

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

ANTHONY MORELLI
Attorney

JANIS DEAN
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis
Denise Bagramian
Jeffery Jones
Andrew Neubauer
Eric Ophardt
Greg Szczesny

(alternate) Teresa LaSalle

Planning Board Meeting
November 14, 2017

Those present at the November 14, 2017 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, D. Bagramian, J. Jones, A. Neubauer, E. Ophardt,
G. Szczesny
T. LaSalle – Alternate Member

Those absent were: E. Andarawis

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
A. Morelli, Counsel
J. Dean, Secretary

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Ferraro announced that Ms. LaSalle would be sitting as a full voting member at this evening's meeting due to the absence of Mr. Andarawis.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian, approval of the minutes of the October 24, 2017 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Public Hearings:

There were no public hearings scheduled for this evening's meeting.

Old Business:

There were no items of old business scheduled for this evening's meeting.

New Business:

[2017-056] **Adirondack Office Suites** – Proposed construction of a 45' x 102.5' detached garage, 282 Ushers Road – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 259.-2-38

Mr. Bob Wilklow, consultant for the applicant, presented this application that calls for the construction of a 45' x 102.5' (4,612 SF) detached garage in the rear of a 39,295 SF parcel of land located on the southeasterly side of the Ushers Road - Commerce Drive intersection. The property, which is situated within the LI-2, Light Industrial zoning district, currently contains an existing office building with existing utility connections and associated parking. An updated plan presented to the Planning Department on November 13, 2017 in response to comments issued by professional staff and the Town's Designated Engineer, indicates that the direct connection to Ushers Road from the site will be removed: site access will be provided by a new single curb cut onto Commerce Drive. The updated plan also shows a rudimentary indication of proposed clearing limits. Mr. Wilklow explained that silt fencing will be installed to address erosion issues. An engineer will provide detailed grading plans.

Mr. Scavo reported that all comments prepared by Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, Ms. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, the ECC, Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, Mr. Dahn Bull, Highway Superintendent, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C., Ms. Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator, and the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee for items on this evening's agenda have been forwarded to Board members for their consideration.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, provided the following comments regarding this application in a memo dated October 26, 2017. The proposed garage is a permitted use within the LI-2 zoning district. The proposed layout appears to meet all setback requirements. Mr. Myers explained that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted two area variances for the existing building on October 20, 1998.

Mr. Scavo explained that the ECC issued the following comment on this application after review of the application at its November 8, 2017 meeting. The ECC is concerned with the intended use of the garage. This question relates to what type of facilities are needed and what environmental impacts may occur.

Mr. Scavo read the comment prepared by Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician. He requested that the applicant show the grading required for the proposed garage and asphalt drive and provide a narrative describing how stormwater runoff from the site will be affected.

Mr. Scavo read comments prepared by the Planning Department. The applicant is asked to add the following notes to the site plan:

Area Variance #80204 granted October 20, 1998, allowed the lot size to be 39,295 SF and granted relief from the 1acre minimum lot size requirement within the LI-2 zoning district.

Area Variance #80204 granted October 20, 1998, allowed the lot width to be reduced from 200' pursuant to §208-98 of the Town Code to 184.83.

The plan should indicate whether or not any of the existing mature vegetation (trees) adjacent to and behind the wood frame office building will remain. If there are trees identified to remain they should be marked with survey flagging tape. The applicant is asked to provide a basic erosion and sediment control plan that delineates the limits of disturbance. Pursuant to §208-65(E)(2) of the Town Code:

...there is established a twenty-five-foot minimum side and rear yard setback, which shall be considered a buffer area, and which shall contain natural or planted vegetation for the purpose of screening uses from adjacent properties. No parking shall be permitted in the buffer area.

Based on the above Town Code requirement for the LI-2 zoning district, removal of the small section of proposed asphalt from the 25' buffer area along the eastern side yard of the site appears warranted. §208-66(A) of the Town Code regarding ingress/egress states the following:

There shall not be more than one curb cut per lot unless the Planning Board finds that traffic safety will be improved with the addition of another curb cut... In the case of a corner lot, no curb cut shall be located closer than 100 feet to the intersection.

