

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

PLANNING BOARD

DENISE BAGRAMIAN
Chairwoman

ROBERT WILCOX
Attorney

PAULA COOPER
Secretary



MEMBERS

Emad Andarawis
Eric Ophardt
Heather Fariello
Andrew Neubauer
Jennyfer Gleason
Keith Martin

(alternate) Lisa Westrick

Planning Board Minutes
June 29th, 2022

Those present at the June 29th, 2022 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: D. Bagramian, Chairwoman, E. Andarawis, H. Fariello, A. Neubauer, E. Ophardt, K Martin, L. Westrick

Those absent were: J. Gleason

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

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

Ms. Bagramian stated that in the absence of Ms. Gleason, Ms. Westrick would be a voting member for tonight's meeting.

Minutes Approval:

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Mr. Andarawis, approval of the minutes of the June 14th, 2022 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Public Hearings:

2022-012 Maxwell Drive 5 Lot Residential Subdivision (Klapija)

Applicant proposes subdividing 12.74 acres into 5 residential lots for construction of single family homes. Project also includes parcel 271.-3-69.2. Project will be serviced by the CPWA and SCSD1. Stormwater will follow existing natural drainage pathways, Maxwell & Plank Rd, Zoned: R-1, Status: PB Preliminary Review w/ determination SBL: 271.-3-70
 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Lansing Applicant: D. Klapija
 Last Seen on: 4-26-22

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

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

Ms. Bagramian called the public hearing to order at 7:02 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on June 18th, 2022.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Scott Lansing – Lansing Engineering – Mr. Lansing stated that he is here tonight asking for final approval for this application. He stated that this subdivision is on the south corner of Maxwell Road and Plank Road and is zoned R-1. Mr. Lansing stated that the property is currently vacant land and there is Army Corp wetlands on the property, .042 acres of wetlands disturbed, and have 1.65 acres total disturbance would be on site. He stated that there would be 5 homes on the property with 3 of them sharing a driveway on Maxwell and the other 2 properties would have their own driveways, one on Plank Road and the other on Maxwell Road. Mr. Lansing stated that all the lots conform to code and are .95 acres to 7.9 acres. He stated that water and sanitary sewer is available to the sites and there is a 15 foot easement for trails are being provided to the Town.

Mr. Lansing stated that the archeological study has been done and the letter stated no further work is recommended. He noted that the DEC stated that there are no endangered species within the site.

Staff Comments:

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 6/7/22 and issued a memo recommending:

1. Because the Bear Brook is a trout spawning stream, in keeping with the recommendations and goals of the Town Comprehensive Plan, the Applicant should retain existing vegetation to the maximum extent practical and/or the use landscaping and grading to provide visual and auditory buffering between the project and LC Zone.
2. The ECC recommends that the limits of the LC Zone be indicated with appropriate signage.

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Turning radius should match apparatus used
2. Appendix D should be referenced, not Appendix E
3. Turn around should be within 10' Lot 5 residence

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 6/17/22 stating:

- No letter from water authority found
- No SCSD #1 permit has been provided
- It is believed that the ESCP should be significantly more detailed due to the amount of wetlands and protected streams on the site
- The proper appendix referenced should be "D" not "E"
- Turnarounds for emergency apparatus shall be within 100' of residence. Lot #5 does not appear to meet this.
- Turning radius for apparatus used needs to be provided.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 6/24/22 with the following comments:

1. The driveway between houses 4 and 5 appear to create a dam for runoff to the south. The design engineer may consider a culvert under the driveway to allow overland drainage to continue surface drainage to the Bear Brook. A driveway culvert should also be considered between lots 3 and 4.
2. What are the mitigation measures requested by the USACOE for the proposed wetland disturbances? Verify the acres of wetlands to be disturbed noted in #13 of the Short EAF.

Donald Austin from the Clifton Park Water Authority submitted the following comments:

- The water service for each lot should be installed entirely on the property to which that service is supplying water
- There is water main along entirety of Maxwell Road, so it is unnecessary to run services along the roadway.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a letter dated 6/24/22 with recommendations he made:

1. Before commencing construction of the sanitary sewer laterals, the property owner is responsible for having a qualified professional field delineate the property boundary line to ensure construction, tree clearing, or soils from trench excavation do not encroach on adjacent private properties.
2. Due to the presence of significant wetlands on-site, it is reasonable to assume that the area has a high groundwater table. Therefore, future homeowners should be aware that they will likely experience wet areas within their properties.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 6/24/22 had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. Part 1 12.b. – Applicant has indicated the site is currently being investigated by Hartgen. The applicant should provide documentation to the Town regarding this investigation and any correspondence from SHPO.

