

**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

Keith Martin  
Lisa Westrick

**Planning Board Minutes**  
**October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

Those present at the October 11, 2023 Planning Board meeting were:

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

Those absent were:

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.

**Minutes Approval:**

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, approval of the minutes of the September 12, 2023 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Martin moved, seconded by Mr. Andarawis, approval of the minutes of the September 26, 2023 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried. Ms. Fariello abstains.

### **Public Hearings:**

#2021-069 Boni Wooddale Drive 18 Lot Subdivision moved to October 24, 2023 Planning Board meeting.

### **Old Business:**

None

### **New Business:**

#### **#2023-027 Southern Saratoga YMCA Site Improvements Site Plan**

SBL: 271.-3-77 Interior and exterior renovations to the Southern Saratoga YMCA, 1 Wall ST Zoned: PIR - Public/Institutional/Recreational, Status: Preliminary w/ possible determination Citizenserve File Number: 23-002159, Application Number: SPR23-000022 Applicant: SSYMCA, Consultant: Engineering Ventures  
[http://www.citizenserve.com/Documents/398/361063487\\_Southern%20Saratoga%20YMCA%20Preliminary%20Site%20Plan.pdf](http://www.citizenserve.com/Documents/398/361063487_Southern%20Saratoga%20YMCA%20Preliminary%20Site%20Plan.pdf)

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

Michael Roman stated that this application is for a renovation to the majority of the inside of the building with enhancements to the exterior. He stated that the proposal would have new steps installed to be able to access the second floor. Mr. Roman stated that there is a composite metal panel on the existing frontage being proposed to the left of the building and the proposed new entry would be painted and everything else on the front of the building would be upgraded with a wrap. He stated that a splash pad is being proposed to the right of the building as well.

Mike Dussault stated that in addition to the building façade the sidewalks would be renovated and that it would be expanded to the south. He stated that they would be losing 7 parking spaces but would still be in compliance. Mr. Dussault stated that the sidewalk would go to the splash pad but the splash pad would only be accessible from inside the building. He stated that the drive

is being expanded due to congestion that they are experiencing currently and the applicant is ok with losing the 7 spaces.

**Staff Comments:**

**John DeSimone, Fire Marshall, issued the following memo:**

- If proposed splash pad holds 24 inches of water additional enclosure protection will be needed per section 3109 of the NYSBC.
- Accessible parking spaces meets building code requirements
- Current Assigned Postal Number Will Remain The Same For This Project. 1 Wall Street Clifton Park, NY 12065

**Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:**

- The proposed use is permitted per Town Code Section 208-58 A. (21) Facilities operated by a not-for-profit entity for the purpose of carrying out the inherent uses set forth above (208-58 A. (1-20)). Applicant shall be aware that the proposed splash pad is within the access and utility easement to Shenendehowa Central School District, the sanitary sewer easement to County of Saratoga & Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1, and the Clifton Park Water Authority.

**Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Officer issued a memo stating:**

- Applicant shall submit a narrative describing how the water will be discharged when the splash pad will be closed for the season. In the narrative also describe how stormwater runoff will be handled.

**The Trails and Open Space Subcommittee issued a memo stating:**

- There is a concrete sidewalk on the north side of Wall Street adjoining the Bentley community association property. This sidewalk should be extended to the YMCA parking lot entrance on the north side of Wall Street. Another consideration is to install a new crosswalk where the Bentley sidewalks end over to YMCA eastern driveway entrance, to connect to the existing asphalt sidewalks of the YMCA that are on the south side of Wall Street.

**Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator issued a memo stating:**

- The YMCA is located next to the Bentley Community and there is a short gap in the sidewalks on the north side of Wall Street to reach the YMCA. There are additional housing units further east that are now in front of the Hannaford -- so even more residents are living in Town Center that may want to walk or bike to the nearby YMCA. The applicant should consider continuing sidewalks on the north side of Wall Street to the YMCA. A second consideration or alternative is to create a new crosswalk in the vicinity of where the sidewalks end near the Bentley, and find a safe mid-block crossing in the vicinity of the YMCA's eastern driveway to Wall Street. The new crosswalk could connect to the existing sidewalks (asphalt paved) on the south side of Wall Street.

