

**Village of Port Dickinson  
Planning Board Meeting  
December 20, 2022**

<b>Present:</b>	<b>Chairperson:</b>	<b>Rob Warholic</b>
	<b>Board Members:</b>	<b>Patrick Doyle</b>
		<b>Stefanie Kermidas</b>
		<b>Peter Dionne</b>
	<b>Attorney:</b>	<b>Nathan D. VanWhy</b>
	<b>Village Clerk:</b>	<b>Susan Fox</b>
	<b>Building Inspector:</b>	<b>not present</b>
	<b>Applicants:</b>	<b>Jay Abbey</b>
		<b>Justin Abbey</b>

The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm by Chairperson Rob Warholic

**Purpose of meeting:**

Public hearing for new batch concrete plant at 18 Phelps St.

**Reference Documents:**

Letter from Broome County planning department, Beth Lucas dated November 15, 2022  
Response from Mr Abbey to comments from Broome County Planning comments  
New new email from Broome County confirming no further comments.  
Set of documents from Mr. Abbey detailing the proposed concrete batch plant

**PLANNING BOARD REVIEW:**

Overview of new batch concrete plant.  
New plant to produce about 10 cu. yds of concrete vs old plant output of 3 cu. yds.  
New plant could be used to service other Binghamton Precast facilities if needed however primary purpose is provide concrete for production at 18 Phelps St. facility.  
Required two new concrete trucks to move concrete to production areas.  
New plant is more efficient than the existing stationary batch plant.  
Binghamton Precast will not sell premix to other customers. Concrete is for internal use only.  
Once new plant is up and running the old plant will shut down and will be dismantled.  
Binghamton Precast has no intention to run both plants simultaneously.  
Four bins will be used for new plant  
    More cement storage to buffer recent shortages  
    Several different types of cements  
Questions from Patrick Doyle:  
    Will hours of operation change? Answer: no  
    Will track traffic increase? Answer: No  
Dust mitigation measure  
    No plans to run the concrete trucks out of Phelps St. facility  
    The vibratory bins will be eliminated reducing noise to neighbors

**Public comment**

Rocco Testani 29 Phelps St.

Mr. Testani wanted to know location of new batch plant and is concerned about location of new plant. Plant location was communicated, and no further concerns were raised were raised by Mr. Testani.

Peter Dionne made motion to close public meeting, Patrick Doyle seconded motion, all members approved.

Time meeting closed 6:55pm

**SEQR review:**

Part one: Provides details that will help the lead agency understand the location, size, type, and characteristics of the proposed project. Topics discussed:

- 1) Potential of this project to conflict to the village comprehensive plan. Since project is within a zoned PUD and is zoned Industrial, no conflict was identified.
- 2) The letter containing comments about the project from Beth Lucas dated November 15, 2022. Mr. Jay Abby thought that comments from Beth Lucas was aimed at any potential future tenants of the property. Planning Board discussed and concluded that there is no concern.

Peter Dionne made motion to have PD planning board be the lead agency and change assessment to an unlisted short environmental assessment.

Patrick Doyle seconded motion.

all members approved.

Motion accepted.

Part two: This part is used to help the lead agency identify potential impacts that may result from the project. Review of the SEQR form, does the proposed project:

- 1) Create material conflict with land use. No impact.
- 2) Change in use of land: no or small impact. Replacement of existing capacity
- 3) Character of community, no impact, because it is an existing plant
- 4) Environmental impact; none or small impact
- 5) Increase transportation or impact to transportation: none or small impact
- 6) Increase in energy resource, use of renewables: none
- 7) Impact to existing public water supplies: none, there will be a net reduction of public water due to new private well water. Drainage or sewage impact: no or none. Truck washout lagoon provided for waste removal, and it is controlled.
- 8) Impacts architecture or aesthetic: none
- 9) Adverse change to natural resources? no or small, still a regulated facility
- 10) Drainage problems: no or none.
- 11) Hazard to human safety none or small impact

Part three: Part 3 is used by the lead agency to determine if the potential adverse impacts identified in Part 2 are significant or not. Concrete batch plants are regulated by EPA and DEC and therefore the board concluded there will not be an significant impact of this project.

Peter Dionne made motion to declare a negative declaration to the state Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF).

Stefanie Kermidas seconded motion.

all members approved.

Motion accepted.

Patrick Doyle made motion to approve project request with the following condition:  
The removal of the existing stationary batch plant shall occur within 6 months from the time NY State DOT or the PA DOT certifies that the new plant to produce concrete.  
Stefanie Kermidas seconded motion.  
all members approved.  
Motion accepted.

Peter Dionne made motion to adjourn meeting  
Stefanie Kermidas seconded motion.  
all members approved.

Respectfully submitted,  
Peter Dionne  
Village Planning Board Member.