SITE PLANS

2. MJ takes no exception to the general utility layout. However, the technical analysis remains subject to the review and approval of Saratoga County Sewer District #1 and the Clifton Park Water Authority
3. Sheet 6 of 10 should incorporate environmental protection fencing adjacent to the wetlands.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

4. The SWPPP shall include documentation that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.4 of GP 0-15-002 with respect to threatened and endangered species. This includes both listed state and federal species.
5. The SWPPP shall include documentation that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.8 of GP 0-15-002 with respect to historic properties. This includes archeological and cultural resources.

Public Comments:

Betsy Santone – 78 Via Da Vinci – Ms. Santone asked if the 5/31/22 map the same as she stated that house 2 is sitting on the wetlands. She stated that she borders the land and that this is very

wet as her property gets wet during the spring as well and has concerns for flooding basements. Mr. Lansing stated that Lot 2 is outside of the primary wetland area and is within a non-jurisdictional wetland, and if possible the home would have a basement. Ms. Santone asked if there would be trees cut down in the wetland areas. Mr. Lansing stated that trees can be cut but there can be no digging, stump removal, stump grinding or fill can be brought in without permitting from the Army Corp of Engineers. Ms. Santone stated that she has concerns with some of the homes having the back yards face the stop sign on Plank Road and asked if a trail would be put in. Mr. Lansing stated that the side yards, not the rear yards would be facing the road and that there will be an easement for a trail not an actual trail out in and this it would be up to the Town in the future to decide if they want one at that location. Ms. Santone asked if the easement behind her house would be cut. Mr. Lansing stated that it is an easement for the sewer and that some of the vegetation would be cut down and it is close to the property line, about 15-20 feet, but it is not meant to be a trail. Ms. Bagramian asked if there could be landscaping for this to help buffer. Mr. Lansing stated that there couldn't be due to it being sewer and there shouldn't be plantings over this but once the sewer is hooked up there should be no traffic there except for maintenance or repair. Ms. Santone asked about sheet 6 of 10 and asked for the small words to be clarified. Mr. Lansing stated that this is stockpile area that is temporary. Ms. Santone asked if the historical marker meant anything to the land. Mr. Lansing stated that if the sign is in the right of way then it cannot be disturbed but he will check with Mr. Scavo on the placement.

There being no additional public comment, Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Mr. Neubauer, to close the public hearing at 7:17 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Neubauer stated that the sewer easement is on private property and mainly on lot 1, but to also service lots 3, 4, and 5. He asked if there would be maintenance needed for this or juts access. Mr. Lansing stated that they would just need access if necessary. Mr. Neubauer clarified this stating it would only be disturbed once, unless for needed repairs, and stated that the Building Department would assess the ground for lot 2 to determine if fill material would be needed for the pocket wetland. Mr. Lansing stated that this is true and that if they have to change the lot layout they can and can bring in engineered fill if needed. Mr. Neubauer stated that he would like to see a visual delineation for the land conservation area. Ms. Bagramian stated that that she would like the same as well as have the signage maintained by the landowner. Mr. Lansing stated that they would like to avoid constrained lands and that way the land owners can enjoy the natural land. Mr. Neubauer stated that some of the lots appear to be possible keyhole lots but sees that there are restrictions with the Bear Brook which would allow for it and requested that driveways stay away from the stream.

Mr. Martin stated that his paramount concerns are that the Board be consistent and fair in its review of applications. Mr. Martin stated that the Board had a similar application with a

constrained parcel and they asked the applicant to condense the lots, which they did. He stated that it may be difficult to approve this application due to lots 1 and 2 being similar to the application. He stated he is concerned about the resident losing her buffer due to the utility easement. Mr. Lansing stated that lots 1 and 2 have double the requirements for the zoning and that they are trying to avoid protected land. He stated that the utility is on their land and not cutting into adjoining properties but remaining on their own property.

Ms. Bagramian asked what the sizes of the homes being proposed are. Mr. Lansing stated that there are no actual footprints yet but 2,500 sf are being shown on the current plan and this will give the opportunity or the owners to add accessory structures if needed.

Ms. Fariello asked if lots 3, 4, and 5 are keyhole lots. Mr. Lansing stated that they are not as they have the required 100' of frontage even though they share a driveway. He stated that the shared drive is to decrease the wetland disturbance.

Mr. Andarawis asked Mr. Scavo if they were considered keyhole lots. Mr. Scavo stated that Mr. Myers did not identify them as keyhole configurations due to the frontage requirements of the R-1 Zoning being met. Mr. Andarawis stated that he has concerns with lots 1 and 2 due the building envelope being so small even though the lots are large Mr. Andarawis stated that this needs to be clearly identified to the land owners because he feels this is a buyer beware situation due to constraints and would like to see deed restrictions on lots 1 and 2. Mr. Neubauer agreed that the information needs to be on the deed. Mr. Andarawis stated that the keyholes are still a concern for him and the homes are behind one another so he wants to be careful as to why or why not this is ok. Mr. Lansing stated that this is not classified as a keyhole by Mr. Myers due to the 100' frontage and that fronts and rears of homes are not facing each other like typical keyhole lots.

Mr. Neubauer stated that there are different road, driveways and wetlands on this property to look at. He stated that pocket wetlands are present as well.

Ms. Bagramian stated that she agrees with Mr. Neubauer's previous comments but stated that the lots can look deceiving but Mr. Myers seems to be ok with them and does not see them as keyholes. She stated that she still has concerns even though the math works out.

Mr. Ophardt offered Resolution No. 07 of 2022, seconded by Mr. Neubauer to waive the final hearing for this application for the 5 lot subdivision, and to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval condition upon satisfaction of all comments, provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Conditions:

1. Visual delineation and identification of protected wetlands and maintained by land owner sand documented on deeds with a maintenance agreement.
2. Deed restrict wetlands on lots 1 and 2 and provide proof to the Town before final stamping

Roll Call:

D. Bagramian - Yes

E. Andarawis - Yes

E. Ophardt - Yes

H. Fariello - Yes

A. Neubauer - Yes

K. Martin – Yes

J. Gleason – Absent

L. Westrick (alternate) - Yes

Ayes 7

Noes: 0

The resolution is carried.

Old Business:

2021-049 Route 146 - Miller Rd Self Storage, Flex Space

Applicant proposes developing the parcel with Flex Space and Self-Storage buildings. The self-storage component will have conventional cold storage and a portion will have vehicle storage. The project will have 57 parking spaces, 524 Miller Rd, Zoned: B-5, Status: PB Preliminary Review w/possible determination SBL: 270.-2-3.121 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Advanced Eng. Applicant: Secure-It Self Storage Last Seen on: 11-23-21

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Nick Costa – Advanced Engineering – Mr. Costa stated that Mr. Mike Satterly, applicant, is also here tonight. Mr. Costa stated that a package has been submitted for this 45 acres that is zoned B-5 Corporate Commerce with frontage over 100’ on Route 146 and Miller Road. He stated that the land has constraints with both DEC and ACOE wetlands delineated and determinations made. Mr. Costa stated that they are working with an archeologist to prepare a final report for the land but a summary has been submitted for review. He stated that that the application asks for access from Miller Road to the first building on the property which will be the office. He stated

that there will be a fence around the property with a gate that will be secured with no public access. Mr. Costa stated that 8 buildings are proposed for self-storage and would be to the north and south. He stated that the proposal is also asking for 6 warehouse buildings 30,000 sf total and the site would still have 87.5% green space after development. He stated that parking is shown on the plans but he does not think all of it would be needed. Mr. Costa stated that sewer and water will be accessed for the office and the warehouses. He stated that the cold storage buildings would not have water or sewer. Mr. Costa stated that the site has circulation and a berm is being proposed along Route 146 and landscaping will be on Miller Road. He stated that there will be no cutting between the wetlands and roadways and there will be no wetland impacts as drainage is proposed thru the site and into a ditch line.

Staff Comments:

The Environmental Conservation Commission held a meeting on 6/7/22 and issued a memo recommending:

1. The ECC recommends that the developer of this site consider solar panels for the roofs of the buildings according to Clifton Park Solar Code.

Wade Schoenborn, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention:

1. Add hydrants at entrance and by building #1
2. Modify parking and dumpster locations between warehouse building #2 to #5 and storage building #5 to #8 for fire apparatus access

Steve Myers, Director of Building and Development issued a memo dated 6/17/22 stating:

- Additional hydrants required. One at the entrance and one in the vicinity of building #1.
- Parking and dumpster locations need to be modified between warehouse building row #2 to #5 and between storage building #5 to #8. This is to allow emergency vehicles access between these buildings.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo dated 6/24/22 with the following comments:

1. The test pits information has the groundwater elevation is that also the seasonal high-water table elevation?
2. Please provide documentation on how this project is waived from channel protection requirements.
3. There is a concern of the long drainage runoff (600'±) over the paved surface.
 - a. The amount of runoff that is collected and is directed towards proposed warehouse buildings #2 - #5 is a concern the runoff may impact the structures.
 - b. Runoff during freeze thaw times will collect in the inverted crowns and ice buildup can be a concern since the runoff can refreeze along the long runs.
 - c. Runoff should be directed into a closed system a maximum of 250 feet of overland flow or redirected between buildings to the swales running alongside the project.

4. Provide a maintenance access to the structures in the fore bay/retention area and bioretention area
5. The density of the planting plan for the Bioretention Basin does not meet the design guidance of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual Section 6.4. “The tree density of approximately one tree per 100 square feet (i.e., 10 feet on-center) is recommended. Shrubs and herbaceous vegetation should generally be planted at higher densities (five feet on-center and 2.5 feet on-center, respectively).”
6. Provide rip-rap sizing and length calculations to show that the runoff leaving the two 12” pipe outlets will be discharging below a non-erosive velocity during the larger storm events.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter dated 6/24/22 had the following comments:

FULL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

1. Part 1.12b indicates that project site is located on or adjacent to an archeologically sensitive site. The applicant should provide the Town correspondence from SHPO to substantiate that SHPO has deemed the project to have no adverse impacts on the site and to be feasible for construction.

SITE PLANS

2. Any approvals offered by the Planning Board should be conditioned on receipt of the Town’s Sewer District and SCSD’s review and approval.
3. Any approvals offered by the Planning Board should be conditioned on receipt of the Clifton Park Water Authority’s review and approval.
4. The proposed sanitary connection that crossing NYS Route 146 will require a Utility Work Permit from the NYSDOT. Letters of approval for this utility crossing shall be provided to the Town as a condition of approval.
5. The plan shows providing 72 parking spaces, therefore 3 ADA parking spaces will be required.
6. Provide documentation from ACOE and NYSDEC that the delineation is still valid. Include a note on the site plan indicated the date and by whom the wetlands were delineated.
7. On Sheet 3 of 14, the northwest corner of Warehouse Building 1 at the dumpster location shows a pavement width of 16 feet. This should be widened to accommodate two-way traffic 22 feet min.
8. On Sheet 4 of 14 the location of the one on-site fire hydrant shall be reviewed with the Town’s emergency services to confirm it is properly located for their needs.
9. On Sheet 4 of 14, the Planning Board may consider extending the proposed berm further west along the property line.
10. On Sheet 4 of 14, accessible parking spaces and access aisles shall be level with surface slopes not exceeding 1:50 (2%) in all directions pursuant to Section 4.6.6 of the ADA 2010 Standards. Provide spot elevations at these locations to confirm conformance.

11. On Sheet 4 of 14, the proposed 12” HDPE pipe discharging to the south out of the fore bay indicates an invert elevation around 212. Proposed grades are a 334, revise accordingly.
12. On Sheet 4 of 14, provide inlet protection on the four (4) 6” pipes from the fore bay to the bioretention.
13. On Sheet 4 of 14, provide a detail for the proposed stone in the four locations on the slope entering the fore bay. This slope protection should be installed along the entire length of slope.
14. On Sheet 4 of 14, will the flow from the driveway culvert be able to get around the proposed retaining wall.
15. On Sheet 4 of 14, it appears runoff in the grass area east of the proposed office is directed to the parking/ADA spaces. This may cause issues in the winter with freezing.
16. It appears the runoff will be concentrated between the rows of self-storage units and discharging into the faces of the warehouse buildings. Revise accordingly.
17. On Sheet 5 of 14, are any cleanouts or air relief valves at high points being proposed.
18. On Sheet 6 of 14, for any road fill section more than 5 feet shall have a descriptive performance specification for appropriate fill and compaction requirements
19. On Sheet 7 of 14, show temporary sediment traps with supporting sizing calculations for the contributory areas. If the proposed stormwater basins are planned for this purpose, appropriate notation should be provides directing the contractor to remove any accumulated sediment that may impact long term operations prior to each being deemed functionally ready.
20. On Sheet 7 of 14 incorporate environmental protection fencing adjacent to the wetlands.
21. The impervious areas have no drainage structures to capture surface runoff and predominately relies upon sheet flow prior to discharge to the site stormwater management areas. The overland travel distance is approximately 625-feet. Provide the velocity of runoff and depth of flow in these locations. It is recommended that surface inlets be incorporated to reduce flow path lengths and limiting the pavement from becoming a major drainage flow conduit. It is common practice to limit flow paths over impervious surfaces like parking lots and roadways to approximately 300 feet to minimize the extend of shallow concentrated flows.
22. Provide notation on the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (Sheet 7 of 14) that all upstream construction shall be completed and stabilized before connecting to the downstream infiltration practice(s) pursuant to Section 6.3.5 of the NYSSMDM.
23. Provide note on plans Sheet 10 of 14, “All retaining wall designs shall be provided by the retaining wall manufacturer and shall be certified by a licensed geotechnical engineer. Copies of all design documents shall be submitted to the project design engineer and the Town for review and approval prior to construction”.
24. Detail sheets 11 and 12 of 14 have not been reviewed as they are under the jurisdiction of Clifton Park Water Authority and Town of Clifton Park Corporate Commerce Sewer District.
25. The following comments are relative to the site plan and its conformance to the International Fire Code (IFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:

- a. If the proposed building is to be provided with an automatic sprinkler, show the location of the fire department connection to ensure they are reasonably accessible.
 - b. Pursuant to Section D104 of the IFC, commercial or industrial buildings that are exceeding 62,000 sq. ft. shall be provided with two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads unless equipped with automatic sprinklers (this exemption is permissible up to 124,000 sq. ft. of building area).
26. The proposed swale along the south side of proposed self-storage building #4 appears to cut through the asphalt. Revise accordingly.
 27. The Planning Board should consider the applicant provide a variety of evergreen plantings along the southeast fence line in lieu of the dogwood trees. Such species would include Balsam Fir, Norway Spruce or Blue Spruce.
 28. Show proposed roof leader connections into the on-site storm sewer system.
 29. The Planning Board may consider a different type of fence in lieu of chain link for aesthetic purposes.
 30. It is recommended that some type of guide rail (timber/box beam, etc.) be provided along the retaining wall to protect vehicular traffic along the driveway.
 31. Provide detail of the outlet control structure out of bioretention area.
 32. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of the NYSSMDM, the proposed stormwater practice needs to have a conspicuous and legible sign posted. The plans need to provide the standard sign with the applicable language as well as the location.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT/STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

33. The SWPPP text shall explicitly state that no soil disturbance of 5 acres or more are not permitted at any one time and if required, written authorization from the MS4 is required.
34. The SWPPP shall include documentation that supports permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.8 of the General Permit. A site specific cultural resource survey has been completed. Upon receipt of the NYSOPRHP no effect" letter, it shall be referenced within the SWPPP.
35. The SWPPP shall include documentation that the project is eligible for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.4 of GP 0-20-001 with respect to threatened and endangered species. This includes both listed state and federal species.
36. The SWPPP text makes no mention of soil restoration. Pursuant to Section 5.1.6 of the NYSSMDM, soil restoration is a required practice applied across areas of a development site where soils have been disturbed and will be vegetated in order to recover the original properties and porosity of the soil. The required soil restoration is a function of the underlying soils where the disturbance is to occur pursuant to Table 5.3 found in Section 5.1.6 of the NYSSMDM.
37. SWPPP text shall include a general discussion of stormwater management planning undertaken with emphasis on items outlined in Section 5.3 (Table 5.7) of the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSSMDM).
38. The Tc calculations for the post development conditions utilizes a sheet flow length of 150-feet for the post development conditions. Chapter 4 of the NYSSMDM requires that the length of overland flow used in time of concentration (tc) calculations is limited to no

more than 100 feet for post development conditions. The Tc calculations for the post development watersheds which include development shall be modified accordingly.

PHASE 1 ARCHEOLOGICAL SUMMARY

39. The Phase 1 report is subject to the review and approval by the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.

SEWER REPORT

40. The average daily flow anticipated from this project is approximately 915 gpd (0.64 gpm) and the peak hourly flow is estimated at 3,660 gpd (2.54 gpm). The pumping rate for each of the grinder pump station being proposed will be approximately 11 gpm, totaling 22 gpm into the system. The report is subject to the review and approval by the Clifton Park Water Authority, Town of Clifton Park Sewer District and Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1 for water and sewer system improvements, respectively.

TRAFFIC

41. Use the most current ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition
 42. Use separate land use codes for each separate land use
 a. 150 for Warehouse
 b. 151 for Mini-Warehouse or Self Storage
 43. For the warehouse use, determine whether the equation or average rate should be used to determine the trips based on the Trip Generation Handbook 3rd Edition, Section 4.4.
 44. Provide the type of vehicles that will be utilizing the warehouse space.

Public Comments:

Ms. Bagramian stated that there seems to be a lot of public concerns tonight so she will have the public speak.

Frank Genovese – 531 Miller Road - Mr. Genovese stated that he has concerns with the impact of this being developed across the street from his residence. He stated that he has concern with stormwater and possible standing water as well as lighting.

Joanie Genovese – 531 Miller Road – Ms. Genovese stated that she has concerns with the warehouse bringing in early morning traffic as well as the visual of cars and large trucks going by. She thanked the applicant for keeping the tree line buffer and asked if the color of the buildings could be pleasing to the area. She stated that her family has been on this land for over 100 years. Ms. Genovese asked if there was a noise ordinance in the Town. Mr. Scavo stated there is and it states quiet hours are between 10pm and 7am which is enforced by public safety. Ms. Genovese stated that she feels that the traffic in this area is bad now and this project will only increase the traffic and the noise from the air brakes on larger trucks disturb the peace for miles.

Scott Calendar – 311 Miller Road – Mr. Calendar stated that eventually there will be a need for a curb cut onto Route 146 and suggested just making one now and not onto Miller Road. He stated that it is residential on Miller Road and the entrance would be better on Route 146. He stated that he likes the idea just not the entrance location.

Peter Keegan 314 Miller Road – Mr. Keegan stated that he echoes Mr. Calendar’s comment and would like to see traffic curbed off of Route 146.

Mr. Scavo stated that the intersection of Tanner and Route 146 has recently been awarded a design grant project and hopefully the outcomes of the design project will offer NYS DOT solutions to improvement traffic flow and safety at the intersection. He stated that there is a public process where the public can give input.

Joel Koval – Miller Road resident – Mr. Koval stated that he is not only a resident who lives on Miller Road but the realtor for this property. He stated that he has been trying for years to do something with this property. He stated that there was a proposal for a solar farm here and it got turned down, this would not have increased any traffic. He stated that he feels that the county would direct traffic to the side road anyway so that’s why he feels it is proposed. He stated that this use is allowed by right.

Resident - 527 Miller Road – The Resident that she lives directly across from this application. She stated that the 2 homes here have been involved with this land for 102 years and she asked that sound and visual sight of the buildings are blocked from the residents that are here. She stated that she feels the road was not made for larger trucks. Mr. Satterly stated that if the entrance were to come off of Route 146 it would have to disturb Army Corp Wetlands and require permitting to do such.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Bagramian asked if the density has been reduced. Mr. Costa stated it has been significantly reduced and the stormwater design is now presented. Mr. Costa stated that it was over 100,000 sf for the buildings and it is now about 89,000 sf. Ms. Bagramian asked if the self-storage was broken up and what the flow of traffic would be. Mr. Costa stated that storage is just regular cold storage and the traffic would flow around the buildings. He stated that traffic is one-way and the roads are wide enough to allow for one car to stop and another to go around. He stated that there is a truck maneuvering plan for emergency vehicles as well. Ms. Bagramian asked if there would be striping or signage for traffic flow. Mr. Costa stated that he doesn’t believe so for striping but parking would have signage. Mr. Satterly stated that he owns the storage facility past Lowes and he stated that he has striping for parking and at the gates. He stated that there are speed limit signs there as well. Ms. Bagramian stated that she feels this is dense and has concerns with

emergency response. Mr. Satterly stated that the drive is wide he stated that along the outside of the units they are 50' wide. Ms. Bagramian asked about overhead doors for the warehouse buildings. Mr. Satterly stated that the warehouses are broken into 4 1,500' sections and are similar to the EDP buildings on Route 9 with 4 overhead doors. He stated that the parking for the warehouse is to the rear of the property and elevations were provided.

Mr. Ophardt asked if there was a traffic study done for this proposal. Mr. Costa stated not yet because the trip generation is not high enough to be required. Mr. Satterly stated that his other storage has 600 units and he looked at the past years trips in and out based on the gate opening records and they found on average there are 30 trips per day. Mr. Costa stated that they will look at the traffic analysis again as per MJ's comments. Mr. Satterly stated that the market is showing that people are looking for bigger storage. He stated that it is a garages door with an 8 foot door as well and everything is gated and code accessed. Mr. Costa stated that people would be in the warehouse storage mainly first thing in the morning and in the evening to pick-up and drop-off supplies for their day. Mr. Ophardt asked if it would only be owners and employees accessing the site and not customers. Mr. Costa stated that is correct.

Mr. Neubauer asked about the locations for self-storage and warehouse buildings as positioned. Mr. Costa stated that the land requires grading so the buildings were placed to help with this. Mr. Neubauer stated that this site is unique due to the zoning and is zoned to be these types of buildings but were never developed. He stated that now since this is visible from Route 146 he feels it should look like the gateway into Clifton Park. He stated that he feels the flex space should be more hidden because he would rather see the storage buildings on 146 due to overhead doors. Mr. Neubauer stated that to the northwest should have warehouse buildings to screen the whole site and have the overhead door buildings to the south. He stated that landscaping along Miller Road does look nice.

Mr. Ophardt asked if the fencing could look nice and be functional but decorative as well. Mr. Ophardt stated that the previous conceptual layout was more spread out and now is the development area is more condensed, and asked if there were any plans for the rest of the property to be developed as he wants to ensure that the applicant won't be back in 6 months with another project for the other portion of this parcel. Mr. Costa stated that it would take a few years to develop this fully so there are no plans right now but there is always a possibility in the future. Mr. Ophardt asked if they could provide a master plan for 5 years out and other possible uses. Mr. Scavo stated that they can have any use that is B-5 compliant and SEQR does view a future project as phased segmentation since any future phase would have to take the incremental impacts of this project into consideration.

Ms. Bagramian stated that she would like to see more robust landscaping and stated that there have been resident concerns about lighting, noise, and traffic that she would like the applicant to address. Mr. Costa stated that there is downward lighting on the plan and that along Miller Road

there would be wooded landscaping that is existing to help screen the property that would remain except at the entry to the property. Ms. Bagramian asked if the lighting would be the same as the storage on 146. Mr. Costa stated it would and the Board can go look if they would like. Ms. Bagramian stated that she does not want lighting to interfere with current residents.

Mr. Neubauer stated that he agreed with Ms. Bagramian's comments and would like to see a vinyl coated fence instead of just metal chain link to make it look nicer and provide more robust landscaping by the office as well. He stated that the stormwater concerns that he has are also significant but thinks they can be resolved with moving around building locations. Mr. Neubauer asked about how many feet the entrance is from the intersection. Mr. Costa stated that is about 250-300'.

Mr. Martin stated that he agrees with all previous comments made and stated that he would like more applications to have rooftop solar and that this is a good project to have it on. Mr. Martin asked if there would be EV charging station. Mr. Costa stated that he can look into this and that the plan is to reduce parking if they can.

Mr. Andarawis stated that visuals are important and would like to see simulations of the proposal from Route 146 coming from the east and west. He suggested turning the berm northeast to southwest to allow for better flow of the buffer with the internal road and to help continue to preserve the existing vista. He stated that rooftop solar was a great suggestion and likes that the applicant wants to land bank parking.

Ms. Bagramian asked why the entrance is on Miller Road and not Route 146. Mr. Costa stated that it would be more expensive, result in disturbances to a federal wetland, and has to be further away from the intersection to the west. Ms. Bagramian stated that she feels it would be better off of Route 146 and would tie in better with future development. Mr. Satterly stated that there are no future plans for the property.

New Business:

None

Discussion Items:

None

Mr. Neubauer moved, seconded by Mr. Martin, adjournment of the meeting at 9:09 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on July 12th, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary