Summary
The Town of New Castle recently completed draft documents for the New Castle Comprehensive Plan (NCCP) as well as the first phase of the Chappaqua Revitalization Strategy (CRS) and Millwood Revitalization Strategy (MRS). This memorandum offers KDLLC’s recommended approach for completing the environmental review of the New Castle Comprehensive Plan and advancing forward the two revitalization strategies.

The memorandum is based upon a detailed evaluation of the draft plan, a thorough assessment of state environmental regulations, and a review of the environmental documents prepared for other comprehensive plans in the surrounding region. Additionally, KDLLC contacted the planning directors of neighboring localities, the Westchester County Planning Department, and the legal department of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Based upon our review, we conclude that the Town of New Castle must complete all three parts of the State’s Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF). Upon completion of the form, we also advise the Town to host a public hearing on the environmental impacts. Based upon our review of the draft comprehensive plan, however, we do not expect that the EAF process will compel further production of an environmental impact statement. At the close of the recommended public hearing, New Castle’s Town Board should be well-positioned to formally adopt the comprehensive plan without requiring any further analysis.

Once the Town Board has adopted the plan, the Town’s Department of Planning and Development should then proceed to initiate Phase Two of the Chappaqua and Millwood Revitalization Strategies. In Phase 1 of these studies, only conceptual scenarios were developed. Under Phase 2, the Town’s Department of Planning and Development should further assess the physical, operational, legal, and financial feasibility of these scenarios for redeveloping downtown Chappaqua and central Millwood. Once the Town has formalized an implementation plan for these areas, further environmental review may be required depending on the scale of the recommended changes.

No environmental impact analysis is required at this time for the CRS and MRS since the Phase 1 planning documents did not propose specific plans for redevelopment. Similarly, the NCCP provides only general policy statements for these areas and does not advance specific changes to land use, zoning, or infrastructure in these areas. Only once the Town agrees upon a specific plan, in accordance with the adopted comprehensive plan and informed by extensive community engagement, does the Town need to undertake further environmental impact assessment for these areas.
Relevant Regulations

Comprehensive plans are “Type I actions” under SEQRA. (6 NYCRR 617.4(b)(1)). A Type 1 action classification means that the action is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and must undergo some form of review. The format of review for a comprehensive plan is the completion of all three sections of the full Environmental Assessment Form (“EAF”). While a public hearing is not required for the EAF, the lead agency has the option of convening one for the sake of gathering public feedback on the comprehensive plan’s expected impacts.

If the lead agency determines, through the EAF process, that the action may include the potential for at least one significant adverse environmental impact, then an EIS is required for a proposed Type 1 action. In this case, a Positive Declaration is filed (6 NYCRR 617.7(a)(1)). If the lead agency determines that there will be no adverse environmental impacts, or that identified adverse environmental impacts will not be significant, a Negative Declaration may be filed.

In the case of a Positive Declaration, the lead agency should then prepare a Generic Environmental Impact Statement (“GEIS”). Generally, GEISs may be appropriate when addressing the environmental impacts of a proposed action that will affect a wide range of resources or geographic areas and for which an exploration of a range of mitigation measures may be appropriate. Generic EISs and their findings should set forth specific conditions or criteria under which future actions will be undertaken or approved, including requirements for any subsequent SEQR compliance (6 NYCRR § 617.10(c)).

In the case of Negative Declaration, however, the lead agency is not required to conduct further environmental impact assessment. The locality’s governing body may proceed to formally adopt the comprehensive plan without any further documentation or public hearings.

MATTER OF SCHAEFER V. LEGISLATURE OF ROCKLAND COUNTY

Residents of Rockland County (petitioners) alleged that Rockland County (respondent) did not satisfactorily examine the potential impacts of a proposed multi-use trail within the comprehensive plan through their Generic EIS. The subsequent Article 78 proceeding raised the question of the appropriate level of analysis required to adequately examine the potential environmental impacts of measures put forth in a comprehensive plan.

The SEQR Handbook presents vague guidelines as to the level of analysis required to adequately examine the impacts of various provisions outlined within a comprehensive plan. It is stated that elements such as hypothetical scenarios, thresholds, and alternatives “may be appropriate” when preparing a GEIS (6 NYCRR § 617.10(c)). The SEQR guidebook does not stipulate whether or not ancillary studies, such as a pedestrian and bicycle trail network analysis, are necessary to satisfactorily meet completion of a GEIS assessment.

The courts reasoned that an action must be final in order to be challenged. Furthermore, in order to be considered final the proposed action must “impose an obligation, deny a right, or fix some legal relationship as a consummation of the administrative process” (id. at 453, quoting Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc. v Waterman S. S. Corp., 333 US 103, 113).
Since the Comprehensive Plan is merely a guiding policy document outlining various recommendations for future actions, and all future specific and concrete decisions will be subject to individual review, the court denied the petition and ruled that Rockland County had not violated the requirements of SEQRA.

**Expected Outcome of the EAF Process**

A final determination of environmental impact of the NCCP cannot be made until the EAF forms are completed. However, a comprehensive review of the current draft document reveals that the comprehensive plan will not result in a “single large and important impact”. Purposefully drafted as a policy framework, the plan does not include any specific proposals for rezoning, land use development, or new infrastructure. As such, we anticipate that the Town of New Castle’s EAF process will result in a negative declaration of environmental impact, thereby exempting the Town from needing to undertake a full scale environmental impact statement.

We should also note that the Phase 1 revitalization strategies for Chappaqua and Millwood also do not result in a “single large and important impact”. The reason is that the Phase 1 strategies provided only conceptual strategies for revitalizing these areas. These options range from fairly minimal changes to pedestrian connections and civic areas to much more ambitious redevelopment plans involving substantial increases in housing and commercial space. The Town of New Castle solicited public feedback from the community on these strategies but will need to undertake considerably more planning and feasibility analysis before arriving at an agreed upon revitalization plan.

For all three studies (the NCCP, the CRS, and the MRS), the Town of New Castle’s only commitment is to further the study and analysis of the redevelopment potential of these areas. Once this analysis yields a coherent development plan, the Town of New Castle should then undertake a dedicated environmental impact review for each plan.

**The Experience of Other Localities**

There is a wide spectrum of opinions regarding the optimal form of environmental review for a comprehensive plan amongst planners and SEQR experts. Whereas some localities have performed an EAF and issued a negative declaration, other localities took the initiative to prepare a full scale GEIS and made the decision to do so early on in the comprehensive planning process. We believe this difference of opinion is largely attributable to the variation of proposed changes in the comprehensive plans undertaken by these localities.

For example, EAFs and negative declarations were made for the comprehensive plans prepared for Somers, Bronxville, Village of Mamaroneck, and Tarrytown. In these areas, the draft comprehensive plan did not adopt dramatic changes in zoning, land use, and infrastructure. Proposals for more significant actions were designated to be further analyzed after the conclusion of the comprehensive planning process, and then subject to further environmental impact assessment as required.

Meanwhile, communities such as Yorktown did conduct a complete GEIS with extensive analysis performed as a prelude to adopting the comprehensive plan. In this case, however, the draft comprehensive plan included proposals for extensive changes in the zoning in lower density residential areas. New Castle’s draft comprehensive plan is not like Yorktown’s. The precise nature of rezoning and development changes planned
for New Castle have been purposefully left for further technical analysis with any resulting environmental impacts to be determined upon adoption of an implementation plan.

**Next Steps on the NCCP, CRS and MRS**

Based upon the above assessment, we advise the Town of New Castle to undertake the following work plan over the coming 12 months.

- January and February: Conduct board and committee review of NCCP
- March: Prepare full EAF form and host public hearing
- April: Submit findings and EAF to Town Board for adoption of NCCP
- May: Launch Phase II for CRS and MRS; Form CRS and MRS Advisory Committees
- June: Host Public Workshop for CRS AND MRS
- July, August, and September: Conduct physical, economic, and operational feasibility analysis for CRS and MRS; conduct developer outreach process; prepare draft Implementation strategy including guiding principles.
- October: Convene Public Workshop for CRS and MRS and present draft implementation strategy
- November: Finalize the CRS and MRS Implementation Plan as well as RFEI
- December: Distribute Request for Expressions of Interest
APPENDIX: CASE STUDIES OF OTHER COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

The following section reviews relevant cases studies of localities within the Hudson Valley that recently engaged in a Comprehensive Plan SEQRA compliance procedure. For ease of reference, the case studies have been separated into two sections: (1) localities that engaged in a negative declaration approach, and (2) those that took the approach of a full generic environmental impact statement (“GEIS”). The first section of the appendix contains two comparative matrices, one for negative declaration designations and one for GEIS designations. The following section provides a summary of the proposed action and approach to SEQRA compliance for each of the localities included in the matrices.

NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS - COMPARATIVE MATRIX OF HUDSON VALLEY MUNICIPALITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Planning Effort &amp; Year</th>
<th>Year of SEQRA Process</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Consultant Contact</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Lead Agency Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Mamaroneck</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>BFI Planning</td>
<td>Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476</td>
<td>Village of Mamaroneck Mayor and Trustees</td>
<td>Bob Galvin</td>
<td>(914) 777-7731 NegDec was issued with the expectation that TOD zoning would be done later as would be further environmental review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Pelham</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Saratoga Associates</td>
<td>NYC Office 212.260.0250</td>
<td>Mayor &amp; Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Agenda states “Adoption of Lead Agency and SEQRA Neg. Dec” but no SEQR documentation found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Tarrytown</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>BFI Planning</td>
<td>Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476</td>
<td>Board of Trustees Village of Tarrytown</td>
<td>Lizabeth Maszaros</td>
<td>(914) 631-1487 Cannot find SEQR documentation, just references in meeting minutes indicating a negative declaration was issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Somers</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td>Expecting Neg Dec</td>
<td>BFI Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somers Town Board</td>
<td>Syrette Dym</td>
<td>914-277-5366 Only doing an EAF and expecting it will result in a negative declaration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GEIS - COMPARATIVE MATRIX OF HUDSON VALLEY MUNICIPALITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Planning Effort &amp; Year</th>
<th>Year of SEQRA Process</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Consultant Contact</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Lead Agency Contact</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Port Chester</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ferrandino &amp; Associates Inc</td>
<td>Vince Ferrandino, Principal, 914.345.5820 ext. 101</td>
<td>Port Chester Village Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Christopher Russo, Village Manager, 914.939.2200</td>
<td>Comprehensive plan did include designation of intensity zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland County</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>BFI Planning</td>
<td>Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476</td>
<td>Rockland County Legislature</td>
<td>Hon. Harriet D. Cornell, 845.638.5269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Clarkstown</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Town of Clarkstown Planning Department</td>
<td>Jose C. Simoes, Town Planner, 845.639.2070</td>
<td>Town of Clarkstown Town Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Town Planning prepared the GEIS with sub-consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Yorktown</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>GEIS 2005, SGEIS 2010</td>
<td>Phillips Preis Grygiel LLC</td>
<td>(201) 420-6262</td>
<td>Town Board of the Town of Yorktown</td>
<td>(914) 962-6565</td>
<td>Full GEIS was done because Plan includes many zoning changes to residential areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEQR COMPLIANCE CASE STUDIES FOR NEGATIVE DECLARATION IN HUDSON VALLEY

Village of Mamaroneck, Comprehensive Plan, 2012

Negative Declaration Prepared by: BFJ Planning
Contact: Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
Mamaroneck did not perform a full GEIS and instead prepared only an EAF. Phase 1 of the plan was addressed in a separate Negative Declaration in 2007, but the information contained in Phase 1 was updated and incorporated into a complete document to be analyzed in the 2012 assessment.

The Village of Mamaroneck submitted a negative declaration for SEQRA compliance for their Comprehensive Plan due to the additional analysis required for the plan’s preliminary zoning and development proposals. Rather than assess these impacts prematurely as part of the environmental review of the comprehensive plan, the Village instead decided to undertake additional studies with the assumption that they would eventually manifest in TOD zoning recommendations whose environmental impacts would be assessed in a separate and subsequent review process. Language used to support a negative declaration states that the recommendations within the plan are “anticipated to have positive environmental impacts on the Village,” and regardless, will be subject to separate review under SEQR.

What the Plan Looks Like:
The concluding chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, Recommendations and Priorities, incorporates recommendations from the document’s previous chapters into an action plan or checklist. The Action Plan is broken up into three sections: Local Laws and Regulations, Village Capital Investment Plan, and Further Study.

For More Information on the Village of Mamaroneck’s Comprehensive Plan:

Village of Pelham, Comprehensive Plan, 2008

Negative Declaration Prepared by: Saratoga Associates
Contact: NYC Office, 212.260.0250

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
Justification for the submission of a negative declaration in regards to the Village of Pelham’s Comprehensive Plan rests on the fact that “the Comprehensive Plan is meant to serve as a vision and a blueprint for the village for future development and re-development.” Again, the Comprehensive Plan was intended simply as a vision for development in the Village, as opposed to zoning amendments or specific plans for physical development.
What the Plan Looks Like:
The plan presents policy and land-use recommendations, as well as an implementation matrix. The implementation matrix lists “possible action items” that could potentially be used in the future to further recommendations listed within the plan. However, the implementation chapter did contain a zoning map on page 91.

For More Information on the Village of Pelham’s Comprehensive Plan:

Village of Tarrytown, Comprehensive Plan, 2007
Negative Declaration Prepared by: BFJ Planning
Contact: Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
Similar to the previously discussed Comprehensive Plans, the Village of Tarrytown went forward with a negative declaration in their SEQRA compliance process due to the fact that the plan does not contain specific zoning amendments or actual land use changes. The Comprehensive Plan is purely a visionary policy document. Thus, the negative declaration stated that there would be no significant adverse impacts to adopting the master plan.

What the Plan Looks Like:
The Tarrytown Comprehensive Plan begins an introduction to the village’s regional and local setting, existing land use and zoning, and demographics. These introductory chapters are then followed by traditional comprehensive plan topic areas including housing, economic development open space, transportation, etc. The final chapter of the plan is titled “Chapter 10: Future Land Use Plan and Implementation.”

For More Information on the Village of Tarrytown’s Comprehensive Plan:

Town of Somers, Comprehensive Master Plan, In Progress
Negative Declaration Prepared by: BFJ Planning
Contact: Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
Somers anticipates that their draft comprehensive plan will not require a full GEIS and that the full version of the EAF will result in a negative declaration. This assumption is based on the fact that relatively modest changes are proposed in the forthcoming comprehensive plan with no significant land use and development changes proposed.

A Draft of the Somers Comprehensive Plan Update has not yet been released.
For More Information on the Town of Somers Comprehensive Plan:
http://www.somersny.com/Pages/SomersNY_Planning/somersmasterplan
SEQR COMPLIANCE CASE STUDIES FOR GEIS IN HUDSON VALLEY

Village of Port Chester, Comprehensive Plan & Zoning Map & Text Amendments, 2012

Contact: Vince Ferrandino, Principal, 914.345.5820 ext. 101, info@faplanners.com

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
The Port Chester comprehensive plan was reviewed concurrently with updated zoning map and zoning text amendments, initiatives which may reasonably be assumed will have significant impacts on the environment and built form within the village. Due to these initiatives and the potential adverse environmental impacts which may pursue, the Village of Port Chester filed a positive declaration and went forward with the completion of a generic environmental impact statement.

The two main components of the GEIS are Environmental Analyses and Build-Out & Associated Impact Analyses. The Environmental Analyses section begins with a relatively in-depth review of existing conditions (zoning, policy, stats, etc.) followed by potential impacts. The potential impacts section is relatively redundant of the comprehensive plan itself, essentially restating what strategies and actions recommended within the plan. A short paragraph on mitigation measure clarifies that the adoption and implementation of the Comp Plan “will not in and of itself impact land because it does not directly authorize any particular development project,” and that all future land developments will be subject to individual review. Similarly, mitigation measure within the transportation environmental analysis section recommend “improve traffic management, safety, parking and energy conservation measures.”

