

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
Mario Fantini
Jennyfer Gleason
Keith Martin
(alternate) Lisa Westrick

Planning Board Minutes
May 9th, 2023

Those present at the May 9th, 2023 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: D. Bagramian, Chairwoman, E. Andarawis, E. Ophardt, M. Fantini, L. Westrick

Those absent were: H. Fariello, K. Martin, 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. Fariello, Ms. Westrick would be a voting member tonight.

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Andarawis moved, seconded by Mr. Fantini, approval of the minutes of the April 25th, 2023 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Public Hearings:

94 Appleton Rd 2 Lot Subdivision

SBL: 270.-1-50.1 Subdivision of 94 Appleton Road to two separate parcels, 94 Appleton RD

Zoned: CR - Conservation Residential, Status: Revised Preliminary

Citizenserve File Number: 23-001025, Application Number: SUB23-000012

Applicant: Lindsey Jeanne, Consultant: Colliers Engineering & Design

Last Seen On: 4-11-23

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 Mr. Andarawis, 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 7:03 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Daily Gazette on April 29th, 2023.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Patrick Mulkern – Colliers Engineering – Mr. Mulkern stated that this application is for a proposed subdivision to make one lot into two. He stated that no work is proposed with this application and the lots would be 70 acres to the east of the road and 25 acres to the west. Mr. Mulkern stated that the existing home and solar farm are to remain. He stated that the 500’ notifications were sent out.

Staff Comments:

Wade Schoenborn, Building and Zoning issued a memo stating:

- Provide complete fire apparatus access plan
- Provide complete master plan showing access roads.

Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:

- This proposed subdivision, Lot 2, appears to meet Town Code Chapter 208-16 E.(2)(b) Development on 10 acres or more. A parcel consisting of 10 acres or more may be developed at a density of one residential dwelling unit per 10 acres, provided there is at least one acre of unconstrained land available to accommodate a residential use, including any required well and septic system.
- This proposed subdivision, Lot 1, appears to meet Town Code Chapter 208-80 C. space and bulk standards for solar energy systems.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo stating:

- Lot 1 has an active NYSDEC SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity for the solar project. If the landowner changes on Lot 1 the active NYSDEC General Permit should reflect the change.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:

- The Saratoga Co. Planning Board issued a recommendation noting that the project would have no sign significant county wide or inter community impacts.
- The subdivision application is an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQR. It is recommended the Planning Board issue a Negative Declaration.

Professional Comments:**Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter had the following comments:**

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. No further comments.

SHORT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

2. No further comments.

SITE PLANS

3. No further comments.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche – 21 Wheeler Drive – Mr. LaFleche asked if an easement along the road would be necessary for a possible future trail. Mr. Scavo stated that if a trail were proposed to be out along the road, it would be significant and feels that the easement could be addressed during trail planning.

There being no additional public comment, Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Mr. Fantini, to close the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Andarawis asked that if the solar array was not present the right to build would be on the created lot. Mr. Scavo stated that it has a commercial operation now, so it would have to be looked at. Mr. Ophardt asked if the solar was removed if there would still be a right to build. Mr. Scavo stated that if the solar was removed, it would not be.

Mr. Ophardt offered Resolution No. 07 of 2023, seconded by Mr. Fantini to waive the final hearing for this application for the 94 Appleton Road Subdivision approval, and to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval condition upon satisfaction of all comments, provided by the Planning Department, Town Designated Engineer, and all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department.

Roll Call:

D. Bagramian - Yes

E. Andarawis - Yes

E. Ophardt - Yes

H. Fariello - Absent

K. Martin – Absent

J. Gleason – Absent

M. Fantini - Yes

L. Westrick (alternate) - Yes

Ayes 5

Noes: 0

The resolution is carried.

Old Business:

None

New Business:

Rexford Square Self Storage Expansion

SBL: 269.-3-2.24 Expansion of an existing self-storage facility, 8 Daggett Drive (Pvt) Rear

Zoned: HM - Hamlet Mixed Use, Status: Preliminary

Citizenserve File Number: 23-001138, Application Number: SPR23-000011

Applicant: Rexford Self Storage LLC, Consultant: Empire Engineering

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Christopher Longo – Empire Engineering - -Mr. Longo stated that he is here tonight with the applicant, Mr. Brian Bellamy. He stated that this application is for an additional 8,400 sf of storage consisting of 14 buildings, each 600 sf. Mr. Longo stated that the original units were built in 2020/2021 and there is now an additional need for storage. He stated that a variance was needed for the project and was granted by the ZBA with buffering conditions represented on the current plans. Mr. Longo stated that some pavement would be removed with the application and the existing swale would remain undisturbed and that stormwater management that is currently in place would be satisfactory for the proposal.

Staff Comments:

The Environmental Conservation Commission and issued a memo recommending:

- 208-43.2 Permitted Uses Self-Storage facilities that appear residential in character are permitted. The ECC recommends the applicant ensure that the proposed structures will be residential in character
- If the intent of these storage facilities is to house motor vehicles or motor vehicle fluids, the Planning Board should require that each building should be situated on an impervious surface to prevent contamination of the surface and subsurface materials.
- The ECC notes that the minimum greenspace requirement is 25%. The current plan does not indicate how much greenspace is preserved. The applicant shall provide this calculation to the Planning Board.

Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:

- An area variance was approved by the ZBA on March 7th, 2023, for the additional 8,400 gross square footage for the self-storage with two conditions.
 1. Applicant shall plant trees the start of the current self-storage building #1 all the way to the stormwater management area forebay.
 2. Applicant shall not build any proposed building any closer than 20 feet to the northern property line.
- The proposed self-storage building shape / residential character / final locations is the Planning Board's discretion.

Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Technician issued a memo stating:

- The applicants engineer Stormwater Assessment, dated March 20th, 2023, should include if the water quality and water quantity controls are being met per the NYSDEC SPDES General Permit requirements.
- If approved, the applicant shall contact the Stormwater Management Officer prior to construction to determine if SWPPP weekly inspections are required.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:

- The applicant should deploy the same down directional building wall mounted lighted used for previous building phases on the new proposed storage units.
- The property owner is responsible for ensuring the asphalt labeled "to be removed" is disposed of at an authorized disposal site or recycling process facility
- The site plan amendment appears to be an Unlisted Action pursuant to the thresholds established by SEQRA.
- As an unlisted action coordinated review is optional and thus the Zoning Board of Appeals issued their own sperate negative declaration for consideration of an area variance that the ZBA granted.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an Unlisted Action. In Town Code Section 208.95(F)(9): Subject to and in accordance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the Planning Board shall be the lead agency for the purpose of conducting the environmental review of the application for subdivision. The Planning Board shall conduct an integrated comprehensive environmental review of the proposed project in combination with its review of the application under this article. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved / interested agencies to be engaged may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:
 - a. Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: site plan approval
 - b. Saratoga County Planning: 239m referral

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

SHORT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

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:

2. Part 1.13.a. – The response indicates that wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by federal, state or local agencies adjoin or are contained within the project site per the EAF Summary Report. The applicant should provide documentation that confirms the presence or absence of federally regulated wetlands adjacent to the project site. Should this change as the project design progresses, additional approvals and permits may be required.
3. Part I.12a – The SEAF submitted by the applicant indicates that the site contains no structures on either the state or National Register of Historic Places. This response is inconsistent with a review of the DEC Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Mapper, located at www.dec.ny.gov/eafmapper/. The applicant should change the response in the SEAF and provide confirmation from the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation that the project site does not contain any listed structures.

4. Part 1.17 The applicant indicated the proposed action will create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources. The applicant provided a stormwater assessment of the existing stormwater management system dated 03/20/23. The storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems and the system has capacity for changes.
5. No further comments at this time. Additional comments may be forthcoming as the project advances.

SITE PLANS

6. The project is located within the Town's Hamlet Mixed Use (HM) zoning district. The proposal for a self storage facility is a permitted use within the HM District as noted in Section 208-43.2 of the Town's Zoning, however it must appear residential in character.
7. Based upon a review of the lot configuration, it appears the minimum bulk lot requirements as identified in Section 208-43.3 of the Town's Zoning are satisfied.
8. Subsequent plans should include architectural elevations of the building with a listing of the materials of construction for review by the Planning Board.
9. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, we will reserve further comments until more detailed plans are submitted.

STORMWATER NARRATIVE

10. It appears the existing stormwater management practices will not be disturbed as part of this expansion.
11. Based on the information provided it indicates the existing detention pond has the capacity to handle the additional impervious area. Provide the discharge rates for the 1, 10 and 100-year storm events to ensure they remain below the previous existing conditions as stated in the October 2020 SWPPP.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Andarawis asked if the amount of impervious surfaces would change due to the build being on what may be existing. Mr. Longo stated that if they change it would only increase about 3,000sf more. Mr. Andarawis asked why the applicant is looking for 14 smaller buildings instead of fewer larger ones. Mr. Longo stated that the demand is for smaller units right now as the larger buildings only have front access. Mr. Andarawis asked if the gravel area was for access and not for boat storage. Mr. Longo stated that it was for boat/RV storage , but they are now developing the area. Mr. Andarawis stated that to the north is residential property and would like the buffer since the buildings would be closer to the property boundary. He stated that he would also like to see the Hamlet look at the location. Mr. Longo stated that buildings 2 and 3 are lower-pitched but would match the other buildings. Mr. Andarawis stated that he would like to see the 6 buildings the north look residential and support the Hamlet Mixed Use. Mr. Bellamy stated that if the northern buildings were pitched then it would be a concern in the winter with ice

and runoff. Mr. Longo stated that they could look into a shed-like roof to allow for a higher pitch.

Mr. Ophardt asked how big each building would be. Mr. Longo stated that they would be 600 sf or about 30'x20' or 20'x30' and this would allow the applicant to develop as the demand grows and allows for access on all sides of the buildings. Mr. Ophardt asked if the esthetics would match the original building. Mr. Longo stated that they would match the buildings to the rear and to the north. He stated that there would be a row of trees on the northern boundary to act as a buffer per the ZBA conditions of approval for the variance. Mr. Longo stated that the siding would go to the ground and it would be color matched to the original buildings and not have a gabled roof.

Ms. Bagramian how many tenants per building the applicant was planning to have? Mr. Longo stated that the buildings would have 4-8 units in them and that the internal breakup could be customizable. Ms. Bagramian asked if there would be single-tenant buildings. Mr. Longo stated that it would not be; the buildings would have no less than 2. Mr. Bellamy stated that he did not expect a high demand for 5'x5' spaces and that they have already sold out of what they have existing so this is to accommodate the need and why the sizes are what is being proposed. Ms. Bagramian asked if this storage would be for strictly storage or if it would house any flex space. Mr. Bellamy stated that this would be for storage only. Ms. Bagramian asked if boats or cars would be allowed to be stored on site. Mr. Bellamy stated that everything would be stored in the buildings and that a staff member would be on site daily if there were any issues.

Ms. Westrick asked if there would be limited access to the buildings in the rear. Mr. Longo stated that they can adjust the plan to allow access depending on where the doors to the buildings would be placed and how many units per building there are. Ms. Westrick asked if green space changes as well as impervious surfaces, would the stormwater need to be updated. Mr. Longo stated that this will be addressed and reflect the plan as the project develops with demand.

New Business:

967 Riverview Road 3 Lot Subdivision (Lee)

SBL: 269.-3-28 Subdivide 9.6 acres into 3 residential lots for family to build on two of them and sell the existing house. 967 Riverview RD

Zoned: HR - Hamlet Residential, Status: Concept

Citizenserve File Number: 23-001197, Application Number: SUB23-000011

Applicant: Virginia Lee, Consultant: N/A

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Virginia Lee – owner – Ms. Lee stated that she is here tonight hoping to build a smaller home for herself and husband as well as a home for her son and his family. She stated that they purchased the current home and land 31 years ago. Ms. Lee stated that there is only one access, which is the long and narrow portion of the flag lot. She stated that she requested access on the adjacent street, Southard Road, but it belongs the Niskayuna with a school on the road and they denied her access request to the private road.

Staff Comments:

Wade Schoenborn, Building and Zoning issued a memo stating:

- No further comments at this time
- Driveways over 500' will be required to meet the requirements of the NYS Fire Code.

Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:

- Applicant requests an area variance from Town Code Chapter 208-7 Definition Keyhole Lot: A lot located to the rear of another lot that meets all the requirements of this chapter and has access to a public right-of-way by a strip of land in fee simple ownership, at least 40 feet wide. Proposed strip of land width 25 feet wide. Variance requested: 15 feet

Mike OBrien, sewer review issued a memo stating:

- This proposed subdivision lies within the Rivercrest Sewer District Ext. No. 1. Any public sewer connection(s) will be required to be separate for each home.
- Southard Drive is a private drive and private sewer. Public Sewer begins at the manhole on the easterly edge of Southard Drive heading east between two lots on Meadow Drive. If connections to this sewer are proposed, easements will be required.
- The Town of Clifton Park requests additional details pertaining to future sewer connections of these additional lots.

