

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
April 13th, 2021

Those present at the April 13th, 2021 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Those absent were: A. Neubauer

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. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Ferraro stated that in the absence of Mr. Neubauer tonight, Mr. Martin would be a voting member. Mr. Ferraro stated that Mr. Szczesny would be joining the meeting later this evening.

Minutes Approval:

Ms. Bagramian moved, seconded by Mr. Andarawis, approval of the minutes of the March 23rd, 2021 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried. Mr. Lalukota abstained from voting as he was absent from the March 23rd, 2021 meeting.

Public Hearings:

2021-003 22/42 Clifton Country Rd Subdivision

Applicant proposes subdividing the 23.1 acre lot into 2 lots to be utilized for Town Center zoning compliant site development. The existing Homewood Suites will be subdivided out from the larger parcel. The previously reviewed 4 lot subdivision has been revised to be a 2 lot subdivision to address residential density requirement for the Form Based Code, 22 Clifton Country Rd, Zoned: TC5, Status: PB Preliminary review w/ possible determination SBL: 272.-1-45.1 To be reviewed by: MJE
 Consultant: EDP Applicant: DCG **Last Seen on: 1-26-21**

Mr. Ferraro explained the review and approval process to those present, stating that the Board was required to render a determination pursuant to SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) prior to conducting a public hearing on this application. He explained that the Planning Board would assume Lead Agency status for the project and issue a negative declaration as a “formality” which neither granted nor implied approval of the subdivision application. Should it be determined that additional environmental review is required, SEQRA discussions will be reopened and a decision rendered when deemed appropriate.

Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Ms. Bagramian, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, a Type II action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the public hearing to order at 7:09 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on April 3rd, 2021.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Joe Dannible - EDP – Mr. Dannible stated that the application tonight is for a 2 lot subdivision. He stated that the subdivision is between Clifton Park Center Mall and Homewood Suites lot. Mr. Dannible stated that the parcels are on lease with all appropriate ingress and egresses to access. Mr. Dannible showed on the Zoom screen a map of the area to show the application location. Mr. Dannible stated that the zoning on the property is TC5 and TC2. Mr. Dannible stated that the subdivision is 5-6 acre leased parcel will become a standalone parcel of 2.9 acres that will have the same tax map number as the previously leased property and was approved by the county. Mr. Dannible stated that Clifton Park Center mall as well as a majority of the outlying buildings associated with it would be one parcel as well as parking and stormwater management and that Homewood Suites would be a separate parcel. CPC is a 48.5 acre parcel and the parcel can be redeveloped. He stated that there are 12+/-% of green space on the parcel. Mr. Dannible stated that Lot 4 would be the proposed 2.9 acres for the hotel and has 35% green space with reciprocal easements that are established for CPC, Homewood Suites, Olive Garden, Hilton Garden Inn, and the building that holds Starbucks. Mr. Dannible stated that no parcels are being added only moving the lease line to reflect the building. Mr. Dannible stated that there are reciprocal easements in place on the proposed parcel to address snow removal, and land maintenance. Mr. Dannible stated that there are waivers that would be needed for this property but have not been identified yet for the setbacks or front, rear or side yards. Mr. Dannible stated that the goal here is not to change any of the ingresses or egresses but to improve with redevelopment of the area. Mr. Dannible stated that there is an individual lateral to water and sewer for the hotel. Mr. Dannible stated that Homewood Suites would be identified as Lot 4 for the area of the Clifton Park Center mall.

Mr. Ferraro asked if the proposed subdivision line for Lot 4 in line with the existing lease line. Mr. Dannible showed on the Zoom screen the lease line and stated it would be eliminated and be adjusted to the proposed subdivision line. Mr. Ferraro asked if the green space would change or if it is 35% for the adjusted line. Mr. Dannible stated that 35% would be the actual green space. Mr. Ferraro asked if the map shows the actual reflection of the current conditions. Mr. Dannible stated that the map on the Zoom screen is not the actual area, and he showed on the Zoom screen for Mr. Ferraro the actual map that will be filed. Mr. Dannible stated that the minimum is 10% of green space and in the Town Center sidewalks are calculated as green space. Mr. Ferraro stated that the map filed with the town should reflect what is on the actual property. For instance, he stated, that the current map before the Planning Board shows green space where a portion of the existing parking lot is located.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 4/5/21 stating:

- A totally different submission than previously
- Appears the only subdivision now is to put Homewood Suites on its own parcel
- The previous proposal to divide out parcels for apartments along Clifton Park Center Road and the proposed commercial building along Clifton Country Road have been eliminated
- Mapping clearly defining the limits of the TC-2 and TC-5 is required to determine if variances for setbacks etc. are required for this proposal

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. No comment

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 4/13/21 with the following comments:

1. The subdivision is excluding the stormwater management areas that were designed for the proposed parcel. Drainage easements / agreements will need to be in place for the off-site stormwater management areas. All stormwater infrastructure that exists on the parcel that comes from offsite locations will need to have easements for future maintenance / repair / replacement access.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 4/6/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC notes that a stormwater drainage pipe crosses the northern boundary of the proposed Homewood Suites Subdivision. In addition, there is a stormwater management area to the southeast of the Homewood Suites Subdivision Property that services that parcel. Any proposed deed for the subdivided property should clearly indicate management responsibilities and ownership for repairs and maintenance of these stormwater management features.

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator:

The subdivision does not frustrate any of the existing connections and will include public access.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 4/6/21 with recommendations he made:

1. The Saratoga Co. Planning Board noted the project would have no significant county-wide or intercommunity impact.
2. Utilities such as water and sanitary sewer that service more than one parcel are required to be owned by a public entity. It is likely that the existing utilities servicing the parcel are privately owned. Similar Subdivisions have required the dedication of public utilities or creation of a transportation corporation. The subdivision plan should depict the utilities and document how the proposed parcels will be serviced. If it is demonstrated by the applicant that the Homewood Suites Improvements are serviced by their own private laterals from public water and sewer mains, there is no issue.

3. Reciprocal ingress/egress easements should be provided for the proposed parcels. The 2.9 acre parcel displayed as Lot#4, should be granted access to the Clifton Country Road curb cut. The remaining Lands of CCM Associates of Clifton Park, LLC should be granted access over the drive aisles within proposed Lot #4.
4. Provide a greenspace calculation for Proposed Lot #4 and include it in the site statistics table to ensure the lot conforms to the minimum requirement.
5. Add assigned 911 addresses to the final plan. Clarify labeling on the Concept Subdivision Plan that references Parcel #4 Remaining Lands of CCM Associates and Lot #4 for the 2.9 acre proposed parcel.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 4/9/21 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments at this time.

SUBDIVISION

2. The applicant indicated additional conversations with the Town are necessary to verify the various setback requirements for the proposed lots.

Public Comments:

None

There being no additional public comment, Mr. Ferraro moved, second by Ms. Bagramian, to close the public hearing at 7:34 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Szczesny joined the meeting at 7:30 pm

Ms. Bagramian stated that she has concerns about the maintenance agreements between the lots and how detailed they are as far as seal coating, spring and fall clean up, snow removal asphalt repair among other things. She stated that this is in the Town Center and that all of this needs to

be orchestrated so that individual parcels don't look as if they are run down. Mr. Donald McElroy – DCG – stated that the Homewood Suites has been there for 4-5 years and is basically self-contained and has been doing their cross maintenance as required by the agreement. Mr. McElroy stated that they do their own maintenance and that Hilton dictates this. Mr. McElroy stated that it has been successful with maintenance throughout this time. Mr. Dannible stated that other lots are also working successfully under this same maintenance agreement and existing easements.

Mr. Ferraro asked the applicant what capital improvements would be assured such as repaving. Mr. McElroy stated that the owner of the property as well as Hilton, assure the maintenance is done as well as the agreements in place will be carried over with the subdivision and there is no end date to the agreement. Mr. Ferraro stated that he would like the town to agree with these reciprocal agreements between lots. Mr. Wilcox stated that he could look at the agreements and stated that he is unsure if it was reviewed by a Town Attorney prior. Mr. McElroy stated that it was given to the Town when the Homewood Suites was built. Mr. Scavo stated that he has a paper copy of the agreement and they are about 4 inches thick so it is not a simple agreement. Mr. Ferraro stated that a condition of an approval if it were to be approved would be that the Town is in agreement with this.

Mr. Martin stated that the Homewood Suites is TC2 and TC5 but open space also needs to be looked at as per Town Code 208-223G and it has not been mentioned in regards to Open Space. Mr. Scavo stated that this is reflective of an additional right of way or town easement and should not affect any private property in the area.

Mr. Ferraro stated that Mr. Myers had said in his letter that variances may be needed based on where the TC Zones change. Mr. Ferraro asked if the Planning Board has the ability to waive them and not have the applicant go to the ZBA. Mr. Scavo stated that the Planning Board can waive the dimensional requirements. Mr. Ferraro stated that they would be waiving something they may not fully understand due to the site plan not being fully representative of Lot 4. Mr. Ferraro stated that he would be willing to make an approval conditioned upon the Planning Department and the Attorney to look at the Zoning regulations to determine what waivers, if any, may be needed, and to review the maintenance agreements and if they have issues then the applicant would have to come back to the Planning Board for further review. Mr. Scavo stated that the setbacks may be in compliance and waivers may not be needed, but it will be looked into.

Mr. Ophardt asked if there is a difference that this parcel is not owner occupied as a TC2 and TC5 Zoning. Mr. Scavo stated that a new lease would be made and the old one would be dissolved.

Mr. Ferraro asked Mr. Scavo if the zoning can be changed to reflect the parcel boundaries. Mr. Scavo stated that it could be at some point but that would be done by the Town Board.

Mr. Andarawis asked if the property boundaries and setbacks taking into consideration future connection streets. Mr. Scavo stated that he feels the eastern portion could be a connection. Mr. Andarawis stated that he feels at this point he does not see it frustrating future vision of the area.

Mr. Ferraro stated that previously the application was for a four lot subdivision and asked what the intent would be for future subdivision as previously proposed. Mr. McElroy stated that at this point there is no plan but as for the future there any or may not be further subdivision but if there is it would have to go through the Planning Board the same as this is.

Mr. Martin offered Resolution No. 06 of 2021, seconded by Mr. Lalukota to waive the final hearing for this application for the Subdivision of 22/42 Clifton Park Center Rd. approval, and to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval condition upon satisfaction of all comments, provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Conditions:

1. Redefine the green space boundaries that on the current plans shows it to overlap and include a portion of the existing parking lot and verify Greenspace calculations and place it on the plan for Lot #4 which includes sidewalks and functional public space improvements.
2. Provide in the statistics table setback information for the existing hotel on Lot #4 (required/provided). This will allow the Town staff to verify if any waivers from the zoning requirements was necessary for the lot created.
3. Provide a copy of the reciprocal agreements which includes Stormwater Management and Maintenance agreements to Town staff and the Planning Board Attorney for review and comment.

Roll Call:

D. Bagramian - Yes

E. Andarawis - Yes

E. Ophardt - Yes

R. Lalukota - Yes

A. Neubauer - Absent

G. Szczesny - Yes

R Ferraro - Yes

K. Martin – Alternate Member - Yes

Ayes 7Noes: 0

The resolution is carried.

Public Hearings:

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: 3-9-21**

Mr. Ferraro explained the review and approval process to those present, stating that the Board was required to render a determination pursuant to SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) prior to conducting a public hearing on this application. He explained that the Planning Board would assume Lead Agency status for the project and issue a negative declaration as a “formality” which neither granted nor implied approval of the subdivision application. Should it be determined that additional environmental review is required, SEQRA discussions will be reopened and a decision rendered when deemed appropriate.

Mr. Martin stated that he feels there needs to be an amended FAS as there was a possible change to the EAF. Mr. Scavo stated that the previous project was reviewed as a Type I action with the previous disturbance area based on the previous roadways and disturbance area. Mr. Scavo stated that if the EAF was reviewed and updated he feels that it will show less impact than what was previously approved. Mr. Ferraro asked if there have been no additional forms from 2008. Mr. Scavo stated there has not been. Mr. Dannible stated that a negative declaration has been made for this and this is an amended subdivision with a significant reduction in impact and impervious surfaces to the area and is now a cluster subdivision which will not change the previous finding. Mr. Wilcox stated that a new declaration can be made and have it reflect the modifications and if there are concerns then the applicant will return and SEQR will be reopened if this is what the Board feels is appropriate.

Mr. Martin moved, second by Ms. Bagramian, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, a Type I action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. A

revised Part I will be submitted to reflect modifications to the subdivision plan and if there are concerns that SEQR will be reopened.

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the public hearing to order at 8:29 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on April 3rd, 2021.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Joe Dannible – EDP – Mr. Dannible stated that MR. Peter Belmonte - owner and applicant – is also on the meeting. Mr. Dannible stated that this application has been pending since 2018 and has been presented 4 times to the Planning Board. Mr. Dannible stated that this application is consistent with the original SEQRA and the applicant will work with the town on any SEQR modifications. He stated that all impacts with this project have had a decrease. He stated that this is a 125 acre parcel with 33 lots being that have already been approved as well as water, sewer, stormwater. Mr. Dannible showed on the Zoom screen the map of the area and a map of the approved subdivision. He showed a map of the amended proposal showing 33 lots plus one additional lot. Mr. Dannible stated that wetlands that were previously looked at are now smaller than originally identified and they now have room for another lot. Mr. Dannible stated that 125 acres for this project are unchanged, he stated there were 27 acres of constrained land and now there are 23, he stated the number of permitted lots increased by 1 from 33 to 34 now, and open space was 64.5 acres and now is 68.5 acres, he also stated that the dedicated land going to the Town of Clifton Park was increased from 49 to 62.7 acres. Mr. Dannible showed on the map the areas that will be dedicated to the Town. Mr. Dannible stated that deed restricted areas have changed as well and indicated them as a purple color on the map.

Mr. Ferraro asked about lots 23, 24 and 25 what the green represented. Mr. Dannible stated it was tree area as most of the property is on a field farm area. Mr. Dannible stated that the purple on the map is private open space.

Mr. Dannible stated that the linear feet of roadway and pavement has been reduced. He stated that the impervious area on the site has been reduced 3 acres. Mr. Dannible stated that the additional lot being proposed is negligible due to the significant decrease in this and stated that he feels the previous negative declaration should be upheld due to all of these findings. Mr. Dannible stated that Clifton Park water and sewer would be available. Mr. Dannible stated that there will be open space to the north of the project so that a future trail connection can be made. He stated that signage will be in place so that property owners will know that there is a future trail in the space.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 4/5/21 stating:

- Overall site plan needs to be available on one sheet
- I believe the applicant is correct in that the NYSFC supersedes the town code restriction of 18 lots on a dead end road if the homes are fully sprinklered according to the NYSFC, that is what is proposed
- High ground water found during test pits (3'-8') will require lots to be built up to keep foundations out of the water table. Proof of compaction of fill in these locations will be required prior to permit issuance

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Provide site plan on one sheet with utility/hydrant locations
2. Revise postal verification

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 4/13/21 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.
2. Impervious liners / clay lining is strongly suggested in pocket ponds and micro-pools to limit stormwater interaction with groundwater.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 4/6/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. Where the wetlands extend into the delineated lots, fencing or signage should designate these boundaries.

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator:

Mr. Scavo stated that he spoke to Ms. Viggiani and stated that she understands a future trail will be constructed she stated that she would like to see a sign indicating where the entrance location will be announcing the intent of the entrance.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 4/8/21 with recommendations he made:

1. Add assigned 911 addresses to the final plat for each Lot to be developed for single family dwellings.
2. Insert the overall subdivision plan shown on one sheet, which you provided separately, into the final plan set.
3. Add a notation to the plan that states, "No further subdivision for the residential lots allowed pursuant to the residential density requirements prescribed by §208-16 of the

Town Code titled, "Conservation Residential Zones." The objective is to ensure that future owners of Lots 1 & 2 do not have the impression that because their parcels are 6+ acres each in size, they have the ability to each create an additional building lot.

4. For the 5.57 acres of deed restricted private open space, add the following notes to the plan: DEED RESTRICTED PRIVATE OPEN SPACE
 - a. Proof of preservation in perpetuity of permanent open space for lands in private ownership shall be made in accordance with §208-16(F) of the Clifton Park Town Code and shall not be subject to future amendments or modifications.
 - b. Allowable uses within the Permanent Open Space are limited to the provisions prescribed within §2016(D)(2) of the Clifton Park Town Code and shall not be amended otherwise.

In the meeting Mr. Scavo stated he wanted to amend the comment 4b and said the open space is contiguous with the wetlands and will request that no disturbance will occur. He stated that 50% open space that 25% of the total unconstrained land should be a part of the open space calculation

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 4/9/21 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLANS

2. Verify ownership of the proposed stormwater management areas. Will areas be conveyed to the Town of Clifton Park or to the HOA.
3. If the Town is to take ownership of each of the proposed stormwater management areas, further modifications are required to fully comply with the NYSSMDM and to ensure Town forces can adequately access and maintain the facilities. The modifications are as follows:
 - a. Provide a turnaround for the access to SMA#3 pursuant to Section 6.1.6 of the NYSSMDM.
 - b. Coordinate with the Highway Superintendent on whether a split rail fence is required around each stormwater area which is a standard requirement of Town owned facilities.
4. Indicate the locations of the existing streams on the plans.
5. The Subdivision Plat shall include the following certification statement pursuant to Section 86-5(F) of the Town Code, "I hereby certify this map to be substantially correct and in accordance with the accuracy required by the Town of Clifton Park Subdivision Standards."

6. Show how foundation drains or sump pumps will be handled for each proposed building lot.
7. Are temporary construction easements proposed to install the water main and force main along Waite Road.
8. Street grades shall not be less than 1.0%. The road slope at STA. 12+00 is shown as 0.85%, please revise accordingly.
9. The proposed road has fill sections that exceed 5-feet. The profiles should note any special provisions to be implemented to ensure a stabilized sub-grade will be provided including lift and compaction requirements.
10. It is suggested that an additional CB be placed across from CB#3. This section of road is proposed to be at the minimum slope of 1%, this will assist to prevent ponding between CB#2 and CB#7 (320 feet apart).
11. Appropriate traffic regulatory signage needs to be shown on the plans and shall be in accordance with the MUTCD standards
12. 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.
13. Provide construction details for the following elements:
 - a. Mailbox kiosk
 - b. Underdrain detail
 - c. SMA maintenance access road
 - d. MUTCD signage
 - e. SMA required signage
14. The proposed mail kiosks are understood to be under the jurisdiction of an HOA. An access easement within the Town right of way that is conveyed to the HOA may be warranted as well as a maintenance agreement for the area and pavement outside the travel way of the future Town road.
15. The erosion control plans should indicate the proposed phasing plan with no single phase exceeding 5 acres.
16. Subsequent submission should include a proposed landscaping plan for review.
17. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSSMDM), the proposed stormwater practices need to have a conspicuous and legible sign posted.
18. At each pond, pursuant Section 6.1.6 of the NYSSMDM, warning signs must be posted prohibiting swimming, wading, and skating, warning of possible contamination or pollution of pond water, and indicating maximum depth of pond. The plan shall show the location of the sign(s) and detail must be provided within the plan set.
19. Pursuant to Section 6.1.3 of the NYSSMDM a fixed vertical sediment depth marker should be installed in the forebay to measure sediment deposition over time. The plans shall show the installed location along with a construction detail for the depth marker.
20. Landscaping plan shall be prepared for each of the P practices pursuant to Section 6.1.5 of the NYSSMDM. The landscaping plan shall indicate how aquatic and terrestrial areas will be vegetatively stabilized and established.
21. "P" practices employ an impermeable liner as an equivalent means to provide separation from a boundary condition. The plans shall specify the liner type and confirm that the

liner will line float due to some of the pond bottoms being well below the observed seasonal high groundwater elevation.

22. Provide a cross section through each type of practice showing the various elevations for stored runoff by storm event. It shall also show various design features including, but not limited to inlet/outlet structure elevations/inverts, barrier between forebay/extended detention with weir/overflow elevation, emergency overflow weir/berm and elevation/location of the aquatic bench location.
23. The proposed sanitary connection along NYS Route 146 will require a Utility Work Permit from the NYSDOT. Letters of approval for this utility crossing shall be provided to the Town as a condition of approval.
24. Provide all off-site water main and force main layout and connection points on plans for review.
25. Water and sewer detail sheets have not been reviewed as they are under the jurisdiction of Clifton Park Water Authority and Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1.
26. Sheet 21 of 22, the pocket pond table items D-1 and D-2 dimension should be in inches, please verify.
27. Sheet 21 of 22, the aquatic bench should be shown on all sides of the proposed pond.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT NARRATIVE

28. Provide an analysis of all segments of storm sewer pipe to show that the 10-year, 24-hour design storm freely discharges without backwater conditions occurring pursuant to 86-7(A)(1)(a) of the Town Code. The analysis shall also account for the design requirements outlined in Section 86-7(A)(2) of the Town Code.
29. Identify the party that will be taking ownership of each stormwater practice proposed.
30. Provide summary of pre and post watershed areas for comparison.
31. Time of concentration (Tc) shallow concentrated flow utilizes several different cover types throughout. However, pursuant to Technical Release 55 (TR55), shallow concentrated flow is to be either paved or unpaved.
32. The watershed maps (pre and post) appear to be utilizing the existing streams in Areas 1E and 3E for the time of concentration. This should be reflected in the model as the Tc will be quicker than the woods/grass used in the model.
33. It is proposed to utilize “conservation of natural areas”, a NYSDEC green Infrastructure practice. Conservation of natural areas shall be located within a conservation easement and permanently conserved as stated within the SWPPP. Subsequent plans shall clearly define this area as an easement with description provided during the final stages of the project’s review.
34. The SWPPP Plans should indicate the disturbance of ACOE wetlands. Ensure that the appropriate nationwide permit is obtained prior to wetland disturbances.
35. The narrative in Section 5.3.2.2 indicates runoff reduction from disconnection of roof runoff is 2,232 cf and conservation area as 782 cf, however the RRv calculation sheet in Attachment A indicates otherwise. Please verify RRv practices.
36. Disconnection of rooftop runoff may only be applied when “filtration/infiltration areas” are incorporated into the site design to receive runoff from rooftops.
37. Provide calculation worksheet for the design of the disconnection of rooftop runoff as proposed.

38. Provide information confirming the criteria in Section 5.3.5 of the NYSSWDM for disconnection of rooftop runoff has been met.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP)

39. Include a section within the SWPPP that discusses permit eligibility with respect to Part I.F.4 (state / federal threatened and endanger species) and I.F.8 (historic properties) of the General Permit. Provide any documentation received from agencies having jurisdiction, either database searches or correspondence that support permit eligibility within the SWPPP.
40. Question 5 of the NOI indicates that no more than 5 acres will be disturbed at one time. The erosion control plans need to be updated to reflect a phased grading/site development to support this statement.

Public Comments:

Michelle Bissonette – Ms. Bissonette asked if the roadways in the subdivision would be wide enough to accommodate a school bus or if children would need to walk to Waite Road to get the bus. Mr. Dannible stated that the roadway is expected to meet the access standards of Clifton Park, and those buses, tractor trailers, and snow plows are all expected to be able to access the road. Ms. Bissonette asked if the green strip along the property line that is adjacent to her property will be on the map. Mr. Dannible stated it is a tree line now; it is not deed restricted but is about 15 to 20 feet wide. Ms. Bissonette asked what the wetlands are indicated as on the site map. Mr. Dannible stated that the wetlands are indicated on the map by the hashed markings.

Janelle Palermo – Ms. Palermo asked about the potential traffic impact to 146 and Waite Road and the concerns she has with the amount of accidents that they have there already. Mr. Scavo went over a project that is potentially for Tanner Road and improvements for it to help mitigate traffic.

