



BT Holdings Residential Project
Town Board Meeting
December 14, 2011

Table of Contents

- 1) Executive Summary
- 2) Project History
- 3) Revisions since DEIS
- 4) Major Issues
- 5) Project Benefits
- 6) Annexation

Executive Summary

- Town's 2003 Comprehensive Plan specifically designated this property for senior and multifamily housing
- Annexation being sought to access Village's municipal water supply
- Project has been navigating SEQRA for the past 4 years with the Chester Village Board as Lead Agent
 - Substantial revisions since DEIS
 - Findings adopted 12/12/11
- Annexation vote is the next step in the process

Project History

- In 2003, the Town of Chester completed its Comprehensive Plan process which detailed a blueprint for future growth
- As part of the Town's rezoning, the 60.6 acre Town property owned by BT Holdings was zoned 'SR-6 - Residential High-Density', one of only two parcels in the entire town to be zoned as such
 - *"The Chester Mall area has land to the rear with access to the Mall and Route 17M that could be developed for senior, adult or a combination of higher-density uses with access to shopping and transportation."*
- The property was designated for this higher-density housing precisely because of its central location, easy access to municipal water and sewer services, proximity to the Chester Mall and Village historic downtown, Route 17M frontage, and easy access to Route 17

Comprehensive Plan Goals

- *“...channel future residential growth into suburban residential areas where central water and sewer services can be expanded efficiently to accommodate that growth”*
- *“...provide multiple dwellings for senior and age-oriented housing in affordable rental units in limited areas close to shopping and transportation services”*
- *“...provide for a mixture of housing types that will help promote a diverse population base”*

The proposed project accomplishes all of the above

The Project

- **A Senior Rental community of 100 apartments**
 - A mix of 1BR and 2BR age-restricted apartments housed in three-story, elevator-serviced buildings with senior-friendly design
 - Located on 10 acres at the western end of the property, next to the entranceway and a short distance from the Chester Mall
- **A Townhouse community of up to 336 homes**
 - 2BR and 3BR Townhouses of various styles and sizes dispersed over nearly 60 acres in two- and three-story buildings
 - Featured amenities to include clubhouse, fitness room, playground, swimming pool, walking trails, and picnic area, among other added benefits

The project would transform a specially-zoned and currently underutilized property into a vibrant residential development

FEIS (Current) Project



SITE DATA	
TOTAL SITE AREA:	± 68.2 ACRES
BUILDING TYPES:	
LARGE FORMAT UPHILL TOWNHOUSES:	28 UNITS
LARGE FORMAT DOWNHILL TOWNHOUSES:	66 UNITS
SMALL FORMAT UPHILL TOWNHOUSES:	53 UNITS
SMALL FORMAT DOWNHILL TOWNHOUSES:	25 UNITS
BACK-TO-BACK TOWNHOUSES:	164 UNITS
SENIOR MID-RISE APARTMENTS:	100 UNITS
TOTAL HOMES PROPOSED:	436 UNITS
PARKING:	
RESIDENTIAL GARAGE AND APRON:	784 SPACES
RESIDENTIAL (ON STREET PARKING):	146 SPACES
SENIOR PARKING:	125 SPACES
CLUBHOUSE:	41 SPACES
TOTAL SPACES PROPOSED:	1,076 SPACES
KEY	
	LARGE FORMAT UPHILL UNITS
	LARGE FORMAT DOWNHILL UNITS
	SMALL FORMAT UPHILL UNITS
	SMALL FORMAT DOWNHILL UNITS
	BACK-TO-BACK UNITS
	SENIORS

CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN - PUBLIC ROAD SCENIC ALTERNATIVE



Project Revisions since DEIS

- Since adoption of the DEIS, a number of project revisions have been adopted to address specific community concerns:
 - Total Homes Reduced
 - 3BR Townhomes Reduced
 - Removal of Buildings on Scenic Ridge
 - Public Through Road
 - Pedestrian Access to Chester Mall
 - Sustainable (Green) Design
 - Additional Senior Parking
 - \$250K for Village Water Improvements

Total Homes/3BR Townhomes Reduced

- Total proposed homes decreased from 458 to 436
- 74 3BR townhomes converted to 2BR
 - 26% decrease in number of 3BR townhomes
 - 3BR townhomes now represent less than 50% of the project
 - Project targets housing needs of seniors, empty nesters, and young professionals
 - **Just 99 projected schoolchildren for the entire project**

Removal of Buildings on Scenic Ridge

- Four buildings were completely removed from the ridge area
 - Distance to border increased from 40 feet to 200 feet (5x required setback)
 - Buildings replaced with open scenic area/park space
 - Tree-lined buffer along ridgeline further enhances aesthetic and shields visibility of any structures
- Minimum of 100 feet from senior buildings to farm's active area
 - Fence may be built along Talmadge border to further separate properties

Public Through Road

- Wide tree-lined boulevard with bike lanes bisecting property
- Connects 17M directly to Princeton Street
- Allows bypass of 17M/94 intersection
- Enhances community connectivity and benefits local traffic circulation
- Diverts Nexans truck traffic off local streets, direct access to 17M
- Roundabout as traffic calming measure, turnaround and bus-stop

Pedestrian Access to Chester Mall

- Pedestrian access to mall added by clubhouse area
- Closest location for seniors to directly access mall grounds
- Places entire development population within walking distance of primary Chester shopping locale
- Reduces vehicular trips to shopping center

Other Revisions

- Incorporation of Sustainable (Green) Design
 - Preliminary studies indicate possibility of 'LEED for Homes' Silver
 - Differentiates homes, bringing greater value and lowering long-term costs
- Additional Parking for Seniors
- \$250K contribution to fund Village water infrastructure improvements

Major Issues

- Water
- Sewer
- Traffic
- Zoning
- Financial Impact

Water

- Town cannot provide municipal water to service existing Town zoning
- Seeking annexation to access Village's municipal water supply
- Water infrastructure is accessible adjacent to the property site
- Through annexation Village would be compensated for water with property taxes

Water Question 1

Does the Village have enough water?

- Conservative studies show Village has more than enough available capacity to service the project even accounting for:
 - Development of ALL undeveloped (vacant) Village parcels
 - Development of pending Village projects
 - Peak (dry) season usage

Water Question 2

Why don't we drill for water instead?

- Studies indicate that water on site would not be able to service existing Town zoning
- Drilling would be less environmentally protective, redundant, expensive and inefficient
- Village's water infrastructure is directly adjacent to the property
- The Village has more than enough capacity to service the project

Sewer

- The property is in Town of Chester Consolidated Sewer District No.1
- The Applicant/Landowner has long paid fees into the district
- The property is therefore entitled to sewer service
- Town has existing sewer capacity of 148,000 gpd
- Upon annexation property would retain entitlement to sewer service from the district

Sewer Question

Would the property be entitled to the existing Town sewer allocation even after annexation into the Village?

- The Town of Chester Consolidated Sewer District No.1 is a town improvement district
- Per NY General Municipal Law §716(12), *“If a village annexes territory of the town in which it is situated...any such annexation shall not affect the boundaries of any town special or improvement district in such town.”*

Yes, even after annexation the property would retain entitlement to sewer service from the district

Traffic

- A full traffic capacity and impact analysis was prepared for the project
 - Traffic was measured during peak AM/PM hours on weekdays/weekends
 - Eight intersections were studied
 - A public boulevard through road was added to enhance community connectivity and improve road circulation
 - Provides a bypass around 17M/94 intersection
 - Through road creates a second access to the site

The study showed that traffic from the proposed development will *not* result in a significant adverse impact on the local street network

Zoning

- Town Comprehensive Plan specifically called for the property to be developed for “senior, adult, or a combination of higher-density uses”
- The property is currently zoned Town SR-6 (Residential High-Density)
- Upon annexation, the property would be rezoned to Village RM-N
- RM-N is a newly proposed Village zoning district comparable to Town SR-6 and Village RM

Zoning Question

Is the proposed project more dense than what is currently permitted in the Town's SR-6 zoning?

No, the proposed project is *less dense* than what would be allowable under current Town SR-6 zoning:

- Non-Age Restricted Townhomes
6.0/acre allowable under SR-6
5.8/acre for the proposed project
- Senior Apartments (proposed mix)
10.4/acre allowable under SR-6
10.0/acre for the proposed project

Projected Financial Benefits

A comprehensive financial analysis was completed to measure the impact of the development on Chester's existing citizens

Proposed Project - Annual Revenue/Cost Analysis			
Jurisdiction	Tax Revenue	Service Cost	Net Benefit
Town of Chester	\$204,084	(\$151,256)	\$52,828
Village of Chester	\$531,596	(\$226,884)	\$304,712
Chester UFSD	\$1,464,492	(\$1,308,766)	\$155,725
Chester Fire District	\$61,422	(\$45,584)	\$15,838
TOTAL	\$2,261,594	(\$1,732,490)	\$529,103

The project will not only cover its own expenses (including schoolkids), it will provide a significant net benefit to *existing* Town residents

Financial Impact Question 1

Will the project's schoolchildren result in higher taxes for existing Chester residents?

- 100 senior apartments included from the start
- Townhouses designed to target seniors/empty nesters/DINKs
- Significant reduction (74 units) in potential 3BR townhomes, lowering 3BR units to less than 50% of total project
- **Net school district *benefit* of \$156K/year**

The project would not increase taxes on existing Town residents

Financial Impact Question 2

Without annexation, what would be the financial impact of development on the property?

- Drilling for water would limit development to a subdivision of up to 120 Single-Family Homes (SFHs)
- SFHs generate significantly more schoolchildren while not paying adequate taxes to cover their cost
 - The 120 SFHs would generate 121 schoolchildren
- **Would result in huge net *deficit* to the Chester School district of **(\$619K)/year****

Financial Impact Comparison

Net Benefit/(Deficit) Comparison for Chester

Jurisdiction	Proposed Project	No-Annexation Alternative	Difference
Town of Chester	\$52,828	\$16,183	(\$36,645)
Village of Chester	\$304,712	\$21,135	(\$283,577)
Chester UFSD	\$155,725	(\$619,216)	(\$774,941)
Chester Fire District	\$15,838	\$21,799	\$5,961
TOTAL	\$529,103	(\$560,099)	(\$1,089,202)

Development without annexation would result in a **\$1.1M negative net financial impact** to Chester's existing taxpayers

Project Benefits

- Addresses the significant need for affordable senior rental housing in the Chester community
- Provides a range of maintenance-free housing alternatives for those not seeking more expensive single-family homes
- Spurs economic growth throughout the Chester business community by placing residents immediately adjacent to commercial zones
- Locates higher-density housing in appropriate central locations with access to transportation, shopping and infrastructure (water/sewer)

A residential project that more than covers its own costs and does not raise taxes on existing Chester taxpayers

Conclusion

Development WITH Annexation

- Implementation of Comprehensive Plan's community growth goals
- Significant financial benefits for the Town, Village and Chester UFSD

Development WITHOUT Annexation

- Prevents implementation of Comprehensive Plan
- Significant negative financial impacts to Chester's existing taxpayers

The annexed project would result in a 'Win-Win' scenario with clear benefits for the entire Chester community, both Town and Village