John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:

- The proposed subdivision has been forwarded to the Saratoga Co. Planning Board for a recommendation per GML Section 239 M and N.
- A copy of the proposed subdivision plan has been provided to the Town of Glenville per GML Section 239 M and N.
- 208-86B. of the Clifton Park Town Code states that Space and bulk standards for keyhole lots shall be the same as delineated in Section 208-11 for the district in which they are located, except that all setbacks, whether front, side, or back yards, shall be a minimum of 50 feet for the main building/structure. Therefore, please update the subdivision plat to reflect the sides, front, and rear setbacks are set at 50' for each keyhole lot.
- The applicant should clarify if access to Southard Road exists for proposed lots 2 and 3. Southard Road is not a Town road. The road is owned and maintained by the Niskayuna School District.
- According to Section 208-86F of the Town Code, add the following note to the subdivision plat - STANDARD NOTE FOR ADDRESS IDENTIFICATION. The street number of a dwelling situated on a keyhole lot shall be permanently and conspicuously

displayed on a sign, with lettering no less than 3 inches nor greater than 8 inches in height, and placed no more than 25 feet from the road pavement. The sign shall be displayed for both directions of travel and be reflective. Identification markers must also be placed at any location where a common drive splits.

- Add a note to the plan that states - Lots 2 and 3 are required to meet the design standards mandated under Sections 511 of the New York State Fire Code.
- The final subdivision map should display assigned 911 addresses for each lot.
- Add the following note to the subdivision plat. STANDARD NOTES FOR KEYHOLE LOT SUBDIVISIONS: Final location and orientation of each house is subject to the approval of the Director of Building and Development at the time the building permit is issued. Foundation location surveys (plot plans) are to be provided and approved prior to proceeding with framing in order to ensure compliance with the original approval.
- Provide evidence from the Clifton Park Water Authority and Clifton Park Sewer District that each has adequate capacities and willingness to service the proposed dwelling lots.
- A note must be added to the plat indicating any work within the Prior to work commencing within the public right-of-way, the property owner shall obtain a curb-cut permit from the Saratoga County Department of Public Works.
- If access to the new lots is through Riverview Road with new driveway extensions, a note should be added to the plat stating that - the property owner must obtain the necessary curb-cut permits from Gary Meir, Saratoga County Department of Public Works.
- According to the NYS DEC EAF Mapper System, the following answers should be corrected by the applicant on Part I of the SEQR EAF to reflect: Part 1 - Question 12b - Archeological Sites - Yes Part 1 - Question 13a - Wetlands or Other Regulated Waterbodies Yes - Digital mapping information on local and federal wetlands and waterbodies is known to be incomplete. Once corrected a revised Part I - SEAF should be submitted through the Citizenserve electronic application management system.

Professional Comments:

Walter Lippmann, P.E. of MJ Engineering in a letter had the following comments:

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an “Unlisted” action. In Town Code Section 208.95(F)(9): Subject to and in accordance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the Planning Board shall be the lead agency for the purpose of conducting the environmental review of the application for a site plan. The Planning Board shall conduct an integrated comprehensive environmental review of the proposed project in combination with its review of the application under this article. If the Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, the need to undergo a coordinated review is optional. Under a coordinated review, involved / interested agencies to be engaged may include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:
 - a. Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: Subdivision approval
 - b. Saratoga County Planning: 239-m County Referral
 - c. NY State Office of Historic Preservation: identification of archeologically sensitive resources

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

SHORT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

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:

2. Part 1.12. The response indicates that the project site is not located within or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archeological site inventory. NYS EAF Mapper identifies the project site, or portion of it, is located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites. The applicant should provide a correspondence letter from SHPO to confirm the presence or absence of archeologically sensitive resources.
3. Part 1.13.a. – The response indicates that no wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by federal, state or local agencies adjoin or are contained within the project site. NYS EAF Mapper identifies wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by federal, state or local agencies adjoin or are contained within the project site. The applicant should provide documentation that confirms the presence or absence of federally regulated wetlands adjacent to the project site. Should this change as the project design progresses, additional approvals and permits may be required.
4. No further comments at this time. Additional comments may be forthcoming as the project advances.

SITE PLANS

5. The project is located within the Town's Hamlet Mixed Use (HM) zoning district. The proposal for single family homes are a permitted use within the HM District as noted in Section 208-43.2 of the Town's Zoning.
6. In reviewing the proposed lot configuration, the created lots appear to be deficient in regards to meeting the minimum standard requirements outlined in Section 208-43.3(A) and 208.86 of the Town's Zoning. The noted deficiencies are as follows:
 - a. Section 208.86 Keyhole Lots (B): Space and bulk standards for keyhole lots shall be the same as delineated in § 208-11 for the district in which they are located, except that all setbacks, whether front, side or back yards, shall be a minimum of 50 feet for the main building/structure.
7. Provide contour lines at a minimum of two-foot intervals to United State Geological Survey datum within the parcel pursuant to Section 179-8 of the Town Subdivision Law.
8. Subsequent submissions shall include the metes and bounds of all the affected lots and right-of-way.
9. Provide the layout of the proposed driveway, house, water and sewer connections on each of the lots.
10. Provide any easements (ingress/egress, etc.) on the subdivision plat.
11. The Short Environmental Assessment Form indicated 0.75 acres of disturbance. Provide the limits of disturbance line on the plan. Any disturbance between 1 and 5 acres will require the preparation of a Basic Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).
12. The project either currently has a shared driveway or proposes a shared drive to the keyhole lot. The applicant shall provide a draft maintenance agreement for review by the Planning Board's legal counsel.

13. The proposed shared driveway shall comply with the IRC and New York Supplement. Details or description of the proposed drive materials of construction shall be provided, confirming it will can support the load of the responding emergency vehicles.
14. The following comments are relative to the subdivision and its conformance to the NYS Fire Code (NYSFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:
 - a. Per Section 511.2. of the NYS Fire Code when driveways are in excess of 500 feet in length and do not exit to another fire apparatus access road or public street, a turnaround shall be provided suitable for use by fire apparatus.
 - b. Driveways in excess of 500 feet in length and less than 20 feet in width shall be provided with turnouts along the driveway that are a minimum 20 feet in width for a length of 50 feet in length. The turnouts shall be placed at intervals not to exceed 500 feet along the driveway.
 - c. Provide a turning template analysis for the largest emergency vehicle that may respond to an event at the site.
15. Appropriate signage must be provided as indicated in the following note which will be placed on the final plat of any subdivision containing a keyhole lot: "STANDARD NOTE FOR ADDRESS IDENTIFICATION. The street number of a dwelling situated on a keyhole lot shall be permanently and conspicuously displayed on a sign, with lettering no less than 3 inches nor greater than 8 inches in height, and placed no more than 25 feet from the road pavement. The sign shall be displayed for both directions of travel and be reflective. Identification markers must also be placed at any location where a common drive splits."
16. All lot grading shall be such that drainage is directed away from the homes and towards lot lines and ultimately to an approved drainage course as required by Section 86-7(A)(5) of the Town Code. In order to demonstrate conformance to the stated regulations, an overall project grading plan must be developed for review.
17. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing water main(s) within proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Clifton Park Water Authority (CPWA). It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the CPWA is willing and capable of providing potable water to the project.
18. The submitted information indicates the project is proposing to connect to an existing sewer main(s) within close proximity to the parcel. These mains are owned and operated by the Town of Clifton Park – Rivercrest Sewer District Extension #1. It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the Town Sewer District is willing and capable of providing sanitary sewer service to the project.
19. Provide notation on the plan as follows:
 - a. No Utilities shall be installed beneath the proposed driveways.
 - b. Any work required within the County right-of-way shall be subject to any permitting from the Saratoga County Highway Department (driveway, culvert, water service, sewer).
20. Prior to approval or filing of the subdivision plat with the Saratoga County Clerk, the appropriate 911 emergency response numbers must be obtained for and assigned to each lot created and placed on the filed plat.

21. The final subdivision plat must be stamped by a licensed surveyor.
22. Considering this plan is conceptual in nature, subsequent comments will be provided with a preliminary plan submission.
23. The applicant shall provide written responses to all technical comments provided by Town staff and consultants as part of the next submission.

Public Comments:

No public comment.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Bagramian asked about the history of Southard Road. Ms. Lee stated that it was a part of the property adjacent before but Niskayuna bought it and created the road, which they own and maintain for the school. She stated that it does have 2 private driveways off of it but they pre-existed the School District property. Ms. Lees stated that she would have to go before a school vote to get access.

Mr. Andarawis asked if the applicant has gone before the school board and if they have been rejected. Mr. Scavo stated that this would have to go to a public ballot not just before the school board. Ms. Lee stated that they have been perusing it for 4 years but it is taking a long time.

Ms. Bagramian asked if the applicant has hired a lawyer to help with this. Ms. Lee stated that they had recently but the lawyer told them it would likely not pass as there is no benefit to the community or the district.

Mr. Andarawis stated that frontage with keyholes are hard to approve as it sets a precedent as they are self-created. Ms. Lees stated that she has been approached by developers about the property before but she feels that her current home has historical sentiment and value and does not want to see it torn down as it is 280 years old.

Ms. Bagramian stated that she would like to see something addressing Southard Road and that the school is not willing to grant access. Ms. Lee stated that she has nothing to show as the School Board discussed this behind closed doors. Mr. Andarawis stated that he agrees with Ms. Bagramian and would like to see a narrative of why this is an exception, historical is not enough.

Discussion Items:

None

Mr. Ophardt moved, seconded by Mr. Fantini, adjournment of the meeting at 8:01 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on May 24th, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary