

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

BETSEY SNYDER
Secretary



MEMBERS

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

(alternate) Teresa LaSalle

Planning Board Minutes
January 22, 2019

Those present at the January 22, 2019 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Those absent were: None

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
J. Bianchi, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C.
A. Morelli, Counsel
B. Snyder, Secretary

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Anadarawis, approval of the minutes of the January 8, 2019 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Chairman Rocco Ferraro reviewed the Planning Board's agenda and advised there would be two discussion items first on the agenda as they were carryover items from the January 8, 2019 meeting.

Alternate member, Teresa LaSalle, will be recused from the Emma Lane PDD discussion item because she is a property owner adjacent to the property with a common boundary.

Discussion Items:

2019-002 1 Emma Lane PDD Amendment (aka Peregrine Senior Living)

Applicant proposes a building expansion of 7,035 SF to the existing memory care facility. Up to 12 new parking spaces are proposed to also be constructed with the proposed expansion, 1

Emma Ln, Zoned: PPD (comm), Status: PB – Discussion

SBL: 271.-2-

22.12

To be reviewed by: no review at this time Consultant: EDP Applicant: Peregrine Senior Living

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Joe Dannible with Environmental Design Partnership presented on behalf of the Peregrine Senior Living application for an amendment to the existing Verbeck Frank PDD. The applicants run a senior memory care facility located at 1 Emma Lane fronting on Route 146. The entire PDD is approximately 15 acres. The project will be located on a parcel of land that is 5.5 acres, with adjacent properties on east and north side. A 100' setback was required for both the eastern and northern edge of the property as part of the original PDD and there will be no changes or modifications to the 100' setback. Applicant is only looking to modify provisions to the code that pertain to Area A of the PDD. Proposed expansion would be removing the pergola. The open courtyard would remain with new residential units facing the courtyard. The addition is about 7,500 square foot. Applicant is asking to expand parking in the rear of the site and modifications to the front of the building. There are provisions of the code that do not allow the applicant to do these modifications without going through the PDD amendment. Those provisions are as follows:

- As part of the PDD there is a 155 foot setback from the center line of Route 146. The proposed addition would encroach on the 155 foot setback to a distance of 137 feet. In the Town code there is a special setback associated with Route 146 that is 130 feet. The proposed addition would not encroach into the 130 foot setback.
- The code also speaks to a building square footage of approximately 30,000 square feet. The current square footage is 31,000 on site and applicant wants to add about 7,000 square feet for a total of approximately 38,000 square feet. Applicant is requesting the allowable square footage on the site increase to 40,000 to accommodate any future minor modifications.
- The third item applicant wants to amend is the number of parking spaces. The Town code states 30 parking spaces and applicant wants to increase the number to 40.

Mr. Dannible showed elevation slides for the expansion. Applicant is proposing to remove the existing trail as part of the expansion and replace it with a new trail that meets the sidewalk in the front of the building.

There were no formal staff departmental comments at this time from ECC, Stormwater Management Technician, Chief of Bureau of Fire Prevention or Director of Building and Development.

Roy Casper of the Trails Subcommittee issued a memo dated 01/20/2019 offering the following comments for consideration by the Planning Board:

- A sidewalk to the shoulder of NY Route 146 should be discussed.
- According to the Town of Clifton Park Trails Concept Plan, sidewalks are designated along the north side of Rt. 146. The applicant should consider the placement of a sidewalk along Rt. 146 that extends from the eastern to the western property boundaries. (Completion of sidewalk segments are crucial in reaching the Trails Concept Plan goals.)

John Scavo, Director of Planning, added the following comments:

Pursuant to SEQRA the Action appears to be an Unlisted Action and would require referral to the Saratoga County Planning Board. The next steps in the process are the Town Board receives the recommendations from the Planning Board and will schedule a Public Hearing to be conducted at a Town Board meeting. If the Town Board approves the PDD amendment then the project will be returned to the Planning Board for Site Plan review.

Chairman Ferraro clarified that the Planning Board is only considering the PDD amendment and not approval of the proposed Site Plan.

Professional Comments:

MJ Engineering/Joel Bianchi, P.E. stated:

No comments or review at this time.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ophardt stated the amendments are minor in nature. He asked for clarification on the set back requirements.

Mr. Ferraro asked for clarification on the additional parking spaces in the preliminary drawing. Applicant stated they may build seven parking spaces in one spot and six in another area.

Mr. Ferraro stated that when the Planning Board does the Site Plan review there has to be a definitive plan for the parking spaces.

Mr. Ferraro said the existing building design looks very appealing from the street view. Mr. Ferraro suggested when the Site Plan comes back to the Planning Board for review to adjust the building design. He suggested showing the design from the prospective of heading east on Route 146 in totality, not just a façade. Mr. Dannible stated it is the intent of the owner to have an attractive building, using cultured stone, similar windows to the existing ones and extensive landscape.

Mr. Jones inquired as to the number of mature trees that will be lost? Mr. Dannible said that Peregrine will put time and effort into the landscaping of the property. Their intent is to keep the existing trees along the front, if possible. If not, they will be replaced.

Mr. Anadarawis questioned the overall greenspace percentage for the larger PDD? Mr. Dannible does not recall reading in the Town code, but will look into it.

Ms. Bagramian moved to support this application to amend the PDD for the purposed 7,035 square foot expansion and up to 12 additional parking spaces, Mr. Jones seconded. All in favor, motion passed.

2018-071 Edison Club PDD Amendment

Applicant proposes to create a Bundled Community by developing residential dwellings on the land surrounding the golf course. There will be single family homes, duplexes, and condominiums. The design maintains current trees and surroundings, the result being a virtually unchanged appearance for those driving along Route 146, 891 Riverview Rd, Zoned: PPD (res), Status: PB – Discussion

SBL: 269.-3-10.1

To be reviewed by: no review at this time Consultant: Zhadral Applicant: Edison Club

Mr. Ferraro explained the Edison Club PDD is proposing the Bundled Community development of:

- Ten 8 unit buildings
- Fourteen 4 unit buildings
- Seventeen 2 unit buildings
- Forty-five single unit buildings
- Reduce the golf course from 27 holes to 18
- Conversion of existing clubhouse to a 60 bed senior care center
- New clubhouse to be built, with amenities
- 1 acre of land be conveyed to Stewart's for future expansion of their store

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Craig McLean, General Manager of the Edison Club, stated not much has changed to the proposal since it was originally presented. The club was founded in 1904 and the golf course was built in 1926. The Edison Clubs' current cycle of membership has been in a long, steady downturn. Therefore the Edison Club is looking for a long term, sustainable and successful solution to the downward trend. The Edison Club helps support the community with a positive economic impact and supports local civic organizations. The present clubhouse will be enhanced to accommodate the 60 bed senior care center. The new clubhouse will be smaller, but will have dining, a fitness center, a golf shop and amenities for residents of the community. There will be new tennis courts and pickle ball courts. One minor change from the original proposal is the removal of development along Route 146. The land that will be developed affords a great deal of green space within the property. The applicant has steadfastly held to the idea of greenspace, they want the area to look like a golf course and not a development.

Mr. Ivan Zhadral, Engineer, described the surrounding area and site boundaries. This proposal is on 287 acres of land divided into recreational use, a residential component and a senior care facility. There will be an HOA. The single family homes will be constructed on lots ranging in size from 10,000 to 50,000 square feet. Clifton Park Water Authority and an existing sewer serve the site. There will be a total of 3 curb cuts. Two curb cuts will be on Riverview Road and one on Route 146 about 400 feet west of the intersection with Garnsey Road. The Project Narrative Report, describing the project in detail, was given to all Planning Board members. The applicant has retained the services of Creighton Manning in a traffic control advisory role. There will be minimal impact on existing wetlands. Project plans include proposed detail site plans, analysis of sanitary sewer service and water supply service. If the project is implemented there will be approximately 93% green space, which includes the golf course and developed area.

There were no formal staff departmental comments at this time from the Stormwater Management Technician, Chief of Bureau of Fire Prevention or Director of Building and Development.

John Scavo, Director of Planning, stated the Environmental Conservation Commission discussed the PDD and will be sending their comments directly to the Town Board. Their concern is what will happen to the remaining golf course. The application mentioned a permanent conservation easement for the remaining open space.

Roy Casper of the Trails Subcommittee issued a memo dated 01/20/2019 offering the following comments:

- For PDD purposes, the proposal needs to have a strong pedestrian component including pedestrian access to Riverview Road, access to the Balltown Road Post Office and the Stewarts at the corner of Balltown and Riverview Roads.

- Discussion should include some form of pedestrian route on the property along Riverview Road.

Professional Comments:

MJ Engineering/Joel Bianchi, P.E. stated:

No comments or review at this time.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ophardt inquired how the applicant decided on the breakdown of the 215 units?

Mr. McLean said a bundled community affords the club the financial stability to go on for years and years and have a stable membership. The clubs have to diversify their offerings and amenities to change the business model to move forward; such as maintenance free living, fitness center, aquatics, walking trails as a benefit to the residents. The mix came about from canvassing their membership. They may alter the mix as the project evolves, dependent upon what is successful and what is not.

Mr. Ophardt asked what is the population breakdown of the senior care facility?

Mr. David Karasz – 930 Riverview Road, Rexford and part of the management team stated the senior community wants to “age in place”, as their needs change different levels of care have to be in place. The senior care facility will offer adult day care to give respite to the caregiver, assisted care and memory/dementia care. The total population of the senior care facility will be 60 people. The applicant feels the smaller the facility, the better quality of care, also allowing a greater staff to patient ratio. The senior population could progress at the same facility and not be moved from place to place for various levels of care. The applicant hopes to see the buyers of the various units in the bundled community put their parents in the senior care facility. This would facilitate family involvement.

Mr. Szczesny asked if this project is an allowable use to the land?

Mr. Scavo stated it is not currently, but that is what the PDD is proposing. A Planned Development Districts supersedes any underlying zoning.

Mr. Neubauer discussed the adjacent zoning which is hamlet/mixed use. The applicant has a very comprehensive plan. Mr. Neubauer wants to make sure the PDD amendment maintains the existing character of the hamlet/mixed use. Mr. Neubauer stated the concept is unique and opposite of most residential proposals the Planning Board is presented. He agrees with the comments made by the Trails Committee and wants to see the PDD incorporate connectivity to the surrounding commercial sites. Mr. Zhadral stated the connectivity will be shown on the final site proposal.

Mr. Andarawis is also concerned with the underlying zoning point. He asked if there was any reason why the development did not happen on the eastern side of the property? Mr. Zhadrall said they wanted to make sure they maintained the resort feeling and incorporate portions of existing golf course. Mr. Zhadrall stated they wanted to maintain a buffer and preserve the travel corridor along the road.

Mr. Jones asked if the project would be built in phases? Mr. Jones is concerned that if it is built all at once and the units do not sell, there will be a multitude of empty buildings on the site. Mr. Zhadrall stated it will be built in phases, it is not economically feasible to build all at once. Mr. Ferraro clarified there are infrastructure requirements that have to be in place before construction can begin. There was discussion regarding the ten year time frame of the proposed PDD. Mr. Jones asked if the construction happens in phases then the third curb cut onto Route 146 could be ten years into the future? Mr. McLean stated there is an abandoned gated entrance across from Dunkin Donuts on Route 146 that is already there for emergency vehicles. There is a second opportunity for an emergency vehicle entrance just east of Stewart's on the other side of the creek.

Mr. Andarawis said one of the review criteria is that this project has to conform to the Town's comprehensive planning objectives. Criteria also include that this project is conceptually sound and meets local and area wide needs. The diversity of housing and the senior care center go a long way towards the area wide needs.

Mr. Szesny said we have to think about what would the Town lose if we do not consider the PDD? We could lose 93% of greenspace and have a large development on this land in ten years. We have to think about the future.

Mr. Jones asked for clarification on the practice holes placement.

Mr. Ferraro said this proposal introduces a residential component that meets the objectives of the Edison Club and also could provide a customer base for some of the hamlet/mixed uses that may be interested in populating the area. It presents a complimentary aspect.

Mr. Ferraro also has concerns with the infrastructure and phasing of development as well as traffic flow off Route 146 and how it will be reconciled. Mr. Jones is also very concerned about the proposed curb cut off set from Garnsey Road and traffic flow. Applicant does not want to introduce a traffic signal at Garnsey Road. Mark from Creighton Manning stated adding the curb cut directly across from Garnsey Road would give you competing traffic off Garnsey and the site driveway. Discussion ensued about the flow of traffic on Garnsey Road and volume on Route 146. It was pointed out by Mr. McLean that there will be a significant amount of traffic taken off of Riverview Road through the removal of public banquet rental and 2/3 of the golfers will live in the bundled community. He anticipates 20,000 rounds off the traffic grid. Mr. Ferraro agreed with that assessment, but pointed out there will be more traffic introduced on Route 146.

Route 146 is already a congested two lane road and is at either a level “D” or “F” traffic flow during peak rush hours and left hand turns will become very problematic.

Mr. Ferraro said he has questions regarding the stormwater management on the proposed site plan and it is not being shown on the present plan. Mr. Zhadral said the senior care facility will have their own stormwater management and it will be shown on the final proposal.

Mr. Ferraro explained this is just a discussion item for a Planning Board recommendation and not a Public Hearing. The Town Board will have a Public Hearing on this topic. The Planning Board is serving strictly in an advisory capacity. A resident of Riverview Road wanted to speak.

Public Comments:

Mr. William Koebbeman – 20 year resident - 861 Riverview Road, Rexford – Resident feels there is a significant increase in traffic with the Grooms Road development. Resident wants the Town Board and Planning Board to consider the GEIS ramifications. When the GEIS was first instituted it was a PDD that was compatible with the surrounding area. Resident feels that the development of this proposed bundled community will be a burden on the community. He feels it is a high density project totally out of character with the surrounding area. Mr. Koebbeman wants the Planning Board to consider the zoning of the surrounding area when making their recommendations.

Mr. Ferraro explained the applicant is proposing 215 units. The Planning Board’s recommendation does not necessarily support the 215 units, it may be less. The number of units will be considered when the project comes before the Planning Board for site review.

Raymond Seymour – 7 Nadler Road – Resident is a member of the Open Space Committee since 2003 and on the committee that developed the open space plan. Mr. Seymour advised during their discussions they focused on the presence of the three golf courses in the western Clifton Park area, The Edison Club, Eagle Crest and Mohawk River Golf Club. In 2017 Eagle Crest was looking for a modification to its’ PDD for residential development. Mr. Seymour would like to see some research done as to the viability of other golf courses that have developed this type of community. He feels if the project conforms to the overriding CR zone then the maximum number of units should be 90-95 for the entire project. Mr. Seymour has the draft goals of the 2019 Open Space Committee Plan that include some level of diagramming in the western GEIS area, with focus on the largest parcels.

Mr. Ferraro stated the Open Space Committee is a great entity to take a critical look at the issue and come up with some ideas and strategies to achieve the objections as outlined in the GEIS, as well as the financial well-being of the golf course.

Mr. Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Resident wanted to verify there will be a Town Board Public Hearing pursuant to this PDD. It was confirmed there will definitely be a Public Hearing.

The PDD application is available for review in the Town Clerk's office. The public can also make comments in writing. The Public Hearing has not been scheduled as of yet.

Mr. Szczesny moved to make a positive recommendation to the Town Board to consider the amendment to the existing PDD to accommodate up to 215 units, a 60 bed senior facility, a new clubhouse and conveyance of one acre of land to Stewart's. Ms. Bagramian seconded. All in favor.

Public Hearings:

2018-007 146A Holdings, LLC Residential Subdivision

Applicant proposes the development of 17 single family residential lots and associated water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure. One curb cut will be constructed out to Route 146A. Water will be provided by an extension of the CPWA main located along the west side of Route 146A. Sanitary Sewer will be provided by either gravity or forcemain connection to the existing gravity sewer located in Stratford Drive and /or Marlboro Drive. Route 146A, Rt 146A, Zoned: CR, Status: Preliminary Review w/ possible final determination

SBL: 265.-3-7.11

To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Lansing Applicant: 146A Holdings, LLC **Last Seen on: 11/14/18**

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, seconded by Mr. Szczesny, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, a 17 single family residential lots subdivision action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the public hearing to order at 7:10 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in The Daily Gazette on January 11th, 2019.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Scott Lansing of Lansing Engineering – Representing the 146 Holdings, LLC. The project is located on the west side of Route 146A, approximately 3,000 feet north of Route 146, just south of Dawson Lane and to the west of Stratford Drive. The parcel is currently a vacant 56.82 acres, zoned CR and is located in the western Clifton Park GEIS. The surrounding uses are vacant land to the west, to the north, east and southeast are residential subdivisions, the southwest is also vacant land. There is a mixture of NYSDEC (.97 acres) and ACOE (1.5 acres) wetlands on the parcel. The applicant looked at the calculations outlined in the CR zoning, minus the NYSDEC and ACOE

wetlands and the sloping over 20% to come up with a net buildable of 49.95 acres. The end result is 17 permitted lots for the project. The applicant is proposing 17 single family lots, not asking for any variances or waivers. The proposed lot sizes are 1.0 acre up to 2.76 acres with 120 feet frontage. The setbacks are minimum 25 feet front yard with a 125 feet minimum from Route 146A, with 10 feet side yard setback and 25 feet back yard setback. Applicant is proposing roadways to be designed and constructed to the Town's standards with approximately 2400 linear feet of roadway overall. The first roadway will be directly across from Stratford Drive and is approximately 1300 feet. The applicant has removed the connection to Dawson Lane. Applicant is proposing a trail connection, an 8 foot wide multi-use paved path. Project is meeting all the required open space; 50% of project area designated as permanent open space and 25% of that is unconstrained lands. There is a minimum of 125 foot buffer area in the front portion of the parcel. Applicant has provided access to the open space in the back of the northern cul-de-sac. Clifton Park Water Authority and Saratoga County sewer district serve the area. Parking is provided in accordance with the Town's zoning code. One small wetland impact along the southern road, less than 1/10 of an acre. The applicant has gone through the technical comments from MJ Engineering and will work through those with MJ Engineering.

Staff Comments:

Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 01/15/2019 and issued a memo recommending:

- In addition, classified streams located in the town of Clifton park have been identified and or mapped by the NYSDEC require a 50 foot adjacent buffer area of each side of the outer bank of the highwater mark (208-69.1.A(2)). This buffer zone shall be clearly marked as well. This area shall be deed restricted.
- The applicant shall reduce the number of units according to Town Code Section 208-16.E(1). The correct number of allowable units should be 16.
- The ECC recommends the applicant to install split rail fencing and or signage to identify the land conveyed for open space.
- The ECC notes that lot 8 does contain existing ACOE wetlands and these should be noted on the deed. The building envelope should exclude the existing ACOE wetlands on the lot.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 01/18/2019 stating:

- Complete the NOI for review.
- In the SWPPP Section 5.3 – Runoff Reduction Technique Evaluation, on the summary calculations is the 17.86 acres for the Rooftop Disconnect, supposed to be for the Area Reduction Practices of Riparian Buffers / Filter Strips?
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should show the location and size of the sediment traps / basins. The infiltration basin cannot serve as a sediment control device during the construction phase.
- In the SWPPP Section 11.2 Maintenance shall be expanded, to be an Operation and Maintenance Manual as per the NYSDEC Maintenance Guidance – Stormwater Management Practices, dated March 31, 2017, as the Town will be maintaining the stormwater infrastructure.

- Show the LC Zone along the stream corridor as no land can be altered for any purpose within the LC Zone areas.
- Provide on plans how the runoff from the back of homes on lots 1-3 will be directed towards the stormwater management area.

Roy Casper of the Trails Subcommittee issued a memo dated 01/20/2019 offering the following comments:

- According to the subdivision site plan dated December 28th, 2018, a parcel has been conveyed to the Town of Clifton Park for a trail connection from Natalie Drive to Dawson Lane. Details for this trail connection should be shown on the site plan.
- Footpath connection between the 2 cul-de-sacs:
 - The Liam Court cul-de-sac should provide footpath space between property 13 and 14 for a footpath connection.
 - It appears that the Natalie Drive cul-de-sac has already provided footpath space between property 6 and 7.

Sheryl Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention issued a memo dated 01/15/2019 stating:

- Place 911 addresses on final map.
- Will the connection street to Dawson be a Town road? Why is the street size reduced?
- The water lines end at the cul-de-sacs. Has the CPWA approved this configuration?

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 01/10/2019 stating:

- Is the connection to Dawson Lane to be built as a Town road?
- It is still recommended the new roads be connected rather than built in a cul-de-sac. It is my understanding that Halfmoon does not allow cul-de-sacs anymore.
- It appears drainage will be directed along property lines for both what appears to be existing drainage corridor beneath Natalie and from the Cul-de-sac on Liam. Ensure these drainage areas are confined to the easements.
- Confirmation should be obtained from Clifton Park Water District that the water lines can end at a hydrant.
- Required front setbacks in a CR zone are 30', building envelope shown is only 25'. The site statistics are incorrect for this and for setback from Route 146A which is 100' not the noted 125'.
- $49.95 \text{ acres unconstrained} \times 0.33 = 16.48 \text{ units}$. It appears only 16 units are allowed not 17 since 208-16E states to round down below 0.5.
- It does not appear the infiltration basin will function correctly since it is 7' deep and there is groundwater at 7'-8" per the test pit. Interfacing with the water table is not allowed.
- Steep slopes alongside houses are expected to be an issue.

John Scavo, Director of Planning read a letter dated 01/18/2019 with recommendations he made to Mr. Scott Lansing of Lansing Engineering stating:

- Add a note to the plan that states, “Subdivision to be included within the Sherwood Forest Park District.”
- The 25 acres of lands proposed to be conveyed to the Town of Clifton Park shall be designated as permanent open space. This land is contiguous with other town owned open space lands to the north of this project site. These town parcels are highlighted in red, per the attached map.
- No notation on plan for additional street light, Stratford Court has an existing street light at the intersection.

Professional Comments:

MJ Engineering/Joel Bianchi, P.E. issued a letter dated 01/21/2019 offering the following comments for consideration:

Subdivision Plans

1. On Sheet COV-1, modify Note 44 to include the NYSDOT for work within the NYS Route 146A right-of-way.
2. The final Subdivision Plat shall also include the 911 emergency response numbers as assigned by the Town.
3. The final Subdivision Plat shall show monument locations of sufficient number to control the subdivision, but as a minimum, they shall be located as necessary to provide visibility between adjacent monuments along one right-of-way line of each street pursuant to Section 86-5(D)(1) of the Town Code.
4. The final 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."
5. The Subdivision Plat shows Lot B between Lot 2 and 3 at a reduced width than the adjacent existing Town right-of-way. Whether or not this becomes a right of way at some future time, it is recommended that Lot B match the width of the adjacent Town right-of-way to provide the opportunity to make such future improvements.

6. The drainage easements shown on the Subdivision Plat planned for conveyance to the Town, between Lots 4 and 4, 7 and 8 and 14 and 15 are shown at 20-feet wide. It is recommended that these easements be increased to 30-feet to maximize the Town's ability to access these areas.
7. Provide the Town an easement to access the east side of the box culvert along Liam Way. As shown, there is limited ability for the Town to access the east side through the lands currently shown for conveyance to the Town. It is further restricted by the proposed guide rail along the top of the box culvert.
8. The proposed mail kiosk is understood to be under the jurisdiction of an HOA or other parties. 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. If such easement is needed, the Subdivision Plat shall show its limits with legal description and appropriate conveyance documents executed prior to right-of-way conveyance.
9. Coordinate with the Clifton Park Water Authority regarding the potential extension of the proposed water mains through proposed Lot B and connecting north into the existing water main as it may provide improved system operations.
10. The proposed sanitary connection that crossing NYS Route 146A 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.
11. On Sheet LMG-1 add one "No Outlet" sign MUTCD W14-2 at the site entrance and "Dead End" signs MUTCD W141 on each cul-de-sac road.
12. Provide a construction detail for the curbing shown at the mail kiosk on Sheet LMG-1.
13. At Sta 3+25 of Liam Court, where the proposed water main passes over the box culvert there will be less than 5-feet of cover between the bottom of the main and top of the box culvert. Coordinate with CPWA whether pipe insulation will be required to protect the water main from freezing.
14. CB 10 and 10A located along Liam Court do not appear to be placed at the low point of the vertical curve. The low point of the curve is at Sta 9+01 and each CB is at Sta 9+09.
15. The stormwater management plan includes Conservation of Natural Areas. The Conservation of Natural Areas shall be located within an acceptable conservation easement instrument that ensures perpetual protection of the proposed area Pursuant to Section 5.3 of the NYSSMDM. The easement must clearly specify how the natural area vegetation shall be managed and boundaries will be marked (plans provide signage

- markers). The Subdivision Plat and all other applicable plans shall show the defined limits of this area.
16. In reviewing the proposed bottom elevation of the infiltration basin of 331.5-feet and observed seasonal high groundwater elevation as noted at TP#2 of approximately 331.5, it appears there will be less than 3-feet of separation as required pursuant to Section 6.3.1 of the NYSSMDM.
 17. For the infiltration basin, indicate how it may function during the winter when the bottom surface will be frozen. The introduction of drywells may be necessary.
 18. Sheet ESC-1 shall show any require sediment traps, inclusive of any necessary by sub-phase of site disturbances.
 19. Sheet ESC-1 shows Phase 2 disturbances at 4.99 acres. Break this phase into two phases as it is impractical for the contractor to keep disturbances below the 5-acres with only 435 square foot of buffer for this phase of work.
 20. Pursuant to Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM, Infiltration practices shall never serve as a sediment control device during site construction phase. In addition, the Erosion and Sediment Control plan for the site shall clearly indicate how sediment will be prevented from entering an infiltration facility. Update Sheet ESC-1 to illustrate compliance.
 21. Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM requires direct access be provided to infiltration practices for maintenance and rehabilitation. The plans show access to the principal outfall from the infiltration basin, but none for the intermediate outfall between the sediment trap and infiltration basin. Further, the access shown has no means to turn around easily.
 22. Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM requires infiltration designs that include dewatering methods in the event of failure. Since no underdrains appear proposed, describe how the system may be dewatered. Section 11.2 of the SWPPP shall also describe dewatering techniques. Should pumping be required, then it may be necessary that this equipment be furnished to the Town since it is proposed to convey the system to the Town upon project completion.
 23. Provide the following note on Sheet ESC-1 pursuant to Section 6.3.5 of the NYSSMDM, "Upstream construction shall be completed and stabilized before connection to a downstream infiltration facility. A dense and vigorous vegetative cover shall be established over the contributing pervious drainage areas before runoff can be accepted into the facility."

24. Detail 7 of Sheet DT-1 and Detail 6 on DT-2 appear to represent end section treatment yet seem to show conflicting information regarding the riprap type and dimensional requirements. Remove one of the details from the plan set to prevent confusion.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

25. Section 2.0 of the SWPPP shall include a discussion of state and federally listed threatened or endangered species to illustrate that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.4 of the General Permit.
26. Section 2.0 of the SWPPP shall include a discussion of cultural and archeological resources to illustrate that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.8 of the General Permit.
27. Under proposed conditions, the HydroCAD model utilizes Bermuda grass believed to represent manicured lawns. It is more appropriate to utilize a lawn surface associated with residential housing adjusted based upon the area of development for each lot. This will likely result in a higher CN value under proposed conditions.
28. The WQv sheet in Appendix D notes the use of filter strips as a green practice which is contrary to the SWPPP text which indicates this practice was being employed but not claimed for WQv / RRv.
29. The NOI found in Appendix J needs to be completed for the project.
30. 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.
31. Provide calculations showing that the infiltration basin will fully dewater within 48 hours after a storm event pursuant to Section 6.3.2 of the NYSSMDM.

Sanitary Sewer Report

32. The sanitary sewer report is subject to the review and approval of the SCSD No. 1 and the NYSDEC as part of the extension of public sewers.

Water Supply Report

33. The water report is subject to the review and approval of the CPWA and the NYSDOH as part of the extension of public water mains.

Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator commented via an email dated 01/22/2019:

Per Joel Biachi's Subdivision comment #5 requesting widening the proposed Lot B strip (that connects Natalie Drive to Dawson Lane, from 30 feet to 60 feet, it *may* work to leave it at the proposed 30 feet width, **so long as** the applicant **actually depicts, designs and builds the actual trail on this 30 foot strip and continues it offsite onto the Town's existing 60 feet of ROW.** I am concerned that the layout is currently not demarcated, nor included in any graphic beyond a conceptual dashed line. A "proposed trail elevation detail" is shown, but the **layout of the trail route** is not depicted in terms of how it connects to Dawson Lane, between 7 Dawson and 5 Dawson.

If off-site sewer can be shown in a plan view with all the design details, why isn't the off-site trail shown with real design details? Showing the trail layout on the preliminary plans and final plans, is important for existing neighbors on Dawson Lane, and is important for ensuring the future construction is conducted. Also, trail work involves some clearing and grading as well that should be accounted for as part of the project, as the trail infrastructure should be constructed at the same time as the roadway infrastructure.

Public Comments:

Robert Voelker – 10 Stratford Drive – Resident stated there is a bike trail that runs along Route 146A and there is a bike trail crossing opposite Stratford Drive and did not see it noted on the plan. Resident is also concerned with the degree of difficulty getting out of the intersection during peak traffic times. Resident feels the entrance should be further south between Marlboro and Stratford. The site plan is showing more trees than are actually there. There has been extensive logging in that area. Mr. Voelker also stated there are entrance signs on the north side of Stratford and Marlboro that were very expensive and are maintained by the Sherwood Forest Park District. There is extensive landscaping at these entrance signs. He is concerned with the destruction of these areas due to sewer connections and wants to make sure they are restored to their like kind condition.

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Wanted to know if the road will be the standard 26 ‘?
Mr. Lansing said he believes the roads are the standard 26 feet.

Mr. LaFleche thanked the applicant for the larger lot size. Mr. LaFleche asked for clarification of the lot setbacks. He felt the setbacks could be 75 to 80 feet because of the large lot sizes. Mr. LaFleche was pleased to see the trail on the end of Natalie Drive. He questioned the trail connection and wondered if it would be better to have it between two properties on the northwestern side versus the southwestern side to make it a more natural terminus. He also wants to see as many mature trees as practical to be kept and avoid clear cutting. Mr. LaFleche

wants the homeowner to be able to decide what trees have to be removed. Mr. LaFleche was pleased with the improved overall look of the project and stated it is better suited for the area.

There being no additional public comment, Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian to close the public hearing at 9:20 p.m.. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Bagramian wanted clarification on the water table.

Scott Lansing stated there are two test pits in the area of the stormwater basin and both show the groundwater elevation exceeding the three point separation.

Mr. Ophardt asked what will be the width of the right-of-way off Natalie to the area designated as Town owned open space? He wondered if it could be wider than 25 feet and some clearing for better access to the open space in case Town or emergency vehicles needed access. Mr. Ophardt would like to see at least a 30' width for the right-of-way. Mr. Andarawis said the access point needs to be marked. Mr. Ferraro does not feel it needs to be cleared at this time. Mr. Neubauer said there are a number of right-of-way easements around Town and it is impossible to keep these areas cleared. It was agreed the public right-of-way needs demarcation. It was suggested a few sections of split rail fence on both sides of the right-of-way could make it more visually appealing. There was also discussion for the proposed right-of-way between Natalie and Dawson Lane. Mr. Neubauer supports making the right-of-way aligned with the existing 60' right-of-way from Dawson Lane. Mr. Ferraro supports the proposed 30' width. Mr. Andarawis remarked 60' leaves open options that we do not have with 30'. An informal survey of the Planning Board members agreed they want to see a 60' wide right-of-way easement. The trail connection would be on the 60' portion. The trail will be an 8' wide paved multi-use path. No need for trail connection on Liam Drive to the open space.

Mr. Ferraro had concerns about the buffer to the wetlands on parcel #8. He wanted to know if the buffer goes onto private property? John Scavo does not believe the buffer goes onto private property because it is ACOE wetlands and the wetlands are much wider than the street corridors. Mr. Scavo does not believe the LC zone extends onto the properties. Mr. Ferraro would like to see a visual indicator on the property if it does extend, to ensure the property remains undisturbed.

Chairman Ferraro had questions regarding the mailbox kiosk and the roadway leading to the kiosk. Since there is no proposed HOA, who is responsible for the maintenance of the kiosk? Mr. Scavo said the homeowners are responsible for the snow removal in front of the kiosk. The Town will plow the road, but not maintain the mailbox kiosk. Discussion ensued about mailbox kiosk maintenance. There is a note on the plan about the cluster mailbox and that it is the homeowners' responsibility. It was suggested moving the kiosk closer to Lot #1 and design with a pull-off that can accommodate two cars. The USPS will have the final sign-off.

There was discussion about sewer connections and disturbances to the existing entrance signs. Mr. Lansing stated the sanitary sewer line is being directional drilled underneath Route 146A and under a good portion of Stratford Drive and going past the signage. The applicant does not anticipate any disturbance to the existing entryways and landscaping. If there are any disturbances there are restoration plans. Mr. Ferraro asked if there is any consideration being given to retaining some of the mature trees that exist along the frontage of the proposed lots? Mr. Lansing said the builder anticipates leaving the lots as is. Because the lots are bigger with more frontage there is no reason to clear cut. The lots will be cleared to the owner's preference. Mr. Neubauer questioned the grading that needs to be done will challenge the builder and thinks the front yards will have to be cleared. The builder will try to maintain as many trees as they can from the right-of-way area to the front of the lots. Mr. Lansing stated every lot is different. Lots #7 and #8 may be a challenge. The applicants' goal is to try to maintain as many trees as possible. Mr. Neubauer does not see how the mature trees on the front of lots can be maintained with the grading challenges. John Scavo stated the standard note that is placed on plans references a two tree minimum requirement and in lieu of the two trees the requirements shall be waived on lots where mature vegetation is preserved. Mr. Ferraro agrees with the alignment with Stratford Drive versus an alternative alignment.

Mr. Neubauer offered Resolution No. 4 of 2019, seconded by Mr. Ophardt to waive the final hearing for this application for the 17 single family residential lots 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 - aye
 E. Andarawis - aye
 A. Neubauer - aye
 G. Szczesny - aye
 J. Jones - aye
 E. Ophardt - aye
 R. Ferraro - aye

Ayes: seven (7)

Noes: zero (0)

The resolution is carried.

Conditions:

- Delineate public strip of land and future trail connection on Natalie Drive between Lots 6 and 7 with signage and/or split rail fence.
- Increase to 60' R.O.W instead of 30' R.O.W from Natalie Drive to Dawson Lane and note the pathway is to be constructed during the initial phase of infrastructure installation.
- Delineate R.O.W with sign or split rail fence

- LC Zone – Signage & Deed + show on site plan
- Maintain mature vegetation to the greatest extent practical. The 2 street trees per lot may be waived on a lot by lot basis based on the preservation of mature vegetation within the front yard area for each dwelling lot.

Old Business

None

New Business:

2019-001 Paulsen Development Office Building - Site Plan

Applicant proposes construction of a 2 story, 40,000 sf medical office building at 1785 Route 9. The total project area is 4.48 acres with road frontage on Route 9 and site access on a private roadway adjacent to the parcel. The proposed site includes parking for approximately 220 vehicles, a patient drop off area and on-site stormwater management, 1785 Route 9, Zoned: B-3, Status: PB Concept Review SBL: 266.3-2-18

To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: EDP Applicant: Paulsen Development of Albany, LLC

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume of Environmental Design Partnership presented for the applicant. He stated a portion of this project is very familiar to the Planning Board as this was part of an overall parcel that was developed back in 2015. The project at that time involved a 60,000 sq. foot two-story medical building that has become the Community Care building on Route 9. This project site is located just west and south of Oakbrook Apartments. This vacant parcel was subdivided from the original parcel and is currently being developed by Paulsen Development of Albany. There is an existing private road that bisects the two parcels. The project will access off of the existing driveway. There are remnants of an old roadway that previously connected with Oakbrook Commons apartments and that roadway will be removed. There will be two other driveways that will align with the driveways that are already developed. The building will be centered with parking on all four sides. There are 220 proposed parking spaces which meets the tenants' requirements, with handicapped parking in the front of the building. There will be a patient drop-off area on the south side of the building. There will be sidewalks around the entire building. Applicant will build a crosswalk to connect with the Community Care facility sidewalk. There is available water and sewer at the project site with easy connections. There is an existing stormwater basin that was developed as part of the other project, that area would be modified and enlarged to accommodate stormwater for the proposed site. Mr. Vuillaume received the MJ Engineering letter and spoke to the comment of the common easement that would be required since the two parcels will be sharing the private roadway. There will be a common ingress/egress access easement. The applicant will save as much vegetation as possible. The applicant will need to provide screening to the apartments. The traffic report will

be updated from the original 2015 report to incorporate any changes that have occurred. A full SWPPP will also be provided.

Staff Comments:

Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 01/15/2019 and issued a memo recommending:

- The ECC is concerned with the proposed projects parking and stormwater management areas in relation to the steep ravine.
- The ECC is very concerned with the proposed construction of the steep ravine, future plans shall demonstrate on the protection, stabilization, and erosion prevention of any work on the steep slopes.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 01/18/2019 stating:

- Future plans for the proposed stormwater management area shall show how the steep slopes of the ravine will be protected.
- The outfall and emergency overflow outlets shall have protection to reduce the velocity and energy of the flow of runoff.
- Verify tree plantings will not conflict with existing / proposed stormwater piping.
- Provide deep test pit and percolation data with preliminary design.

Roy Casper of the Trails Subcommittee issued a memo dated 01/20/2019 offering the following comments for consideration:

- A sidewalk connection should be provided to Route 9.
- A sidewalk connection should also be considered for pedestrian access for residents living in Oakbrook Commons.
- A crosswalk should be provided from the proposed office building sidewalk to the adjacent medical building sidewalk.
- An internal crosswalk should also be provided between the entranceway sidewalk shown on the plans and the sidewalk shown around the office building's exterior.
- A bicycle rack should be placed in close proximity to the entrance of the office building.

Sheryl Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention issued a memo dated 01/15/2019 stating:

- Provide hydrant locations on this map.

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 01/10/2019 stating:

- Proposal is an allowed use in the B-3 zone.
- Property is a keyhole lot.

- It is assumed entrance to Oakbrook Commons is eliminated and vehicles will enter via road built for 1783 Route 9. Will the road be transferred to the Town or remain private?
- 30' setback for parking from front line is required, 20' shown, variance is required.
- More comments to follow with more detailed submittal.
- EAF stated stormwater will drain to adjacent properties and SWPPP says it will stay on site as is required.

John Scavo, Director of Planning read a letter dated 01/18/2019 with recommendations he made to Mr. Gavin Vuillaume of Environmental Design Partnership stating:

- The ability to accommodate additional flows for both water and sewer should be provided. Confirmation from the Clifton Park Water Authority and Saratoga Co. Sewer District #1 should be provided to demonstrate they have both the capacity and are willing to service the proposed building.
- A traffic impact study should be provided to identify any potential impacts to traffic within the Route 9 Area as a result of the proposed 40,000 sq.ft. medical office building within the Route 9 Corridor. Specifically, the study should include a section dedicated to:
 - Determine anticipated future non-site (background) traffic volumes.
 - Identify other approved projects within the Route 9 Corridor from the Route 146 intersection north to the Kinns Road Intersection.
 - Evaluate existing traffic patterns and operating conditions from the 60,000 sq. ft. medical office building adjacent to this project to assess cumulative impact of traffic for the construction completion target year.
- Lot 1 (1783 Rt.9) & Lot 2 (1785 Rt. 9) are considered a group of establishments pursuant to §208-41 of the Town Code and share a single curb cut with common access for ingress and egress.
- Pursuant to §208-41, an architectural plan (exterior elevations) will be required. As the project moves forward, colored architectural renderings and samples of proposed building materials will need to be provided.
- A notation documenting the shared ingress and egress easement and maintenance responsibilities should be added to the plan.
- As plans develop, the applicant should demonstrate adequate turning radii for emergency service vehicles in travel lanes around the proposed building.
- Due to the proximity of vehicle parking adjacent to a steep slope, a barrier or suitable guide rail may be needed.
- To what degree grading with cut/fill lines along the steep slope are required to accomplish the proposed improvements needs to be evaluated. Clear limits of disturbance should be clearly established as plans advance.

- Additional comments will be forthcoming, based on a review of future information provided with a preliminary plan submittal.

Professional Comments:

MJ Engineering/Joel Bianchi, P.E. issued a letter dated 01/18/2019 stating:

State Environmental Quality Review

1. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an “Unlisted” action (see also Comment 2). 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. Saratoga County Planning Board – 239m referral for proximity to U.S. Route 9;
 - b. Clifton Park Water Authority – public water supply connection permit
 - c. Saratoga County Sewer District #1 – Reserve capacity request and sanitary sewer connection permit
 - d. NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation – permit coverage under stormwater SPDES, identification of threatened and endangered species, and potentially taking of additional water for public use.
 - e. NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation – identification of cultural or historic resources
 - f. NYS Dept. of Transportation – Consultation for additional vehicle trips onto a State highway.

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

2. 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:
 - a. Part I.1: Review and include additional agencies having jurisdiction. Specifically, the agencies identified in Comment 1 above.
 - b. Part I.3.b: The response indicate more than 1 acre of land will be disturbed. Therefore, the project is subject to the NYSDEC Phase 2 Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-15-002. As the project proceeds through the regulatory review process, a fully conforming Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required that addresses stormwater quality, quantity and green infrastructure elements and must be submitted as part of a preliminary plan submission to the Town.
 - c. Part I.8.a: The response indicates that the proposed action will not result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels. The proposed medical office building and land use code (LUC) may result in more than 100 peak hour vehicle

trips, which may be compounded when considering the development of the southern parcel also as a medical office building. At a minimum, the applicant needs to provide a summary of expected peak hour trips for review. This information may require the preparation of a project specific traffic impact study. If the study is warranted, it must account for projects currently be proposed or under construction and planned for occupancy in the near future within close proximity of the project site. Consultation with the Region 1 office of the NYSDOT may be considered since the primary access to the site is from an existing access onto Route 9 constructed as part of the development to the south.

- d. Part I.8.c: The response indicates that there are no pedestrian or bicycle routes are available on or near the site of the proposed action. A sidewalk was installed on the project located immediately to the south, which is part of the on-going effort by the Town to provide pedestrian connectivity along Route 9. The response shall be revised accordingly.
 - e. Part I.10: The response indicates the project will connect to an existing public water supply. The applicant will need to prepare the appropriate technical studies to confirm adequate capacity exists to service the project. It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the CPWA is willing and capable of service this project.
 - f. Part I.11: The response indicates that the project will connect to existing wastewater facilities. The applicant will need to prepare the appropriate technical studies to confirm adequate capacity exists to service the project. It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the SCSD No 1 is willing and capable of servicing this project.
 - g. Part I.12.b: The response indicates that the project site is located in an archeologically sensitive area. A “no effect” letter will be necessary and shall be provided to the Town.
 - h. Part I.15 Confirm response provided regarding species of plants or animals listed by the federal government as endangered or threatened. The FEAF environmental mapper does not account for federal species and a search of the USFW Ipac database would be necessary.
3. Based upon the information submitted to date, Part 2 of the SEAF has been reviewed with potential impacts identified for the Town’s review all of which are identified in Comment 2 above. The purpose of Part 2 is to generally identify areas where significant environmental impacts may occur. This allows the Town to request additional information from the applicant to document the extent of the impact. The following items were identified in Part 2 and additional information should be provided responding to the items below.
- a. Impact on transportation, refer to comment 2.c.
 - b. Impacts on public water supplies, refer to comment 2.e.
 - c. Impacts on existing public wastewater treatment facilities, refer to comment 2.f.
 - d. Impair the character or quality of archeological resources, refer to comment 2.g.
 - e. Adverse change to natural resources (e.g. wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater air quality, flora and fauna), refer to Comment 2.h.

- f. Potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems, refer to Comment 2.b.

Site Plans

4. The project is located within the Town's Neighborhood Business District (B-3). The proposal for a medical office is a permitted principal use in the B-3 District as noted in Section 208-32(A)(2) of the Town's Zoning, assuming there will be no overnight occupancy by patients.
5. Based upon a review of the proposed building location on the parcel, it appears the minimum bulk lot requirements as identified in Section 208-38 of the Town's Zoning are adequate. This statement is based upon the following assumptions:
 - a. The frontage for this lot may be considered part of the adjacent lot to the south as part of a group of establishments.
 - b. The common lot line with the adjacent lot to the south is considered a side yard and not a front yard.

These matters shall be confirmed by the Chief Zoning Officer of the Town.

6. Show the required yard setback lines on the plans.
7. Section 208-40 of the Town Zoning requires the property margins at the sides from the front building line to the rear property line shall be planted with trees and shrubs for a width of not less than 10 feet. Subsequent submissions must demonstrate how this provision of the Town's Zoning is being satisfied.
8. Section 208-99 of the Town zoning requires 1 parking space for every 150 gross square feet of building for general office uses. The plan notes 220 spaces are proposed which is deficient by 46 spaces. The Planning Board can amend these requirements based upon local or unique conditions. At a minimum, the applicant should provide the Planning Board with a narrative as to why the proposed project does not need to provide the minimum parking spaces pursuant to the Town Zoning to assist in their consideration of a potential amendment.
9. If not already completed as part of the subdivision, appropriate access easements and maintenance agreement shall be noted on subsequent plans for the common roadway to the south.
10. 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.
11. There needs to be indication as to whether the building will be provided with an automatic sprinkler as a result of proposed building materials and occupancy type. Depending on whether the building is sprinklered will dictate if an on-site hydrant is required.

12. The applicant shall coordinate with the responding fire department for the location of the Knox Box and fire department connection. Notation to that effect shall be added to the plans.
13. The concept plan shows the proposed stormwater management facility within an area that includes a constructed road embankment and stormwater area. Subsequent plans and submissions shall define how this will be constructed. If the stormwater system is planned to be an infiltration practice, clear means to establish infiltration rates will be required if the bottom of the basin is on placed fill. In-situ soil investigations will be necessary as part of the preliminary submission.
14. Northern portions of the site are shown on a steep embankment that may require earthwork. This includes portions of the parking and stormwater management area. It is recommended that a site-specific geotechnical investigation be advanced to ensure earthwork in these area does not adversely impact the slope or the adjacent stream due to a slope failure.
15. Provide the Planning Board with architectural renderings with listing of building materials for review.
16. 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 site grading, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – How far back is the parcel from Route 9?

Mr. Vuillaume stated it will be 80 to 100 feet.

Mr. LaFleche asked for clarification regarding the sidewalks and extension of sidewalk.

Mr. LaFleche asked how often is the parking lot for the existing medical building filled to capacity?

Mr. Hoffman, owner of the property, has never seen the existing parking lot filled.

There will be no shared parking since the two parcels are owned separately.

Mr. Vuillaume raised the point that there is a great deal of concern with the slope in the back of the property. He stated the entire area that is raised will be lowered by 8' to 10'. The contours will be flattened out. They are taking the top of the hill down to create a flatter area where the parking spaces will be built. The parking spaces will not be on steep slope. The contour map shows the existing and not the proposed. There will be no retaining wall.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Neubauer suggested the applicant does a cut and fill analysis as suggested by Mr. Scavo. He stated that along the north side there will be a ravine and a barricade is needed.

Mr. Andarawis does not want to see two under-utilized parking lots next to each other. Mr. Vuillaume stated it is two different parcels with two different land owners. The proposed project has the correct amount of parking for the tenants and he does not think it will be under-utilized.

Ms. Bagramian asked for clarification on the square footage because the drawing on the board shows a change from the drawing that the Board members have? Mr. Vuillaume said the footprint of the building has changed, but that it is the same square footage. The building is a little narrower with a jog in the front.

Mr. Neubauer asked if the applicant would be open to land banking the last row (northern most row) of parking near the sloping? Mr. Vuillaume said he would re-visit the parking requirements with the tenants that are looking to occupy the building.

Mr. Ferraro had questions regarding the landscaping to the east. He questioned the large cluster of trees to the eastern side that abuts the existing area near Oakbrook Commons. Mr. Hoffman stated he did recently re-plant 6' to 8' spruce trees in the area in question and erected a welcome sign.

Mr. Ferraro also wanted to know if there had been any discussion for a sidewalk along the driveway going to the Oakbrook Commons apartments? Mr. Vuillaume stated it could work and pointed to an area on the map where it could be built.

Mr. Ferraro wanted to bring the following item to the Planning Board's attention, that an Article 78 lawsuit has been filed by Abele Builders regarding the proposed 14 lot subdivision with duplexes off of Crescent Road because of the Planning Board's disapproval of the Special Use Permit. The Town Attorney, Mr. Thomas McCarthy is responding and Mr. Ferraro will be discussing with Mr. McCarthy.

Ms. Bagramian moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on February 12, 2019.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsey Snyder, Secretary