**John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:**

- The project site is zoned PIR -Public, Institutional, Recreation - The site plan includes a minor building addition with façade enhancements that complement the intent of the Town’s Adjacent Form Based Code.
- Pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 6.17.5 Type II Actions - construction or expansion of a primary or accessory/appurtenant, nonresidential structure or facility involving less than 4,000 square feet of gross floor area and not involving a change in zoning or a use variance and consistent with local land use controls, but not radio communication or microwave transmission facilities. Actions classified as Type II are not subject to additional environmental review requirements under SEQR.

### **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 a “Type II” action which requires no further SEQR review. The action appears to be consistent with Section 617.5-c(9) that states “construction or expansion of a primary or accessory/appurtenant, nonresidential structure or facility involving less than 4,000 square feet of gross floor area and not involving a change in zoning or a use variance and consistent with local land use controls” is not subject to review under Part 617.

#### SITE PLANS

2. The project is located within the Town’s Public/Institutional/Recreational Zoning District (PIR). The expansion would be permitted under the prior approved principal use.
3. Based upon a review of the lot configuration, it appears the minimum bulk lot requirements as identified in Section 208-58 of the Town’s Zoning are satisfied.
4. On Sheet C001, General Notes, 2C, revise to read the Town of Clifton Park.
5. Provide a basic erosion and sediment control measures plan.
6. Provide the locations on the plans for the EV charging stations.
7. Provide on the plans the details and locations of any ADA ramps/tactical warning strips.
8. The proposed splash pad system should be reviewed by the NYS Department of Health.
9. The plans need to indicate how roof drainage from the new building expansion will be collected and conveyed to the on-site stormwater management system.
10. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, we will reserve further comments until more detailed plans are submitted.

### **Public Comments:**

No public comment.

### **Planning Board Review:**

Ms. Bagramian asked how much square footage is being added to the building. Mr. Roman stated that it is minimal, between 400 and 500 square feet at the vestibule and the rest of the proposal is skinning the entrance. Ms. Bagramian asked if the applicant was still within parking

codes with removing some spots. Mr. Roman stated that they are still within ratio and that they will have the employees start to park in the overflow lot.

Mr. Martin stated that he thinks the splash pad is a great idea and that he lives next door to this application. Mr. Martin asked if the YMCA was changing their logo. Mr. Roman stated that they are and that the new features are trying to implement the new logo features.

Mr. Martin asked for clarification on Ms. Viggiani's comments about a trail extension adjacent to the property. Mr. Scavo stated that it would be an offsite improvement. Mr. Andarawis asked if there would be a cross walk with the expansion. Mr. Roman stated that he believes that it would be needed and stated that he feels that this can be looked at and they are also improving ADA access on this site as well with the proposal. Mr. Scavo stated that at one point the access road was supposed to be turned over to the Town for full access but it never happened and feels that it still should be done as it makes sense with the improvements that are being made in the area on Clifton Center Road. He stated that he can include this in the Town proposal for the improvements to be able to connect to the YMCA.

Mr. Andarawis asked if there was more bike racks included in the proposal as they are shifting to a more walkable community. Mr. Dussault stated that they currently have a covered bike rack and that they plan to expand it with the proposal.

Mr. Ophardt asked if there are plans to add EV charging stations to the parking lot as well. Mr. Roman stated that there are 4 parking spaces with 2 stations being proposed but they have to still figure out how to connect them. Mr. Martin asked if the applicant has enough parking to accommodate the EV stations as well as handicapped parking. Mr. Dussault stated that he is confident they have enough parking. Mr. Andarawis stated he would like the applicant to keep in mind the future and the demand for more EV parking.

Mr. Martin asked if the application would be losing trees on the site. Mr. Dussault stated that there is tree removal being proposed but they are planning on replanting some trees as well.

Ms. Westrick asked if it was possible for the applicant to give an easement to the Town to allow for a crosswalk with the new expanded trail. Mr. Roman stated that he can look at the layout and find the best placement for a crosswalk.

Mr. Ophardt, second by Ms. Westrick, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, a Type II action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.  
The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Andarawis moved, second by Mr. Ophardt to waive the final hearing for the application for the site plan review for the Southern Saratoga YMCA, and to grant preliminary and final site

plan approval conditioned 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.

Ayes:   7                        Noes:   0                        The motion is carried.

**New Business:**

**#2023-028 Bobrick Building Commerce Drive Addition Site Plan**

SBL: 259.-2-93 Construction of Building Addition, 200 Commerce DR , Zoned: L2 - Light Industrial 2 Status: Concept Citizenserve File Number: 23-002192, Application Number: SPR23-000023 Applicant: Usher Road Partners , Consultant: ABD Engineers, LLP - John Hitchcock  
[http://www.citizenserve.com/Documents/398/361771836\\_1427-Site%20Plan%20-%202023\\_09\\_18.pdf](http://www.citizenserve.com/Documents/398/361771836_1427-Site%20Plan%20-%202023_09_18.pdf)

**Consultant/Applicant Presentation:**

John Hitchcock – ABD – Mr. Hitchcock stated that the lot is 8.63 acres in the L-2 zone and the applicant is proposing a 1,300 sf addition to the building to house the maintenance department and take the off of the floor of the original building. He stated that it would be a 900sf concrete slab off the side of the building and less than one acre of disturbance is expected with no additional parking required.

**Staff Comments:**

**Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:**

- The proposed addition for the maintenance department appears to be an ancillary support of the primary use of light manufacturing. Per Town Code Chapter 208-64 B. (1) Light manufacturing is a permitted use in the Light Industrial 2 District

**Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Officer issued a memo stating:**

- No additional comments other than the TDE comment letter dated October 6th, 2023 regarding the Bobrick Building Addition Commerce Drive.

**Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator issued a memo stating:**

- The Bobrick site includes an easement for Saratoga PLAN to maintain a Karner Blue Butterfly Habitat area on the south side of the parcel. This habitat area appears to be nowhere near, nor to be affected by the proposed addition. No further comments.

**John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:**

- The proposed expansion building off of a prior 2013 expansion approved by the Planning Board January 14, 2014
- Pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 6.17.5 Type II Actions - construction or expansion of a primary or accessory/appurtenant, nonresidential structure or facility involving less than 4,000 square feet of gross floor area and not involving a change in zoning or a use variance and consistent with local land use controls, but not radio communication or microwave transmission facilities. Actions classified as Type II are not subject to additional environmental review requirements under SEQR.
- The project is within the GEIS Study Area and as a Type II Action is in compliance with the applicable GEIS Findings Statement.

**Professional Comments:**

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

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

Based upon our review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be a “Type II” action which requires no further SEQR review. The action appears to be consistent with Section 617.5-c(9) that states “construction or expansion of a primary or accessory/appurtenant, nonresidential structure or facility involving less than 4,000 square feet of gross floor area and not involving a change in zoning or a use variance and consistent with local land use controls” is not subject to review under Part 617.

- a. Town of Clifton Park Planning Board: Plan approval

SITE PLAN

1. The project is located within the Town’s L2 – Light Industrial District. The proposed modifications are to a previously approved use and corresponding site plan. The current plan appears to continue with the same use previously proposed and approved.
2. Based upon a review of the lot configuration, it appears the minimum bulk lot requirements as identified in Section 208-65 of the Town’s Zoning are satisfied.
3. Elevations and materials of construction for the proposed building should be submitted to the Planning Board for review pursuant to Section 208-66 of the Town’s Zoning.
4. Show how roof top drainage from the building addition is to be collected and routed into the site stormwater collection.
5. Indicate the current purpose of the rip rap swales to the existing detention basin that will be removed.
6. Provide an erosion and sediment control plan.

**Public Comments:**

No public comment.

**Planning Board Review:**

Ms. Bagramian stated that she feels this application is strait forward.

Mr. Ophardt asked if the addition would be visible from the Northway. Mr. Hitchcock stated it would not be seen but it would match the existing exterior of the building.

Mr. Martin, second by Mr. Fantini, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, a Type II action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Ophardt moved, second by Ms. Fariello to waive the final hearing for the application for the site plan review for the Brobrick Building Commerce Drive Addition, and to grant preliminary and final site plan approval conditioned 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.

Ayes: 7                      Noes: 0                      The motion is carried.

### **New Business:**

#### **#2023-029 Sunshine Landscaping Warehouses Site Plan**

SBL: 270.-2-3.11 Construction of Warehouses, 610 Tanner RD , Zoned: B5 - Corporate Commerce, Status: Concept Citizenserve File Number: 23-002193, Application Number: SPR23-000024 Applicant: Richard Mollnow / Sunshine Landscaping , Consultant: ABD Engineers, LLP - John Hitchcock  
[http://www.citizenserve.com/Documents/398/361780206\\_5140.Site%20Plan.pdf](http://www.citizenserve.com/Documents/398/361780206_5140.Site%20Plan.pdf)

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

John Hitchcock – ABD – Mr. Hitchcock stated that this proposal is in the B-5 zone on 21 acres of land. He stated that in 2019 the lot was approved for a landscaping and nursery facility. He stated that they are looking to add nine 6,000 sf warehouse building to be leased out in the existing gravel area. He stated that due to the placement of the proposal, there will be no loss of greenspace and it would go from 74% to 73.3%. He stated that the bulk storage bins would be moved to the south side of the building. Mr. Hitchcock stated that the applicant would like to continue mulch and top soil so the bins for this would be moved to the west. He stated that there is a Phase II to the original application which is to build a greenhouse but it is not yet built out.

### **Staff Comments:**

**The Environmental Conservation Commission and issued a memo recommending:**

- The ECC requests the applicant provide a detailed lighting plan as it will likely impact the adjacent residential zone to the east.
- The ECC requests the applicant supply a landscaping plan that will address the buffer zone and complies with Town Code Chapter 208-54 C – Buffers

**Wade Schoenborn, Building and Zoning issued a memo stating:**

- Applicant has a permit for a greenhouse # 65115 that expired 7/16/2021 and does not have a approved final inspection. Applicant must reapply for a new permit and complete the permit process to close out the green house permit.
- submit a code compliant Fire dept access plan.

**Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator issued a memo stating:**

- The applicant is proposing flex warehouse buildings on site. The parcel is zoned Corporate Commerce District B-5 where appropriate facilities providing research and information and communication services, light manufacturing, processing, assembly and fabrication facilities, warehouse and storage facilities are permitted. Each proposed tenant fit-up permit for these proposed warehouses will need to verify if the proposed use adheres to Town Code Chapter 208-53 A. (1)-(12) Permitted uses.
- Per Town Code Chapter 208-54 A. Any structure shall be set back a minimum of 100 feet from the nearest property line of any residential district property boundary. This 100 foot setback line shall be shown on the proposed plans.
- Per Town Code Chapter 208-54 B. Lot coverage - Add stormwater retention areas, all the plant areas, shade areas, display areas, future gravel access areas, and other site amenities to the Lot Coverage that is not part of the green space calculation. The stormwater retention area can be improved to form an integral part of the landscaping scheme, but will need to be approved.
- Per Town Code Chapter 208-54 C. Buffer - No building shall be located closer to any residential district property line than 100 feet, and there shall be no encroachment into this area by anything other than natural vegetation or planted landscaping. In addition, there shall be established a minimum ten-foot planted buffer along the rear and side property lines of all parcels, or multibuilding office complexes; the extent of internal buffering to be determined during site plan review. These buffer areas shall be shown on the plans. Current plantings do not reflect approved landscaping plans.
- The property owner shall abide by the stamped site plans on the location of display areas and signage on the property.
- There is a topsoil / mulching processing facility on the property that will need planning board approval or removed from the site.

**Scott Reese, Stormwater Management Officer issued a memo stating:**

- Applicant shall verify the existing stormwater management areas and outlets are installed to the latest approved site plans.
- The existing SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity is still open, therefore the existing Full SWPPP shall be modified with the proposed project.

**The Trails and Open Space Subcommittee issued a memo stating:**

- Consider a 15' right-of-way easement along the west side of the applicant's Tanner Road frontage for a future trail. Also, consider installing a new crosswalk from the Sunshine Landscaping driveway entrance east to the end of the Vista Court sidewalks.

**The CPWA issued the following memo:**

- The plan shows a proposed "Covered Bag Material Area" over the existing water main. It also shows "Propane Storage" in very close proximity to the fire hydrant. Both of these proposed storage areas present unacceptable obstacles or dangers in the event of future emergency water main repairs. Modifications should be made to locate these storage areas outside of the CPWA easement area and at a safe distance from existing water infrastructure.
- Please submit an amended utility plan to this office for review

**Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator issued a memo stating:**

- Sunshine Landscaping's driveway is directly across from Vista Lane and existing concrete sidewalks along the south side of Vista Lane. Since the plans show a concept for ROW easement for a future multi-use trail along the west side of Tanner Road, the applicant could consider installing a new crosswalk from the end of the sidewalks at Vista Lane, across to the south side of their driveway, to enable current residents to walk to their commercial property, and also, to be ready for the future trail route. The attention to pedestrians could be visual signal to drivers to slow down, as an additional benefit with the visual markings of a crosswalk.

**John Scavo, Director of Planning issued a memo stating:**

- Identify on the site plan where the bulk storage area is proposed to be relocated and determine if truck access is sufficient.
- Clarify for the record the intended user for the warehouse space. Address if the improvements are to be leased to offpremises tenants or if the proposed buildings are directly associated with the operations and storage of materials and equipment of Sunshine Landscaping.
- Add a note to the plan stating that the conservation easement area shall be clearly identified and field delineated before construction activities commence. No intrusions to the conservation easement area shall occur, including but not limited to construction activity, equipment, material storage, or pushing/grading soils into the easement area.
- Address if any additional exterior lighting is proposed for the building. If wall pack lighting is shown, provide a detail for down directional full cutoff fixtures so that no light is emitted above the lowest light-emitting part of the fixture.
- Under Section 208-53 of the Town Code: Architectural. The architectural design shall consider building facade, including color, and other significant design features such as exterior materials and treatments, roof structures, exposed mechanical equipment and service and storage areas. Architectural block or similar facades, especially along the

road frontage, shall be required. Therefore, the applicant should provide renderings of the proposed buildings. I recommend the applicant consider a Morton Storage Style Building

- Provide a rationale for the .2 acres shown in Part I of the EAF to be disturbed. If 9 - 6000 s.f. buildings are proposed, and each requires disturbance to accommodate the structure, the disturbance most likely then exceeds 1 Acre.

### **Professional Comments:**

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

#### STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

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: Plan approval
- b. Saratoga County Planning: GML 239-m County Referral
- c. NYS Historic Preservation Office: Archeological sensitive area

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

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:

1. Part 1.3.b - The response indicates total acreage to be physically disturbed will be 0.2 acres. Nine (9) – 6,000sf warehouses total 54,000sf converted, that is 1.24 acres. It appears the project will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-20-001. Therefore, a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required. As the project proceeds through the Town’s regulatory review process, a fully conforming SWPPP shall be provided for review, as indicated.
2. Part 1.12.b - The response indicates that the project site is located within or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archeological site inventory. The applicant should provide a correspondence letter from SHPO to confirm the presence or absence of archeologically sensitive resources.
3. 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.

4. Part I.17 – The response indicates that the proposed action will create stormwater discharge. The applicant stated “existing on-site stormwater management”. However, it appears the project will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-20-001. Therefore, a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required.
5. No further comments at this time.

#### SITE PLAN

6. The project resides within the Town’s B5, Corporate Commerce District. We would defer to the Town’s Chief Zoning Officer on determining whether the uses being proposed are permitted “as of right”.
7. Based upon a review of the lot configuration, it appears the minimum bulk lot requirements as identified in Section 208-65 of the Town’s Zoning are satisfied.
8. Provide a chart of the proposed uses and a narrative on how the parking spaces were derived.
9. The applicant has indicated that no water and sewer is proposed for any of the warehouse/storage facilities.
10. Elevations and materials of construction for the proposed building should be submitted to the Planning Board for review pursuant to Section 208-66 of the Town’s Zoning.
11. Show how roof top drainage from the buildings are to be collected and routed into the site stormwater collection.
12. Provide the limits on disturbance on the plan.
13. The project site appears to have disturbance currently occurring on the property, these areas should be stabilized prior to commencing the next phase of construction.
14. If the project will disturb more than 1-acre of land, it will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-20-001. A full SWPPP will be required that addresses water quantity and quality controls.
15. If less than 1-acre of disturbance, subsequent plans shall show how the stormwater from the increased impervious area will be captured. Provide confirmation that the existing on-site stormwater management areas can accommodate the additional runoff.
16. A pond buffer shall be provided that extends 25 feet outward from the maximum water surface elevation of the pond. One of the proposed warehouse structures appears to be at the top of the pond embankment.
17. Subsequent submissions should include architectural renderings of the building along with identification of materials of construction.
18. Subsequent submissions shall include the proposed lighting plan.
19. This project may have a cumulative impact on the level of service of the adjacent roadways. As such, it is recommended that a traffic impact study be completed that assesses peak hour vehicle trips, site distance and accident data (specifically at Miller Road and Rt 146). Give the proximity to NYS Rt 146, the findings of the study should be provided to the Region 1 office of the NYSDOT for input.
20. The following comments are relative to the site plan and its conformance to the International Fire Code (IFC). The Town Fire Official shall have final authority on the applicability of these comments to the proposed site layout:

- a. If the proposed building is to be provided with an automatic sprinkler, show the location of the fire department connection to ensure they are reasonably accessible.
  - b. Section 912.2 of the IFC requires a fire hydrant to be located within 100-feet of the building's fire department connection. It is not clear from the plans where the closest hydrant to the site is or where the fire department connection may be. Additional hydrants may be necessary
  - c. Determine if a Knox Box is required based upon the building arrangements, occupancy and materials of construction. If one is required, its location is subject to the review and approval of the Fire Chief
  - d. Identify the actual height of the buildings. If greater than 30-feet in height above the average grade plan, aerial apparatus access shall be provided that is between 15 and 30 feet of one entire side of the building in accordance with Appendix D105 of the IFC. If aerial apparatus access is required, its location shall be identified on the plans
  - e. Pursuant to Section D104 of the IFC, commercial or industrial buildings that are exceeding 62,000 sq. ft. (current plan shows 96,032 sf) 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).
  - f. Where two fire apparatus access roads are required, they shall be placed a distance apart equal to not less than one half of the length of the maximum overall diagonal dimension of the lot or area to be served, measured in a straight line between accesses.
  - g. Provide a turning template analysis for the largest emergency vehicle that may respond to an event at the site.
21. Considering the plan submitted is conceptual in nature, we will reserve further comments until more detailed plans are submitted. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town zoning specific to site grading, lighting, landscaping, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

**Public Comments:**

No public comment.

**Planning Board Review:**

Ms. Bagramian asked if there would be offices here. Mr. Hitchcock stated that there would not be and it would only be for people to come and retrieve materials that they store there. Ms. Bagramian asked if there would be water or sewer hook ups. Mr. Hitchcock stated that there will be hookups as there will be bathrooms but no offices. Ms. Bagramian asked if the should be considered a Phase III for the site. Mr. Hitchcock stated no, this will be developed before Phase II so this would be the new Phase II and that the garage and greenhouse would be approved but this is more demand at the moment.

Mr. Andarawis stated that the zone here is important and that it needs a well-rounded landscaped site. He stated that he is concerned with the look of this from Tanner Road and how the applicant

will shield this. He stated that it is not too out of character as some buildings are being built across 146 but that that has shielding also.

Mr. Martin stated that he agrees with this and that considerable berms were done across the road as well as extensive landscaping so they are not the same project but would also like to see robust berms or landscaping.

Ms. Bagramian stated that a landscaping plan needs to be added to the application. She stated that this is a well-traveled area and wants to see renderings and elevations to ensure a soft view to not impact Tanner Road residents. MS. Bagramian asked if there is sufficient turn radius on the site. Mr. Hitchcock stated that box trailers can get in but he can provide a report.

Mr. Ophardt stated that he would like to keep trucks off of Tanner Road and asked what the trip generation would be. Mr. Hitchcock stated he is unsure but would estimate 4 for peak hours.

Ms. Bagramian asked if the applicant looked at cutting the buildings into smaller ones. Mr. Hitchcock stated they have and this is all dependent on the tenants needs.

Mr. Ophardt stated that a lighting plan and screening are important here and asked if there would be overnight activity, Mr. Hitchcock stated that there would not be and that the lights can be automatic.

Mr. Andarawis asked if the facades would be available for the road frontage as it is important to the site plan. Mr. Fantini stated that he agrees that esthetics are important on the site.

Ms. Fariello asked if paving would be done between the buildings. Mr. Hitchcock stated it would be paved and be impervious but it is currently crusher run and the SWPPP will be amended to reflect this.

Mr. Ophardt asked if there was a 15' trail easement granted already along Tanner Road. Mr. Scavo stated that that one was granted with the original site plan that was approved so it would carry over and that it may have been for both Tanner Road and 146 but he is unsure. Mr. Ophardt asked whether the 15-foot strip easement shown on the applicant's plot plan along Route 146 was an easement for future trails or was taken in taken in FEE. Mr. Hitchcock stated the land had been donated in FEE by the applicant to the Town of Clifton Park for future highway expansion.

**Discussion Items:**

None

Ms. Westrick moved, seconded by Ms. Fairello, adjournment of the meeting at 8:10 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

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

Respectfully submitted,

*Paula Cooper*

Paula Cooper, Secretary