

Town of Clifton Park

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
Michael Hale
Joel Koval
Eric Ophardt
Sandra Pace
Kim Paulsen
Tom Werner

(alternate) Emad Andarawis

Those present at the January 25, 2011 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, M. Hale, J. Koval, E. Ophardt, S. Pace, E. Andarawis – Alternate Member

Those absent were: T. Werner, K. Paulsen

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
J. Romano, CHA Companies
R. Ferraro, Chairman
P. Pelagalli, Counsel
M. Springli, Secretary

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:03p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Ferraro announced that the alternate Emad Andarawis will sit in for Mr. Werner tonight.

I. **Public Hearings:**
None

II. **Old Business:**

- A. [2010-026] **Coburg Village Expansion** – Proposed construction of 88(78??) additional apartments and 170 parking spaces, 1 Coburg Village Way, Preliminary site plan review with possible determination. SBL: 276.-2-54

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume with Environmental Design Partnership, consultant for the applicant, presented tonight's preliminary site plan and described changes since it was

last seen on October 26th, 2010. The consultant stated that the applicant would like to address the newer comments that had been added since the last meeting. Next, a facade rendering of the 3-story building was shown. Mr. Vuillaume commented that fire access concerns were addressed in order to keep the boulevard design on the plan and modifications to the width closest to the building, the wingcurb and sidewalk have been planned after meeting with the Building director and Fire and Safety Officer. The speaker also noted that utilities will be rerouted to accommodate the new building with the existing structures, that stormwater runoff will be changed with the addition of a new pond and sanitary sewer laterals will be redone in some areas so as not to interfere with the footings of the building. Mr. Vuillaume then remarked that pedestrian access has been increased with the addition of the sidewalk to the intersection of Grooms and Vischer Ferry Road as well as internal multi-use paths. The speaker added that the Birch Tavern is still being discussed with Historic Preservation Commission as to its function and noted that it is required per the PDD to be preserved. It was also noted that the commons area will have a coffee shop and other amenities for pedestrians such as a courtyard and benches and a construction phasing plan will be presented at the time of acquiring a building permit so that no more than 5 acres being disturbed at any one time during the project. The consultant stated that the commons area projects would likely be done first and fenced off from public until safe and that the applicant would resurvey the pedestrian areas when weather permits to provide further detail. Finally, Mr. Vuillaume stated that the applicant requests using the existing guidelines for SWPPP rather than the new regulations which will become mandated as of 3/1/2011 and will provide justification for that.

Staff Comments

Building and Zoning Director, Steve Myers (as read by J. Scavo)

- Need stormwater phasing plan for site work.
- A maintenance agreement with the town will be required.
- Filter fabric drop inlet protection is not recommended due to their poor performance.
- Specify a time frame for the use of fabric inlet protection other than “short term”
- Explain reasoning for fabric instead of stone inlet protection.
- Will general traffic use the construction entrances as well?
- Submit specific locations of and design details for the rain gardens.
- The reasons stated for not employing more green infrastructure into this site are not acceptable. An example of this is the SWPPP states porous pavement is not feasible due to clogging. It is expected porous pavement will be maintained such as cleaning. Significantly more detailed reasoning will be required to be released from the green infrastructure requirements.

Planning Director J. Scavo Comments

-It appears there is approximately 15' to 25' of R.O.W. from the edge of pavement to opposite ROW boundary along Vischer Ferry Road and Grooms Road.

- My third comment as per the October 28, 2010 meeting still needs to be completed. Under General Notes on the First Page of the Site Plan add, "Site Plan as authorized by PDD No. 35, Coburg Village and Lowry Commercial Complex amended on May 17, 2010 by Local Law No. 5 of 2010.

-The subject property is located within the Vischer Ferry Road Corridor GEIS Study Area. If development of the project is deemed to be in conformance with the statement of findings, then a negative declaration pursuant to SEQR may be appropriate. The applicant is required to contribute to the mitigation fees established in the Vischer Ferry Corridor GEIS and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). An Estimate of the C.I.P. fees are as follows:

Vischer Ferry GEIS Fees for Coburg Village Expansion

• Transportation	13 Trips x \$268.00/Trip	= \$3,484.00
• Sanitary Sewer	xx EDU's x \$3,314.00/EDU	=
• Water Distribution	xx EDU's x \$1,728.00/EDU	=
• GEIS Preparation	xx EDU's x \$310.00/EDU	=
• CIP Preparation	xx EDU's x \$49.00/EDU	=

CHA Comments

We have reviewed the site plan dated October 5, 2010, Stormwater Management Report dated October 2010 and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan dated January 2011 for the above referenced project as prepared by Environmental Design Partnership, LLP. In general, there are a number of significant plan deficiencies that should be addressed before the plan is considered for final site plan approval. In addition, there are a number of technical deficiencies associated with the storm water management plan and SWPPP that prevent compliance with the storm water management requirements.

The following comments from our October 19, 2010 letter remain to be addressed (*additional comments provided in italics*):

1. The plan should depict the required 18" minimum separation the watermain and sanitary sewer. It appears the watermain will need to be buried at a depth greater than 5 feet in areas to maintain the separation. (*A note has been added to the plan indicating 18" minimum separation. Additionally the areas of watermain that will be required to be buried greater than 5 feet should be identified on the plans.*)
2. The survivability of the proposed Canadian Hemlocks on the 3:1 slope along Vischer Ferry Road should be evaluated.
3. The proposed construction will impact both entrances to the facility. A phasing plan should be provided that depicts how access to the site will be maintained during construction. (*The response letter indicates that*

a construction phasing plan will be prepared by the contractor prior to issuance of a building permit.)

We offer the following additional comments:

4. In general, we support the planned locations and types of pedestrian connections including an asphalt multi-use pathway and concrete sidewalk. That said, there are a number of construction details that need to be addressed.
5. Additional grading and construction detail of the proposed crosswalks and sidewalk at Vischer Ferry Road and Grooms Road should be provided. We strongly suggest providing a detail at a larger scale to address the following comments. The sidewalks are proposed immediately adjacent to existing drainage features; however the plans do not show existing or proposed grades in sufficient detail to review impacts to existing drainage patterns. A sidewalk is proposed to connect to the existing Stewart's driveway. This connection should be coordinated with Stewarts. It appears the sidewalk may impact existing landscaping, which has also not been addressed. Concrete pedestrian landing pads with detectable warning strips are required where the sidewalk terminates into existing asphalt pavement at the intersection. The crosswalks need to be in accordance with MUTCD and will require removal and re--establishment of the existing stop bars and stop signs in correct locations.
6. NYS Fire Code requires emergency access drives that provide service to a fire hydrant to be a minimum of 26 feet wide. The access drive entering the court yard area is only twenty feet wide and will need to be widened.
7. We do not support construction of the building on top of an existing water main as currently proposed.
8. The proposed light pole bases are depicted immediately adjacent to the proposed watermain along the eastern access drive. We are concerned with the potential impact of the light pole base (5' minimum depth) on the proposed watermain. Additional detail regarding the proposed separation and construction sequencing of the bases and watermain should be provided.
9. The bends and thrust blocks of the proposed watermain should be depicted on the utility plan. Additional valving will be required to provide appropriate isolation of the various water main segments.
10. The invert elevation of the swale underdrain outlet to the stormwater management area should be depicted on the plan.
11. The erosion and sediment control plan depicts silt fence running downhill at the south end of Coburg Village Way. The silt fence should be aligned to run parallel to the contours.
12. The north slope of the proposed stormwater pond appears to be too

close or within the tree drip line of the “row of trees” shown to be preserved adjacent to Grooms Road. This may become a slope stability issue for the basin.

13. The emergency spillway of the proposed basin should be aligned to discharge to the end section of the existing culvert. The plan appears to depict the spillway discharging across the entrance drive.
14. Stone aprons should be used at all culvert outlets throughout the site and particularly at outlets entering the stormwater management area.
15. A staged phasing plan showing the disturbed limits for each phase limited to five acres or less should be provided. The response letter indicates that a phasing plan will be prepared by contractor prior to issuance of a building permit. We do not recommend approval of the SWWPP until a phasing plan is provided.
16. We offer the following comments on the Stormwater Pollution Prevention dated January 2011:
 - In the (II. Site Description - E. Name of Receiving Waters) section of the SWPPP, list the Class and Standards of the receiving waters.
 - Question #16 of the NOI should be completed.
 - For question #26 of the NOI, the sediment basin option is checked. If a sediment basin is intended to be used, calculations, location and details for the sediment basin should be provided.
 - A sequence of major activities categorized into a phasing plan that defines staged major activities specific to a maximum disturbed area of 5 acres per phase should be provided in the SWPPP. This sequence should reflect the staged construction sequence notes on phased ESC plans
17. We offer the following comments on the Stormwater Management Narrative dated October 2010: *asked for clarification of which SWPPP would be pursued, the current or the new.*
 - In Section 4.2.1 Water Quality (WQv), the required and provided WQv columns in Table 2 are labeled in (acre-ft). The values in the columns appear to be in cubic feet.
 - In Section 4.2.2 Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv), the minimum Runoff Reduction Volume stated is 6,200 cubic feet. In Appendix A, the minimum Runoff Reduction Volume calculated is 5,709 cubic feet. It appears that the impervious value that should be used in the calculations should be 3.27 acres instead of 3.01 acres. The calculation spreadsheet should be updated.
 - In Section 4.2.2 Runoff Reduction Volume (RRv) and 4.2.2.1 Green Infrastructure, the narrative discusses that the green infrastructure/SMP combination has not met the minimum RRv and there will be a proposed implementation of further green infrastructure techniques in the currently developed area to the west. The design should be finalized and submitted for review.
 - The reports discuss the use of conservation of natural areas, vegetated swale, disconnection of roof run-off, rain gardens and dry swale to meet the RRv. The areas and design associated with

- these practices should be depicted on the plans.
- It does not appear as though the stormwater model addresses the impact of the existing downstream basin on the proposed basin and closed storm sewer system. We are concerned with the operation of both basins and how they may adversely affect one another.
- There appears to be a doubling in runoff volume during a 100-year storm that has not been addressed or mitigated.
- Please provide a cross section through both basins and show high water elevations for each of the design storms in order to evaluate possible impacts on the inlet and outlet pipes.
- Provide a detail of the SMA #1 outlet structure consistent with what is shown in the Stormwater Management Narrative. Please show actual proposed elevations on the detail.
- Provide a capacity analysis on the storm line network discharging into the stormwater management basin, considering tail water effects from the basin during a 25 year design storm.
- The boring locations with groundwater elevation data within the stormwater basin referenced in the report should be depicted on the plan.
- The phasing plan should be submitted for review by professional staff and support staff prior to stamping of plan.
- An agreement would need to be reached with Stewart's in order to connect the sidewalk although an easement would not be required. If Stewart's does not agree to it, then the planned crosswalk would need to be extended elsewhere to the North to an existing walkway.

Mr. Vuillaume next showed the landscaping plan and discussed the types of plants that had been planned for the 3:1 slope and explained that the hemlocks could be planted with some irrigation in order to be established for longterm survivability. Mr. Ferraro asked if those plants were outside the right of way for trees. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the easement could be increased to the 10' ROW in that area as opposed to 7' and that a retaining wall could be established if necessary.

ECC Comments – no comment

Public Input period - no comments from public

Planning Board Discussion

Mr. Ophardt asked if there was going to be a traffic study for this project. Mr. Vuillaume replied that a current study was not done, but some traffic estimates and a narrative had been done during the PDD period and that trip generations had been established at about 13 per hour. It was explained that most traffic would be attributed to service rather than residents. Mr. Scavo noted that mitigation fees in Vischer Ferry Road are collected with this project for future improvements. It was agreed by the Planning Board that low-level lighting should be used in this plan, but that pedestrian lighting might be needed along the internal trail. Mr. Ferraro asked about the pear trees depicted in the middle of the sidewalk and the consultant agreed they could be moved to the side. Mr. Ophardt asked about current parking at the Birch Tavern and whether that was used. Mr. Vuillaume

stated that the parking could be used in the future but that it might need to be revised. Mr. Koval was concerned that there was some connection from the Birch Tavern parking to the main parking lot and that it could become known as a “shortcut” to Vischer Ferry Road that could become a problem with pedestrians. Mr. Vuillaume remarked that it might be better to disconnect those two lots although it had been considered for bus pickup. Mr. Grasso suggested a gate might be preferable for future growth. Mr. Hale asked if Stewarts had shown crosswalk connection in their own concept plan. Mr. Vuillaume remarked that he will follow up with contacts at Stewart's.

Mr. Koval suggested that screening be examined carefully along the road and continued for possible enhancements if needed. Mr. Hale remarked that it might be reasonable to waive the transportation fees in lieu of offsite improvements and the board seemed agreeable to that. Mr. Ophardt asked about the sidewalk being extended to “future multi-use path”. The owner stated that he would be amenable to a note being placed on the plan that owner will build sidewalk connector at such time as trail is put in immediately adjacent to the site along the roads. It was noted by the Planning Director that if it were on the final stamped site plan, it would be enforceable in the future.

Mr. Ferraro asked about the steep slope along the service road and Mr. Vuillaume noted that it is about as steep a grade as could be workable and Mr. Grasso agreed. The chairman requested that the internal pedestrian systems be highlighted on the next submission to make it easier to see the connectability of the whole site, including common hallways and “lobby” for residents.

It was agreed that the applicant would need to submit the SWPPP before 2/23/2011 in order to get approval before the 3/1/2011 deadline. Mr. Scavo stated that the SWPPP can be submitted by then but would not need to have Planning Board approval necessarily. Mr. Grasso explained that if a SWPPP permit is issued, but plans change substantially, the applicant could THEN be required to comply with new regulations. The Board seemed to be generally agreeable to the plan as presented tonight, but not ready yet for vote.

The applicant asked for the project to be put on the agenda for 2/8 if they can submit plans for review by Monday 2/1/2011 and it was deemed acceptable.

II. New Business:

None

III. Minutes Approval: January 11, 2011

Mr. Koval moved accept the minutes of January 11, 2011, seconded by Andarawis. The motion was unanimously carried.

IV. Discussion Items: [2005-009] Tractor Supply – Propane Tanks

Mr. Scavo state that the Building Department received a proposal for a 1000 gallon propane fill station at Tractor Supply. The State Building code and fire safety regulations

were discussed. The Planning Director recommended a notation be made in file with an updated site plan filed rather than an amendment since it is not a permanent structure. The Planning Board members were agreeable.

Mr. Ferraro passed out information about a March 4th Planning conference in Schenectady county.

It was discussed that at the February 8th meeting J.Koval, K. Paulsen and S. Pace would not be available, but T. Werner, E. Ophardt, R. Ferraro, M. Hale and E. Andarawis will be present. The February 23rd meeting is scheduled during school vacation week and is canceled due to anticipated absences.

S. Pace moved, seconded by M. Hale to close the meeting at 8:16 pm. The motion was unanimously carried.