

One Town Hall Plaza
Clifton Park, New York 12065
(518) 371-6054 FAX (518)371-1136

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

PAUL PELAGALLI
Attorney

MARGARET SPRINGLI
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis

Michael Hale

Joel Koval

Eric Ophardt

Kim Paulsen

Tom Werner

(alternate) Eric Prescott

Planning Board Meeting Minutes

April 8, 2014

Those present at the April 8, 2014 Planning Board Meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, M. Hale, J. Koval, E. Ophardt,
K. Paulsen, T. Werner,

Those absent were: E. Prescott – Alternate Member

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
J. Bianchi, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.
P. Pelagalli, Counsel
M. Springli, Secretary

Mr. Ferraro called the meeting to order at 7:03pm. All in attendance stood for the pledge of allegiance.

The chairman welcomed all in attendance to the meeting. Mr. Ferraro noted that some Albany Law students were present to observe the planning process.

Minutes Approval

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Hale, to approve the minutes of the meeting on March 25, 2014 as written. Ayes: Ophardt, Andarawis, Koval, Hale, Ferraro, Paulsen. Noes: None. Abstain: Werner

II Public Hearings - start at 7:00 pm –

2010-038 Windhover Farms

Proposed (25) lot subdivision with area for future soccer fields, Zoned:CR, Grooms Road, Public hearing and possible SEQR determination

Reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Infinigy Applicant: Dailey

SBL(s)276.-1-15.21, 276.-1-27.111, 276.-1-77, 276.-1-9 Last seen on: 1/28/2014

Mr. Ferraro noted that although it was advertised for a public hearing, SEQR was not completed and therefore we would have to have another public hearing pursuant to SEQRA. The secretary read the public hearing notice as it was published on March 31, 2014 in the Daily Gazette.

Presentation

Duane Rabideau of Vanguilder and Associates represented the applicants, John Stevens and Kevin Dailey, indicating the location of the site within the town and discussed the subdivision plan within the CR zone. The consultant described 92 acres as permanent Open Space.

Staff Comments

John Scavo stated that the Open Space Trails subcommittee and ECC comments were forwarded to the Planning Board members.

SMyers issued a memo on 3/31/2014 stating that his prior comments had not been addressed

ECC issued a memo dated 4/1/2014:

1. The ECC requests that the applicant clarify the designation of ACOE and DEC wetlands. The DEC Wetland is also labeled ACOE.
2. ECC notes, per Town Code, the Applicant must provide proof of preservation in perpetuity of permanent open space.
3. In order to establish the permanent open space the Applicant must develop an existing resources and site analysis plan of the natural, cultural, and scenic feature of the proposed project.

SReed issued a memo dated 3/8/2014:

- 1) Prior to final determination the subdivision needs to be sent to the Rexford and Vischer Ferry Fire Districts for a district line adjustments. Once they have agreed to the boundary line changes then the Town Board will pass a resolution for the adjustments.
- 2) Will all the proposed street be Town Roads?
- 3) Require street names and postal verification.

Saratoga County Planning Board:

- Read February 24, 2014 SCPB letter into record.

Reviewed by the Saratoga County Planning Board on February 20 2014

Decision: Request Additional Information

Comment: In reviewing the above referenced project the members of the SCPB requested that additional information be provided on the application. The application references that the large open space area is suitable for active recreational purposes. The SCPB is encouraged that this may be the case however if there will be active recreational uses occurring in the rear of this parcel then the impact on traffic (both on subdivision street and intersection with

Grooms Road) and possible noise, lights, traffic, etc. impacts to the homes being proposed within the development need to be evaluated. The board also expressed concern with the long distance being proposed for the directional boring of the sewer force main. Although wetland impacts will be minimal with this procedure, if there is a maintenance issue in the future it could prove difficult to repair. A signoff on this sewer connection will be required from the Saratoga County Sewer District.

JScavo

- Per Town Code the following items must be included within the application for preliminary subdivision consideration:
 - 1) Contour lines at two-foot intervals to United States Geological Survey datum. This information should be reflected on a proposed grading plan.
 - 2) Sanitary sewers, stormwater management system and waterlines with all appurtenances, labeled to show size and material of each. A specification detail sheet should also be provided. Individual water and sewer reports with usage analysis should also be provided.
 - 3) Stormwater management and erosion control plan prepared in accordance with Article XVI, § 208-115D of the zoning regulations of the Town of Clifton Park. The applicant submitted a SWPPP in September of 2013 based on the concept plan at that time.