It appears the proposed second curb cut onto Commerce Drive is approximately 95' from the front property corner at the intersection of Ushers Road and Commerce Drive. The access should be adjusted to meet the minimum 100' separation requirement. The applicant may also want to consider eliminating the existing curb-cut onto Ushers Road and consolidating the ingress/egress for both parking areas into one access onto Commerce Drive. Commerce Drive has less intense vehicle traffic during peak hours than that found on Ushers Road. Since the project is within 500' of the NYS DOT right-of-way boundary for I-87 Exit 10, a referral to the Saratoga County Planning Board has been made for a recommendation on the proposed site plan in accordance with General Municipal Law §239-(m) and (n).

Mr. Scavo noted that, based upon the current plan, he would recommend that a note be added to the plan stating that no outdoor storage will be permitted. He requested that verification of clearing limit lines be provided and that the established boundaries be formally depicted on the final site plan.

Mr. Scavo reported that, after review of the documents presented for conceptual consideration, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. offered the following comments and recommendations. Based upon review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. Assuming 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: Saratoga County Planning –239m referral due to the parcels proximity to Interstate 87. Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review process. Several comments related to the site plan. The project resides within the Town's LI-2, Light Industrial zoning district. The proposal is for a freestanding garage, assumed to be ancillary to the principal use. Pursuant to Section 208-64(B)(11) of the Town Zoning Code, buildings accessory to the allowed principal use which are an integral to that use and are not in conflict with the purpose of the referenced

article are permitted. Review of the lot configuration and improvements proposed revealed the following deficiencies:

- a. Section 208-65(A) of the Town Code requires the minimum lot size to be 43,560 SF. The existing lot is 39,295 SF. It is understood that the lot already has been granted relief for a substandard lot.
- b. Section 208-65(A) of the Town Code requires a minimum lot width of 200 feet along Ushers Road. The existing lot width is 184 feet. It is understood that the lot already has been granted relief for a substandard lot.
- c. Section 208-98 of the Town Code requires a 130 setback from the center of Ushers Road. The existing building is within the noted setback.
- d. Section 208-65(2) requires an established a twenty-five-foot minimum side and rear yard setback, which shall be considered a buffer area and which shall contain natural or planted vegetation for the purpose of screening uses from adjacent properties. No parking shall be permitted in the buffer area. The parking lot on the east side of the lot shall be modified so that it is not within the side yard buffer.

Of the above lot deficiencies, if any have approved variances granted, notation should be provided on the plan indicating this. The plan proposes two access points, retaining the existing access from Ushers Road and constructing a new access from Commerce Drive. Section 208-66 of the Town Zoning Code indicates there shall not be more than one curb cut per lot unless the Planning Board finds that traffic safety will be improved with the addition of another curb cut. In the case of a corner lot, no curb cut shall be located closer than 100 feet to the intersection. It is understood that the applicant is considering the elimination of the Ushers Road access and retaining the Commerce Drive access. If this still remains as an option, the new access off of Commerce Drive should attempt to align with the access to the gas station across the street to the west. The new access onto Commerce Drive may require a culvert as there is a defined low area along the roadway serving as a drainage way. Subsequent plans shall show the pipe location, size, and slope and shall be adequate to convey the Town's design storm event. Subsequent plans shall show the extent of grading and limits of tree clearing associated the work proposed. With an increase in impervious surfaces, at a minimum it is recommended that a stormwater analysis be conducted to show how the site changes may impact runoff from the site. It may be necessary incorporate stormwater management systems to retain pre-development conditions and to mitigate against increases in stormwater runoff.