There being no additional public comment, Mr. Ferraro moved, second by Mr. Szczesny, to close the public hearing at 9:03 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ferraro stated that this time the full site plan was not submitted as part of the Planning Board's review until a week before the meeting and was not complete with showing the public vs. private open space and therefore he could not determine the area of private open space. He stated that issues raised by MJE and information like landscaping plans that are still needed as well as the signage that was discussed tonight in regards to the future trails and site statistics. Mr. Ferraro stated that these things need to be addressed before he feels comfortable taking action on this.

Mr. Belmonte stated that any of the questions brought to the applicant was only brought to the applicant today so a verbal response is the only way this could be addressed. Mr. Belmonte stated that all the items will be reviewed and addressed to satisfy the concerns of the Board and the Staff. He stated that preliminary approval would be helpful tonight for the applicant to be able to submit to the Health Department as they are backed up right now. He stated that all comments will be addressed moving forward and will be addressed before they ask for a final approval. He asked the Board for preliminary approval tonight.

Mr. Ferraro stated that he appreciates Mr. Belmonte's comments tonight and that there are still comments that need to be addressed before final approval can be made. Mr. Ferraro asked for confirmation that if preliminary is given tonight if they would have to come back to the Board for final approval. Mr. Scavo stated that this is correct; the applicant would still have to come back for final approval from the Board. He stated that preliminary approval means the layout is approved but any other conditions are subject to Board review and the applicant is bound to come back.

Mr. Ferraro stated he has concerns on lot 5 and the map that was received; it has non jurisdictional wetlands on a good portion of the land and asked if the lot was at all buildable. Mr. Belmonte stated that test pits were done in the area and the wetlands were actually surface water pent up; once it was penetrated, the water dispersed and there are no concerns about high water table.

Mr. Ferraro stated that he would be comfortable to grant preliminary approval with the understanding that comments will be addressed and the applicant will come back for final approval. Mr. Andarawis, Mr. Ophardt, Ms. Bagramian, and Mr. Martin stated they agree with Mr. Ferraro.

Mr. Ophardt asked about fencing around wetland ponds and if there would be any. Mr. Dannible stated that there is a town requirement and the applicant will be following it, most likely with a split rail fence.

Mr. Szczesny offered Resolution No. 07 of 2021, seconded by Mr. Ophardt to waive the preliminary hearing for this application for the Waite Meadows 34 Lot Subdivision approval, and to grant preliminary subdivision approval condition upon satisfaction of all comments, provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listed in the comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Conditions:

1. SEQR Action Type I – Submit fully revised Part I EAF, Data necessary already appears to be provided within the revised SWPPP and Site Statistics Table on the

- Subdivision Plan. A revised narrative and certain data information for the Part I EAF revised on the form previously and was provided in 2018. Missing data on that form should be filled in based on information provided in the project file from other reports provided by the applicant.
2. Clearly delineate and label on the subdivision map the privately owned permanently protected open space and the open space boundaries that are to be dedicated to the town.
 3. Add a note for a sign to be mounted at the future trail head location off the private roadway on lands to be donated to the Town of Clifton Park. Sign should read “Future multi-use pathway trail location.”
 4. Provide CPWA Sign-Off.
 5. Due to the presence of non-jurisdictional wetlands present on building lots such as Lot #5, a notation should be added to the plans noting, “Foundations will not be allowed in standing ground water.
 6. Intermittent split rail fence and/or signage to visually discern for private property owners the limits of the wetland boundaries and permanently protected open space present on their lots.
 7. Note and verify the location, type and quantity of street trees provided.

Roll Call:

D. Bagramian - Yes
 E. Andarawis - Yes
 E. Ophardt - Yes
 R. Lalukota - Yes
 A. Neubauer - Absent
 G. Szczesny - Yes
 R Ferraro - Yes
 K. Martin – Alternate Member - Yes

Ayes 7

Noes: 0

The resolution is carried.

Public Hearings:

2021-006 Pasquariello Waite Rd 2 Lot Subdivision

Applicant proposes to subdivide a 94.27 acre parcel into two separate parcels. Parcel 1 shall be 7.47 acres and parcel 2 shall be 86.80 acres to be retained by the owner, 587 Waite Rd, Zoned: B-5, Status: PB Preliminary review w/ possible determination

SBL: 270.-1-72 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: EDP
 Applicant: A. Pasquariello **Last Seen on: 2-9-21**

Mr. Ferraro explained the review and approval process to those present, stating that the Board was required to render a determination pursuant to SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) prior to conducting a public hearing on this application. He explained that the Planning Board would assume Lead Agency status for the project and issue a negative declaration as a “formality” which neither granted nor implied approval of the subdivision application. Should it be determined that additional environmental review is required, SEQRA discussions will be reopened and a decision rendered when deemed appropriate.

Mr. Ferraro stated that he has concerns about MJE comment that the plan did not include the land features on the parcel as required by 179-11 of the Town subdivision law. Mr. Ferraro stated the submitted plan is lacking the detail that is required. Mr. Dannible showed on the Zoom screen the previously approved subdivision of the adjacent parcel and that the map he showed had Mr. Ferraro’s signature. He stated it did not show these features and it has been filed with the town and the county. Mr. Lippmann asked if the next mapping could show it and just because it was missed in the past it is being asked to be shown tonight. Mr. Dannible stated that there is no work being done on the property and there is a wetland delineation complete and that the map being shown on the Zoom screen will be filed along with the new one, and that there is a site plan to be reviewed that will have all of the requested information on it. Mr. Ferraro stated that this is a review for the subdivision and feels that the information is needed to complete the SEQR before action can be taken. Mr. Ferraro stated that this concern was brought up by other town staff as well as MJE and himself.

After further discussion with all Planning Board Members, the applicant, and Town Staff present, it was concluded that the applicant will provide the information for SEQR and that the applicant will come back at the next meeting for the public hearing.

Old Business:

2021-002 Ushers Rd (256-262) Medical Buildings Site Plan

Applicant proposes construction of a 40,000 SF two story Medical Office Building on a 3.79 acre parcel with parking. Project includes access on Ushers Road. Also includes parcel: 259.-2-42.1, 262 Ushers Rd, Zoned: B-3, Status: PB Preliminary review w/ possible determination SBL: 259.-2-41.2 To be reviewed by: MJE
 Consultant: EDP Applicant: CEH **Last Seen on: 1-12-21**

Ms. Bagramian stated that she will be recusing herself from this application.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Gavin Vuillaume – EDP – Mr. Vuillaume stated that this application was before the Planning Board back in January and that the layout has not changed since then. He stated it is a 2 story 40,000 square foot medical building at the corner of Route 9 and Ushers Road where an old bank and a pizza restaurant used to be. He stated that the two parcels will be merged to create a 3.8 acre parcel for this proposed medical building and parking area. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the property to the south is also owned by the same company and has access to the roadway from this property. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there will be some grading to make the area flattened to match the building and the parking. He stated that there are grading and stormwater plans for the application. He stated that the existing driveway access to the site from Ushers Road will be removed and relocated further away from Route 9 providing more stacking room on Ushers Road. Mr. Vuillaume stated the traffic narrative has been attached in the application packet and it shows that the impact would be increased by 39 trips. Mr. Vuillaume verified site distance as requested at the last meeting and that they do conform but there is heavy vegetation along the right of way and it has been recommended that the vegetation be pulled back. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the driveway would be full access and there would also be full access to the building to the rear of the property. He stated that there would be a formal drop off for patients which are common with medical buildings. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there are handicapped parking near the entrance and there are EV parking spaces being proposed. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there are stormwater managements areas on the property some of which discharges towards the Route 9 ditch line. He stated there are current water lines along Ushers Road that the connection would be made to as well as a pump station for the building that would tie into the sewer lines that run along Route 9. He stated that the landscaping plan has been included and that the trash enclosure will be to the rear of the building with landscaping along the front of the property and landscaping to buffer the property from the west. Mr. Vuillaume showed on the Zoom screen a model of what the building would look like and if more details are needed they will be provided to the Board as the plan progresses. Mr. Vuillaume stated that he has received the entire review letter and feels the grading and stormwater management can be addressed. He stated that he recognizes the need for erosion control along Route 9 and they will be working on this.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 4/5/21 stating:

- Directional signage will be required for access to rear building

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Put 911 address of 256 Ushers Road on map

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 4/13/21 with the following comments:

1. It appears that significant amount of grading will be required to construct this project. The SWPPP should include in the narrative where the haul routes and location of where soil material is being brought to or from.
2. Some of the stormwater management areas (SMA) are where large cuts or fills will take place. When test pits and percolation tests are being performed, the depth should be four feet below the designed bottom elevation of the SMA.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 4/6/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC is concerned with the stormwater drainage of this new and larger development. The existing drainage to the Dwaas Kill is directed and piped under the existing railroad to Prestige Motors that is adjacent to the Dwaas Kill. Newly developed systems associated with the proposed project must consider the possible inadequacy of existing stormwater drainage capacity.
2. The ECC notes that the project includes extensive paving adjacent to, or in the vicinity of (the LC Zone, State or Federal Wetlands). The ECC recommends that the Planning Board require the Applicant to incorporate sediment traps and oil water separators with appropriate capacity to limit the migration of vehicular contaminants into these sensitive environments.
3. The ECC recommends that the applicant incorporate lighting that is directional and limited.

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator:

Mr. Scavo stated that he spoke to Ms. Viggiani and she stated that the exiting path along Ushers Road that is not frustrated.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 4/8/21 with recommendations he made:

1. As noted in the VHB Traffic Analysis, to maintain good sight lines, the vegetation along the Usher Road project frontage, except for well-established desirable trees that are not found to impede sight lines, be cleared a minimum of 14.5 feet back from the travel way.
2. Ensure all accessible isles adjacent to accessible parking spaces have curb ramps that will meet the slope requirements.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 4/9/21 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLAN

2. Show the sight distance on the plans and Identify the recommended areas for vegetation removal per VHB's site distance evaluation.
3. Show on plans the ingress/egress shared access easement for 258 Ushers Road. Provide a copy of the agreement to the Town.
4. The plan shows 213 parking spaces, 54 less than required pursuant to Section 208-99, of the Town Zoning (1 for each 150 square feet). Applicant has indicated that the spaces provided is adequate based on similar size facilities. Planning Board shall reserve the right to amend these requirements based upon local or unique conditions.
5. For any existing utilities that are to be abandon, their location shall be noted, and the extent of removals/abandonment identified in accordance with authorities having jurisdiction (ie wells).
6. Any work required (Utility or non-utility) within the NYSDOT right-of-way shall be subject to any permitting from the New York State Department of Transportation (driveway, culvert, water service, sewer). Notation to that effect shall be added to the plans.
7. All sanitary sewer system improvements and construction details are subject to the review and approval of the Saratoga County Sewer District #1. Any requested plan changes shall be incorporated in subsequent plan submissions.
8. All potable water system improvements and construction details are subject to the review and approval of the Clifton Park Water Authority. Any requested plan changes shall be incorporated in subsequent plan submissions.
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 on the west side of the building.
10. The ADA accessible parking signage detail needs to be updated to denote the correct language on the accessible aisle sign which shall be "No Parking Anytime" to be consistent with Section 1111.5 of the NYS Building Code
11. Show the turning template for the largest responding emergency vehicle accessing the site up to and through the aerial apparatus access road.
12. Indicate whether there will be any roof top mechanical units that may be visible from the public roads. If there are any, screening of these units may be required.
13. Provide notation on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that all upstream construction shall be completed and stabilized before connecting to the downstream infiltration practice(s) pursuant to Section 6.3.5 of the NYSSMDM.
14. Provide notation on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan that the infiltration practice(s) shall not be used as sediment control device during site construction phase pursuant to Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM.

15. The applicant shall provide a cross section detail for all of the forebay and infiltration basin shown. The cross section should provide design elevations including stone invert, pipe invert and depth of runoff by storm event as reported by the SWPPP.
16. The applicant shall provide a cross section detail for the underground infiltration system. The cross section should provide design elevations including stone invert, pipe invert and depth of runoff by storm event as reported by the SWPPP. It is suggested that cleanouts/access ports be provided at the end of each pipe for maintenance and inspection.
17. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of the NYSSMDM, the proposed stormwater practice needs to have a conspicuous and legible sign posted. The plans need to provide the standard sign with the applicable language as well as the location.
18. It appears runoff from portions of the asphalt drive and trash enclosure adjacent to Stormwater Management Area #1 (SMA#1) will not be directed to the pretreatment forebay. Therefore, a gravel diaphragm should be placed just off the edge of the asphalt to ensure adequate pretreatment is achieved.
19. Stormwater Management Area #2 is located directly adjacent to the existing building on the neighboring parcel. Pursuant to NYSSMDM section 6.3.1 infiltration practices cannot be placed in locations that cause water problems to downgradient properties. Infiltration basins need to be setback 25-ft downgradient from structures and septic systems.
20. There appears to be a sanitary grinder pump, cleanout and forceman within infiltration basin SMA#2. The plan needs to show relocation of these utilities as they will likely be inundated with stormwater runoff.
21. Stormwater Management Area #3 (SMH#3) encroaches onto the NYSDOT right-of-way. This work will require approval from NYSDOT, and a work permit will be required as previously noted. Correspondence from NYSDOT for preliminary approval should be provided to the Town.
22. The weir elevations associated with SMA#3 are all at 237.0-ft and the top of the berm for the stormwater practice and associated forebays appear to be at 237.0-ft. Therefore, the stormwater will likely overflow the berms at the same time it flows over the weirs. It is suggested to provide a minimum of 6-inches of freeboard from the peak elevation of the 100-year storm.
23. The underground infiltration pipe array seems to conflict with several of the site lights. Confirm installation is viable in the location shown. Otherwise, relocate the underground storage to ensure it does not conflict with any of the other proposed or existing utilities.
24. There is an existing manhole located within Forebay #3. Confirm manhole type and if it will be removed. Otherwise, it appears the inlet and outlet pipe of the manhole will conflict with the underground infiltration piping.
25. The existing grades beneath the proposed infiltration basin SMA#1 appear to be at a slope of approximately 33%. Pursuant to Section 6.3.1 of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSSMDM), infiltration practices cannot be located on areas with natural slopes greater than 15%. Confirm the natural land slope does not exceed the maximum allowed.
26. The infiltration basin needs to include means to operate during wintertime conditions. This may include the installation of a series of drywells that penetrate the upper frost layers of the soil, which would permit infiltration even in cold/freezing weather.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT NARRATIVE AND STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

27. A Geotechnical Report was not submitted. Ensure geotechnical testing is completed per NYSSMDM Appendix D to confirm infiltration rates utilized in the design and depth to ground water/ refusal. A summary of the sitespecific soil investigation should be added to the Stormwater Narrative once complete.
28. It is noted that Stormwater Management Area (SMA#2) is located off from the project parcel on the neighboring property that is owned and operated by the same owner as this project parcel. An easement is required in the event the owner sells one of the parcels in the future
29. The post development watershed total area is approximately 6,000sf less than the predevelopment watershed total area. The pre and post watershed areas should be similar in size.
30. Confirm catchbasin CB#1 Hydrocad model elevations and revise the plans as needed. There appears to be a typo putting the CB 100-ft above finished grade.
31. Pond SMA#2 within the HydroCAD model takes credit for storage up to the 233-ft contour. However, on the plan, the last contour before the existing building is 232-ft. This will allow water to pond against the existing building. TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT
32. For vehicles exiting the site driveway heading WB on Ushers Road, will the sight distance for this movement be compromised by vehicles queuing on Ushers Road EB for a red light at the intersection of US Route 9?
33. Does the vegetation along the south side of Ushers Road west of the site driveway impact the intersection sight distance looking left for existing vehicles? It appears that some of this vegetation needs to be removed to achieve the sight distance in Table 4.
34. For the trip distribution, it was determined that the split is 60/40 for vehicles traveling to/from the west/east, respectively. This represents the PM peak distribution and is opposite to the AM peak distribution of 40/60 split to/from west/east, respectively. What was this determination based on? Why not use different distributions for the AM and PM peak periods?

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ophardt stated that improvements have been proposed to the southeast end of the property and asked whose property it is on. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there is a slight depression in the area and that there is no stormwater but it will be made to conform to code. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the same owner is on all three properties. Mr. Ophardt asked about a drainage inlet near Route 9 and if would drain there. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it would be a spill way for the

overflow but there is other significant stormwater plans and that there is underground stormwater storage to be proposed under the parking. Mr. Ophardt stated that he feels that the dumpster placement is awkward and would like to see if it can be moved. Mr. Vuillaume stated he can talk to the owner about relocating it. Mr. Ophardt asked about the access to the rear of the building and if there would be a rear entrance into the building. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there may be another access into the building but it is not yet determined. Mr. Ophardt asked if all stormwater was being managed on site as they are close to the Dwaas Kill. Mr. Vuillaume stated that all stormwater is being managed on site before it gets to the DOT ditch on Route 9.

Mr. Ferraro stated that the sidewalks are showing on 3 sides of the building but not on the side where there may be an entrance. Mr. Ferraro asked if the sidewalk can be extended to the fourth side. Mr. Vuillaume stated that if a doorway is installed there would be a sidewalk installed along all sides of the building with landscaping. Mr. Ferraro thanked the applicant for the EV charging stations and stated that he feels the stormwater comments can be addressed. Mr. Ferraro asked if there would be a need for a wall between the adjacent property and this one. Mr. Vuillaume stated that grading is enough that a wall should not be needed. Mr. Ferraro asked that they try to preserve as much vegetation as possible.

Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Mr. Szczesny, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Andarawis moved, second by Mr. Martin, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of Ushers Rd (256-262) Medical Buildings, 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. Add wrap-around sidewalk to encompass all four sides of the medical building
2. Relocation of dumpster area to the rear of the property
3. Address all outstanding technical comments provided by MJ Engineering and Town Staff.

Ayes: 6

Noes: 0 The motion is carried

Old Business:

2021-005 Solar Foundations Site Plan

Applicant proposes construction of a 24,000 sf 2 story warehouse & light manufacturing structure on the 2.82 vacant lot, Wood Rd, Zoned: L 2, Status: PB Preliminary review w/ possible determination SBL: 259.-2-74.2 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Insite Eng. Applicant: Solar Foundations **Last Seen on: 3-9-21**

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

John Romeo – Solar Foundations – Mr. Romeo stated that since the last meeting a plan set has been provided as well as a full SWPPP and architectural drawings are in the plan. Mr. Romeo stated that there are stub outs for future connections for EV stations. Mr. Romeo stated he included the HVAC plans on the drawing of the building that would be to the rear of the building. He stated that the drawing includes the fire hydrant as requested and the laterals for it. Mr. Romeo stated that stormwater plan is in detail and there is a lighting plan. He stated that Knox boxes were addressed as well as other comments from the Town staff. Mr. Romeo showed on the Zoom screen the architectural renderings and the elevations of the building. Mr. Romeo stated that they have received comments over the past few days and they can be addressed as they are mostly technical in nature. Mr. Romeo stated that a plan for the erosion control plan would be submitted by the end of the week and that a handicapped ramp would be installed.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 4/5/21 stating:

- The fire hydrant should be moved to adjacent to the driveway
- Building access now appears sufficient

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Hydrant should be moved closer to the building adjacent to the driveway
2. Put 911 address of 18 Wood Road on site map

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 4/13/21 with the following comments:

1. If silt fences are planned to be utilized as full site sediment control for the disturbed area, please provide the sizing calculations as per the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control – November 2016 - Standard and Specifications for Silt Fence – with the maximum ponding depth in correlation with the 3,600 cubic feet per drainage area.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 4/6/21 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 4/10/21 with recommendations he made:

1. The applicant should ensure that the accessible parking isle adjacent to the sidewalk is accessible to a wheelchair user via a curb ramp.
2. All my prior comments have been adequately addressed.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 4/9/21 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLAN

2. Suggest relocating the water main from beneath the infiltration basin.
3. Storm pipes daylighting at grade shall be provided with FES and stone apron.
4. Provide existing and proposed contours to demonstrate that the erosion control measures shown are appropriate and being placed correctly.
5. Provide an erosion and sediment control plan with existing and proposed contours and with the proposed site plan to demonstrate that the erosion control measures shown are appropriate and being placed correctly.
6. Indicate whether there will be any roof top mechanical units that may be visible from the public roads. If there are any, screening of these units may be required.
7. The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan needs to indicate locations for temporary sediment traps to be used during construction.
8. Include stoned check dams along graded swale behind southern-most building.
9. Consider providing an erosion control blanket on slopes 1:3 and greater.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT

10. Replace GP 0-15-002 in Appendix G with the updated GP 0-20-001.
11. The applicant provided a Notice of Intent (NOI) form that has not been filled out. A draft NOI shall be provided for review
12. Time of concentration (Tc) shallow concentrated flow utilizes several different cover types throughout the HydroCAD model. However, pursuant to Technical Release 55 (TR55), shallow concentrated flow is to be classified as either “paved” or “unpaved”.
13. The SWPPP shall include the operation and maintenance required of the installed stormwater management facilities pursuant to Part III.B.2.f of GP 0-20-001. It shall also cover the post construction O&M requirements associated with soil restoration pursuant to Section 5.1.6 of the NYSSMDM.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Andarawis thanked Mr. Romeo for the EV charging stations. Mr. Andarawis asked if the applicant was considering a roof top solar. Mr. Romeo stated that the applicant is considering solar but not sure when it would be installed.

Mr. Ferraro asked if the rooftop mechanical equipment for the HVAC would be on the roof. Mr. Romeo stated that it would not be rooftop but in the rear of the building as well as the dumpster in order to keep the front of the building as nice as possible. Mr. Romeo stated that they looked into reducing the swales and the slopes in the rear in order to reduce the amount of wooded area designated to be cleared. But due to topographical issues, the slopes could not be reduced, but the applicant would do as much as possible to not disturb existing trees during construction.

Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Mr. Martin, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was unanimously carried.

Ms. Bagramian moved, second by Mr. Szczesny, to waive the final hearing for this application for the site plan review of the Solar Foundations Site Plan, 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. Provide final hydrant location based on input from Steve Myers.
2. Add 911 Address to final site plan.
3. Address all outstanding comments provided by Town Staff and MJ Engineering.

Ayes: 7

Noes: 0 The motion is carried

New Business:**2021-022 168 Vischer Ferry Rd 2 Lot Subdivision (Stevens)**

Applicant proposes subdividing a 50.23 acre lot creating a new 3.61 acre lot to be utilized for a single family home. No Clearing of existing woodlands or vegetation is necessary.

New well and septic, 168 Vischer Ferry Rd, Zoned: CR,

Status: PB Concept Review SBL: 282.-2-51 To be reviewed by: MJE

Consultant: None Applicant: M. Stevens

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Maggie Stevens – applicant – Ms. Stevens stated that she would like to subdivide a 50 acre lot to create a new 3.61 acre lot. She stated that the property is owned by her grandmother and that a single family residence would be built on the 3.61 acre parcel which she would reside in. Ms. Stevens stated that her father, Mr. John Stevens, also an engineer will address all comments. Mr. Stevens stated that the MJE review letter has been review and that most can be addressed and went over the comments. Mr. Stevens stated that they are in the CR zone and stated he is looking for clarification on the handling of the conservation layout.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 4/5/21 stating:

- There appears to be NYSDEC wetlands and 100' buffer on this property as well
- Lot appears to meet the CR zone requirements
- Will need proof of a viable well and septic system before granting a permit

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. No comments

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 4/13/21 with the following comments:

1. It appears NYSDEC Wetland N-11 (2) and the 100-foot adjacent area encroaches on to the site. Please verify and update plans as needed. 2. Show outline of proposed septic field and proposed well locations on plan and distances from open waters and wetland boundaries.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 4/6/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC notes that the CR Zone requires a minimum of 3 acres of unconstrained land per dwelling.
2. It appears that the wetlands maps show more than 0.61 acres of wetlands (constrained land) on the proposed parcel. Approval of this proposed subdivision would result in a parcel that is less than 3 acres of unconstrained land, which is not a buildable lot per CR Zoning.
3. The limits of (the LC Zone and 100-foot buffer zone, DEC Wetlands, Federal Jurisdictional Wetlands) shall be identified on the plot plan.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 4/10/21 with recommendations he made:

1. I commend the applicant for utilizing the conservation resource inventory chart. It provides pertinent information to the Planning Board and Town Staff when evaluating projects with the Conservation Residential Zoning District.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant needs to obtain a permit for construction of the proposed driveways and utility work within the County's ROW and is advised to contact Gary Meier, Saratoga County Department of Public Works, at 518-885-2235 to commence the permit process.
3. The assigned 911 address for the new lot shall be added to the final subdivision plat once the information is provided to the applicant from the Town's Fire Marshall.
4. A referral to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board has been made for a recommendation in accordance with GML Section 239 (m) & (n).

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 4/9/21 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 a "Type 1" action per 6 CRR-NY 617.4.b(8) based on the location of the action occurring wholly within Saratoga County Agricultural District 2. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is required. 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: Subdivision approval
- b. Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral is required due to the parcel's location within Saratoga County Agricultural District 2
- c. NY State Office of Historic Preservation: identification of archeologically sensitive resources

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. The action is classified as a Type 1 Action per 6 CRR-NY 617.4.b(8) based on the location of the action occurring wholly within Saratoga County Agricultural District 2. A Type 1 Action requires that a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) be completed. The applicant will need to provide a FEAF with the next submission.
2. Part I. 12b – The applicant indicates that the project site is not located within or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archeological site inventory. This response is inconsistent with a review of the DEC Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Mapper, located at www.dec.ny.gov/eafmapper/. The applicant should change the response in the SEAF.
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. 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. No further comments at this time.

SUBDIVISION

5. 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.
6. Include a site statistics table indicating the space and bulk standards per Section 208.11.
7. In reviewing the proposed lot configuration, the created lots appear to be deficient in regards to meeting the minimum standard requirements outlined in Section 208-16 of the Town's Zoning. The noted deficiencies are as follows:
 - a. Include a site statistics table indicating the following per Section 208.16(E) Standards:
 - i. Bulk
 - ii. Density
 - iii. Permanent Open Space
 - iv. Conservation Design Layout
 - v. Variances
 - b. A one-time, single-lot exception is allowed, meaning a subdivision of one parcel, as it existed as of January 1, 2005, into a maximum of two lots to be used for single-family residential purposes only shall not be required to follow the conservation approach, although it is highly encouraged to be protective of the natural and cultural resources of the community. This shall only be permitted for parcels greater than 10 acres and shall only be allowed if both of the newly created lots will be initially owned by family members, at the discretion of the Planning Board.
8. Indicate whether any permanent or protected open space is proposed with the project. If proposed, the method of protection in perpetuity needs to be provided.

9. A private well is proposed. Subsequent submissions shall show suggested location. In locating the proposed wells, they shall account for the location of the neighboring septic system and wetland setbacks per NYSDOH Appendix 75A.
10. Verify location of proposed septic system including the 50% expansion area. Confirm it meets the setbacks required of Appendix 75-A of the State Sanitary Code.
11. An on-site septic system is proposed. Subsequent submissions shall include the percolation and test pit results.
12. The applicant proposes to service the lot with an on-site septic system. The proposed septic system shall be designed by a New York State licensed professional engineer and conform to the requirements of the New York State Department of Health (Section 208-91) for review and approval by the Town Building Department.
13. The project does not have access to a public water supply, with all lots being serviced by on-lot wells for drinking water. Section 507.2 of The New York Fire Code (2020) allows the fire code official to approve the use of NFPA 1142, in rural and suburban areas in which adequate and reliable water supply systems do not exist. The applicant shall discuss with the Town's emergency response agencies whether NFPA 1142 will be applied to the project.
14. All lot grading shall be such that drainage is directed away from the homes and towards lot lines and ultimately to an approved drainage course as required by Section 86-7(A)(5) of the Town Code. In order to demonstrate conformance to the stated regulations, an overall project grading plan must be developed for review
15. Subsequent plans shall show the Town's LC location and boundaries which are defined by Section 208-69.1 of the Town's Zoning.
16. Provide the building setback lines for each lot shown.
17. Provide hatching for existing wetlands areas for clarification on the plans.
18. Confirm that the proposed driveway has adequate site distance based upon the posted speed limit of Vischer Ferry Road
19. There may be a need to provide a drainage culvert at the new driveway to support existing drainage along Vischer Ferry Road. The applicant will need to coordinate with Saratoga County Highway Department for any such improvements. If required, show the location, size and materials of construction.
20. Pursuant to Section 86-10 of the Town Zoning, the applicant shall be required to plant two trees per living unit on the street side of new construction sites. Provide planned species to be planted for review.
21. Provide notation on the plan as follows: a. No Utilities shall be installed beneath the proposed driveways. b. Any work required within the County right-of-way shall be subject to any permitting from the Saratoga County Highway Department (driveway and culvert).
22. Subsequent submissions shall include the metes and bounds of the affected lots and right-of-way. This plat shall be prepared by a surveyor licensed to practice in the State of New York.
23. 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 created and placed on the filed plat.

24. Considering this plan is conceptual in nature, subsequent comments will be provided with a preliminary plan submission.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Andarawis asked about the subdivision code. Mr. Stevens stated that they would be looking for a one time exception for the subdivision and find out if it qualifies. Mr. Andarawis asked if the option for under 10 acre would be acceptable. Mr. Stevens stated that this is a 4 acre parcel that seems to cut off nicely and as to not play favorites for grandchildren.

Mr. Ferraro stated that this code 208-16 is a little confusing and that the ECC comments may not be accurate. He stated that, based on his understanding of the code, this proposal meets the requirements of 2b or 2c code for the subdivision and asked for clarification. Mr. Scavo stated that this can be a “c” option but if they were to further subdivide then they would fall under the “b” option. Mr. Ferraro thanked the applicant for including the 15 foot right of way for a future possible trail.

Mr. Stevens asked if the Planning Board can establish lead agency for SEQR tonight. Mr. Scavo stated that they can do this to start the SEQR process tonight and there is no formality that needs to be done.

New Business:

2021-023 Clover Meadow Farm 2 Lot Subdivision

Applicant proposes subdividing an existing 10.06 acre parcel into 2 residential lot.
 Proposed Lot 1 will be 2.6 acres and Lot 2 will be 7.46 acres, Hubbs Rd, Zoned: CR,
 Status: PB Concept Review SBL: 258.-1-44.211 To be reviewed by: MJE
 Consultant: Lansing Applicant: Clover Meadow Farm, LLC

Mr. Andarawis stated he will be recusing himself from this project due to his proximity to the application.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Scott Lansing – Lansing Engineering – Mr. Lansing showed on the Zoom screen the map of the area where the proposal is located. Mr. Lansing stated that it is on Hubbs Road and showed where the parcel is in relation to Schaubert Road. He stated it is CR zoned and slopes towards the southeast and vegetation is shown well on the map, which is primarily wooded. Mr. Lansing stated that this would be a 2 lot subdivision consistent with the CR code with single family lots. He showed the density map on the Zoom screen and indicated the wetland areas. He showed the agricultural map as well on the Zoom screen. Mr. Lansing stated that 6.45 acres of buildable land on the property and 2.13 units are allowable and what is being proposed. Mr. Lansing stated that the lots would disturb 1.99 acres of land and the lots would be 40,000 square foot minimum and frontage would be on Hubbs Road with all the setbacks. Mr. Lansing stated that they are not disturbing the wetlands and that there will be a shared driveway to avoid wetland disturbance. Mr. Lansing stated that 5.16 acres would remain open space as required. He stated that individual wells and septic systems are being proposed for each lot and stormwater would be managed and has been a part of another projects SWPPP that was before the Board previously and approved. Mr. Lansing showed a map of the proposal to show that the lots would not be landlocked.

Staff Comments:

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 4/5/21 stating:

- Both proposed lots are keyhole lots
- Both lots are required to have 40’ of frontage on a public road, which they do not
- Each should be a minimum of three acres
- Proof of viable well and septic design are required prior to obtaining a permit
- Map shows adjacent property is owned by the town. County mapping does not reflect this
- How is the “open space” to be accessed?
- Cleared land maps does not match proposed building footprints
- All issues with this and other parcels associated with this owner should be resolved prior to any approvals

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Postal verification
2. Clearly specify compliance to Section 511 of the NYS Fire Code. – driveway width, clear height, stability (75,000lb load), and turn outs

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 4/13/21 with the following comments:

1. Applicant has submitted a FULL SWPPP for the 2-lot subdivision in conjunction with the previously approved 5-lot Subdivision of Lands of Santoro & Masseria, last revised February 4, 2021. The town has approved the stormwater management & erosion and

sediment controls on March 4th, 2021. The SWPPP is subject to be revised with any modifications that is approved and/or denied by the Planning Board.

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 4/6/21 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The minimum standards for developing parcels in the CR district are clear. Per Section 208-16 (E) Standards subparagraph (2)(b) shows the methodology for calculating the approved density on a parcel of 10 acres or more. It states that a parcel may be developed at a density not to exceed 0.33 units per acre of unconstrained land. This proposal does not meet that standard.
2. The ECC recommends that the Planning Board reject this proposal as designed.

Mr. Ferraro stated that the narrative does reflect the density and asked for confirmation that the applicant's calculation is accurate. Mr. Scavo stated that this is true.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 4/12/21 with recommendations he made:

1. The two lots proposed each appear to meet the 80' minimum frontage requirement prescribed by the CR Zoning District.
2. A draft agreement for the shared driveway should be provided by the applicant to the Planning Board and Mr. Wilcox for review and comment.
3. The proposed driveway shall conform to sections 503 & 511 of the Fire Code of New York State.
4. It appears wetland disturbances are avoided. The applicant should confirm if wetlands are to be disturbed.
5. Postal verification addresses shall be added to the final plan.
6. Test pits and percolation tests should be performed within the limits of the proposed septic areas to determine the adequacy of the underlying soils to accommodate the proposed septic systems.
7. The borders of all land that is to remain undisturbed shall be clearly marked on the site before site preparation begins. These on-site boundary markers shall remain until construction is completed and soils are stabilized.
8. Provide the approximate distance of the proposed driveway to the adjacent side yard at the two closest points. Confirm if construction of the driveway and associated grading, will occur onsite without encroaching onto the neighboring property to the west. This includes pushing of dirt or grading of materials offsite.
9. Add the following note to the preliminary plan:
A regulated 100' buffer area to a freshwater wetland is present on the lot. Prior to undertaking any project that may be within the wetland buffer, the property owner shall contact **both** the DEC Region 5 Office at (518) 623-1200, and the Town of Clifton Park at (518) 518-371-6651, to obtain required permits.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 4/9/21 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: Subdivision approval
- b. Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral is required due to the parcel’s location within 500 feet of Saratoga County Agricultural District 2
- c. NY State Office of Historic Preservation: identification of archeologically sensitive resources

SUBDIVISION

3. 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.
4. In reviewing the proposed lot layout in comparison to Section 208-11 of the Town’s Zoning, it would appear all minimum bulk lot requirements are satisfied.
5. It appears Lot 2 is a land locked parcel. Frontage should be provided to Hubbs Road.
6. Identify the date and by whom the wetlands shown were delineated.
7. Provide contour lines at a minimum of two-foot intervals to United State Geological Survey datum within the parcel.
8. The project proposed a shared drive. The applicant shall provide a draft maintenance agreement for review by the Planning Board’s legal counsel
9. The proposed shared driveway shall comply with the IRC and New York Supplement. Details or description of the proposed drive materials of construction shall be provided, confirming it will can support the load of the responding emergency vehicles.
10. Verify location of proposed septic system including the 50% expansion area. Confirm it meets the setbacks required of Appendix 75-A of the State Sanitary Code.
11. An on-site septic system is proposed. Subsequent submissions shall include the percolation and test pit results.
12. The applicant proposes to service the lot with an on-site septic system. The proposed septic system shall be designed by a New York State licensed professional engineer and conform to the requirements of the New York State Department of Health (Section 208-91) for review and approval by the Town Building Department.
13. The project does not have access to a public water supply, with all lots being serviced by on-lot wells for drinking water. Section 507.2 of The New York Fire Code (2020) allows

the fire code official to approve the use of NFPA 1142, in rural and suburban areas in which adequate and reliable water supply systems do not exist. The applicant shall discuss with the Town's emergency response agencies whether NFPA 1142 will be applied to the project.

14. All lot grading shall be such that drainage is directed away from the homes and towards lot lines and ultimately to an approved drainage course as required by Section 86-7(A)(5) of the Town Code. In order to demonstrate conformance to the stated regulations, an overall project grading plan must be developed for review.
15. Subsequent plans shall show the Town's LC location and boundaries which are defined by Section 208-69.1 of the Town's Zoning.
16. Provide the building setback lines for each lot shown.
17. Confirm that the proposed driveway has adequate site distance based upon the posted speed limit of Hubbs Road.
18. There may be a need to provide a drainage culvert at the new driveway to support existing drainage along Hubbs Road. The applicant will need to coordinate with the Clifton Park Highway Department for any such improvements. If required, show the location, size and materials of construction.
19. Pursuant to Section 86-10 of the Town Zoning, the applicant shall be required to plant two trees per living unit on the street side of new construction sites. Provide planned species to be planted for review.
20. 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 and culvert).
21. Subsequent submissions shall include the metes and bounds of the conservation easement areas.
22. 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 created and placed on the filed plat
23. 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 what the terrain is on the south side of Hubbs Road where the property lines are. Mr. Lansing showed on the Zoom screen a picture of the area that showed a drop off near the roadside. Mr. LaFleche asked if there could be an easement for a possible bike path. Mr. Lansing stated that he can talk to the applicant. Mr. Lansing stated there is not much frontage but does not believe it would be an objection.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Martin asked about the page 3 of the narrative and asked about an adjacent subdivision that was referenced to the east. Mr. Lansing stated that this was the Santoro & Masseria subdivision that was referenced. Mr. Ferraro stated that was approved in 2019.

Mr. Ferraro asked about the CR1 map that was provided and that a note stated that a portion was to be donated to the Town; Mr. Ferraro clarified that this was a part of the Masseria subdivision and that it should be 9.26 acres. Mr. Lansing stated that it was and that it would be corrected. Mr. Ferraro inquired about the area dedicated to open space that would be under private ownership and that signage and split rail fencing should be placed to define the area as well as along the perimeter of the wetland buffer area to ensure it is not disturbed. Mr. Ferraro stated he has to agree with Mr. Scavo's comment preferring this layout rather than having the homes directly fronting the road. Mr. Ferraro asked Mr. Scavo if this property would be considered a keyhole lot. Mr. Scavo stated it could be but it does meet all the frontage requirements so it can be argued otherwise. Mr. Ferraro stated that putting the homes where they are proposed resulting in keyhole lots versus having the homes fronting directly onto Hubbs Road may be preferred since it would be more in keeping with the area by screening the homes from the road.

Mr. Martin asked about the adjacent subdivision that was recently approved and the town getting public open space, why is the town not getting open space here. Mr. Scavo stated it was looked at that and that on the 5 lot subdivision there is a large wetland running through the Towns open space and to the east of that would be a trail connection and if there is additional land on this side, it would be a benefit to the Town even if left in private ownership. Mr. Ferraro stated he still does have concerns about home owners disturbing the land 5+ years down the road and there is a need for a visual reminder that the land is dedicated open space and cannot be disturbed.

Mr. Lansing asked if the Planning Board could establish Lead Agency and if the Public Hearing could be scheduled. Mr. Scavo stated that they can move forward with SEQR and that the soonest he can get the applicant in for another hearing would be May. Mr. Scavo stated that this application has been referred to the County and this means before any final decisions can be made by the Town the County needs to give their recommendation.

Discussion Items:

None

Mr. Szczesny moved, seconded by Mr. Lalukota, adjournment of the meeting at 11:57 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on April 27th, 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary