page 436

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION # 2017-1274

WHEREAS, paragraph 3.14 (Alternatives Analysis) of the Proposed Westwood Development FGEIS prepared by Stantec Inc. presently reads, in pertinent part:

"Specifically, the following alternatives need to be provided:

- 1) A predominantly residential alternative with a lower intensity neighborhood-scale commercial component. The alternative should consider a more gradual transition from the surrounding single-family neighborhoods to the more intense uses on the subject parcel; and
- 2) An alternative whereby the scale and magnitude of the project is commensurate with the existing utility capacities. This alternate may consider future phases that could be developed as available utility capacities are realized."

and

WHEREAS, this language creates an inappropriate presumption that the property comprising the former Westwood Country Club will include "commercial component[s]" and "more intense uses," and that future Amherst Town Boards will contemplate expenditures of taxpayer funds to increase sewer capacity on said property;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Proposed Westwood Development FGEIS be and hereby is amended to delete the foregoing language from paragraph 3.14 (Alternatives Analysis), and to replace it with the following language:

"This issue has been raised with the Applicant, but to date there have been no additional alternatives provided to the Lead Agency."

and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Resolution 2017-1274 shall provide for a finding and determination that the FGEIS prepared by Stantec Inc., as amended, shall be deemed complete and filed with the "Notice of Completion" as required by the procedure set forth in paragraph 2 of Resolution 2017-1274.

Current Language in Paragraph 3.14 (Alternatives Analysis) of Proposed Westwood Development FGEIS:

han to a

One of the components of the DGEIS is to provide a description and evaluation of the range of reasonable alternatives to the action that are feasible, considering the objectives of the project sponsor as set forth in 6 NYCRR 617.9(b)(5)(v). The Lead Agency agrees with the commenters that DGEIS did not adequately address all reasonable alternatives, although it is acknowledged that the Concept Plan has developed since the DGEIS was approved for public comment. As set forth herein, however, there are environmental factors that have been identified since the DGEIS was deemed adequate for public comment, such as the limited sewer capacity. As such, the Lead Agency has determined that there are other reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project that could and should be evaluated in further detail. Specifically, the following alternatives need to be provided:

- 1) A predominantly residential alternative with a lower intensity neighborhood-scale commercial component. The alternative should consider a more gradual transition from the surrounding single-family neighborhoods to the more intense uses on the subject parcel; and
- 2) An alternative whereby the scale and magnitude of the project is commensurate with the existing utility capacities. This alternate may consider future phases that could be developed as available utility capacities are realized.

Proposed Revised Language for Paragraph 3.14 (Alternatives Analysis) of Proposed Westwood Development FGEIS:

One of the components of the DGEIS is to provide a description and evaluation of the range of reasonable alternatives to the action that are feasible, considering the objectives of the project sponsor as set forth in 6 NYCRR 617.9(b)(5)(v). The Lead Agency agrees with the commenters that DGEIS did not adequately address all reasonable alternatives, although it is acknowledged that the Concept Plan has developed since the DGEIS was approved for public comment. As set forth herein, however, there are environmental factors that have been identified since the DGEIS was deemed adequate for public comment, such as the limited sewer capacity. As such, the Lead Agency has determined that there are other reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project that could and should be evaluated in further detail. This issue has been raised with the Applicant, but to date there have been no additional alternatives provided to the Lead Agency.