In response to Ms. Bagramian's question regarding the proposed use of the new building, Mr. Chuck Hotaling, site development contractor representing AAA Tri-City Remodeling, LLC, reported that the applicant plans to rent spaces to small business owners who require storage for such items as lawn maintenance tools or electrical equipment. It is possible that portions of the building's interior would be "sectioned off" to provide small office areas, each with its own washroom facility. He assured Board members that no customers would "visit the space." Mr. Ferraro asked about the current use of the existing building. Mr. Hotaling stated that the building currently houses a professional office and that the tenant intends to remain for the foreseeable future. When questioned about the number of bays to be contained in the proposed building, Mr. Hotaling reported that four (4) bays would likely be provided. Mr. Ferraro asked about the design for the building's façade. Mr. Hotaling explained that a garage door would be provided for each bay and that upgraded building materials such as vinyl siding possibly enhanced by decorative stone foundation trim, would be used for the construction in an attempt to create a residential look. In response to Mr. Ferraro's question regarding the number of parking spaces on site, Mr. Hotaling explained that there are currently seventeen (17)

spaces defined in front of the existing building and it is likely that parking would be permitted in front of each garage bay. When Mr. Ophardt asked about maintenance for the rear of the building, Mr. Hotaling explained that 10'-15' of clearing beyond the building footprint would allow for access. Stormwater runoff will be directed to a dry well and all stormwater will be handled on site. In response to Mr. Neubauer's question concerning utility connections, Mr. Hotaling explained that, although he plans to clear the site in the next few weeks, he anticipates that utility construction will occur in the spring. Connection to an existing water line on the opposite side of Commerce Drive is proposed and the new garage as well as the existing office building will connect to sewer service via grinder pumps. Observing that the existing connection to Commerce Drive – currently barricaded with split-rail fencing – is unsightly, Mr. Ferraro asked that that area be, at the least, reclaimed and reseeded: the applicant may wish to install some small shrubbery or plantings that would not interfere with sight distances. Mr. Hotaling explained that it is the intention of the developer to treat the area in the same manner as the Ushers Road closure, tying a newly grassed area into the existing lawn. The applicant intends to preserve as much vegetation on site as possible. Mr. Neubauer asked that the contractor take into account the potential redevelopment of the office building when considering placement of the grinder pumps. Mr. Jones recommended that the developer align the proposed new access from Commerce Drive with the northern most curb cut for the adjacent gas station/convenience store. Mr. Hotaling stated that this would be the intent, though the new driveway would have to meet the 100' separation distance from Ushers Road. Mr. Ferraro expressed concerns regarding stormwater management on the site. Mr. Scavo explained that adherence to a basic Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required. He pointed out that, should a culvert be required, a work permit from the town's Highway Department would be required.

Mr. Hotaling reiterated his request for approval to conduct site clearing and install the second construction-stone access in the next few weeks in preparation for construction of the building and the permanent driveway in the spring. Mr. Scavo advised him that the double silt fencing to be used for erosion control should be installed at this time as well. Mr. Ferraro commented that although he felt comfortable offering the applicant "some pre-considerations," he was reluctant to "take action" on the site plan that lacked details such as a formal grading and disturbance limit plan, landscaping plan, utility connection information, accurate driveway location, and architectural renderings which are normally included with a preliminary submission. Mr. Neubauer stated that he believed that since it appeared that "the setbacks were fairly well defined," the building footprint seemed reasonable, and that placing details as discussed did not appear to be "a heavy lift," that he would support a ruling that allowed the applicant to clear the site at this time. Mr. Ferraro remarked that, since the area is surrounded by commercial uses he is not as concerned with buffering and site aesthetics as he would normally be. He asked that Mr. Scavo be tasked with reviewing the proposed limits of clearing and driveway location to ensure that code requirements are met and that town interests are protected should the Board act positively on the applicant's site clearing request.

Mr. Ferraro called for a SEQRA determination with the caveat that, should environmental issues be identified prior to the rendering of a preliminary site plan determination, SEQRA review would be reopened.

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Jones, 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. Neubauer moved, seconded by Mr. Szczesny, to permit tree and stump removal on the area of the parcel to be cleared for future construction of the 45' x 102.5' garage and construction-stone paved driveway which is to align as closely as possible with the northern-most entrance to the adjacent gas station/convenience store as authorized and approved by Mr. Scavo, Director of Planning and Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, following field investigations which are to take into consideration preservation of existing mature vegetation on the site to the greatest extent practicable. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Ferraro explained to the applicant's representatives that a detailed site plan which included details of the reclamation of the existing Ushers Road curb cut, grading plan, disturbance limit boundaries, landscaping plan, driveway and culvert specifications, utility connection information, façade renderings, and any other relevant site development information must be provided prior to further Planning Board review.

[2017-057] **Shenendehowa Medical Park** – Razing of three (3) existing one-story medical office buildings and construction of one (1) 14,600 SF medical office building, 989 Route 146 – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 271.6-1-44

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, consultant for the applicant, introduced Mr. Richard Rosen, Columbia Development representative, who is overseeing the proposed project on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Vuillaume then unveiled plans for redevelopment of the complex currently described as Shenendehowa Medical Park which is located on the northerly side of Route 146 directly opposite Lace Lane. The 2.8 acre parcel is located within the B-1 (Business Non-Retail) zoning district. Project plans call for the razing of three (3) single-story existing medical office buildings, each of 4,800 SF, to provide for the construction of a single 14,600 SF medical office building with approximately one hundred (100) parking spaces. The existing building is served by connections to the Clifton Park Water Authority and the Saratoga County Sewer District. The new building will be served by the same utility services. The site plan indicates that stormwater will be managed on site: stormwater management areas are shown in an area just west of the Route 146 curb cut and along the rear property boundary.

Mr. Vuillaume provided rationale for the proposal, stating that although the current owners find the location of the medical complex desirable, site issues and obsolescence have provided the impetus for redevelopment: the buildings are “outdated,” the traffic flow through the site is problematic, pedestrian access to buildings is difficult, and the separation of services is inconvenient. The speaker acknowledged that the project design would require approval of two variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals: one for the size of the proposed building since code permits no more than 4,800 SF per building and one for lot coverage since code compliance would limit the building to no greater than 12% lot coverage.

Mr. Vuillame presented two alternative site plans for the Board's consideration. The first plan showed a large, rectangular building situated along the property's easterly boundary with a large drop off area and circular parking lot. The second configuration showed a building with “more architectural relief” designed with a central receiving corridor connected to two “wings.” Three drop off points would be provided. Both plans would utilize the existing curb cut onto Route 146 and would require

modification of existing stormwater management infrastructure. Addressing comments issued by professional staff and the town's designated engineer, Mr. Vuillaume explained that exterior lighting would be improved through the use of dark sky fixtures, charging stations would be incorporated into the parking design, and landscaping would be increased to 50% of the site. Mr. Vuillaume stated that it is the opinion of existing tenants that the number of parking spaces is sufficient for the site. Mr. Scavo noted that the Planning Board does have the authority to waive parking requirements should members consider approving a plan with fewer than required spaces. Mr. Vuillaume stated that the proposed facility will be outfitted with automated fire sprinklers and that sidewalks will be installed as recommended by the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee. Water and sewer connections which currently serve the complex are available on Arnold Drive and will be upgraded as deemed necessary.

Mr. Ferraro, citing Mr. Myers' comment regarding the inclusion of stormwater management areas in greenspace calculations, requested clarification of the statement. Mr. Scavo explained that, should stormwater management areas can be considered "useable greenspace," they may be included in the overall greenspace calculation.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers offered the following comments in a memo dated October 26, 2017. He notes that the parcel is currently zoned B3 and contains three buildings of 4,800 SF each in compliance with zoning regulations. One 14,600 SF building as proposed is not allowed in the zone: a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals would be required. He points out that the total square footage of the existing buildings amounts to 14,400 SF: the proposed building is larger than the three existing buildings combined. A full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required due to the amount of disturbance proposed. The proposed building is just below the 12% allowable for building coverage. Per Section 208-35D(3), 50% green space is required. The plan states that 48% is provided. If the green space calculation includes the stormwater areas, green space would be even less than presented.

Mr. Scavo reported that the ECC issued the following comments after review of the proposed plan at its November 8, 2017 meeting. The ECC notes that this project is requesting a substantial area variance: the applicant shall supply and demonstrate the basis for this substantial variance. Proposed stormwater management areas and proposed building and parking areas are in close proximity to residential areas and will require a reduction in existing vegetative buffers. Proposed and existing landscape shall be preserved to the greatest extent practicable to maintain the residential character of the area. The ECC recommends that this project be carried out in keeping with the goals of tree preservation as stated in the Town Comprehensive Plan to the greatest extent practicable. The ECC is concerned with the architectural character and how it will be compatible with the surrounding single family residential area.

Mr. Scavo explained that Ms. Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator, provided the following comments regarding this application. The new building should include an internal sidewalk from the front door to the NYS Route 146 shoulder for pedestrian access to the site. In addition, it would be ideal for this project to include construction of a sidewalk parallel and along NYS 146 along the site frontage, as the site is close to George Drive to the east and Arnold Drive to the west. The demand for a sidewalk along the north side of NYS Route 146 has been articulated by the public further east

of this site. The development pattern of this “block” between Arnold Drive and George Drive lends itself to a future sidewalk connection as these projects appear to all be converting into office spaces.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, issued the following comment regarding this application. The applicant shall look into reducing the footprint of the stormwater management area in the northern portion and extend the management area along the western property line to reduce the disturbance of the existing vegetative buffer between the project and the existing residences.

Mr. Scavo offered a number of comments prepared by the Planning Department. The applicant has made application to the Zoning Board of Appeals to seek relief from site development requirements outlined in the zoning code. The B-1 zone restricts maximum building size to 4,800 SF. The proposal consists of a net increase of 200 SF beyond the cumulative total for the 3 existing medical office buildings, each 4,800 SF. It appears the current configuration is 2% below the 50% minimum greenspace requirement of the B-1 zone: the applicant should attempt to address this issue or seek an area variance for relief. Since the project is adjacent to NYS Route 146, a recommendation to the Saratoga County Planning Board will be required in accordance with GML §239(m) & (n). At the time of preliminary plan consideration, proposed building elevations will be required for review. In accordance with §208-32(D) of the Town Code:

Architecture. The architectural design of a rehabilitated or newly constructed building shall be consistent with the designs compatible for residential dwellings. The design shall take into consideration the existing neighborhood, the exterior facade in regard to building materials and color and other appurtenances, such as rooflines, dormers, windows, chimneys and other items that create a residential appearance. All exposed mechanical equipment and service and storage areas shall be screened from public view. The architectural design should give the appearance of compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and shall try, to the maximum extent possible, to avoid the creation of a monolithic mass by implementing architectural relief within the building design. Long, unbroken lengths of walls and the appearance of huge massive structures within an area of residentially sized buildings should be discouraged.

The following note should be added to the site plan:

All businesses in the B-1 District shall be limited to hours of operation, for the public, between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. In addition, if the proposed use abuts an existing residence, no outside commercial activities, e.g., garbage pickup, etc., shall take place between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 6:30 a.m.

As the exterior lighting design details are developed, the applicant should pursue energy efficient lighting options that are dark sky friendly (International Dark-Sky Friendly Fixtures can be researched at www.darksky.org). Since business hours within the B-1 zone are restricted for the public between 7:00 a.m. and 10 p.m., the exterior lighting should be placed on a shut-off timer system. Based on visual observations of a recent commercial construction project near this project, the area has sandy soils. The applicant should explore the opportunity to utilize porous pavement within the parking area. The applicant should consider, as an aspect of the new construction, accommodations to install the conduit under the pavement to designated parking stalls for preparation of future EV Charging Stations. Such infrastructure accommodations at the time of new construction will further the goals of the 2016, “Capital District Electric Vehicle Charging Station Plan.” The costs to run conduit at the time of new construction greatly decreases costs to install EV Charging Stations in the future since

pavement within the parking area will not need to be torn-up to run electrical connections. The applicant, when working with a structural architect for the building design, may want to identify an electrical panel location for convenient PV system inter-connections, and keep space available in the electrical panel for a PV circuit breaker. It is easier and more cost effective to plan at the time of new construction for future green infrastructure accommodations such as PV Systems. The applicant is asked to add a note to the plan which states:

Any utility work or construction within the State Highway right-of-way requires the property owner to obtain a highway work permit from the NYS Department of Transportation, whether it is for construction or installation of facilities or for repairs and maintenance.

Landscaping near the rear property boundary will be important to provide a visual buffer from the adjacent residential properties fronting Arnold Drive. The applicant should verify the limits of disturbance required to connect the proposed building to the existing 1 ½" private force main to the rear of the parcel.

Mr. Scavo reported that, after review of the materials submitted for conceptual review of this project plan, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. provided the following comments. Based upon review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. Assuming 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 are not necessarily limited to the following: Saratoga County Planning - 239m referral due to the parcel being within 500 feet of NYS Route 146; New York State Department of Environmental Conservation – potential permit coverage under stormwater SPDES and identification of threatened and endangered species if project is subject to GP-0-15-002; New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation – identification of the existence or absence of cultural and historic resources since the project be subject to GP-0-15-002. Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review. Several comments related to the site plan. The project resides within the Town's B-1 zoning district. Pursuant to Section 208-32(A)(1) of the Town Zoning Code, the proposed medical office is a permitted principal use within the B-1 zoning district. In reviewing the concept plan submitted, it appears that there are instances where the bulk lot requirements are not satisfying the minimum requirements set forth in Section 208-33 and 208-35 of the Town Code. The potential lot deficiencies identified are as follows:

- a. Section 208-33(B) of the Town Zoning Code indicates that no preexisting building(s) shall be rehabilitated or remodeled or new building(s) constructed on a vacant lot to a size greater than 12% of the lot size, with no single building to have a maximum square footage exceeding 4,800 square feet. With a 2.8 acre parcel, the maximum total square footage is 12% of the lot, or 14,636 SF which the plan does not exceed. However, the maximum square footage per building shall not exceed 4,800 SF. The proposal calls for a single building, exceeding the maximum allowed by zoning.
- b. Section 208-35(D)(3) requires a minimum of 50% greenspace with the plan proposing 48%.
- c. Section 208-35(D)(4) requires a 10-foot buffer area along the side and rear yards for the purpose of screening from adjoining properties. While the concept illustrates buffers greater than what is required, this shall be confirmed as part of the detailed site

design and grading. There may be a need to supplement existing landscaping to maintain a minimum buffer.

Subsequent plans shall provide the proposed landscaping species to demonstrate conformance to Section 208-33(C) of the Town Zoning Code. It is noted that the lot has a substantial mature tree buffer along NYS Route 146. It may be desirable to maintain this existing buffer to the greatest extent practicable. Any proposed utility work within the NYS 146 right-of-way is subject to the review and approval by NYSDOT. Notation to that effect shall be added to the plans. The applicant is asked to provide a delineation of the area of expected disturbance associated with the project along with the numerical value. There needs to be a determination as to whether or not the proposed building construction and use will warrant automatic sprinklers as prescribed in the Building Code of New York State. This information is needed to determine whether or not an on-site hydrant is required to satisfy the requirements of Section 508.8 of the Fire Code of NYS. There should be consideration of providing pedestrian accommodations and linkages to the public right-of-way. This may include a sidewalk along NYS Route 146 and a connecting sidewalk to the primary point of entry to the building. Any sidewalks planned along NYS Route 146 shall be coordinated with the Town's Trails Committee. The location of the bicycle rack, which shall be in proximity to the building's primary entrance, needs to be shown on the plan. The detailed site plans shall illustrate how the existing water and sewer services to each building will be terminated and new services are to be provided to the single building. The concept shows additional land clearing towards the rear of the property, diminishing existing buffers to residential properties. Consideration should be given for the use of alternate stormwater practices or alternate locations to retain the existing buffer to the greatest extent practicable. With the total disturbance exceeding one acre, subsequent submissions shall include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Based upon the concept provided, it is anticipated that a redevelopment approach will be pursued, which appears appropriate. The Planning Board has considered the inclusion of cross-lot access easements to adjacent properties along NYS Route 146 as part of sound access management strategy. There should be a discussion as to whether or not the inclusion of a cross lot access easement is viable at this location. Elevations for the proposed building have been provided. The Planning Board shall provide the applicant comments as it relates to the buildings compliance with Section 208-33(D) of the Town Zoning Code. Specific attention should be paid to the scale and style being proposed. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town Code specific to lighting, site grading, landscaping, and erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Mr. Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive, stated his support for the construction of a sidewalk link along the property's Route 146 frontage and requested that such a sidewalk be placed as far as possible from the Route 146 driving lanes. He recommended that the applicant consider reorienting the proposed building as shown in the "first alternative" from the easterly boundary to the rear of the parcel, constructing it parallel to the boundary line. In response to his query regarding closures of the existing buildings during site redevelopment, Mr. Rosen stated that it was likely that two buildings would be closed: it may be possible to keep the westerly building in operation.

Ms. Diana Flavin commented that existing tenants in the buildings were unaware of the plans to upgrade the site.

Dr. O'Neill expressed dismay that the applicant appears not to be concerned with the views of current tenants since they have not been notified of the project plan or possible building closures.

Mr. Rosen commented that the concerns expressed by Ms. Flavin and Dr. O'Neill are tenant-landlord issues rather than concerns related to the specific site redevelopment plan being considered at this meeting.

Dr. Stephen Grant asked if it was likely that the proposed new building would be utilized as an urgent care facility. Mr. Rosen stated that such a designation was unlikely since the permitting process for approval of an emergent care facility was costly and time-consuming.

Mr. Scavo called upon the applicants to advise current tenants occupying the existing buildings of the anticipated changes to the site.

Ms. LaSalle expressed her preference for the "first alternative" since the "second alternative" appeared "awkward" with many points of conflict. Mr. Ferraro, however, preferred the "second alternative," finding that it maintained a more residential character reflective of the surrounding community. Though Mr. Rosen argued that the "first alternative" allowed the developer more flexibility, Mr. Ferraro found that the "second alternative" met "more of the B1 zoning district objectives," noting that sometimes circuitous traffic patterns encourage drivers to "become more deliberate." In response to Mr. Jones question regarding possible renovation of the existing buildings rather than demolition and regeneration of the site, Mr. Rosen explained that the principals involved in the application liked the location but that the buildings were outdated and that coordination of medical visits and procedures could be better accommodated within a single facility. Mr. Ophardt preferred the "first alternative" as did Mr. Szczesny, with Mr. Ophardt noting that the design would allow for establishment of a cross-easement with the property to the west. Mr. Ophardt asked if it would be possible for the "first alternative" to incorporate a drop off portico. Mr. Rosen stated that the site was too narrow for such an accommodation. Commenting on the conceptual façade renderings, Mr. Neubauer stated that he found that they "looked like newer medical office buildings" while respecting the residential character of adjoining properties. He remarked that, considering the concerns of adjoining residents, the "second alternative" may be more desirable since it "breaks down the massive scale" of the building. Mr. Jones criticized the "sea of parking." Mr. Ferraro preferred that the site "be broken up a bit." Mr. Ferraro encouraged the applicant to consider the purposes of the B1 zone as outlined in the Town Code and urged the applicant to consider how landscaping could be used to create a residential character.

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian, adjournment of the meeting at 8:57p.m. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on November 28, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Dean, Secretary