alternative would likely result in a construction period similar to that of the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 7: ALTERNATE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT LOCATION

This alternative is a variation of the proposed project, differing in that the wastewater treatment facility would be located on the east side of NYS Route 416, in a location closer to the main body of residential units. Because the treatment facility in this Alternative is not located on a 9-acre separate parcel (referred to as Parcel C in the proposed project), the net developable site acreage is decreased by 9 acres, to approximately 361 acres, and therefore the total number of residential units is decreased from 300 to 291.

Several locations east of NYS Route 416 were assessed as potential locations of the sewage treatment plant. Due to site constraints, primarily wetlands and steep slopes, three locations east of NYS Route 416 were evaluated for suitability. These sites are briefly discussed below.

The first site considered potentially suitable for the sewage treatment plant location is located in the southwestern corner of Parcel A, immediately adjacent to and behind the former Grove Street District No. 5 schoolhouse, which is located along Route 416 adjacent to the proposed site of an emergency access road to the project site. As discussed in Chapter 3.15, Cultural Resources, this 1875-era schoolhouse is potentially eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places. This site was deemed unacceptable as a sewage treatment plant site on the basis of the need for major access driveway and access road improvements which were judged to have a significant negative effect on the historic schoolhouse building and its locale. In addition, this site would require the routing of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 linear feet of outfall pipeline to the proposed outfall location on the Walkill River.

The second site considered potentially suitable for the sewage treatment plant is located on Parcel A, on the southeast corner of Eager Road and NYS Route 416. This site provided superior access opportunities in comparison to those of the site discussed above, in that it could be

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

accessed alternately from either NYS Route 416 or Eager Road, depending on sewage plant site layout configuration. In addition, this siting provided for a significantly shorter outfall pipeline between the plant and the outfall location on the Walkill River. However, this site is located within a highly visible portion of Parcel A, within the Gateway Overlay District. The sewage treatment plant would be plainly visible from vantages along NYS Route 416 and Eager Road. For this reason this site was deemed unacceptable.

The third site considered potentially suitable for locating the sewage plant is on the northeast corner of Eager Road and NYS Route 416, on Parcel B. Although this site also lies within the Gateway Overlay District, this site is occupied by a large barn and several smaller outbuildings. On the basis of favorable environmental and access considerations, and due to the presence of existing structures, this site was selected for further analysis in this Alternative.

As shown in Figure 5-6, this Alternative would be accommodated within a site design configuration that locates the sewage treatment plant on Parcel B. The proposed sewage treatment plant would be sited in the approximate location of the existing large barn. To minimize effects on the Gateway District and to maintain the rural character of the immediate area, the treatment plant structure would be designed to match the architectural features of a traditional barn. The sewage treatment plant at this location would require an outfall pipeline to extend westward, across Route 416, to the proposed outfall location on the Walkill River. The outfall location would be as described in Chapter 3.8, "Infrastructure and Utilities."

Like the proposed project, this 291 unit Alternative would be an active adult, age-restricted residential community consisting of 223 detached single-family houses, and 68 attached townhomes sited on approximately 116 acres of the 361 acre site (370 acres minus the 9 acre parcel west of NYS Route 416). Amenities and other site features discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," would be incorporated into this alternative, including a clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, putting greens, and walking trails. In all other respects, the site plan, infrastructure, and building program evaluated under this alternative are the same as that considered in the analyses of the proposed project. The build year analyzed for this alternative is 2008, and construction would occur within the timeframe anticipated for the proposed project.

Like the proposed project, this alternative has been designed to conform with Town of Hamptonburgh Town Law 2 of 2003, which created a new special permit use, active-adult, age-restricted housing. This alternative, therefore, would require a special permit from the Town Board.

This alternative is included in this analysis to evaluate whether locating the sewage treatment plant on the main site would result in incremental impacts above or below those identified in the analyses of the proposed project that would result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

As discussed above, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative requires that the project be developed under a waiver of building separation standards by the Town Board in granting the Special Permit application. Like the proposed project, the plan clusters the proposed units in a manner to conserve significant portions of the site as open space.

Like the proposed project, this Alternative generally complies with the Gateway Road Overlay District in that the majority of the development would be screened from view from Route 416. The site plan indicates that the majority of large meadow adjacent to Route 416 would remain as open space under the Alternative. In addition, as in the proposed project, approximately 5 single-

family homes would be sited at the far edge of the large open meadow, within the homes situated so that the front of the units would face Route 416. Pursuant to Section 150-21, the buildings are “sited and clustered on the tract in such a way as to avoid occupying or obstructing view of land” in the Gateway Road Overlay District.

However, under this Alternative, the sewage treatment plant would now be located within the Gateway Overlay District. The sewage treatment plant would be set back approximately 300 feet from NYS Route 416, and would be plainly visible within the Gateway Overlay District. In addition to the treatment plant, necessary security fencing and a larger access road to accommodate sludge removal trucks and other operational and maintenance vehicles would be within and visible from the Gateway Overlay District. The proposed plan sited the sewage treatment plant outside of the Gateway Overlay District. Therefore this Alternative would result in a greater impact on the scenic Gateway Overlay District in comparison to the proposed project.

This plan would comply with Town and County policies regarding open space and housing priorities by preserving open space and creating age-restricted housing. The amount of open space set aside under this Alternative, however, would be diminished by the siting of the sewage treatment facility on a portion of Parcel B, which, under the proposed project, is entirely protected as open space. Due to the siting requirements of the sewage treatment plant, this open space parcel would be reduced by approximately 9 acres, resulting in a total of 246 acres of open space set aside under this Alternative, as compared to 255 under the proposed project.

Because this Alternative does not utilize the 9-acre Parcel C for the sewage treatment plant, there would be no need to undergo the subdivision of the land to the west of NYS Route 416 to create a separate lot on which the plant would be sited.

VISUAL CHARACTER

Under the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative, the sewage treatment plant would be located within the scenic Gateway Overlay District, on Parcel B, on the northeast corner of Eager Road and NYS Route 416. This site is currently developed as a horse farm and is therefore a consistent and traditional element of the overall rural landscape of this segment of NYS Route 416. Locating the sewage treatment plant on this site would alter the visual character of this site and the immediate environs by replacing a farm-related barn complex with structures housing sewage treatment facilities.

The visual impact of the sewage treatment plant could be reduced by constructing the structure housing the treatment facility in the form of a barn-like building with a color palette and style consistent with local farm architecture. The facility, however, would locate security fencing and an increased access roadway to the scenic district, and would introduce an industrial form of land use involving truck traffic to and from the facility to this agrarian landscape that would be plainly visible from NYS Route 416.

As with the proposed project, the proposed homes comprising the community would be clustered in a manner to minimize impacts to the visual character of the area. The homes would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. Approximately 5 single family homes would be located within the Gateway Overlay District and would be visible from NYS Route 416. These homes would be built in a style consistent with the area’s traditional architecture and screened and landscaped in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Gateway Overlay District regulations.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Under the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered to minimize impacts on vegetation and wildlife. The homes in the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.3, "Vegetation and Wildlife," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to vegetation and wildlife; thus, there would also be no adverse vegetation and wildlife impacts associated with the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

In comparison with the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and would create similar amounts of total impervious surface. The amount of the site grading required for this alternative is expected to be similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.5, "Topography and Soils," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to topography and soils; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts on topography and soils associated with the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

The Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would likely generate a marginally decreased demand for water supply over that of the Proposed Project, causing a decreased demand on groundwater resources. As a result of the decrease in the number of units, this Alternative would not result in an adverse impact on ground water supply resources.

STORMWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would be expected to result in similar amounts of impervious surface and similar stormwater runoff flows and pollutant loadings. Similar to the proposed project, a storm water management plan would be developed for the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative, which would maintain current direction, quality and quantity of storm water flow into nearby wetlands and water courses. As with the proposed project, this alternative would result in no stormwater impacts.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

In comparison with the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would be expected to result in slightly less water consumption and, as a result, slightly less wastewater generation due to the reduction in unit count from 300 to 291. Similar to that provided for the proposed project, a sewage treatment plant and central wells would be required for the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative. Unlike the proposed project, the sewage treatment plant would be located on Parcel B. As with the proposed project, the sewage treatment plant would discharge to the Wallkill River via an outfall pipeline. Like the proposed project, groundwater wells would be located on Parcel A.