The Build-Out Analysis was completed for two capacities; (1) village-wide and (2) more detailed analysis of three Focus Areas selected for rezoning. Assessment was done using maximum build-out potential and focuses mainly on the net number of residential units resulting from the Proposed Action. Examination of potential environmental impacts stemming from the Proposed Action included fiscal, traffic, infrastructure (stormwater, water supply, and wastewater), natural resources, and visual assessment. For all potential impacts, recommendations for mitigation were also provided. As an example, the listed fiscal impacts include number of public school children generated, residential tax revenue per zone, residential average assessment per zone, all zones- taxes paid, total taxes for downzoned areas, total taxes for upzoned areas. The traffic analysis stated an expected decrease in number of vehicular trips due to an overall reduction of residential densities in the village.

What the Plan Looks Like:
The Comprehensive Plan was prepared by BFJ Planning in association with Urbanomics. The comprehensive planning process was done concurrently with three additional studies: Local Waterfront Revitalization Program, Port Chester Housing Study, and Route 1/North Main Street Corridor Study. Rather than “strategies” the planning document lists “recommendations” within each topic area. Similar to the NCCP, the Port Chester Comprehensive Plan identifies “three Planning Intensity Zones” in order to provide geographic framework for the land use strategies and zoning recommendations. In addition to a map depicting the location of the Planning Intensity Zones, an Official Zoning Map is also included within the plan.

For More Information on the Village of Port Chester’s Comprehensive Plan:
http://www.portchesterny.com/Pages/PortChesterNY_Webdocs/plan
Rockland County, Comprehensive Plan, 2011

GEIS Prepared by: BFJ Planning
Contact: Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476

Sub-Consultants:
Urbanomics - Contact: Regina Armstrong, Principal (212) 353-7465
McLaren Engineering Group- Contact: Steven L. Grogg, P.E., Chief, Site-Civil Division (845) 353-6400

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
The rationale for going forward with a GEIS as opposed to a negative declaration was not clearly stated within the documentation. It is assumed that the inclusion of a relatively detailed build-out analysis within the comprehensive plan may have prompted the locality and advising consultants to engage in a more detailed GEIS approach.

The structure of the GEIS consists of (1) a list of policies proposed by the comprehensive plan, (2) a list of recommendations proposed by the comprehensive plan to address deficiencies and challenges, and (3) mitigation measures. For the majority of topic areas, the “mitigation measures” section states something along the lines of “impacts that are associated with the Comprehensive Plan’s transportation recommendations are beneficial. Some minor fiscal impacts may occur but these do not constitute significant environmental impacts for purposes of SEQR. Therefore, adoption of the Comprehensive Plan is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse transportation impacts and no mitigation measures are required.” Overall, the document uses mostly existing conditions maps and charts rather than newly generated illustratives depicting potential future scenarios.

See MATTER OF SCHAEFER V. LEGISLATURE OF ROCKLAND COUNTY in Section III

What the Plan Looks Like:
The Comprehensive Plan was prepared by BFJ Planning, Urbanomics, and McLaren Engineering Group. The Land Use and Zoning chapter contains existing conditions, a residential build-out analysis (an effort that was begun by the County in 2007, and is “consistent with the existing zoning and development patterns”), issues, and recommendations. The recommendations look similar to NCCP strategies. For example:

Recommendation #1: Concentrate Growth in Existing Centers
- Promoting a mix of uses including office, retail, and residential.
- Identifying brownfields and greyfields.
- Adaptive reuse of older historic and industrial buildings.
- Upgrading the infrastructure and amenities

Subsequent chapters have a similar structure to the Land Use and Zoning chapter, with the exception of the inclusion of a build-out analysis.

For More Information on Rockland County’s Comprehensive Plan:
http://rocklandgov.com/departments/planning/comprehensive-plan/

Town of Clarkstown (Rockland), Comprehensive Plan, 2009

GEIS Prepared by: Town of Clarkstown Planning Department
Contact: Jose C. Simoes, Town Planner, 845.639.2070
Consultants to the Special Board:
Pace Land Use Law Center (Public Facilitation), Saratoga Associates (Econ Development), Geospatial and Ecological Services (Biodiversity), Cambridge Systematics, Inc. with the RBA Group & Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates (Transportation), CT male Associates. P.C. (Recreation, Parks & Open Space)

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
The rationale for completing a GEIS could not be determined. The GEIS portion of the document evaluates the potential impacts of the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and objectives. The evaluation portion of the report includes a table outlining (1) impact, (2) topic, (3) goal or objective, and (4) mitigation (see tables below). A table with these four columns was created for impacts regarding land, water, air, plants and animals, aesthetic resources, open space and recreation, transportation, energy, noise and odor, public health, growth & character of community or neighborhood.

What the Plan Looks Like:
The Comprehensive Plan and GEIS were drafted as one document. The first two main chapters address the Comprehensive Plan Goals & Objectives and Implementation. The Goals & Objectives Chapter is broken up into the traditional categories (economic development, transportation, housing, etc). The Implementation Chapter addresses infrastructure improvements, map changes, and zoning text amendments, but only very briefly and in narrative form (total of 5 pages). The following Evaluation of Potential Impacts chapter and Analysis of Alternatives chapter address analysis for SEQRA compliance.

For More Information on the Town of Clarkstown’s Comprehensive Plan:
http://town.clarkstown.ny.us/Html/DGEIS.asp

Town of Yorktown, Comprehensive Plan, 2010
434 Sixth Avenue, Fifth Floor, New York, (212) 475-3030

Sub-Consultants: Sive, Paget & Riesel, P.C. – Special Environmental Counsel
460 Park Avenue New York, N.Y. 10022 (212) 421-2150

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
Yorktown undertook a full GEIS because the comprehensive plan included substantial changes to the zoning code. Rather than split the process of rezoning and the comprehensive plan update, Yorktown decided to do them together. The GEIS report uses narrative format to compare future baseline conditions to likely impacts of the Proposed Action. For each topic area (utility infrastructure, transportation, community character, etc.) the report discusses existing conditions, future baseline conditions, and likely impacts of proposed action. As an example, the future baseline condition for transportation includes language such as “there could be as many as 4,200 additional vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and 6,800 additional trips in the PM peak hour.” The section regarding “Impacts of the Proposed Action” specifically states the difficulty of evaluating the numerous combinations of development that could occur. Instead the section makes general assessment conclusions such as “proposed actions appear likely to generate a level of development that would require traffic impact studies.
in the Jefferson Valley, Mohegan Lake, and Yorktown Heights business centers. Alternatively, mitigation
measures including a reduction in office buildout could be applied so as to avoid the traffic impacts.”

What the Plan Looks Like:
Comp Plan was prepared by Phillips Preiss Grygiel, LLC, Dodson Associates, and Eng-Wong Taub & Associates.
Traditional Comprehensive Plan structure with vision statement, goals, overview (i.e. existing conditions), and
policies (i.e. strategies) for each of the traditional topic areas. Only spatial component is a Proposed Land Use
Plan.

For More Information on the Town of Yorktown’s Comprehensive Plan:
http://www.yorktownny.org/planning/yorktown-comprehensive-plan-seqra-page

Village of Ossining, Comprehensive Plan, 2009
Contact: (212) 475-3030

Sub-Consultants: Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, (212) 479-5400

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
The Village engaged into a full generic environmental impact statement during their SEQRA compliance process
due to the fact that the Comprehensive Plan was adopted simultaneously with amendments to the Zoning Code
and a Local Waterfront Redevelopment Program (LWRP) for the Village of Ossining. In addition to the vision
proposed within the Comprehensive Plan, the associated amendments to the Zoning Code and LWRP provided
specific regulatory changes and a new zoning maps that may have increased potential for adverse environmental
impacts

What the Plan Looks Like:
The Comprehensive Plan includes amendments to the Zoning Code and a Local Waterfront Redevelopment
Program (LWRP) for the Village of Ossining

Town of Mamaroneck, B & SB (TOD) Zoning Text and Map Amendments, 2013
GEIS Prepared by: BFJ Planning
Contact: Frank S. Fish, Principal, 212.353.7476

Approach to SEQR Compliance:
Similar to Yorktown, the Town of Mamaroneck prepared a basic narrative discussion for each topic area
(transportation, land use, etc) consisting of existing conditions, potential impacts, and mitigation measures if
necessary. Traffic generation estimates were based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip
Generation Handbook methodology.

For More Information on the Town of Mamaroneck’s GEIS:
http://www.village.mamaroneck.ny.us/pages/mamaroneckny_webdocs/Mamaroneck%20DGEIS%20Proposed