

## Appendix E:

# NYSDAM Site Plan Process Guidelines

and reviewed locally through a process which includes public notice and hearing, much like zoning laws are adopted and amended. Therefore, absent any showing of an overriding local concern, generally, an exemption from special use permit requirements should be provided to farm operations located within an agricultural district.

The application of site plan and special permit requirements to farm operations can have significant adverse impacts on such operations. Site plan and special permit review, depending upon the specific requirements in a local law, can be expensive due to the need to retain professional assistance to certify plans or simply to prepare the type of detailed plans required by the law. The lengthy approval process in some local laws can be burdensome, especially considering a farm's need to undertake management and production practices in a timely and efficient manner. Site plan and special permit fees can be especially costly for start-up farm operations.

Generally, farmers should exhaust their local administrative remedies and seek, for example, permits, exemptions available under local law or area variances before the Department reviews the administration of a local law. However, an administrative requirement/process may, itself, be unreasonably restrictive. The Department evaluates the reasonableness of the specific requirement/process, as well as the substantive requirements imposed on the farm operation. The Department has found local laws which regulate the health and safety aspects of the construction of farm buildings through provisions to meet local building codes or the State Building Code (unless exempt from the State Building Code <sup>1</sup>) and Health Department requirements not to be unreasonably restrictive. Requirements for local building permits and certificates of occupancy to ensure that health and safety requirements are met are also generally not unreasonably restrictive.

### **Site Plan Review for Farm Operations within an Agricultural District**

Many local governments share the Department's view that farm operations should not have to undergo site plan review and exempt farms from that requirement. However, the Department recognizes the desire of some local governments to have an opportunity to review agricultural development and projects within their borders, as well as the need of farmers for an efficient, economical, and predictable process. In view of both interests, the Department developed a model streamlined site plan review process which attempts to respond to the farmers' concerns while ensuring the ability to have local issues examined. The process could be used for farm buildings and structures (new and significant expansions) proposed for a site, but should not be required for non-structural agricultural uses. For example, to require farm operations in an agricultural district to undergo site plan review to engage in the production,

---

<sup>1</sup> A discussion of the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code follows below.

preparation and marketing of crops, livestock and livestock products, would generally be unreasonably restrictive.

The authorizing statutes for requiring site plan review are quite broad and under "home rule" municipalities retain significant flexibility in crafting specialized procedures (e.g., the selection of a reviewing board; uses which trigger submission of site plans; whether to have a public hearing and the length of time to review an application). Town Law §274-a and Village Law §7-725-a define a site plan as "a rendering, drawing, or sketch prepared to specifications and containing necessary elements as set forth in the applicable zoning ordinance or local law which shows the arrangement, layout and design of the proposed use of a single parcel of land... ." These sections of law further outline a list of potential site plan elements including parking, means of access, screening, signs, landscaping, architectural features, location and dimensions of buildings, adjacent land uses and physical features meant to protect adjacent land uses as well as additional elements.

Many municipalities have also added optional phases to the site plan review. While a preliminary conference, preliminary site plan review and public hearings may assist the applicant earlier in the review process and provide the public an opportunity to respond to a project, they can result in a costly delay for the farmer.

For the sake of simplicity, the model site plan process and the following guidance presume that the planning board is the reviewing authority.

### **Site Plan Process**

The applicant for site plan review and approval shall submit the following:

- 1) Sketch of the parcel on a location map (e.g., tax map) showing boundaries and dimensions of the parcel of land involved and identifying contiguous properties and any known easements or rights-of-way and roadways.

Show the existing features of the site including land and water areas, water or sewer systems and the approximate location of all existing structures on or immediately adjacent to the site.

- 2) Show the proposed location and arrangement of buildings and uses on the site, including means of ingress and egress, parking and circulation of traffic.
- 3) Sketch of any proposed building, structure or sign, including exterior dimensions and elevations of front, side and rear views. Include copies of any available blueprints, plans or drawings.

- 4) Provide a description of the project and a narrative of the intended use of such proposed buildings, structures or signs, including any anticipated changes in the existing topography and natural features of the parcel to accommodate the changes. Include the name and address of the applicant and any professional advisors. If the applicant is not the owner of the property, provide authorization of the owner.
- 5) If any new structures are going to be located adjacent to a stream or wetland provide a copy of the floodplain map and wetland map that corresponds with the boundaries of the property.
- 6) Application form and fee (if required).

If the municipality issues a permit for the structure, the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) determines if the structures are subject to and comply with the local building code or New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code prior to issuing the permit. Similarly, the Zoning Enforcement Officer (or the CEO in certain municipalities) would ensure compliance with applicable zoning provisions.