As with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in no significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

The Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would construct 9 less units than the 300 units proposed under the proposed project, discussed in Chapter 3.9, “Traffic and Transportation.” As a result, this alternative is expected to generate a slightly less amount traffic than the proposed project due to the reduction of project density from 300 units to 291 units resulting from the removal of Parcel C from the density calculations.

The alternate location of the sewage treatment plant on Parcel B would relocate the plant’s access drive from the west side of NYS Route 416 to the east side. The effects on traffic resulting from the sewage plant would be the same as those of the proposed project.

This Alternative, like the proposed project, would create one impact requiring mitigation. The analysis detailed in Chapter 3.9, “Traffic and Transportation,” identified that the northbound Neelytown Road left-turn/through lane group at the intersection of Neelytown Road and Beaver Dam Road would decline from LOS E to LOS F during the PM peak hour. As such, it is recommended that the existing flashing traffic signal be converted to a fully operational traffic signal, if warranted. As a result, the project is not expected to have any significant adverse impacts on the existing transportation network.

It is important to note, however, that the traffic analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 “Traffic and Transportation” was conducted based on the proposed project being a conventional (e.g., non-age restricted) residential development. Further, the analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 assumed the construction of 307 housing units, whereas the number of units represented in this Alternative has been reduced by 16 units to 291 units. The results, therefore, further overestimate the number of vehicle trips generated by the project, and therefore provide a very conservative evaluation of potential traffic impacts.

NOISE

As with the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts related to noise. This Alternative would generate slightly less traffic (the primary source of noise generation) than the proposed project, the incremental decrease is not significant. The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3.10, “Noise,” indicates that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in noise levels. The Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative is not expected to result in any adverse noise impacts.

AIR QUALITY

As detailed in Chapter 3.11, “Air Quality,” the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. The incremental difference between the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative and the proposed plan does not present a significant difference in regards to Air Quality. As with the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

As with the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would not present a significant adverse impact to community facilities.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

The difference of 9 units between the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative and the proposed project would cause a slight decrease in the demand for community facilities such as Town Hall functions, police, fire, ambulance, and recreational services.

Under this Alternative, as with the proposed project, the units would be age-restricted and therefore would not increase the number of school-age children in the Town of Hamptonburgh. As such, this Alternative would not create an adverse impact on the school system.

DEMOGRAPHICS

In comparison to the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would provide an incremental decrease in the number of households within the Town of Hamptonburgh. The 9 less units would decrease the number new residents in the Town of Hamptonburgh from 600 to 582. This decrease would be minor and would not significantly alter the demographics of the Town of Hamptonburgh.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Under this Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative, as with the proposed project, the project site would be subject to improvements associated with the development of 223 detached single-family houses, and 68 attached townhomes, as well as amenities and other site features, including a clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, trails, and infrastructure, such as the wastewater treatment facility. The removal of 9 residential units from the project would correspondingly result in a marginal decrease in property taxes generated by the overall project. As compared to the taxes generated by the proposed 300 unit project, the 291 units developed under this Alternative would annually generate a range of approximately \$163,192 to \$261,822 in Town taxes, and between approximately \$515,613 and \$827,239 per year in school taxes.

The removal of 9 residential units from the project would correspondingly result in a marginal decrease in property taxes generated by the overall project. As compared to the taxes generated by the proposed 300 unit project discussed in Chapter 3.14, "Fiscal Impacts," the 291 units developed under this Alternative would annually generate approximately \$5,047 and 8,098 less in Town taxes, and \$15,947 and 25,585 less in school taxes per year than the 300 unit project.

As discussed above, this Alternative would consist of age-restricted units, and therefore would not increase the number of school-age children in the Town of Hamptonburgh. As a result, the effect of this Alternative on the Valley Central School District will be to provide real property tax revenues with no associated student-related costs.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

This Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would largely limit site disturbance to that of the proposed project. As detailed in Chapter 3.15, "Cultural Resources," the proposed project would not block the view of or significantly alter any significant cultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with this Alternative.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would preserve approximately 245 of the 370 acres as open space, similar to that of the proposed project. Continuing agricultural practices on the remaining farmland is being explored by the Applicant.

Under this Alternative, as with the proposed project, the horse farm located on Parcel A would be removed. Unlike the proposed project, Parcel C would remain undeveloped. On Parcel B an existing barn would be replaced by the proposed Sewage Treatment Plant. The sewage treatment plant would be designed to mimic the architectural character of the existing barn in order to maintain the rural character of the area and the Gateway Overlay District.

The detailed agricultural resource studies in Chapter 3.16, "Agricultural Resources," indicate that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in agricultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse agricultural impacts associated with this Alternative.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

In comparison with the proposed project, the Alternate Sewage Plant Location Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and a similar amount of site disturbance and grading. Therefore, compared to the proposed project, this alternative would likely result in a construction period similar to that of the proposed project.

ALTERNATIVE 8: PROPOSED PROJECT WITHOUT THE CUL-DE-SAC

This Alternative is a variation of the proposed project, differing in that the five-unit cul-de-sac located in the northeastern part of Parcel A, within the Gateway Overlay District, would be removed, as shown in Figure 5-7. These five units would be located elsewhere in the proposed project, and the project under this Alternative would therefore involve construction of 300 units, as with the proposed project. Like the proposed project, this Alternative proposes 300 units which would be an active adult, age-restricted residential community consisting of 232 detached single-family houses, and 68 attached townhomes sited on approximately 115 acres of the 370-acre site. Amenities and other site features discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," would be incorporated into this alternative, including a clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, putting greens, and walking trails. In all other respects, the site plan, infrastructure, and building program evaluated under this alternative are the same as that considered in the analyses of the proposed project. The build year analyzed for this alternative is 2008, and construction would occur within the timeframe anticipated for the proposed project.

Like the proposed project, this alternative has been designed to conform with Town of Hamptonburgh Town Law 2 of 2003, which created a new special permit use, active-adult, age-restricted housing. This alternative, therefore, would require a special permit from the Town Board.

This alternative is included in this analysis to evaluate relocating the 5 residential units on the cul-de-sac within the Gateway Overlay District would result in incremental impacts above or below those identified in the analyses of the proposed project that would result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

LAND USE, ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

As with the proposed project, this Alternative requires that the project be developed under a waiver of building separation standards by the Town Board in granting the Special Permit application. As with the proposed project, the plan clusters the proposed units in a manner to conserve significant portions of the site as open space. Approximately 245 acres of the site would remain as open space.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

This Alternative generally complies with the Gateway Road Overlay District in that all of the development would be screened from view from Route 416. The site plan indicates that the majority of large meadow adjacent to Route 416 would remain as open space under this Alternative. This Alternative differs from the proposed project which proposes to locate approximately 5 single-family homes at the far edge of the large open meadow, within the homes situated so that the front of the units would face Route 416.

This plan would comply with Town and County policies regarding open space and housing priorities by preserving open space and creating age-restricted housing to the same degree as the proposed project.

VISUAL CHARACTER

Under this Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered in a manner to minimize impacts to the visual character of the area. The homes would be arranged to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. Unlike the proposed project, this Alternative would not propose any structures visible from Route 416 and would therefore reduce any potential visual impact to the Gateway Overlay District.

VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Under this Alternative, as with the proposed project, the proposed homes would be clustered to minimize impacts on vegetation and wildlife. The homes would be arranged in a manner to limit site disturbance to an area similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.3, "Vegetation and Wildlife," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to vegetation and wildlife; thus, there would also be no adverse vegetation and wildlife impacts associated with this Alternative.

TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

In comparison with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and would create similar amounts of total impervious surface. The amount of the site grading required for this alternative is expected to be similar to that of the proposed project. As identified in Chapter 3.5, "Topography and Soils," the proposed project would not result in a significant adverse impact to topography and soils; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts on topography and soils associated with this Alternative.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

This Alternative would likely generate the same demand for water supply as the Proposed Project. As a result, this Alternative would not result in an adverse impact on ground water supply resources.

STORMWATER RESOURCES

In comparison with the proposed project, this Alternative would be expected to result in similar amounts of impervious surface and similar stormwater runoff flows and pollutant loadings. Similar to the proposed project, a storm water management plan would be developed for the this Alternative, which would maintain current direction, quality and quantity of storm water flow into nearby wetlands and water courses. As with the proposed project, this alternative would result in no stormwater impacts.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES

This Alternative would be expected to result in the same water consumption and wastewater generation as the proposed project. Similar to that provided for the proposed project, a wastewater treatment plant and central wells would be required for the Alternate Access Plan Alternative. Like the proposed project, groundwater wells would be located on Parcel A.

As with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in no significant impacts to infrastructure and utilities.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

This Alternative, as with the proposed project, would construct 300 units, as discussed in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation."

This Alternative, like the proposed project, would create one impact requiring mitigation. The analysis detailed in Chapter 3.9, "Traffic and Transportation," identified that the northbound Neelytown Road left-turn/through lane group at the intersection of Neelytown Road and Beaver Dam Road would decline from LOS E to LOS F during the PM peak hour. As such, it is recommended that the existing flashing traffic signal be converted to a fully operational traffic signal, if warranted. As a result, the project is not expected to have any significant adverse impacts on the existing transportation network.

It is important to note, however, that the traffic analysis presented in Chapter 3.9 "Traffic and Transportation" was conducted based on the proposed project being a conventional (e.g., non-age restricted) residential development. The results, therefore, overestimate the number of vehicle trips generated by the project, and therefore provide a very conservative evaluation of potential traffic impacts.

NOISE

As with the proposed project, this Alternative would not have significant adverse impacts related to noise. This Alternative would generate the same amount of traffic (the primary source of noise generation) as the proposed project. The noise analysis presented in Chapter 3.10, "Noise," indicates that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in noise levels. Therefore, this Alternative is not expected to result in any adverse noise impacts.

AIR QUALITY

As detailed in Chapter 3.11, "Air Quality," the proposed project would not result in any significant adverse air quality impacts. This Alternative, which proposes the same number of units as the proposed project and would generate the same amount of traffic, would not result in adverse air quality impacts.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

As with the proposed project, this Alternative would not present a significant adverse impact to community facilities.

Under this Alternative, as with the proposed project, the units would be age-restricted and therefore would not increase the number of school-age children in the Town of Hamptonburgh. As such, this Alternative would not create an adverse impact on the school system.

Four Seasons at Hamptonburgh

DEMOGRAPHICS

In comparison to the proposed project, this Alternative would provide the same increase in the number of households within the Town of Hamptonburgh as the proposed project. This Alternative would add approximately 600 new residents to the Town.

FISCAL IMPACTS

The fiscal impacts of this Alternative would be expected to be the same as those resulting from the Proposed Project, as discussed in Chapter 3.14, "Fiscal Impacts."

CULTURAL RESOURCES

This Alternative would largely limit site disturbance to that of the proposed project. As detailed in Chapter 3.15, "Cultural Resources," the proposed project would not block the view of or significantly alter any significant cultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse impacts to cultural resources associated with this Alternative.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

This Alternative would preserve approximately 245 of the 370 acres as open space, similar to that of the proposed project. Continuing agricultural practices on the remaining farmland is being explored by the Applicant.

Under this Alternative, as with the proposed project, the horse farm located on Parcel A would be removed.

The detailed agricultural resource studies in Chapter 3.16, "Agricultural Resources," indicate that the proposed project would not produce any adverse changes in agricultural resources; thus, there would also be no adverse agricultural impacts associated with the Conservation Subdivision Alternative.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

In comparison with the proposed project, this Alternative would result in a similar concentration of development, and a similar amount of site disturbance and grading. Therefore, compared to the proposed project, this alternative would likely result in a construction period similar to that of the proposed project.