

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

PLANNING BOARD

DENIS BAGRAMIAN  
Chairwoman

ROBERT WILCOX  
Attorney

PAULA COOPER  
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis  
Eric Ophardt  
Heather Fariello  
Andrew Neubauer  
Jennyfer Gleason  
Keith Martin  
(alternate) Lisa Westrick

**Planning Board Minutes**  
**May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022**

Those present at the May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: D. Bagramian, chairwoman, E. Andarawis, H. Fariello, E. Ophardt, K. Martin, J. Gleason, Lisa Westrick (alternate)

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

Ms. Bagramian called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. Bagramian stated that in the absence of Mr. Neubauer, Ms. Westrick would be a voting member tonight.

Ms. Bagramian introduced herself as the new chairwoman as well as introduced Ms. Westrick. Ms. Westrick gave all in attendance a brief background of herself.

### **Minutes Approval:**

Mr. Andarawis moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, approval of the minutes of the May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried by all who were in attendance for the meeting.

### **Public Hearings:**

#### **2021-004 DCG Tallow Wood Subdivision**

*Applicant proposes to subdivide the 8.15 acre lot into 2 lots which will be utilized for zoning compliant site developments., 855 Rt 146 & 3 Tallow Wood Dr, Zoned: TC4, Status: PB Review w/possible determination*

SBL: 271.-3-67.1

To be reviewed by: MJE

Consultant: EDP

Applicant: DCG

Last Seen on: 4-26-22

Ms. Bagramian 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. She 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 moved, second by Ms. Fariello, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an Unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

Ms. Bagramian called the public hearing to order at 7:04 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

### **Consultant/Applicant Presentation:**

Joe Dannible – EDP – Mr. Dannible stated that he is here tonight for a 2 lot subdivision on Route 146. He stated that this was last seen on 4/26/22 and that a large portion of the property’s frontage is on Tallow Wood Drive as well. He stated that if the subdivision is approved one lot would front Tallow Wood and one lot would front Route 146. Mr. Dannible showed a map with the existing daycare to the North and an existing building that was previously approved to be converted into apartments along Tallow Wood Drive and stated that the project lies within the Town Center Zoning. He stated that the applicant is looking to keep the residential portion

separate from the commercial uses and that a density allocation of 2.4 and 2.6 acres for the 50% green space is provided. He stated that the Planning Board liked the idea of borrowing land to protect for density at the last meeting. Mr. Dannible stated that the applicant is working on a maintenance agreement that will be finalized with Mr. Scavo. Mr. Dannible stated that there would be a stormwater pond on lot 2 and the owner of this lot would be responsible for the maintenance of it but if upgrades are needed, it would be the responsibility of both lot owners.

**Staff Comments:**

**Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 5/11/22 stating:**

- No further comments

**Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:**

1. No comment,

**Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 5/24/22 with the following comments:**

1. The applicant shall narrate on the ownership and maintenance responsibilities of the stormwater management area that will be on Parcel #2. Drainage easements may need to be added if the maintenance will be shared between the three parcels

**The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 5/3/22 and issued a memo recommending:**

1. Any sales of the involved lots must refer to the subdivision maps for density requirements.

**John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 5/20/22 with recommendations he made:**

1. The Saratoga Co. Planning Board offered a recommendation noting the project would have no significant county-wide or inter-community impact.
2. Add the following notes to the Subdivision Plan:
  - a. The Town will ultimately require the property owner to ensure that the private stormwater control facilities are maintained in working condition, including provisions to raise, maintain, and expend funds for necessary maintenance and repair functions over the project's life and improvements.

**Professional Comments:**

**Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 5/20/22 had the following comments:**

**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW**

1. No further comments at this time. Additional comments may be forthcoming as the project advances.

**SUBDIVISION**

2. Provide the building setback lines for each lot shown.
3. 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.
4. Comments on the individual site plans were addressed during each site plan application process.

**Public Comments:**

There being no public comment, Ms. Ophardt moved, second by Ms. Fariello, to close the public hearing at 7:14 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

**Planning Board Review:**

Mr. Andarawis asked if parking agreements were covered under the reciprocal agreements. Mr. Dannible stated that that are similar to the reciprocal agreements for Clifton Park Center.

Ms. Bagramian asked if there are specific times for spring and fall clean ups so that the look of the property is fluent. Mr. Dannible stated that he does not know details for timing but can look into that and intent of the document should be to have the work completed at the same time.

Mr. Andarawis offered Resolution No. 05 of 2022, seconded by Ms. Gleason to waive the final hearing for this application for the DCG Tallow Wood Subdivision 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.

**Roll Call:**

D. Bagramian - Yes  
 E. Andarawis - Yes  
 E. Ophardt - Yes  
 H. Fariello - Yes  
 A. Neubauer – Absent  
 K. Martin – Yes  
 J. Gleason – Yes  
 Lisa Westrick (alternate) - Yes

Ayes   7  

Noes:   0  

The resolution is carried.

**Old Business:**

None

**New Business:****2022-019 Woodhaven Corporate Commerce Shovel Ready Site Plan**

*Applicant proposes construction of an shovel ready office park on 90.4 acres. The project includes one and two story buildings with a total of 123,000 sf and approximately 450 parking spaces with access on both Waite Road and Route 146. Also involves parcel #270.-1-73. The project includes public sewer, water and on-site stormwater, 587 Waite Rd, Zoned: B-5, Status: PB Concept Review SBL: 270.-1-72.1 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: EDP Applicant: Woodhaven Lawn Partners, LLC*

**Consultant/Applicant Presentation:**

Gavin Vuillaume - EDP – Mr. Vuillaume stated that he is presenting a conceptual site plan for the remaining property for that was purchased by the applicant, Woodhaven Lawn Partners, LLC. He stated that a map was developed to show the corner of Waite Road and 146 with over 500 feet of frontage on Waite Road and 800 feet on 146 and noted it is broken up by a separate corner lot. He stated that the applicant would like access off of both roads and he knows there will be traffic concerns that must be reviewed and addressed. He stated that there are uplands and wetlands on-site, and noted that delineations of the wetlands are almost complete, but feels the layout shown is the best plan with the information currently available to the applicant. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the property is zoned B-5 Corporate Commerce and within the Corporate Commerce GEIS that was done back in 2001. He stated that since it apart of the GEIS, wetlands, traffic, and sewer were already looked at but knows that the Board will want updates on the information. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the buildings would range from 5,000 sf to 30,000-40,000 sf and have one and two stories as well. Mr. Vuillaume stated that some buildings may change in size or be combined dependent on the tenant. Mr. Vuillaume stated that parking would be split up and at most they would have 450 spaces and the map shown has 400. Mr. Vuillaume stated that access would be on Waite Road about 300' from the intersection and that the second access would be on an easement from the adjacent property owner to 146 and all the drives would be privately owned. He stated that the buffers are 100' per town code when adjacent to a residential property. He stated there is 0.32 acres of wetland disturbance and overall disturbance of 16 out of 90 acres.

**Staff Comments:**

**Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 5/11/22 stating:**

- Access to several of the buildings appears limited
- Use appears compliant with B-5 zoning Corporate Commerce
- Three (3) of the proposed buildings are on their own parcels. The parcel furthest to the North has five buildings proposed. Is there a reason for this division?
- Much more detail is required to be able to fully review the proposal.

**Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:**

1. Provide a complete NYSFC compliant fire apparatus access plan
2. Postal verification
3. Specify all existing and proposed hydrant locations
4. Specify proposed fire department locations
5. Specify hydrants within 100' of fire department connection location
6. More comments may follow once the above items have been submitted

**Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 5/24/22 with the following comments:**

1. When the applicant prepares a Full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, deep test hole information at the proposed stormwater management areas will be necessary to indicate seasonal high water table elevations.
2. The proposed concept stormwater management area located at NYS Route 146 and Waite Road intersection should maintain the minimum NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual design required elements for pond buffers and setbacks.

**The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 5/3/22 and issued a memo recommending:**

1. Given the existing traffic conditions, the ECC is concerned with the entrance location on Waite Road and the potential impacts.
2. Given the rural character of the area, the ECC recommends that the applicant incorporate lighting that is directional and limited.
3. Given the proximity to the Belmonte project to the North, the ECC recommends the applicant incorporate a substantial visual buffer between the project and the newly constructed homes.

**John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 5/20/22 with recommendations he made:**

1. The primary purpose of the Corporate Commerce district is to permit, where appropriate, the construction of facilities providing research, information, and communication services; light manufacturing, processing, assembly, and fabrication facilities; warehouse and storage facilities. These permitted uses provide for high-technology campuses, office parks, and research and development facilities. In general, based upon the information provided, the project appears to meet the intent of the zoning district regulations

2. A referral to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board is required for a recommendation to be considered by the Planning Board based on a future preliminary plan set submittal per GML §239(m)&(n).
3. According to NYCRR §617.4, construction other than residential facilities involving the physical alteration of 10 acres or more meets the threshold for a Type I Action. Therefore, the applicant must provide a completed Part I Long Environmental Assessment Form to replace the Short Environmental Assessment Form.
4. The Full EAF and supporting materials should specifically address the following issues, potential impacts and mitigation methods:
  - i. Traffic impacts for project full build-out. Provide a traffic study that analyzes the Waite Road and Route 146 intersection at a minimum and the proposed site access points. The applicant should schedule a coordination meeting between the Town, NYSDOT, MJ Engineering, and the applicant's consultant to discuss access and potential traffic impacts.
  - ii. Threatened or endangered species. A detailed site investigation is recommended.
  - iii. Archeological/Historical resources. A Phase 1A Archeological Survey is 2 recommended.
  - iv. Impacts and mitigation of federal wetland areas. The proposed site plan impacts existing federal wetlands in at least 3 locations.
  - v. Impacts and proposed mitigation of the surrounding land uses, existing lots along Waite Road and Route 146.
  - vi. Address potential visual impacts from Waite Road and Route 146.

Assuming the potential impacts and mitigation measures are sufficiently documented in supporting plans and reports, an Environmental Impact Statement may not be required

5. Since the project meets the criteria as a Type I Action, a coordinated review is required. Therefore, I recommend that the Planning Board declare lead agency for the SEQR review process by a motion vote. Town Staff will then circulate a letter expressing the desire for lead agency status with the site plan and long environmental assessment form once submitted by the applicant to all involved agencies.
6. The applicant should confirm that approximately .32 acres of federal wetlands are shown to be disturbed and include the total wetland disturbance in the site statistics table. The applicant should minimize the potential impacts to the environmentally sensitive features of the site.
7. The applicant should provide information indicating the site's construction for shovelready status, access roads, stormwater management areas, and extending utility systems for each building
8. The 100' required buffer from the adjacent residential zoning district must be field delineated before commencing any construction activities on-site.
9. The applicant should provide the date for when the wetlands were delineated. Based on the building out of the project, the applicant is responsible for keeping a valid jurisdictional determination for the project.
10. Documentation from the Clifton Park Water Authority stating that the existing water supply system has sufficient capacity to support this proposed project should be provided.

11. Note if any work offsite is anticipated for utility extensions and include such work in the project's environmental review.
12. Documentation stating that the existing sewer system has sufficient capacity to support this proposed project should be provided.
13. Documentation stating that the existing electrical supply system has sufficient capacity to support the proposed project should be provided.
14. Plans should note that the proposed roads within the project site are to be privately owned and maintained.
15. The applicant should explain how §208-55 Development Standards for each proposed building area will be met. 3
16. The applicant's design team should meet with the Town's Fire Marshall and Director of Building & Development to review and ensure the plans provide adequate emergency services access to each building.

**Professional Comments:**

**Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 5/20/22 had the following comments:**

**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW**

1. 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(6)(i) . 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: Plan approval
  - b. Saratoga County Planning: Plan approval
  - c. Clifton Park Water Authority (CPWA): Connection to municipal water
  - d. Saratoga County Sewer District #1: Connection to public wastewater infrastructure
  - e. NYS Historic Preservation Office: archeological sensitive area
  - f. NYS Dept of Environmental Conservation: Stormwater permit approval
  - g. USACOE: wetland disturbance

Additional agencies may be identified by the Town during its review of the project.

The applicant has submitted a Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), however a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) should be prepared for a Type 1 action. Based upon our review of the submitted SEAF, the following comments are offered:

2. Part 1. 3.b. – The response indicates that the action will disturb 16+/- acres of land. It appears the project will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-20-001. Therefore, a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required. As the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review process, a fully conforming SWPPP shall be provided for review.
3. Part 1 12.b. – 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

4. Part 1 13.a. – The response indicates that wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by federal, state or local agencies adjoin or are contained within the project site (per the EAF Summary Report. 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.
5. Part 1 17. B – The response indicates that the proposed action creates storm water discharge, from either point of non-point sources. The applicant indicates that proposed stormwater management areas will be the established conveyance system method. The applicant should provide further detailed documentation of the management tools.
6. Submit a Full Environmental Assessment Form for review (EAF).

No further comments at this time. Additional comments may be forthcoming as the project advances.

## **SITE PLANS**

7. 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.
8. 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.
9. Identify the date and by whom the wetlands shown were delineated. Verify if any wetlands are under the jurisdiction of the USACOE.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. The extension of public water mains to the project is subject to NYSDOH plan approval and potentially the NYSDEC for the taking of additional water. As part of the project's regulatory review, the applicant will have to apply for the referenced plan approvals. Any action on the subdivision application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the NYSDOH and/or NYSDEC for the additional taking of water.
13. The project proposes to provide sanitary sewer service via the Town of Clifton Park Corporate Commerce Sewer District and eventually into the Saratoga County Sewer District #1 (SCSD). The applicant shall provide the Town documentation indicating both sewer districts's have the ability and willingness to provide sewer capacity to the project.
14. The extension of public sewer mains to the project is subject to NYSDEC plan approval. As part of the project's regulatory review, the applicant will have to apply for the

referenced plan approvals. Any action on the subdivision application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the NYSDEC.

15. The method for extending sanitary sewer to the site shall be clearly shown on the plans. The method and location for connecting the subdivision's sanitary sewer to the municipal sanitary sewer network must be included on the plans.
16. Show proposed site layout of utilities (water/sewer and storm).
17. Provide engineering reports for water and sewer including but not limited to anticipated demands and existing conveyance systems capacities to determine if each system is capable to accommodate the proposed usage.
18. Show the location of and provide a detail for any exterior refuse areas.
19. This project represents one of several developments in the vicinity of the Rt 146 / Waite Road intersection and will have a cumulative impact on the level of service of the adjacent roadways or mentioned intersection. As such, it is recommended that a traffic impact study be completed that assesses peak hour vehicle trips, site distance and accident data (specifically at Waite Road and Rt 146). Given the proximity to NYS Rt 146, the findings of the study should be provided to the Region 1 office of the NYSDOT for input.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. 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 closest 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. Section 503.1.1 of the International Fire Code (IFC) requires an approved fire apparatus access road be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building and 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. Confirm that there is adequate fire access being provided
  - e. Identify the actual height of the buildings. 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.

- f. Pursuant to Section D104 of the IFC, commercial or industrial buildings that are exceeding 62,000 sq. ft. shall be provided with two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads unless equipped with automatic sprinklers (this exemption is permissible up to 124,000 sq. ft. of building area).
  - g. Provide a turning template analysis for the largest emergency vehicle that may respond to an event at the site.
23. 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:**

Ms. Bagramian gave more information on the fact that the project this evening is not a public hearing and stated that the public is welcome at all meetings. She stated that public hearings are scheduled to give the community an opportunity to make comments and have their concerns heard. Ms. Bagramian stated that many questions that the public may have would be answered with each meeting leading up to the public hearing since the project this evening is in for conceptual site plan consideration only. Mr. Martin stated that during this process anyone can submit comments or concerns in writing to the Planning Department.

Ms. Pollarmo – 602 Waite Road – Ms. Pollarmo stated that the intersection onto 146 is bad and requested a traffic study be done with only one curb cut on Route 146. Ms. Bagramian stated how the traffic study is done and how the town staff and Planning Board looks at the process, and noted the comments by staff and the Planning Board Members have requested such analysis.

### **Planning Board Review:**

Ms. Bagramian asked if there are 3 commercial buildings that are larger and asked what type of commercial buildings they would be. Mr. Vuillaume stated that they would be smaller offices like a medical office building but could be light industrial with more equipment than people such as flex space. Ms. Bagramian asked if there would be overhead doors to the buildings and smaller spaces would be broken up in the buildings as she has concerns with traffic. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it would be similar breakdown to the EDP site recently completed and dully occupied. Ms. Bagramian asked what medical would be at the location and if there would be land-banked parking. Mr. Vuillaume stated the applicant would likely do land banking parking and medical usage would be a doctor's office. Ms. Bagramian asked why the parcels are being subdivided. Mr. Vuillaume stated that right now there is no subdivision proposed but can possibly see in the future the desire for such. However, right now there are no public roads on the property. Ms. Bagramian asked if a landscaping plan would be done. Mr. Vuillaume stated that a landscaping plan will be completed and provided at preliminary site plan consideration.

Mr. Ophardt asked how many parking spots would be on the site and if there was parking for larger trucks. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there are 450 shown and that tractor trailers would only be on site for deliveries and not parking, only light duty trucks. Mr. Ophardt stated that the traffic is still a concern in the area coming out onto Route 146. Mr. Vuillaume stated that a traffic study will be done and it is likely to note 2 entrances are needed which is why 2 accesses are shown in concept.. Mr. Ophardt asked if stormwater basins could be shown on the plans as well as space for fire access. He stated that he would also like to see building renderings and would like to see buffering for the neighbors. Mr. Vuillaume stated that fire code will be met and that there is dense vegetation to screen from neighbors but if more is needed the applicant will evaluate such considerations.

Mr. Martin asked why two curb cuts are being proposed when only one is allowed. Mr. Scavo stated that there is one existing curb cut for the existing building so it doesn't count. Mr. Martin asked what type of property borders this one. Mr. Scavo stated that it is Conservation Residential (CR) which is residential. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the applicant's property is zoned Corporate Commerce, so buffers are being met shown at 100' from adjacent residential.

Mr. Andarawis asked that since the applicant is keeping existing vegetation, the grading should be kept away from the buffers. Mr. Vuillaume stated that they will maintain the 100' buffer area as natural vegetation. Mr. Andarawis asked if the traffic study would be looking at mixed use for the property. Mr. Vuillaume stated that they would use the higher traffic number for the study. Ms. Bagramian asked if there would be 2 traffic studies done for different types of usages such as light industrial and flex space. Mr. Andarawis asked how much traffic was considered in the GEIS from Tanner to 146. Mr. Scavo stated that the GEIS findings called for more traffic entering or exiting Tanner Road. Intersection improvements were shown for Tanner Road and Waite Road Intersections at Route 146. Mr. Andarawis asked if there were more wetlands on the property would development been forced to the East? Mr. Scavo stated that looking at background growth it could be possible.

Mr. Scavo asked if this project would be phased. Mr. Vuillaume stated that there are no tenants yet but build-out and construction would be phased. Mr. Scavo stated that to help give a timeline, Tech Valley off of Woodin Road has taken 14 years to fully develop.

Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Mr. Martin, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the review of this Type I action pursuant to SEQR.

### **Discussion Items:**

Mr. Scavo stated that primary voting this year falls on June 28<sup>th</sup> which is a scheduled Planning Board meeting. He stated that they could meet via Zoom as per the Governors executive order or

change the meeting date to Wednesday June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 7 p.m. Planning Board members agreed that the meeting could be held on Wednesday June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022 at 7 p.m., in person at Town Hall.

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, adjournment of the meeting at 8:03 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

*Paula Cooper*

Paula Cooper, Secretary