MJ Engineering from a review letter dated, 4/3/2014:

State Environmental Quality Review

1. No additional comments.

Full Environmental Assessment Form

2. Comment 2 through 5 of our January 27, 2014 review specific to the full environmental assessment form need to be formally responded to, which includes submission of an updated full environmental assessment form.

Subdivision Plan

3. Comment 9, 11, 12 and 13 of our January 27, 2014 review specific to the conceptual subdivision plans need to be formally responded to.
4. The current plans show the proposed routing of the sanitary sewer force main through a NYSDEC wetland. It is assumed this utility would be installed via directional drilling to avoid wetland impacts. Since the SCSD No.1 would be the end owner of this utility, we would encourage the applicant to have the SCSD No. 1 review this proposal as soon as possible as they may not be willing to consider the sewer routing proposed, which may limit the project's viability if no other route for the utility exists.
5. During the prior appearance before the Planning Board, the applicant's representative indicated that the emergency access road would be offered to the Town has a public road. In Comment 11.a of our January 27, 2014 review, it was noted

that the right of way appeared to be less than the minimum as required by Section 86-6 (B)(1) of the Town Code along with other deficiencies. In addition to being deficient from the noted section of the Town Code, under New York State Town Law, Article 8, § 180, no highways shall be laid out less than three rods in width (or 49.5-feet). There needs to be further discussion regarding the dedication of this road as a Town road and how the minimum requirements of both the Town Code and New York State Town Law would be satisfied.

Public Comment

Dan Hartnett, voiced concerned with lack of detail on the bike trail along the secondary access road, adding that the Trails subcommittee would like to see an 8' wide trail with physical separation from the road itself. Next, Mr. Hartnett asked that a 15' ROW be shown along Miller Road and to have the trail connect in some way to continue into Settler's Hill which would allow connection to pedestrian/bike trails within that subdivision. Board members suggested that due to the extensive wetlands separating the two subdivisions a substantial boardwalk system would be required making it not financially feasible.

Mr. Hale moved, seconded by Mr. Paulsen to close the public hearing at 7:24pm. Ayes: all, Noes: none. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Pelagalli stated that this was not the official public hearing because SEQR had not been completed but since it was advertised as a public hearing, the Planning Board allowed the project to be reviewed and those residents who chose to speak to do so.

Planning Board Discussion

Mr. Hale stated that he recognized the difficulties with the bike trail along the access road and suggested that it might be worth exploring running the bike trail along the neighborhood street as an alternative. Mr. Koval added that he did not envision there being a lot of pedestrian/bike traffic in this area. Other board members stated that it had to start somewhere at some time. It was also suggested that a 5' sidewalk or a dedicated roadside bike lane might do. Mr. Ferraro asked if the road had to be 30' and the planning director stated that it might be necessary with the turn lane as proposed. It was agreed that board members would like to see something that encourages safe pedestrian/bike access without agreeing on the design. The chairman asked that a couple of notes be visibly incorporated into the plan for potential homebuyers to see as discussed at the January meeting i.e.: 1) airplane noise 2) right-to-farm law in the vicinity 3) active recreation in future.

III Old Business

2014-016 Fairchild II Subdivision

Proposed (2) lot subdivision, Zoned: L-1, Ushers Road Rear, conceptual subdivision review with possible SEQR determination.

Reviewed by: MJE Consultant: ABD Applicant: MJ Rekucki

[SBL\(s\): 259.-2-84.1](#)

Mr. Ferraro reviewed the process that would be followed for the next two projects which are related stating that the applicant had revised their original proposal and at this time were asking

to subdivide the subject parcel where it is bisected by Maple Line Road. Development at this time was proposed only for the southerly section.

Mr. Tom Andress and Mrs. Jacqueline Phillips-Murray represented the applicant MJ Rekucki. The consultant described the parcel which is one large triangular lot per with one SBL # on Van Patten Drive and is divided 1/3 to 2/3 by Maple Line Drive. The proposal would subdivide the property so each section north and south of Maple Line would be separate parcels with individual SBL #s to be assigned.

Staff Comments:

John Scavo stated that Trail subcommittee and ECC comments were forwarded to the Planning Board members.

ECC issued a memo dated 4/1/2014:

1. The ECC requests that the applicant clarify their intentions for development of the property parcel to the north. Specifically, the applicant's timeline for future development so that the established SEQRA record addresses potential segmentation issues.

Sheryl Reed issued a memo dated 4/7/2014
No comment on subdivision

Steve Myers issued a memo dated 3/31/2014

[2014-016] Fairchild II Subdivision

- Setback line along Van Patten Drive is labeled as 25', should be 50'.
- Will modifications to the drainage easements on both sides of Mapleline be required? It appears town road drainage discharges to privately owned storm-water management areas. No consideration of this is shown. No delineation of SW easement on south end of property is shown.
- No sewer easements shown and sewer line appears to be on private property.
- More detail should be provided prior to approval.

J Scavo

- Public Hearing shall be scheduled for the proposed subdivision once a SEQR determination has been completed for the proposed action which based on the current proposal appears to be an unlisted action for both subdivision and site plan approval.
- The Clifton Park Sewer District has requested additional information regarding usage of the facility and sewage flows.
- It appears that there is an established drainage ditch within the R.O.W. along Van Patten Drive. An adequately sized driveway culvert pipe should be shown to ensure runoff can still flow and infiltrate within the established drainage ditch.

MJ Engineering

State Environmental Quality Review

1. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project (subdivision and site plan) appears to be an "Unlisted" action. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to un-

dergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved / interested agencies to be engaged may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:

- a. Clifton Park Water Authority – public water supply.
 - b. Saratoga County Sewer District #1 – public sanitary sewer service.
 - c. NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation – identification of cultural or historic resources due to the project being subject to the NYSDEC Phase 2 Stormwater Regulations.
 - d. NYS Dept of Environmental Conservation –permit coverage under General Permit GP-0-10-001 and identification of threatened and endangered species due to the project being subject to the NYSDEC Phase 2 Stormwater Regulations.
2. As a procedural matter, any SEQRA action taken must consider both the subdivision and the improvements contemplated under the site plan application currently before the Board for proposed Lot 1.

Short Environmental Assessment Form

3. No comments.

Subdivision Plan

4. Please note the recipient of the two existing easements listed on proposed Lot 1.
5. It is suggested that notation be added to the plat indicating no development on proposed Lot 2 is planned at this time.
6. 911 emergency response addresses need to be obtained from the Town and included on the filed subdivision plat.

Public Comments

William Trump, 7 Maple Line Road stated that he met with Town Highway Supt. regarding the four speedhumps on Maple Line Road and voiced his opposition to the proposed project for the following reasons:

- traffic
- new projects in Fairchild Square have not established traffic patterns yet
- pedestrian/bike safety
- Van Patten is only entry/exit for their subdivision,

Jay Hopek 10 Maple Line Road, voiced his opposition to the proposed project for the following reasons:

- Maple Line only legal in and out for subdivision

- 100' setback could be cleared between building and neighbor
- Would like 100' buffer on either side of Maple Line
- 30' no cut buffer preferred
- reviewed what he believed were errors on the submitted EAF form
 - asked for archeological review, recognition of a stump dump and the Dwaaskill in the area, and that this should be marked as a moderate or large impact
 - #6... believe the answer should be no
 - reduction of natural environment

Chad Koslow 5 Maple Line Road stated that he represented his family of 4, and voiced his opposition to the proposal for the following reasons:

- concerned with impact of traffic
- the potential impact on his home value

Wendy Milovec 2 Maple Line Road stated that she lived near the emergency egress and voiced the following concerns in opposition to the proposal:

- concerned with speeders already existing
- felt it will increase speeding
- impact to safety
- a change in the ambience of neighborhood

Mrs. Paulsen stated that she felt that it makes sense to divide the parcels into two lots that are already separated by a road. The chairman stated that cumulative impacts need to be considered even when projects are segmented. Mr. Ferraro also stated that landowners had a right to develop and that the parcel in question was zoned Light Industrial and that the planning board has a responsibility to see that the proposed development was done safely and in consideration of others.

Mr. Andress noted that two traffic studies had been done in 2008 and 2011. The consultant noted that levels of service were at good levels and those labels had not changed, adding that the brewery does add some traffic in the area in the evening. Mr. Andress then said that this proposal was for a small office space and the originally proposed access from Maple Line had been removed and that some of the trees would be preserved per the plan. Mr. Andress also stated that he felt that traffic would be coming from Van Patten, and that there would be no reason for this to increase the traffic on Maple Line. Mr. Andress gave a summary of the traffic counts along Ushers and Van Patten intersection per the 2011 traffic study.

One of the Maple Line residents then asked that the project be slowed down, and not allowed to build any more at Fairchild Square for now, adding that he would like to have a new traffic study update done once the approved Helping Hands School opened.

2013-032 Fairchild II

Proposed construction of a 15,350sf office/warehouse, Zoned: L-1, Ushers Road Rear,

revised conceptual site plan review.

Reviewed by: MJE Consultant: ABD Applicant: MJ Rekucki

SBL(s): 259.-2-84.1 Last seen on: 10/9/2013

Mr. Andress showed the changes to the proposed site plan since it was last seen in October of 2013. The consultant described the stormwater basin on the property which granted an access easement to the Town of Clifton Park for maintenance. Mr. Andress stated that the applicant was proposing to dissolve that agreement and take over the maintenance of the stormwater area himself. Next, Mr. Andress indicated a no-cut buffer at the corner of Maple Line and Van Pat-ten Drive.

Staff Comments:

John Scavo stated that Trail subcommittee and ECC comments were forwarded to the Planning Board members.

ECC -

1. The ECC recommends that the design utilize shrubbery to screen the dumpster area that is less likely to be eaten by deer (e.g., Hemlock).
2. If the building tenants uses or stores hazardous materials onsite, they must comply with the Town's Hazardous Materials Policy, which can be obtained from the Town Environmental Specialist.

Sheryl Reed

- 1) Provide location of existing and proposed fire hydrants.
- 2) Emergency Services will not have access to the Northwest side of the proposed building. The radius will need to be changed as well as an area needed as a turn around point for fire apparatus.
- 3) Postal Verification.

Steve Myers

- As is shown by SWPPP checklist the stormwater report is not complete therefore no review will occur until document is complete. How can an acceptance form be approved by the engineer if the design is incomplete?
- Site should not be done in pieces. Entire site should be in all submissions especially when considering stormwater and traffic impacts. Subdivision of site does not remove the requirements
- There are no town stormwater controls on the site to my knowledge. There is a depression present that may have been considered a SMP in the past but needs to meet new standards. Even if determined to be stormwater management facilities, the entire site must be redesigned to meet the current standards and infiltration. Basins are a last resort not a first choice.
- This does not even begin to talk about how this existing "basin" does not meet the current requirements for that type of practice. Many required aspects of a basin do not exist.
- No soil boring data as required.

- I believe there are building access issues for emergency services. 150' to all points of building. I don't believe emergency vehicles can negotiate pavement areas, may need second entrance.
- No Parking or maneuvering area in front yards, property had two fronts with parking shown in both front yards, variance required.
- I do not see how a proper review of this proposal or any proposal for Fairchild anywhere can be properly conducted without an understanding of the full build out for entire facility.
- Not enough information provided to do any real evaluation.
- I also believe Mapleline Road will have to be returned to two-way traffic and the adjacent neighborhood should be notified early in the process for obvious reasons.

J Scavo

- The Clifton Park Sewer District has requested additional information regarding usage of the facility and sewage flows.
- It appears that there is an established drainage ditch within the R.O.W. along Van Patten Drive. An adequately sized driveway culvert pipe should be shown to ensure runoff can still flow and infiltrate within the established drainage ditch.
- Add a note to the plan which states, "A street opening permit issued by the Clifton Park Highway Department will be required to be obtained prior to the issuance of a building permit."
- A note should be added to the plan which states, "Approved building mounted lighting and/or exterior lighting shown on the approved plan will be verified by town staff prior to the certificate of occupancy being issued by the Building Department. No modification, additions, and/or substitutions to the approved exterior lighting shall be permitted without first obtaining written approval from the Clifton Park Planning Board for such modification."
- Once the landscaping plan is approved by the Planning Board the applicant's design professional shall furnish an estimate for the landscaping security deposit that will be verified by the Town Designated Engineer.
- The Stop Sign Detail should be modified to replace notation, "N.Y. DOT Sign R1-1D" with "MUTCD STOP Sign R1-1".
- Supplement proposed arborvitae plantings around the dumpster for a species less likely to be eaten by deer.
- Clearly call out on the site plan where the detectable warning strips and sidewalk curb ramps are to be located. Contractors once in the field will neglect to install them properly if not clearly displayed on the plan.
- I appreciate the site plan modifications proposed by the applicant to eliminate access onto Maple Line Road.

MJ Engineering State Environmental Quality Review

1. See comments provided for Application No. 2014-016.

2. As a procedural matter, any SEQRA action taken must consider both the subdivision and the improvements contemplated under the site plan application currently before the Board for proposed Lot 1.

Short Environmental Assessment Form

3. No Comments.

Site Plans

4. For the I-2 stormwater practices, in-situ soil testing is required. The minimum geotechnical testing is one test hole per 5000 sf, with a minimum of two borings per facility pursuant to Section 6.3.1 of the NYSSMDM.
5. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan needs to identify how site runoff will be diverted away from the northern most stormwater area.
6. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan needs to indicate locations for temporary sediment traps to be used during construction for areas tributary to the northern most stormwater area.
7. The dumpster enclosure is proposed as a chain link fence. Considering its location to be within the view shed of Van Patten Drive there may be consideration to provide an alternate enclosure.
8. The proposed onsite sanitary sewer and potable water system layout and details have not been reviewed as they are under the purview of other authorities having jurisdiction. Any comments provided by these agencies shall be furnished to the Town for their records.
9. The site plans note that the existing easement granted to the Town of Clifton Park will be modified, likely so the proposed building is not within the easement. The modifications of the easement are subject to the review and approval by the Town Board. Future site plans should show the conceptual modifications to the easement. If deliberations with the Town Board on the modifications to the easement result in changes to the site plan, the applicant may need to reappear before the Planning Board to review those changes.
10. Colored renderings of the proposed building along with listing of materials of construction should be provided for review by the Planning Board to satisfy the requirements of Section 208-66(C) of the Town Zoning.

Stormwater Management Report

11. Pg 7 of the SMR makes referenced to infiltration testing conducted. Please provide test results and indicate where on the site these tests were conducted.

12. Provide calculations demonstrating that each of the I-2 practices will fully de-water after a storm event pursuant to Section 6.3.2 of the NYSSMDM.
13. Provide calculations demonstrating how pretreatment is being furnished for each of the I-2 practices pursuant to Section 6.3.3 of the NYSSMDM.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

14. Question 27a of the NOI indicates soil restoration will occur on-site. There needs to be a plan or narrative description of where and what type of soil restoration will be occurring on-site that is consistent with Table 5.3 of the NYSSMDM.
15. If soil restoration is going to be employed as indicated in the NOI, then the SWPPP needs to include maintenance requirements as outlined in Section 5.1.6 of the NYSSMDM (pg 5-24).
16. The final SWPPP need to clear copies of materials furnished in Appendix C.

Public Comments

Richard Chapman 9 Maple Line Road, voice his opposition to the proposal for the following concerns:

- LI zone near a residential area
- property value impact
- would like the buffer increased
- stated he agreed with neighbors previous points

Planning Board Review

Mr. Ferraro asked about variances that might be required. Mr. Scavo stated that the applicant will need to pursue that with the chief zoning officer before proceeding with the Planning Board.

Discussion ensued regarding buffers and no cut zones during construction. as well as additional plantings to be done post-construction to supplement the buffer.

Ralph Morris 12 Maple Line Road voiced his opposition to the site plan for the following concerns:

- 57 evergreens 6-7 ft tall won't reduce visual impact of a 25' building
- clearing of almost entire property except for drainage area
- lighting on building and in parking lot
- property values
- traffic studies not representative of today's conditions in area
- allow existing buildings to become fully occupied to study traffic impacts before allow-

ing further growth

- increased pedestrian traffic through Maple Line
 - lunch time walk
 - to and from the brewery
- construction impact, vehicles parking on Maple Line
- asked if residents' homes could be reassessed if property values decline

Casey Chapman 9 Maple Line, stated that she agreed with her neighbors and voiced her opposition to the site plan proposal for the following:

- subdivision comments applied to site plan
- asked how many of the existing trees in 100' buffer would be preserved
- what would be planted
- traffic study needs updating

Casey also remarked that she felt it was fair for residents to raise concerns without having solutions because they are not professionals.

An unnamed resident then asked what the building would look like and if it would be more appealing since it would be near the residential area.

Mr. Andress showed a very preliminary facade sketch. Mr. Ferraro stated that he would like to see a nicer facade and Mr. Werner asked for visual simulations with plantings etc. from each angle being sensitive to the residential zone adjacent to the project.

Mr. Ferraro explained that the property owner had the right to develop as long as they design in accordance with town code and they mitigate some of the impacts. Board members asked for an update to the traffic study with new counts and ITE trip generation manual.

Mrs. Philips-Murray stated that she reviewed the laws relevant to segmentation and that the code stated that if this site could stand alone and be completely independent with its own access, parking, and stormwater, that it would not legally give rise to segmentation concerns under SEQR. The legal representative also addressed the proposed extinguishment of the maintenance agreement and that they would ask the Town Board to relinquish the easement if the concept is agreeable to the Planning Board. Mr. Pelagalli and Mr. Scavo noted that the Building and Zoning/ Highway/ Buildings and Grounds Departments and the Town Attorney / Town Board would be the appropriate bodies to approach for that issue rather than a Planning Board. Board members appeared to agree that segmentation was not an issue here.

Mr. Ferraro asked about the existing line in the buffer area. Mr. Andress stated that comes from Maple Line Road and would not be disturbed.

Mr. Bianchi clarified that even if the applicant did not, the town could actually clear the trees entirely over that line if the Highway Department needed access to it in the future even though the applicant would not have the right to do so themselves.

Mr. Hale asked whether the traffic speeding concerns on Maple Line were related to this project but he did say that he agreed with the required buffer.

IV New Business

2014-015 St. Peter's Health Medical Campus

Proposed development of a medical campus within Northcrest Park PDD, Zoned: PUD, 1 Tal-low Wood Dr., Preliminary site plan review with possible determination

Reviewed by: MJE

Consultant: EDP

Applicant: St. Peter's Health Partners

SBL(s): 271.-3-67.1 and 271.-3-9.212 **Referred by Town Board for site plan review**

Joe Dannible, of Environmental Design Partnership, presented the project on behalf of St. Peter's Health Partners. Mr. Dannible showed the proposed lots to be redesigned on an aerial map describing the plan to improve connectivity of the existing buildings to create a medical campus for increased services and expanded hours of operation. Additional renderings were shown of building facades, birds' eye views, parking, landscaping and signage.

Staff Comments:

John Scavo stated that Trail subcommittee and ECC comments were forwarded to the Planning Board members.

ECC -

1. The ECC suggests additional landscaping at the corners of the parcel adjacent to Route 146, *and, to the extent possible, along the front boundary line along Route 146*, to provide additional buffering.
2. The ECC recommends that the applicant incorporate lighting that is directional and limited.

Sheryl Reed no comment

Steve Myers

- Proposal is a redevelopment project per Chapter 9 of the NYSSWDM.
- All zoning and signage issues were resolved as a result of approval of Local Law #1 of 2014 establishing Northcrest Park II Planned Unit Development District.
- A maintenance agreement will be required with the town as the SMP's will be the responsibility of the property owner.

J Scavo - noted that the project had been referred by resolution of the Town Board to the Planning Board for recommendation on a Planned Unit Development.

MJ Engineering from a letter dated 4/7/2014:

State Environmental Quality Review

1. The existing Northcrest Park PDD was amended to allow for the proposed site plan application to proceed. As part of the PDD amendment, the Clifton Park Town Board, as the SEQRA Lead Agency issued a negative declaration under SEQRA. As part of the Planning Board's review,

they must ensure that the proposed site plan is consistent with the SEQRA findings of the Town Board.

Site Plans

2. The project resides within the Executive Woods PDD. For clarity and to verify that the bulk-lot requirements of the PDD are being satisfied, provide a bulk lot summary for review.
3. Please note the location of all proposed pedestrian cross walks.
4. The plans identify proposed sidewalks along NYS Route 146. There needs to be clarification as to who will own and be responsible for long term maintenance of the sidewalks.
5. There needs to be discussion as to how the end points of the proposed sidewalk are to terminate. Each end point as they are currently proposed require an accessible ramp with the western ramp requiring tactile warning plates since it will continue over a public roadway.
6. For the western termination of the sidewalk, there needs to be further coordination as the existing stop bar of Tallow Wood Road would need to be relocated to accommodate a painted crosswalk. There may be consideration of installing the cross walk and accessible ramp on the west side of Tallow Wood Drive as part of this project.
7. The proposed project signage on the eastern end of the project resides within the N.Y.S.D.O.T. right of way and approval from the N.Y.S.D.O.T. must be obtained to allow placement at the location proposed.
8. The bioretention facility needs to have a sign posted in the immediate vicinity of the practice. The sign shall be not less than 18 inches by 24 inches and shall contain the information outlined in Section 3.5 of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSSMDM).
9. The detail for the bioretention filter needs to include a 4-inch perforated underdrain pursuant to Section 6.4.2 of the NYSSMDM.
10. Subsequent plans should include architectural elevations of the building with a listing of the materials of construction for review by the Planning Board.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

11. Section II.A of the SWPPP indicates that a “no effect” letter is being requested from the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation with regards to the existence or absence of cultural resources within the project site. Once correspondence is received, please furnish it to the Town to confirm that the project will be permit-eligible consistent with Part I.D.8 of GP-0-10-001.
12. Section VI of the SWPPP needs to be modified to include the maintenance associated with soil restoration as noted in Section 5.1.6 of the NYSSMDM (Pg 5-24).

Stormwater Management Narrative

13. Some of the stormwater management facilities will employ infiltration. The Stormwater Narrative (SMN) notes that USDA soil data was utilized as the initial basis for infiltration rates and system design, but indicates that in-situ testing will be conducted. This field testing must be completed prior to the applicant submitting a Notice of Intent or requesting the MS4 Acceptance Form. The testing shall be done in accordance with the NYSSMDM.
14. Section 5.3.1 of the SMN notes that the stormwater management system design employs the redevelopment approach as outlined in Chapter 9 of the NYSSMDM. The SMN must clearly identify and document the design difficulties encountered to achieve full compliance, referencing the three criteria listed in Section 9.3.1 of the NYSSMDM. Documented justification must be provided for the use of proposed alternative approaches presented in Chapter 9.
15. The design calculations furnished for the proposed conditions appear adequate under the assumption appropriate justification for the use of the redevelopment criteria can be provided. In the event justification is not adequate, then the provided calculations will need to be revised accordingly, which will require subsequent reviews.
16. Provide calculations for the gravel diaphragm up-gradient of the bioretention facility to ensure it provides the minimum level of pretreatment as defined in Section 6.4.3 of the NYSSMDM.
17. There needs to be consideration for cold climate operation of the bioretention facility as noted in Section 6.4.7 of the NYSSMDM which may require a back-up treatment unit when the filter media becomes ineffective
18. The final SMN must be signed and sealed by the appropriate licensed professional.

Public Comments

Dan Hartnett stated that he felt many prior concerns were addressed but asked the consultant to clarify the location of the bike racks. Mr. Hartnett asked if some street trees could be planted between the sidewalk and Rt. 146 and if the sidewalk could be continued to the internal walkway that connects to Maxwell Road. Mr. Dannible replied that the bike racks would be centrally located.

Anthony LaFleche asked about the location of the telephone poles relative to the sidewalk and Mr. Dannible said that the actual line might vary a little from the proposal based on actual topography.

Planning Board Review

Mr. Werner asked if a traffic analysis was requested since it is a change of use from general office to medical offices. Mr. Bianchi explained that SEQOR was closed and that he felt that it was likely that an increase in traffic would be spread throughout the day rather than limited to everyone arriving and departing only during peak hours.

Mr. Scavo added that New York State DOT was planning to synchronize the traffic signals along Rt. 146 to allow more efficient mobility of vehicles.

Discussion ensued regarding landscaping and the elimination of the fence. Board members asked for visual simulations of landscaping from the Rt. 146 viewpoint. Board members stated that they preferred to keep the fence along the sidewalk and asked the consultant to revisit that issue to eliminate visual impacts from the road of the parking lot.

Mr. Bianchi stated that the Planning Board could ask to be allowed to validate the findings of the Town Board. Planning Board members asked to be sent copies of the PDD Amendment and Legislation as well as a copy of the minutes from the meeting at which the Town Board passed it.

Discussion Item

Based on a flier that was shown to the Planning Board, Mr. Ferraro asked for clarification about site plan approvals for the Brewery and tasting room to be able to host special events. Mrs. Paulsen stated that the tasting was definitely limited to small amounts and hours were limited as well. It was also recognized that the flier was for a special one year celebration of the opening of the brewery.

There being no further comment, Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Hale to close the planning board meeting at: 10:21 pm. Ayes: all, Noes: none. The motion was unanimously carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Springli