The Department urges local governments to take into account the size and nature of the particular farm buildings and structures when setting and administering any site plan requirements for farm operations. The review process, as outlined above, should generally not require professional assistance (e.g., architects, engineers or surveyors) to complete or review and could be completed relatively quickly.<sup>2</sup> The Department understands, however, that in some cases, a public hearing and/or a more detailed review of the project which may include submission of a survey, architectural or engineering drawings or plans, etc., may be necessary. The degree of regulation that may be considered unreasonably restrictive depends on the nature of the proposed activities, the size and complexity of the proposed buildings or structures and whether a State agricultural exemption applies.

### **Time Frame for Review and Decision**

Town Law §274-a and Village Law §7-725-a require that a decision on a site plan application be made within a maximum of 62 days after receipt of the application or date of a public hearing, if one is required. Town and Village Law authorize town boards and village boards of trustees to adopt public hearing requirements and local laws often provide planning boards with the discretion whether to hold a public hearing. The Department recommends that if the municipality requires construction of farm buildings and structures within a state certified agricultural district to undergo site plan review, that the review and decision be expedited within 45 days, with no public hearing. The Department recognizes that the Town Law allows municipalities to determine which uses

---

<sup>2</sup> Please see discussion of Agricultural Exemptions below.

must undergo site plan review, the time frame for review (within the 62 day maximum), and whether to conduct a public hearing. A protracted review of most agricultural projects could, however, result in significant economic impacts to farmers.

The process outlined above affords the community an opportunity to examine a proposed agricultural project and to evaluate and mitigate potential impacts in light of public health, safety and welfare without unduly burdening farm operations. Of course, the “process” must also be administered in a manner that does not unreasonably restrict or regulate farm operations. For example, conditions placed upon an approval or the cost and time involved to complete the review process could be unreasonably restrictive.

### **Agricultural Exemptions**

**State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)** - Agricultural farm management practices, including construction, maintenance and repair of farm buildings and structures, and land use changes consistent with “generally accepted principles of farming” are designated as Type II actions which do not require preparation of an Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and are not subject to compliance with State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR). 6 NYCRR §617.5(a), (c)(3). [See *In the Matter of Pure Air and Water Inc. of Chemung County v. Davidsen*, 246 A.D.2d 786, 668 N.Y.S.2d 248 (3<sup>rd</sup> Dept. 1998), for application of the exemption to the manure management activities of a hog farm.] The SEQR regulations require localities to recognize the Type II actions contained in the statewide list.

**New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code** - While farmers must comply with local requirements which regulate health and safety aspects of the construction of farm buildings, many farm buildings are exempt from the State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code (“Uniform Code”). The Uniform Code recently underwent major revisions and now is comprised of seven sub-codes (the Building Code, Fire Code, Residential Code, Plumbing Code, Mechanical Code, Fuel Gas Code, and the Property Maintenance Code). The exemption for agricultural buildings has been incorporated in the following portions of the revised Uniform Code and the Energy Conservation Construction Code, which became fully effective on January 1, 2003.

- Agricultural building is defined in §202 of the Building Code as “A structure designed and constructed to house farm implements, hay, grain, poultry, livestock, or other horticultural products. This structure shall not be a place of human habitation or a place of employment where agricultural products are processed, treated or packaged, nor shall it be a place used by the public.”

- Building Code §101.2(2) provides an exemption from the Building Code for "[a]gricultural buildings used solely in the raising, growing or storage of agricultural products by a farmer engaged in a farming operation."
- Section 102.1(5) of the Fire Code of New York State provides that "[a]gricultural buildings used solely in the raising, growing or storage of agricultural products by a farmer engaged in a farming operation" are exempt from the provisions of the Fire Code pertaining to construction but are subject to applicable requirements of fire safety practice and methodology.
- Section 101.4.2.5 of the Energy Conservation Construction Code ("ECCC") exempts "nonresidential farm buildings, including barns, sheds, poultry houses and other buildings and equipment on the premises used directly and solely for agricultural purposes" from the provisions of the ECCC.

The above briefly highlights the agricultural buildings exemptions. Any specific questions regarding the interpretation and applicability of the revised State Uniform Fire Protection and Building Code should be directed to the Department of State's Codes Division at (518) 474-4073.

**Professionally Stamped Plans** - Education Law §7209(1) provides that no official of the State or any city, county, town or village charged with the enforcement of laws, ordinances or regulations may accept or approve any plans or specifications that are not stamped with the seal of an architect, or professional engineer, or land surveyor licensed or authorized to practice in the State. Thus, where local laws, ordinances or regulations require that plans and specifications for private construction be accepted or approved, they may not be accepted or approved without the required seal, subject to the exceptions set forth in the statute. 1981 Op Atty Gen April 27 (Informal).

However, the exceptions contained in Education Law §7209(7)(b) include "farm buildings, including barns, sheds, poultry houses and other buildings used directly and solely for agricultural purposes." As a result, plans and specifications for such buildings are not required to be stamped by an architect, professional engineer or land surveyor.<sup>3</sup>

Against this backdrop, specific guidelines for review of zoning and planning regulations by local governments and the Department can best be understood.

### **Generic Review Guidelines**

Generic reviews are those of entire zoning regulations or sections of zoning regulations that impact the municipality's farm community as a class or several farm operations in the same way. Examples of actions which might result in a generic review include the adoption or administration of an entirely new or

---

<sup>3</sup> Similar requirements and exceptions are also provided in Education Law §7307(1) and (5).

substantially amended zoning regulation that results in a material change in the use and area standards applied to farm operations in a State certified agricultural district. In such cases, the Department recommends that the municipality ask itself the following questions:

- Do the regulations materially limit the definition of farm operation, farm or agriculture in a way that conflicts with the definition of “farm operation” in AML §301, subd.11?
- Do the regulations relegate any farm operations in agricultural districts to “non-conforming” status?
- Is the production, preparation and marketing of any crop, livestock or livestock product as a commercial enterprise materially limited, restricted or prohibited?
- Are certain classes of agriculture subject to more intensive reviews or permitting requirements than others? For example, is “animal agriculture” treated differently than crop production without demonstrated links to a specific and meaningful public health or safety standard designed to address a real and tangible threat?
- Are any classes of agricultural activities meeting the definition of “farm operation” subject to special permit, site plan review or other original jurisdiction review standard over and above ministerial review?
- Are “farm operations” subject to more intensive reviews than non-farm uses in the same zoning district?
- Are “farm operations” treated as integrated and interdependent uses, or collections of independent and competing uses on the same property?
- Is the regulation in accordance with a comprehensive plan and is such a plan crafted consistent with AML Article 25-AA as required by law?

If the answer to any of the first six questions is “yes,” or if the answer to either of the last two is “no,” the zoning regulations under review are likely to be problematic and may be in violation of AML §305-a, subd.1. Certainly such regulations would appear to be on their “face” inconsistent with the statutory requirement that *“Local governments ...shall exercise these powers in such manner as may realize the policy and goals set forth in this article [Article 25AA-Agricultural Districts].”*

### **Guidelines for Site Specific Reviews**

AML §305-a zoning case reviews often involve application of zoning regulations to a specific farm operation. Such cases typically result from applying the site plan, special use permit, use or non-conforming use sections, yard requirements, or lot density sections of the municipal zoning device to an existing farm operation.

These cases often evolve because although the zoning regulation may appear to be consistent with the agricultural districts law, its application to a specific issue or set of facts is not. In such cases, the Department recommends that the municipality ask itself the following questions:

- Is the zoning regulation or restriction being applied to a use normally and customarily associated with a “farm operation” as defined in AML Article 25-AA?
- Does the regulation or restriction materially limit the expansion or improvement of the operation without offering some compelling public benefit?
- Is the regulation or restriction applicable to the specific farm operation in question or, under the same circumstances, would it apply to other farm operations in the community?
- Does the zoning regulation impose greater regulation or restriction on a use or farming activity than may already be imposed by State or federal statute, rule or regulation?
- Is the regulation or restriction the result of legislative action that rendered the farm operation a “non-conforming use”?

If the answer to any of these questions is yes, then the zoning regulation or restriction under review is likely to be problematic and may be in violation of the statutory prohibitions against unreasonably restrictive regulation of farm operations in an agricultural district, unless a threat to the public health or safety is demonstrated.

### **Guidance on Specific Zoning Issues**

The following are some specific factors that the Department considers when reviewing local zoning laws<sup>4</sup>:

#### **A. Minimum and Maximum Dimensions**

Generally the Department will consider whether minimum and maximum dimensions imposed by a local law can accommodate existing and/or future farm needs. For example, many roadside stands are located within existing garages, barns, and outbuildings that may have dimensions greater than those set by a local ordinance. Also, buildings specifically designed and constructed to accommodate farm activities may not meet the local size requirements (e.g., silos and barns which may exceed maximum height limitations). The size and scope of the farm operation should also be considered. Larger farms, for example, cannot effectively market their produce through a traditional roadside

---

<sup>4</sup> Please see other Department guidance documents for further information on issues related to specific types of farm buildings and practices.

stand and may require larger farm markets with utilities, parking, sanitary facilities, etc.

## B. Lot Size

Establishing a minimum lot size for farm operations within a zoning district that includes land within a State certified agricultural district might be unreasonably restrictive. The definition of "farm operation" in AML §301, subd. 11 does not include an acreage threshold. Therefore, the Department has not set a minimum acreage necessary for protection under AML §305-a and conducts reviews on a case-by-case basis. For example, a nursery/greenhouse operation conducted on less than 5 or 10 acres may be protected as a "farm operation" under §305-a if the operation is a "commercial enterprise" and more than a hobby farm.

For agricultural assessment purposes, however, AML §301, subd. 4 states that a farm must have "land used in agricultural production" to qualify (either seven or more acres and gross sales of an average of \$10,000 or more in the preceding two years *or* have less than seven acres and average gross sales of more than \$50,000 in the preceding two years). A recent amendment to AML §301, subd. 4 also provides for an agricultural assessment on seven or more acres which has an *annual* gross sales of \$10,000 or more "...when such land is owned or rented by a newly established farm operation in the first year of operation." AML §301, subd. 4.h. *Laws of 2003, Chapter 479*, effective September 9, 2003.

Local requirements for minimum lot sizes for farm buildings raises concerns similar to those involving minimum and maximum building dimensions. A farmer may be unable to meet a minimum lot size due to the configuration of the land used for production or lying fallow as part of a conservation reserve program. The need to be proximate to existing farm roads, a water supply, sewage disposal and other utilities is also essential. Farm buildings are usually located on the same property that supports other farm structures. Presumably, minimum lot size requirements are adopted to prevent over concentration of buildings and to assure an adequate area to install any necessary utilities. Farm buildings should be allowed to be sited on the same lot as other agricultural use structures subject to the provision of adequate water and sewage disposal facilities and meeting minimum setbacks between structures.

## C. Setbacks

Minimum setbacks from front, back and side yards for farm buildings have not been viewed as unreasonably restrictive unless a setback distance is unusually long. Setbacks that coincide with those required for other similar structures have, in general, been viewed as reasonable.

A farm operation's barns, storage buildings and other facilities may already be located within a required setback, or the farm operation may need to locate new facilities within the setback to meet the farm operation's needs. Also, adjoining land may consist of vacant land, woodland or farmland. The establishment of unreasonable setback distances increases the cost of doing business for farmers because the infrastructure needed to support the operation (e.g., water supply, utilities and farm roads) is often already located within, and adjacent to, the farmstead area or existing farm structures. Setbacks can also increase the cost of, or make it impracticable to construct new structures for the farm operation.

#### D. Sign Limitations:

Whether or not a limitation on the size and/or number of signs that may be used to advertise a farm operation is unreasonably restrictive of a farm operation depends upon the location of the farm and the type of operation. A farmer who is located on a principally traveled road probably will not need as many signs as one who is located on a less traveled road and who may need directional signs to direct the public to the farm. The size of a sign needed may depend on whether the sign is used to advertise the farm's produce or services (e.g., for a commercial horse boarding operation) as part of the farm's direct marketing, or just for directional purposes.

#### E. Maximum Lot Coverage

Establishing a maximum lot coverage that may be occupied by structures may be unreasonably restrictive. For example, it may be difficult for horticultural operations to recoup their investment in the purchase of land if they are not allowed to more fully utilize a lot/acreage for greenhouses. Farm operations within an agricultural district should be allowed the maximum use of available land, consistent with the need to protect the public health or safety. Generally, if setbacks between buildings are met and adequate space is available for interior roads, parking areas (where required), and safe operation of vehicles and equipment, health and safety concerns are minimized.

#### F. Screening and Buffers

Some municipalities impose buffer requirements, including setbacks where vegetation, landscaping, a wall or fencing is required to partially or completely screen adjacent land uses. Often, the buffer area cannot be used or encroached upon by any activities on the lot. Requirements for buffers or setbacks to graze animals, construct fences and otherwise use land for agricultural purposes are generally unreasonably restrictive.

Buffers and associated setbacks may require farmers to remove land from production or otherwise remove land from use for the farm operation. The impact on nursery/greenhouse operations is especially significant since they are often

conducted on smaller parcels of land. Maintenance of the buffer also creates a hardship to the landowner. If a setback is required for fencing, the farmer may have to incur the expense of double fencing the perimeter of the property, or portion thereof, to prevent encroachment by neighboring property owners.

A requirement to screen a farm operation or agricultural structures such as farm labor housing or greenhouses from view has been found by the Department to be unreasonably restrictive. Screening requirements suggest that farm operations and associated structures are, in some way, objectionable or different from other forms of land use that do not have to be screened. Farmers should not be required to bear the extra costs to provide screening unless such requirements are otherwise warranted by special local conditions or necessary to address a threat to the public health or safety. While aesthetics are an appropriate and important consideration under zoning and planning laws, the purpose of the Agricultural Districts Law is to conserve and protect agricultural lands by promoting the retention of farmland in active agricultural use.