

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

ROBERT WILCOX
Attorney

PAULA COOPER
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis
Eric Ophardt
Ram Lalukota
Andrew Neubauer
Denise Bagramian
Greg Szczesny

(alternate) Keith Martin

Planning Board Minutes
March 9th, 2021

Those present at the March 9th, 2021 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, D. Bagramian, R. Lalukota,
A. Neubauer, E. Ophardt, G. Szczesny
Keith Martin – Alternate Member

Those absent were:

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
W. Lippmann, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.
R. Wilcox, Counsel
P. Cooper, Secretary

COVID-19 Note: Executive Order No. 202.1 suspends Article 7 of the Public Officers Law (also known as the Open Meetings Law), to the extent necessary to permit any public body to meet and take such actions authorized by law without allowing the public to be physically present at the meeting. The order also authorizes public bodies to meet remotely by conference call or similar service. For the Public Hearing Agenda Items during these unprecedented conditions, the Planning Board will provide the public reasonable and meaningful opportunities to submit comments via online videoconferencing technology during the meeting and in writing via email or mailed written comments.

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Ferraro stated that the Planning Board meeting for tonight is being held remotely due to the current health crisis and inability to hold large gatherings in one place.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Szczesny moved, seconded by Mr. Neubauer, approval of the minutes of the February 23rd, 2021 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried. Denise Bagramian abstained.

Public Hearings:

None

Old Business:

2018-056 Waite Meadows 34 Lot Subdivision

Applicant proposes to amend a previously approved 33 Lot Subdivision to increase the density by one lot bringing the total to 34 lots in accordance with the CR Zoning regulations, Waite Rd, Zoned: CR, Status: PB Preliminary Review w/possible determination

SBL: 270.-1-19.1 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: EDP Applicant: Waite Meadows, LLC

Last Seen on: 10-23-18

Mr. Ferraro stated that this item has been moved to old business and is not a public hearing tonight as advertised.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Joe Dannible – EDP – Mr. Dannible stated that this application does have a history and that many members of the Board have been involved with this project before. He stated that in 2009, Waite Meadows was approved as a 33 lot subdivision and construction was able to start at that time or any time thereafter. Mr. Dannible stated that in 2017, the Planning Board was given an option for density incentive zoning, to increase the number of buildable lots to 64 in exchange \$1 million offered to the Town for Open Space Acquisition and Protection in the western part of Clifton Park. Mr. Dannible stated that this got as far as the public comment meeting and opposition comments were stated that the land on site was not preserved, traffic would increase, and pedestrian safety would be impacted. Mr. Dannible stated that adjacent land owners were

approached to provide land protection within the Waite Road Corridor but there were no parties interested in selling their parcels to get a density bonus for the project. Mr. Dannible stated in 2019, a PDD application would have 100 acres preserved for the Town adjacent to the Waite Meadows Project and that trail connections and parking was also a part of that project as well. Mr. Dannible stated that the ECC and Trails was not supportive or in recommendation of a PDD and therefore one is no longer being pursued. In 2018, Wetlands Mapping was updated and shown there was a decrease in protected land. He stated that since there is more buildable land the application is for 34 lots in accordance with what the CR Zoning Density Regulations allow for. Mr. Dannible shared on the Zoom screen an old map of the area to be developed with a boulevard entrance and special lots and cul-de-sac roadways. He then shared on the screen a map of the new proposal for 34 lots and the cul-de-sacs reduced from 4 to 2, which he stated would decrease the impervious surfaces for the project as well as have less wetland impacts. Mr. Dannible stated that all the homes would be sprinklered and that the open space would be increased from 64 to 68 acres. Mr. Dannible stated that the dedicated land to go to the town is also increased from 50 to 63 acres and the unconstrained land is increasing to 43 acres. Mr. Dannible stated that this layout promotes the cluster development, decreases impervious surfaces, and increases fire safety. Mr. Dannible stated that the traffic was evaluated and that during peak hours the application would create 33 trips, which is an increase of only 1 trip as the proposal only has one additional lot. Mr. Dannible stated that he would like to ask to keep the SEQR determination as a negative declaration as there is not a significant increase in impacts. Mr. Dannible showed on the Zoom screen a map with the land to be dedicated to the Town highlighted in orange. He stated that the deed restrictions would be maintained, there would be 50 foot setbacks from wetlands as well as connections to public water and sewer. He stated that stormwater management would be on site and there would be one wetland crossing which the applicant would get a permit for from DEC and Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Dannible stated that in this subdivision each of the two cul de sacs would have a different home design. On one of the cul de sacs, the homes will be smaller in size oriented toward empty nester homebuyers while the second cul de sac would have larger homes.. Also there will be 3 large estate lots closer to Waite Road to keep in character with Waite Road. Mr. Dannible stated that wetlands and open space would buffer the view of the cluster subdivision community from Waite Road.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 3/1/21 stating:

- Approved boulevard roadway to intersection has been removed from proposal – not allowed, not zoning compliant
- Without the approved boulevard the subdivision is limited to 18 lots per town code.
- This proposal looks nothing like the subdivision approved in 2018 as is suggested.

- Further consideration to this configuration could occur if each home were required to have sprinklers.
- In previous submissions it was suggested to connect the two roads rather than use cul-de-sacs for numerous reasons.
- Is the adjacent Pasquarello parcel that is currently under subdivision review going to be attached to this proposal? If so what effect is the expected result? A secondary entrance from Rt 146 would greatly ease the fire requirements.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 3/5/21 with the following comments:

1. The new concept plan states it has reduced impervious area to about three acres. The reduction of impervious area increases Green Infrastructure Practices of preserving of undisturbed areas and reduction of clearing and grading. This may reduce the volume of stormwater runoff, increase groundwater recharge and reduce pollutant loadings that would be generated from the site.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 3/4/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC has no comments at this time.

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator:

- Waite Road Trail. Where did the 5-foot wide asphalt pathway “go” that had been on the Planning Board approved 2014 subdivision plan filed with the county? Is the 5-foot wide asphalt path formerly approved for the east side of Waite Road, along the site frontage and which was proposed to reach all the way to NYS Route 146, now removed from the current amended subdivision? Why?
- Public Trail through Open Space Area #2. A “pathway” set of lines is shown on the current plans that extends north/northwest into the “Open Space Area #2” (28.93 acres). Does that indication of a pathway mean that the developer will design for, and then build a nature trail during project construction? It is recommended that the project applicant include both the trail design and the construction of the nature trail, as part of the project development, not for the town to construct at some undefined future. The neighborhood will gain an enhanced, marketable asset with a constructed trail available during the sales of the homes. And additionally, the entire Waite Road neighborhood would benefit from having an additional natural area to walk to and around. Please see attached marked-up plan 3-2-21.
 - The trail needs to be installed at the time the roads are constructed, so that the residents immediate to the trail and the 28.93-acre open space – understand that the trail route will be on these lands.
 - The sketch lines for the nature trail route – are shown very tightly next to an adjacent home lotline. This entrance to the future trail needs to be clearly laid out, and a fence will likely be needed of some kind, to demarcate neighbor’s property

from the future open space and trailhead, if the location remains so tightly situated.

- Could the trail loop, be expanded into a bigger loop that crosses the northern, narrow wetland with a small boardwalk, and then meets back with the route in the “break” shown in the wetlands connectivity in this 28.93 acre open space parcel?
- What will the trail surface be proposed to be? Compacted stone dust?
- It is noted that the proposed local roads are proposed to be reconfigured, to result in a lesser amount of roadway length and area to be paved (and thus less impervious surfaces).
- It is also noted the reduction from 4 cul-de-sacs down to 2 cul-de-sacs proposed to be created, which is a likely positive for snowplowing concerns.
- Wetlands on site have apparently been reduced from 27.13 acres down to 23.62 acres which is a reduction of 3.51 acres of wetlands, but it is not clear, which type of wetlands. Can the applicant show the new wetlands mapping and jurisdictional determinations and the calculations and locations of the federal wetlands and NYS Freshwater Wetlands? Or is it all about the USACOE Federal Jurisdictional Wetlands? What date was the newer wetlands delineation conducted? Is there a now current JD on these remapped wetlands? Where on the site did the changes occur? Please illustrate and breakdown the calculations for clarity sake.
 - What is the acreage change in the federal wetlands delineation acreage from the prior plans to this current plan?
 - What is the acreage change in the NYS DEC Freshwater Wetlands acreage from the prior plans to this current plan?

It appears that due to the decrease in wetlands on site, thereby “increasing” the unconstrained acreage, that that is the basis for the one additional lot being added to the density. The unconstrained acreage appears to have been characterized as 98.30 acres, and now it is calculated as 101.81 acres, or a 3.51 acre increase in unconstrained lands

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 3/2/21 with recommendations he made:

1. It will be beneficial for the Planning Board, Town Staff and public to have the applicant review the modifications to the subdivision plan since it was last seen by the Planning Board on October 23, 2018.
2. Due to the timing of advertising requirements for a public hearing with the Town’s Official Newspaper - “The Gazette”, the project was advertised as a public hearing on the draft agenda. However, the plans do not appear to have the necessary level of advanced details for a preliminary plan set. Therefore, the public hearing will be rescheduled, and the current submittal is considered a revised concept as noted in the applicant’s transmittal letter.
3. The Planning Board will need to close-out SEQR prior to opening the public hearing for the proposed project. The project is a Type I Action pursuant to SEQR and the Town has already initiated coordinated review in 2018 with the Planning Board declaring Lead Agency Status.

4. I have no additional comments to offer at this time other than those I previously raised at the October 23, 2018 Planning Board Meeting.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering stated that a letter dated 9/12/2018 had the following comments from Mr. Joel Bianchi, P.E. of MJ Engineering which are still valid:
General Comments

1. The applicant is proposing to make modifications to a previously approved realty subdivision. The major changes being requested include increasing the number of lots from 33 lots to 34 lots, modifications to the individual bulk lot requirements, reduction in length of roadway, revised project layout, as well as an apparent decrease in the project's physical footprint on the site. It is understood that the increase in the number of lots is based upon a recently updated wetland delineation and regulatory review which revealed a decrease in jurisdictional wetlands. The decrease of jurisdictional wetlands has yielded less constrained lands.
2. The prior application received various regulatory approvals, including but not limited to Clifton Park Water Authority, Saratoga County Sewer District No 1, NYS Department of Health and NYS Department of Environmental Conservation. Should be updated concept move forward, it is anticipated that the applicant would have to once again seek approval from the same agencies for various improvements being proposed. Any approval that may be granted by the Planning Board shall be conditioned upon the receipt of noted approvals.
3. The concept plan indicates that there are regulated waters of the US within the project boundaries that will be impacted as a result. Any previously approved wetland impact permits received may need to be modified based upon the current concept. The applicant shall provide the Town with all correspondence with the USACOE regarding modifications to wetland impact permits.
4. The previously submitted and approved stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) would need to be updated to reflect the current development plan. It is not known which design standards were applied in the State Stormwater Management Design Manual standards would apply to the updated SWPPP prepared if not utilized for the SWPPP of record.

Stated Environmental Quality Review

5. The previously approved subdivision was classified as a Type I action, with the Planning Board issuing a negative declaration. MJ met with Town staff to discuss how this revised plan would be handled, whether a new SEQRA review would be initiated or if the Planning Board could rely upon the prior SEQRA record. Our initial assessment of the current plan suggests that with an apparent reduced project footprint, it is likely that any impacts previously identified, and magnitude of those impacts may be reduced. We will continue to work with Town staff on the most appropriate manner to addressing SEQRA

for this application. Notwithstanding how SEQRA is to be handled, an updated Full Environmental Assessment Form shall be submitted for review.

Subdivision Plan

6. The project is located within the Town's Conservation Residential District (CR). The proposal for single family homes is a permitted principal use within the CR District as noted in Section 208-16(D)(1)(b) of the Town's Zoning.
7. The parcel is located within the Town's CR Zoning District. The maximum permitted base density is calculated in accordance with Section 208-16(E)(2)(b) of the Town Zoning. Based upon the bulk lot table of the concept plan, the project has a total of 101.81 acres of unconstrained lands. Utilizing the calculation example provided in Section 208-16(E)(2)(b) of Town Zoning, the maximum base density would be 101.81 acres x .33 or 33.5 lots or 34 lots (applicants may round down fractional units of 0.5 or less and round up fractional units greater than 0.5). the applicant is proposing 34 lots which meetings the CR zoning requirements
8. On the site statistics, clarify the percentage of permanent open space dedicated to the Town and unconstrained area within the open space.
9. The proposal calls for a single boulevard entrance off Waite Road. Since receiving approval of the prior application, the State of New York adopted the current version of the International Fire Code (IFC). Pursuant to the IFC, Section D107.1, developments of one or two-family dwellings where the number of dwelling units exceeds 30 shall be provided with two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads. The two fire apparatus access roads shall be placed at a distance apart equal to not less than one-half of the length of the maximum overall diagonal dimension of the property area to be served, measures in a straight line between accesses. There are exemptions which include providing an approved automatic sprinkler system for each home. The current proposal does not meet the IFC for fire apparatus access and further revisions are necessary unless each home is going to include automatic sprinklers.
10. The current plan does not show any planned connections to adjacent undeveloped parcels. There should be some level of evaluation of making connections or setting aside a right-of-way to adjacent parcels.
11. The concept plan shows areas set aside for stormwater management. Given the conceptual nature of the plan, the type of practice has not yet been determined. The applicant should be aware that the Town prohibits the use of a P-5 practice and in the event it is determined that the P-5 practice is the only viable option, supporting materials will need to be submitted to the Town for review before it will be deemed acceptable for use. As the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review process, it is urged that the applicant meets with the Town's Stormwater Management Officer to review any proposed green infrastructure practices to avoid those that may be deemed undesirable.
12. Prior to approval or filing of the subdivision plat with the Saratoga County Clerk, the appropriate 911 emergency response numbers must be obtained for and assigned to each lot or created and placed on the filed plat.
13. Considering this plan is conceptual in nature, subsequent comments will be provided with a preliminary plan submission.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche asked Mr. Scavo if since this has been changed if it would need a new public hearing and if so if there is a deadline to do so. Mr. Scavo stated that yes, since it has gone from a 33 lot to a 34 lot subdivision it would need a new public Hearing and it would have to be done within 62 days of SEQR unless extended by the applicant. Mr. LaFleche asked how far from the road is the first home on the right hand side off Waite Road. Mr. Dannible stated it is 400-500 feet from Waite Road. Mr. LaFleche stated that he supports an easement on the property line on Waite Road for a future trail and asked about making a smaller loop street rather than the two cul de sacs. Mr. Dannible stated that many designs have been on the property but looping the roads would increase disturbance and impervious surface and not keep in the cluster design. Mr. LaFleche asked if the applicant would be leaving an opening on the proposed road to allow for possible future road connections. He also asked how big the lots are on the south east part of the subdivision and asked for the applicant to consider pushing the homes back further. Mr. Dannible stated they are about 3-4 acres and have a setback of 30 feet. Mr. Ferraro stated that the setbacks were brought up at the last review and the preference was to have the homes on the two lots closer to the road rather than on the other side of the wetland requiring the wetland to be crossed for the driveways.

Mr. Scavo showed on the Zoom screen a map of the property from the roadway. He displayed the ditch drainage along Waite Road heading south towards Route 146 that is a significant constraint to achieve what the Trails Committee desires. He also noted that there is no site control over some of the properties along that side of Waite Road by this applicant and off site private property easements would be necessary. He also stated that there are utility poles as well as private landscaping and drainage ditches. Mr. Scavo stated that long term, there would need to be conversations with the property owners to build a trail adjacent to their property and that a closed drainage system would have to be planned out. Mr. Ferraro asked if the Trails Committee has proposed a trail along Waite Road. Mr. Scavo stated there has been talk of such but 4' shoulders of asphalt adjacent to the drive lanes may be a more feasible option here. Mr. Dannible stated that there is a federal safety design requirement for 8 feet separation from the drive isle. Mr. Ferraro stated that if the applicant would be willing to give an easement along his property frontage on Waite Road, it would be appreciated. Mr. Dannible stated that it would be dedicated to the town, so there would not be liability on the applicant. Mr. Ferraro stated that he would like this in addition to the land donation, not in place of other open space contributions or parkland mitigation fees. Mr. Dannible stated he can ask the applicant.

Mr. Dannible stated he would like to address some comments made by town staff. Mr. Dannible showed on the Zoom screen a map of the old proposal and the new. He stated that Mr. Myers had made a comment about the previous plan and the lot widths and roadways, Mr. Dannible stated that the old plan and this do not show much difference, though the roadway is shortened. Mr. Dannible stated that by sprinkling the homes, the applicant may have more than 18 lots on a

single access road. Mr. Ferraro stated that another lot was added. Mr. Dannible stated that when the road was shortened the lot was moved to a new position. Mr. Ferraro stated that the open space was originally 71 acres and then new plan has 68.55 acres of dedicated open space due to the corner lots being increased in length. Mr. Dannible agreed with the statement Mr. Ferraro made. Mr. Dannible stated that Open Space comments and Trails comments would be addressed as the plan progresses and he will speak with Mr. Scavo and Ms. Viggiani.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Andarawis stated that he likes this proposal better than the last one. He stated that he appreciates the increase in the open space and decrease in infrastructure and the thought that was put behind the application. Mr. Andarawis asked the applicant his thoughts on road connectivity to any future applications and to other future trails as well. Mr. Dannible stated that the Open Space and Trails Committee stated that they do not foresee trails feasible or desirable for connections, and this was brought to them before, so there is confusion and that he will address them with Ms. Viggiani down the road. Mr. Dannible stated that one of the adjacent properties is commercial zoned and stated that he does not see a residential tie into a commercial property as it would increase traffic difficulties or have the potential commercial vehicles come through a residential neighborhood. Mr. Dannible stated the property to the north was proposed to be purchased by this applicant and the neighbor made it clear they did not want to sell and wanted to keep the land as it is now.

Mr. Neubauer stated that he is in favor of this application more so than the previous one and the applicant should be commended on the work that was put into the project proposal. Mr. Neubauer thanked Mr. Scavo for talking about the possible future trail as it helped to see where the project is going.

Mr. Ophardt stated that he prefers this proposal as well and likes the amount of open space that is being kept. Mr. Ophardt asked if the applicant could let him know how much land is going to be dedicated to the town and how much is for the property owners. Mr. Dannible stated that open space is 69 acres total, 63 acres are being donated to the town and 5 acres of privately owned acres. Mr. Dannible stated that out of the 63 acres donated to the town, 43 of them are useable lands. Mr. Dannible showed on the Zoom screen a map of the area and indicated what property is being dedicated to the town. Mr. Ophardt asked about the property of land to the north and asked if it was landlocked. Mr. Scavo stated that this is a priority piece identified by the Open Space Committee for desired protection. Mr. Peter Belmonte (applicant) stated that Mr. Sandler, the property owner to the north stated he is not willing to sell his property and wants to keep it for open space.

Mr. Ferraro stated that he likes this proposal was well and is comfortable with internal trail systems but would also like to see the opportunity for a trail connection to other trails on adjacent properties in the future that the town may choose to construct. Mr. Scavo added that a sign at the end of the cul-de-sac noting future trail connection should be placed in the subdivision to alert adjacent private property owners. Mr. Dannible asked if the donated land could come with restrictions as it can only be used for open space and trails, and not as a park. Mr. Scavo stated he is unsure but he does not think it is not any different than any other town open space. Mr. Ferraro stated that he agrees with Mr. Scavo and does not see it as a concern and would like to see signage as well. Mr. Ferraro stated that lots 25 and 24 have signage indicating that portion of the property is for open space as well so that the area is not disturbed. Mr. Scavo stated that he can look into this but feels he can work with the applicant.

Old Business:

2019-050 15 Synergy Park Drive

Applicant proposes to construct a 40,000 sf office/warehouse that will house 2 tenants. Tenant 1 will have 15,000 sf of garage space and 10,000 sf of office space. The garage space will house service vehicles. Tenant 2 will occupy the remaining office/warehouse space. There will be 91 parking spaces that will be shared by the 2 tenants, 15 Synergy Park Dr, Zoned: B-5, Status: PB Prelim Review - Poss. Determination

SBL: 265.-5-8 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: ABD Applicant: Synergy Park, LLC

Last Seen on: 12-8-20

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Luigi Palleschi – ABD – Mr. Palleschi stated that he has been able to review the comment letters submitted by the town staff and they can be addressed. Mr. Palleschi stated that the curb cuts on the site are the same as well as the parking and building location. Mr. Palleschi stated that the building will have 2 tenants, one with 25,000 square feet at the front of the building and the one to the rear of the property would be 14,100 square feet. Mr. Palleschi stated that the employee parking has changed; the curve in the roadway to the parking had been changed to 90 degrees as commented to allow for maximum surface drainage to swales. Mr. Palleschi stated that the dumpster location was modified and is more efficient and indicated its location on the map shown on the Zoom screen. Mr. Palleschi stated that Mr. Myers comments were reviewed and that they agreed with Mr. Myers and the width of the parking lot was also changed from 24 to 26 feet. He stated that aerial access meets code and the building would be sprinklered and a hydrant has been installed in front of the property. Mr. Palleschi stated that the retaining wall to the northeast corner will remain in the same place but be shortened to provide access to the rear of the building and the grade will be 1 on 3 to make the rear walkable. Mr. Palleschi stated that

sidewalks and landscaping have gone unchanged. And water and sewer laterals will be used with grinder pumps for the sewer. Mr. Palleschi showed grading and drainage on the Zoom screen and stated that it meets regulations. Mr. Palleschi stated that Mr. Myers will be looking into the location of the hydrant to ensure that another one is not required. Mr. Palleschi stated that the front building elevation was changed to be below 30' and those other remaining technical comments can be addressed.

Mr. Ferraro asked to see the other elevations and Mr. Palleschi stated that all of the sides would look similar but to the northeast the stone façade would most likely stop by the truck bays and the rear would not have any masonry treatments. Mr. Palleschi noted that the stone treatment would be carried along the building sides and frontage along areas most visible from the roadway.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 3/1/21 stating:

- 26' drive lanes required per NYS fire code 503.22 as required by the code official. This will apply to all parking areas and a turnaround will be required in the south parking lot.
- The steep slopes (north corner =30%+/-, SW/NW corner = 17%+/-) render the rear of the building inaccessible. Guardrails will be required along the sidewalks, especially due to handicapped access.
- The engineer states the building does not require aerial access. This may not be correct. The plans note the building height as 29.5'. The actual height of the building may be over 30' and would therefore require full aerial access. Since approximately 38% of the building is not accessible from the ground aerial access may be very much required. The front road side of the building is not considered aerial accessible since it is more than 30' from the road.
- Since the engineer does not wish to ensure protection of the wetlands, be assured any contamination will result in immediate stoppage of work until corrected.
- The hydrant location to the fire department connection per your drawing is 70' not 60'. Hydrants are required within 400' of all parts of the building. Another hydrant will be required.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 3/5/21 with the following comments:

1. Please provide the response letter for Synergy Park Drive referenced in your February 12, 2021 response letter.
2. Bioretention areas are only suitable for water quality treatment. It does not matter if surface sheet flow or a closed pipe system is routed to it. Provide NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual approved stormwater management practice for the Overbank and Extreme Flood Protection.
3. How will the stormwater management areas perform in the high perched water table? Provide cross sections / profiles of the stormwater management areas.

4. Are the three proposed temporary sediment traps sized for the drainage area for each individual sediment trap?

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 3/4/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC has no comments at this time.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter with recommendations he made:

1. The applicant should coordinate and meet with Steve Myers, Director of Building & Development to discuss and address his technical comments offered in a review letter dated March 1, 2021. Mr. Myers comments are related to fire apparatus access and the site's ability to accommodate emergency vehicles in accordance with NYS Fire Code Requirements.
2. The Saratoga Co. Planning Board issued a letter dated January 22, 2021, noting that the project will have no significant county-wide or inter-community impact.
3. The proposed building elevation should be attached to the final approved site plan for stamping purposes. The elevation should ensure that the building does not exceed 30' in height.
4. Based on the dumpster location, I agree with the note on the plan calling for a masonry structure for the dumpster enclosure to match the brick of the proposed building.
5. The applicant should add to the site plan as an aspect of the new construction, accommodations to install the conduit under the pavement to designated parking stalls for preparation of future EV Charging Stations. Such infrastructure accommodations at the time of new construction will further the goals of the 2016, "Capital District Electric Vehicle Charging Station Plan". The costs to run conduit at the time of new construction greatly decreases costs to install EV Charging Stations in the future since pavement within the parking area will not need to be torn-up to run electrical connections
6. The applicant, when working with a structural architect for the building design, may want to identify an electrical panel location for convenient PV system interconnections, and keep space available in the electrical panel for a PV circuit breaker. It is easier and more cost effective to plan at the time of new construction for future green infrastructure accommodations such as PV Systems.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 3/5/21 had the following comments:

State Environmental Quality Review

1. No further comments. Site Plans
2. Provide ADA signage at all accessible parking spaces and access aisles. Also provide signage detail on plans.

3. Sheet 1 of 6, consider placing a fence on top of the retaining wall that runs parallel to the sidewalk.
4. The plans contain two of the same outlet control structure detail, one can be deleted from the plans.
5. The following comments are relative to the site plan and its conformance to the International Fire Code (IFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:
 - a. Section 503.1.1 of the IFC requires an approved fire apparatus access road be provided that shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building. The site plan shall be reviewed by the Fire Chief for acceptance of 220 feet and to ensure there is adequate space around the building due to the grading.
 - b. Provide elevation views to verify the height of the building is not in excess of thirty feet in height. As such, appropriate aerial apparatus access roads shall be provided conforming to Appendix D, Section D105 of the IFC. At least one of the required access routes meeting this condition shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building. These conditions shall be reviewed by the Fire Dept.
6. Show where snow storage is being provided within the project site.
7. Pipe crowns differing in diameter, branch, or trunk lines shall be at the same elevation when entering structures. CB on north side of building has an inlet of 12" and outlet of 18".
8. On the ESC Plan, supplement the silt fence at the LOD with orange construction fence including signage prohibiting entry where it adjoins an environmentally sensitive area.
9. The applicant shall provide the Town documentation of the CPWA's ability and willingness to service the project with potable water. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the CPWA.
10. The applicant shall provide the Town documentation of the SCSD's ability and willingness to service the project with public sewer. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the SCSD.
11. The detailed site plans need to illustrate how hydrant spacing satisfies the requirements of Table C102.1 of the International Fire Code (IFC). Locations of any hydrants shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Chief.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT

12. No further comments.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

13. No further comments.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche asked if Mr. Palleschi had a drawing of the proposal with a view of where Kinns Road and Route 9 are. Mr. Palleschi showed on the

Zoom screen a view. Mr. LaFleche also asked the applicant how high the pedestrian walkway was over the covert. Mr. Palleschi stated it is 5-6 feet high over the depression.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Neubauer stated that he feels that the stub sidewalk is awkward and asked if the applicant could make the sidewalks look nicer around the perimeter of the sidewalks and stated that the front of the building could be dressed up to help with this as well.

Mr. Ferraro asked Mr. Palleschi what the letters “RM” meant on the landscaping plan. Mr. Palleschi stated it stood for red maple. Mr. Ferraro stated he agrees with additional landscaping to be included on both sides of the walkway leading to the front of the building from the road.

Mr. Ophardt asked where the runoff from the north side of the building would go. Mr. Palleschi stated it would all drain to catch basins and then into the Synergy Park catch basins and is a part of the SWPPP. Mr. Ophardt asked the applicant how the retaining wall to the rear of the property would affect snow removal in the winter months. Mr. Palleschi stated that the wall was modified for this reason as well and that the snow would have to be removed and relocated in the winter months. Mr. Ophardt asked Mr. Palleschi what type of wall is being proposed. Mr. Palleschi stated it would be a segmental wall.

Mr. Ferraro stated that he thinks there needs to be a guard rail along the sidewalks and that there are standards and requirements for this as well. Mr. Scavo stated there are regulations in the building code. Mr. Palleschi stated he talked to Mr. Myers about this and the guide rails are needed for sloping to assist individuals in wheel chairs, he stated he will talk more with Mr. Myers and stated he would address Mr. Lippmann’s comment about the rails on the south side of the building as well, and there will most likely be a rail along the pedestrian bridge. Mr. Ferraro stated that he would like EV charging stations and would like to see them installed and not just the infrastructure and would like them in the employee parking area. He stated that the applicant can find a good area where they feel they can be installed.

The SEQR determination was unanimously reaffirmed with a negative declaration.

Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Mr. Szczesny, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of 15 Synergy Park Drive, and to grant preliminary and final site plan approval conditioned upon satisfaction of all comments provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listened in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Conditions:

1. EV infrastructure installed with the site plan development.
2. Appropriate railings are installed for walkways, addressing wheelchair concerns.
3. Landscaping concerns for the front entry and walkway are reconciled
4. Stormwater concerns are reconciled.
5. Fire access and hydrant location concerns are reconciled.
- 6.

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 the motion is carried.

Old Business:**2021-005 Solar Foundations Site Plan**

Applicant proposes construction of a 20,000 sf warehouse & light manufacturing structure on the vacant lot, Wood Rd, Zoned: L 2, Status: PB Preliminary Review

SBL: 259.-2-74.2 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Insite Eng.

Applicant: Solar Foundations **Last Seen on: 1-12-21**

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

John Romeo – Solar Foundations – Mr. Romeo stated that since the last meeting the applicant has taken into account the comments given by the Planning Board and the Town Staff and has progressed the site plan for additional consideration. Mr. Romeo stated that since the last meeting the applicant was able to increase the width of the property by 10 feet and is now able to accommodate the pavement on the site due to DCG receiving approval for the modified subdivision. Mr. Romeo stated that the plan is to have 34 native trees around the property as well as an identified dumpster area and parking plan. Mr. Romeo stated that the building has been pushed back but the 26 foot width of the parking has been maintained. Mr. Romeo stated that the water utilities would come onto the site from off the street and there is a plan to have a manhole on the northwest corner of the property for sewer access via gravity and he hopes to have everything in the next plan submission. He stated that an engineering report was submitted with connections identified. Mr. Romeo stated that the water connections will have 2 locations, one with a 1 ½” diameter line for domestic use and one 6” line for the fire line. Mr. Romeo stated that he is aware that MJ has requested a hydrant and that the applicant is willing to work with MJ to locate this as well as the requested Knox box. Mr. Romeo stated that the SWPPP is being worked on currently and will be distributed when ready. He showed on the Zoom screen the site plan with the turning radiuses for emergency vehicles as well as the commercial vehicles that

would be coming on premises. He stated that the façade plan is currently being worked on and will be provided when it becomes available.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 3/1/21 stating:

- Access road around building required to be 26' wide in all areas
- Fire hydrant required within 100' of fire department connection
- A knock box will be required due to the requirement of needing an alarm system to monitor for sprinkler flow at a minimum.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 3/5/21 with the following comments:

1. The test pit data provided lists water found depth, verify if this is the seasonal high-water elevations.
2. On the Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, show the location and size of the sediment trap / basin.
3. When plans progress, submit the FULL SWPPP documentation for review.
4. One of the first steps in planning for stormwater management using green infrastructure is to avoid or minimize land disturbances by preserving natural areas. Preservation of vegetative resources and steep slopes helps to prevent soil erosion and minimizes stormwater runoff. The designer should look into preserving the natural vegetation and slopes to the south of the project to the maximum extent practical.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 3/4/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The Applicant should reserve and display on the site plan or subdivision proposal sufficient Rights of Way to accommodate multi-use trails to interconnect the proposed property with existing and contemplated trail networks, as defined in the Town Trails Master Plan.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 3/2/21 with recommendations he made:

1. The Saratoga Co. Planning Board issued a recommendation in a letter dated February 18, 2021, to the Clifton Park Planning Board noting the Project will have no significant countywide or inter-community impact.
2. Pursuant to Findings Statement #31 of the Wood Road GEIS, the traffic impact fee is \$1,465.47 per generated vehicle trip. The max peak hour vehicle trip per ITE Standards is documented by the applicant to be 3.6 Trips. Therefore, the amount due at the time of stamping the final plan for GEIS Traffic Mitigation Fees is \$5,274.97. (\$1,465.47 per generated vehicle trip X 3.6 Peak Hour Trips = \$5,274.97)

3. The applicant should ensure the mounting heights for the Accessible Parking Sign and No Parking Anytime Sign for the access isle should be between 60” minimum and maximum 72” from the bottom of the sign to the ground.
4. The Building Elevations and lighting plan appear to be the only remaining items still needed to be submitted by the Applicant for review and consideration by the Planning Board.
5. The applicant should consider as an aspect of the new construction, accommodations to install the conduit under the pavement to designated parking stalls for preparation of future EV Charging Stations. Such infrastructure accommodations at the time of new construction will further the goals of the 2016, “Capital District Electric Vehicle Charging Station Plan”. The costs to run conduit at the time of new construction greatly decreases costs to install EV Charging Stations in the future since pavement within the parking area will not need to be torn-up to run electrical connections.
6. The applicant, when working with a structural architect for the building design, may want to identify an electrical panel location for convenient PV system inter-connections, and keep space available in the electrical panel for a PV circuit breaker. It is easier and more cost effective to plan at the time of new construction for future green infrastructure accommodations such as PV Systems.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 3/5/21 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an “Unlisted” action. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo 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. Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: Site Plan approval
- b. Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral is required due to the parcel’s proximity to both I-87 and State Route 9.
- c. NYSDEC: Stormwater permit approval and confirmation of threatened or endangered species
- d. Town of Clifton Park connection to municipal water
- e. Saratoga County Sewer District #1 connection to public wastewater infrastructure

The applicant has submitted Part 1 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF). Based upon our review of the submitted Part 1 SEAF, the following comments are offered:

1. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLAN

2. The applicant indicated a full SWPPP would be provide for review in subsequent submission. Once complete a copy should be provided to the Town for review.
3. Applicant has indicated a copy of the correspondence from the Clifton Park Water Authority ability and willingness to service the project will be provided to the Town upon receipt. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the CPWA.
4. Applicant has indicated a copy of the correspondence from the Saratoga County Sewer District ability and willingness to service the project will be provided to the Town upon receipt. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the SCSD.
5. Applicant has indicated that the potential sump pump laterals will be shown on subsequent submissions,
6. Applicant indicated the following notes will be provided on subsequent submissions. Provide notation on the plan as follows:
 - a. No Utilities shall be installed beneath the proposed driveways.
 - b. Any work required within the Town right-of-way shall be subject to any permitting from the Clifton Park Highway Department (driveway, culvert, water service, sewer).
7. Subsequent submissions should include architectural renderings of the building along with identification of materials of construction. There should also be indication whether or not roof top units are expected and how they may be screened from the public right of way.
8. Subsequent submissions shall include the proposed lighting plan.
9. Accessible parking spaces and access aisles shall be level with surface slopes not exceeding 1:50 (2%) in all directions pursuant to Section 4.6.6 of the ADA 2010 Standards. Provide spot elevations at these locations to confirm conformance.
10. The water and sewer plans shall be submitted to each regulatory agency for review. It is noted that the proposed PVC fire service line on plans differs from the ductile iron pipe in narrative.
11. The following comments are relative to the site plan and its conformance to the International Fire Code (IFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:
 - a. Section 912.2 of the IFC requires a fire hydrant to be located within 100-feet of the building's fire department connection. It is not clear from the plans where the closes hydrant to the site is or where the fire department connection may be. Additional hydrants may be necessary.
 - b. Show or note the location of any required Knox Box associated with the building.
 - c. Identify the actual height of the building. The site statistics table indicates less than 35 feet. If greater than 30-feet in height above the average grade plan, aerial apparatus access shall be provided that is between 15 and 30 feet of one entire side of the building in accordance with Appendix D105 of the IFC. If aerial apparatus access is required, its location shall be identified on the plans.
12. Provide ADA parking space sign on plans.
13. Provide information on how roof drains will be connected to the proposed storm sewer system.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche asked how close the trees would be to the right of way on Wood Road. Mr. Romeo stated that they are about 5-10 feet outside of the right of way and near a swale but not in the swale. Mr. LaFleche asked if there is a possible trail in the future if the roots of those trees interfere with it. Mr. Romeo stated the trees would be about 40-50 feet tall. Mr. Ferraro stated he would like to keep the plan as shown here and if there were a trail to be built to reevaluate it then. Mr. Scavo stated he agrees with Mr. Ferraro.

Mr. Romeo stated that he would like to have rooftop solar as well EV parking station infrastructure.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ferraro stated that the applicant needs to submit the lighting plan, the SWPPP and the façade renderings, but he would like to get clarification on a stormwater comment. Mr. Ferraro stated that comment 4 from Mr. Reese raises a concern for him as well on the southern portion of the property and that the majority of the tree line is being removed to accommodate the swale. He stated that he would like to keep as many existing trees as possible to serve as a natural drainage area. Mr. Romeo stated they did try to disturb as little as possible, but the swale is required for the stormwater management. He stated that they can look at reducing the size of the swale to save trees and also stated that 34 more trees are being planted on the property. Mr. Ferraro thanked Mr. Romeo for looking into trying to preserve the trees.

New Business:**2021-014 Route 146 Technology Building Site Plan**

Applicant is proposing construction of a 10,520 SF two story technology building with approximately 20 parking spaces and access onto NYS Route 146, Rt 146, Zoned: B-5, Status: PB Concept Review SBL: 270.-1-20.111 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: EDP Applicant: Woodhaven Land Partners, LLC

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Gavin Vuillaume – EDP – Mr. Vuillaume stated that this project is a part of a subdivision. Mr. Vuillaume stated that this parcel has wetlands around the property and tonight he would like to develop lot 1 with 10,520 square foot 2 story technology building. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the right side of the building would be about 4,000 square feet for warehousing with a loading dock

to the rear of that and 6,000 square feet of office space would be on the west side. He stated that the frontage is about 530 feet. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the east side of the building has enough room from the property line to expand with another 6,000 square foot building in the future that would be mostly for warehouse space. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the access would be off of Route 146 with a full curb cut, and the parking would be on the side of the building for employees and in front of the building for visitors. The employees would have a picnic area off the building as well. He stated that public water and sewer are accessible and showed the initial renderings on the Zoom screen. He stated green space is above the minimum for the zoning. Mr. Vuillaume showed on the Zoom screen a map of the area with the potential for buildup of the property.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 3/1/21 stating:

- Parcel is zoned B-5. This appears to be an allowed use
- Area of disturbance may require a full SWPPP
- Parking states 20 on plan and 53 on agricultural statement
- Much more detail required for further review.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 3/5/21 with the following comments:

1. When stormwater management plans progress, please provide test hole results with the seasonal high-water marks.
2. There appears to be a LC Zone overlay that borders and traverses this site. Add to plans and remove any disturbances that may lie within the LC Zone.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 3/4/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The Applicant should reserve and display on the site plan or subdivision proposal sufficient Rights of Way to accommodate multi-use trails to interconnect the proposed property with existing and contemplated trail networks, as defined in the Town Trails Master Plan.
2. The future addition would be subject to an additional planning review including any additional required parking.
3. In keeping with the rural nature of the project area and the recommendations of the Town Comprehensive Plan, the Applicant should retain existing vegetation to the maximum extent practical and use landscaping and grading to provide visual and auditory buffering between the project and Route 146.
4. Applicant shall show all Waters of the United States and appropriate buffers on the plans.

Jennifer Viggiani submitted the following comments on behalf of The Trails Subcommittee for the Planning Board to consider in its decision making:

- The site is along NYS Route 146 which is a potential future route for pedestrian/bicyclists. It is recommended to provide either a 15 foot fee simple land or 15-foot easement along the 146 frontage towards future trail use along the frontage of this property to extend a route along NYS 146.
- Progress is being made on such route in the vicinity of Sterling Heights and The Vistas, and also, near the vicinity of Tanner Road.
- This proposed development site is just west of Tanner Road/Miller Road intersection with NYS 146, and the proposed route would continue to the west towards Garnsey Park and Rexford.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 3/5/21 with recommendations he made:

1. A referral to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board for a recommendation on the proposed site plan is required, due to the proximity of State Route 146.
2. This project is located in the Corporate Commerce Zone GEIS study area, and therefore, must comply with the findings statement. In order to initiate SEQR review of the application, the findings statement should be reviewed by the applicant's consultant and a narrative should be provided that indicates how each finding statement item either applies and is being addressed or does not apply. The DGEIS and FGEIS can be reviewed by clicking on the following Dropbox Link:
<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/m6ba74unvbt2azn/AABH8U1JYertNuff4eUKfpOa?dl=0>
3. Pursuant to Page III-19 of the Corporate Commerce FGEIS, "With infill development that is expected to be between Route 146A and Tanner Road, it is recommended by CDTC that a connector road linking individual parcels be considered." This site plan should include provisions for access connections to adjoining properties by means of a floating easement.
4. The subdivision which was initially reviewed in February, must be approved prior to final approval of this site plan and should include concepts for transit, pedestrian, and bicyclist access to the entire area (94.27 acre parcel) subject to commercial uses under the B-5 Zoning. Information regarding anticipated traffic patterns, volume, and timing should be included with the applicant's next submission.
5. In order to evaluate the impacts of the proposed subdivision and this site plan, a full build-out plan should be provided. The plan should include the conceptual building footprints, parking, and utilities. The plan should also quantify the proposed wetlands impacts. Town of Clifton Park Planning Department One Town Hall Plaza | Clifton Park, New York 12065 | (518) 371-6054 | FAX: (518) 371-1136
6. The applicant should address if the wetlands shown have received a current jurisdictional determination from NYS DEC and the Army Corps of Engineers.
7. The 6,000 square foot future addition will require additional Town review and site plan approval when and if the applicant desires to construct the addition.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 3/5/21 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an “Unlisted” action. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo 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. Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: Site Plan approval
- b. Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral is required due to the parcel’s proximity to NYS Route 146
- c. NY State Historic Preservation Office: correspondence with SHPO to ensure no archeologically sensitive resources on project site
- d. NYSDOT: Driveway curb cut
- e. NYSDEC: Stormwater permit approval
- f. Town of Clifton Park: Connection to municipal water
- g. Saratoga County Sewer District #1: Connection to public wastewater infrastructure

The applicant has submitted Part 1 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF). Based upon our review of the submitted Part 1 SEAF, the following comments are offered:

1. Part 1. 3b – The response indicates that the proposed action will disturb more than one acre of land. As such a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required.
2. Part I.12b – The response indicates that the project site is located within or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archeological site inventory. The applicant should provide a correspondence letter from SHPO to confirm the presence or absence of archeologically sensitive resources.
3. Part I.13a – The response indicates that a portion of the site or lands adjoining the site of the proposed action, contains wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency. The applicant should provide documentation that confirms the presence or absence of federally regulated wetlands adjacent to the project site. Additionally, a 100’ wetland buffer should be clearly shown on plan to confirm. Should this change as the project design progresses, additional approvals and permits may be required and the response to Part I.1 may need to be updated.
4. Part I.17 – The response indicates that the proposed action will create stormwater discharge. A stormwater analysis should be conducted to ensure there will be no adverse impacts to adjacent or down gradient properties.
5. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLAN

6. The project is located within the Town's Corporate Commerce District (B-5). In our review of Section 208-53 of the Town's Zoning, the proposal to for a professional office is a permitted principal uses within the B-5 Zoning District.
7. In our review of the concept plan submitted, it would appear that the bulk lot requirements as outlined in Section 208-54 of the Town's Zoning are satisfied.
8. The plan shows 20 new parking spaces for the proposed and future development of the site. Pursuant to Section 208-99 of the Town Zoning, total parking required for office space is 1 space/300 SF. The initial phase of 10,520 SF would yield 35 spaces and with the additional 6,000 SF yields a total of 55 spaces. Provide a narrative as to how the number of parking spaces was determined for the use proposed. Banked parking spaces shall be considered until future expansion takes place. Based on this information the required ADA accessible parking spaces can be determined.
9. The project will disturb more than 1-acre of land. As such, it will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-20-001. Therefore, a full SWPPP will be required that addressed water quantity and quality controls. As the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review process, a fully conforming SWPPP shall be provided for review.
10. The project proposes to provide potable water via the Clifton Park Water Authority (CPWA). The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating the CPWA's ability and willingness to provide potable water to the project.
11. The project proposes to provide sanitary sewer service via the Town of Clifton Park Corporate Commerce sewer District. The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating sewer district's ability and willingness to provide sewer capacity to the project.
12. Provide anticipated water and sewer usage information.
13. It is recommended that at a minimum the number of peak hour vehicle trips, including truck trips and sight distance at the project entrance be provided.
14. Subsequent plans shall show how the project will satisfy the requirements of Section 208-55(B) of the Town's Zoning are being satisfied with respect to lot landscaping.
15. Elevations and materials of construction for the proposed building should be submitted to the Planning Board for review to ensure the requirements of Section 208-55(C) of the Town's Zoning are being met.
16. If the project proposes any utility improvement work within the State right-of-way, the work will be subject to the review and approval to the NYSDOT. The applicant shall coordinate with the regional office of the NYSDOT and obtain permitting in advance of construction.
17. Subsequent submissions should include architectural renderings of the building along with identification of materials of construction.
18. The following comments are relative to the site plan and its conformance to the International Fire Code (IFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:
 - a. If the proposed building is to be provided with an automatic sprinkler, show the location of the fire department connection to ensure they are reasonably accessible.
 - b. Section 912.2 of the IFC requires a fire hydrant to be located within 100-feet of the building's fire department connection. It is not clear from the plans where the closes

- hydrant to the site is or where the fire department connection may be. Additional hydrants may be necessary.
- c. Determine if a Knox Box is required based upon the building arrangements, occupancy and materials of construction. If one is required, its location is subject to the review and approval of the Fire Chief.
 - d. The fire apparatus access road on the concept plan appears greater than 150 feet in length so a turn-around will be required to meet Section 503.2.5 of the IFC. Also, if the building is greater than 30 feet in height, an aerial fire apparatus access road will be required meeting the requirements of Appendix D, Section D105 of the 2020 Fire Code of New York State (FCNYS).
 - e. Provide a turning template analysis for the largest emergency vehicle that may respond to an event at the site.
19. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, we will reserve further comments until more detailed plans and reports are submitted. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208- 115 of the Town zoning specific to lighting, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche asked how far away the building will be from Route 146. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it is 130’ from center line. Mr. LaFleche asked if there could be an easement on 146 for a possible future trail and if so if it could be greater than 15 feet. Mr. LaFleche asked if the entrance to this is going to be the only entrance to the area from Route 146 and if there are any plans to extend the road from the rear of the building throughout the property. Mr. Vuillaume stated this would probably be from 146 but there may be a future one from Waite Road and the roadway would probably service the rear property in the future.

Mr. Ferraro stated that there was a question in the chat room asking if the amount of noise from trucks have been investigated yet. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there is not a lot of traffic anticipated as far as large trucks; there is estimated to have one or two trucks a week. Mr. Scavo stated he believes there is a noise impact study with the original GEIS and is documented within the findings statement.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Andarawis asked if the applicant has considered moving the parking from the south to the west of the building to eliminate or reduce the pavement that is seen from Route 146. Mr. Vuillaume stated that some can be minimized to soften the front of the building.

Ms. Bagramian asked what size trucks would be entering the premises and where the loading dock would be. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it would be one to two tractor trailers per week and the loading dock is in the rear of the building. Mr. Vuillaume showed on the Zoom screen the driving pattern of the trucks into the premises, to the docks, and then their exiting.

Mr. Ophardt asked about an internal roadway network and how this building would tie into the future development of the remaining acreage from the proposed subdivision. Mr. Vuillaume stated the owner will have to cross wetlands to access the rear of the property for adjacent lands. Mr. Ophardt suggested one large access to the site off of Waite Road and eliminating the access on Route 146. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the applicant wants the Route 146 access to stay and that the road would give access to the back parcel as well as this one. Mr. Vuillaume stated that a floating easement is going to be put in place for the back parcel since the owner is unsure of what access location would be needed for the future. Mr. Scavo agreed with the floating easement as the rear development is not yet being contemplated. Mr. Ophardt suggested turning the building clockwise to take the parking off the road. Mr. Vuillaume stated this would not work for the possible future development of another warehouse space and the building could not be pushed back due to the length needed for the tractor trailers to be able to access the warehouse. Mr. Ophardt has concerns with the access road from Route 146 and it going through the properties and the placement of it.

Mr. Ferraro clarified that there is no proposal for the rear parcel to be developed and that this needs to be looked at as a whole not one parcel at a time. Mr. Vuillaume stated that at this time there is no plan to develop. Mr. Ferraro stated that he feels the internal circulation needs to be looked at as a whole not piece by piece and the GEIS was done for the area not just for one parcel. Mr. Vuillaume stated he can review the GEIS and see how this meets the intent. Mr. Ophardt agreed that he would like to see this as a whole not piece by piece. Mr. Szczesny stated it is hard to force them into making a plan when the adjacent property may never get developed.

Discussion Items:

None

Mr. Scavo stated that there are opportunities for webinars. He stated he would send out information to Board members. He asked the members to get back to him if they are interested and the town will pay the fee. Mr. Szczesny stated he already registered. Mr. Szczesny asked how to identify classes that Board members take for the requirements. Mr. Scavo stated he will check to see if the CDRPC will be keeping track of attendance or not. Mr. Ferraro asked if it was a series. Mr. Scavo stated it is a weekly series with only one fee. Mr. Ferraro stated that though it is a series, attendance to all of them is not required.

Mr. Szczesny moved, seconded by Mr. Neubauer, adjournment of the meeting at 10:05 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on March 23rd, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary