

6/9/26

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

STEFANIE BITTER
Attorney

PAULA COOPER
Secretary



MEMBERS
Emad Andarawis
Eric Ophardt
Heather Fariello
Denise Bagramian
Keith Martin
Lisa Westrick
Joanne Coons (alt.)

Planning Board Minutes
June 9, 2026

Those present at the June 9, 2026 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: E. Andarawis, H. Fariello, E. Ophardt, D. Bagramian, L. Westrick, J. Coons (alternate)

Those absent were: R. Ferraro, Chairman, K. Martin

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

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

Mr. Ophardt stated in the absence of Mr. Martin, Ms. Coons would be a voting member tonight.

Minutes Approval:

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian, approval of the minutes of the April 28, 2026 Planning Board meeting as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

6/9/26

Public Hearing:

#2024-044 Kinns Rd 3 Lot Subdivision (Synergy Park)

SBL: 265.-5-12 Kinns Rd 3 Lot Subdivision (Synergy Park), Kinns RD , Zoned: B5 - Corporate
Commerce Status: Final Last Seen On: 07/08/2025 (Part of the Site plan approval)

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

Ms. Bagramian moved, second by Ms. Fariello, to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, a Type I action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

Mr. Ophardt called the public hearing to order at 7:07 p.m. The Secretary read the public notice as published in the Times Union on May 30, 2026.

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Scavo stated that tonight he will be presenting the application that was last seen on July 8, 2025 for a site plan review as well as a subdivision. He stated that the Site Plan was approved but a Public Hearing should have been addressed for the Subdivision but this was not done. He stated that all outstanding comments were addressed.

Staff and Professional Comments:

Certain staff comments were highlighted by John Scavo, Director of Planning & Zoning, and MJ Engineering, the Town Designated Engineer. Copies of all remarks read into the record for the agenda items are included and attached to these minutes.

Public Comments:

Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive, asked where the lot lines are located. Mr. Scavo stated that the southwest lines were changed and there were some adjustments to them as well along the roadway and indicated the changes on the map shown. Mr. Scavo stated lot lines were removed from the right of way and moved to the developing property. Mr. LaFleche asked if the lot lines affect the bike trail. Mr. Scavo stated he believes the site plan is not changing.

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

6/9/26

Planning Board Review:

Mr. Ophardt asked if the site plan triggers a right turn lane at the corner of Kinns Road and US 9. Mr. Scavo stated it may and MJE will look at the new development and see.

Mr. Andarawis asked if reciprocal easements are in place. Mr. Scavo confirmed they are.

Mr. Andarawis offered Resolution No. 03 of 2026, seconded by Ms. Westrick to waive the final hearing for this application for the Kinns Rd 3 Lot Subdivision (Synergy Park) 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:

R. Ferraro - Absent

E. Andarawis - Yes

E. Ophardt - Yes

H. Fariello - Yes

K. Martin – Absent

D. Bagramian - Yes

L. Westrick – Yes

J. Coons (alternate) - Yes

Ayes _____6_____

Noes: _____0_____

The resolution is carried.

Old Business:

#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan

SBL: 265.-5-10 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan, 19 Synergy Park Drive Rear
Zoned: L2 - Light Industrial 2, Status: Preliminary Last Seen On: 10/28/2025

Consultant/Applicant Presentation:

Paul Lubera stated that this is the last piece of the Tech Park to be developed and it has taken some time to get the engineering done. He stated the application is in the LI/B-5 zone and a variance that was needed for parking has been obtained. Mr. Lubera stated there are wetlands on the property but none are being impacted. He stated the buildings will be 100,000 sf and 30,000 sf with 462 parking spots and green space has been met. Mr. Lubera stated he is here tonight to ask for this application to be scheduled for a Public Hearing.

6/9/26

Staff and Professional Comments:

Certain staff comments were highlighted by John Scavo, Director of Planning & Zoning, and MJ Engineering, the Town Designated Engineer. Copies of all remarks read into the record for the agenda items are included and attached to these minutes.

Public Comments:

No public comments.

Planning Board Review:

Ms. Coons asked if 20' of fill is needed to be brought into the site. Mr. Lubera stated that there will be earth moving on the site but there would not be fill brought into the site. Ms. Coons asked if a retaining wall would be needed and stated she has concerns of dust control and erosion so close to the Dwaas Kill. Mr. Lubera stated there is one but it is not near building 4 and the proposed landscaping plan shows 6 maples and 4 oaks around building 4. Ms. Coons stated she would like to see more around the Dwaas Kill. Ms. Coons stated that 104 lights on one building seems like a lot. Mr. Lubera stated that the light count is on the site not the one building. Ms. Coons thanked the applicant for clarifying and stated they are 5,000 Kelvins and she would like them reduced to 3,000 and no lumens are currently listed. Mr. Lubera stated that all of the lighting is down facing and placed strategically.

Mr. Ophardt asked if there was lighting by the Northway (I-87) proposed. Mr. Lubera stated they have proposed staggering trees along the Northway and the building. He stated the eastern pine species can get 60' in height and the cedars will be planted at 6'-8' high. Mr. Ophardt stated that buildings seem to be prominent on the highway and he would like to maintain greenery. Mr. Lubera stated he will have the landscape team look at the plan.

Ms. Bitter asked if there was existing vegetation along the Northway. Mr. Lubera stated there is. Mr. Ophardt stated that the applicant is clear cutting to the property line with the Northway, and that he would like to see a visual presentation at the next meeting.

Mr. Ophardt stated that a traffic study has already been done and asked if this development plan it reflected in the traffic analysis. Mr. Lubera stated it is and has been updated. Mr. Lippmann stated that MJE is reviewing the plan now and they will send comments when the review is complete.

Mr. Andarawis stated that land banking parking is favorable in this plan. Mr. Lubera stated the applicant should be able to do this and that the plan currently shows the required parking for the application, but subsequent site plans for tenants may likely only need 1/3 of what is shown.

Mr. Ophardt asked if the bike paths are already developed. Mr. Scavo stated the path is only in Phase I and not Phases II or III. Mr. Ophardt stated he feels this would be beneficial to employees and asked why not proposed here. Mr. Lubera stated that they are not planning on a path at this time but they could look at passive greens space with a picnic table. Ms. Coons stated

6/9/26

she has walked across the bridge and have seen others walking as well. Mr. Ophardt asked the applicant to look into non-motorized paths.

New Business:

None

Discussion Items:

Mr. Scavo stated that starting July 12 new SEQRA regulations are taking effect. He stated he is not prepared to speak on it but he has provided citations for the Board to review. He stated there are not many major changes to the regulations that should affect current workflow processes of applications through the Planning Board.

Public Privilege

Any member of the public may speak for up to three (3) minutes on matters currently before the Planning Board as open projects. Comments should be relevant to the Planning Board's jurisdiction under Subdivision, Site Plan, and Special Use Permit regulations. This opportunity is intended to allow the public to provide input or raise concerns related to active applications under review.

No public comments.

Ms. Fariello moved, seconded by Ms. Bagramian, adjournment of the meeting at 7:37 p.m. The motion was unanimously carried.

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on July 14, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Cooper

Paula Cooper, Secretary

ATTACHED:

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF, TOWN
DESIGNATED ENGINEER & ADVISORY
COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

Review Comments by Permit#

Permit Number: SPR26-000015

File#	Permit#	Project Name	Route Name	Activity Type	Reviewer	Completion Date	Comment
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	The ECC notes that this project is adjacent to the Dwaas Kill, a Class A trout stream, a C(T) stream and a 303D protected water way. The fishery contains both native and stocked brook trout. The town and its residents have a significant investment in the quality and the protection of this waterway (Dwaas Kill Nature Preserve). The proposed project is located within approximately 100 +/- feet of this important environmental resource. This is closer to the Dwaas Kill than the previous submission. Given the proximity of this project to the Dwaas Kill the ECC is concerned about potential adverse environmental impacts.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	Considering the amount of impervious surface being proposed (36%+/-), the ECC requests the applicant provide information on the impact to the ground water quality as trout in the Dwaas Kill are very sensitive to PH and all water quality changes. The applicant has not responded to this concern.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	The proposed stormwater management configuration may radically alter the existing surface pattern away from the Dwaas Kill. This potentially will have an impact on the water level and quality of this stream. The applicant has not responded to this concern.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	The ECC requests that the Planning Board require the applicant to revise the SEQRA application to reflect the property in its original form (prior to any development).
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	The lighting plan should be in compliance with International Dark Sky Standards and should include cut off shields as part of the design.

		and Site Plan					
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	The current application does not show the existing contours nor the distance of the grading plan to the Dwaas Kill. Without this information it is impossible to determine if the design meets Town Code. The ECC requests that the planning board ask the applicant to provide this information before approval. Given that the existing contours are not provided the following comment still needs to be addressed: "Given the steep topography of this site, the square footage of the proposed buildings and parking appear to be excessive due to the amount of grading required. For example, lot 4 will require up 20+ feet of fill in order to create a level surface. Considering the issues experienced the recent slope failures and sink holes on building site adjacent to the Dwaas Kill, the ECC recommends that the Planning Board require the footprint of the buildings along the Dwaas Kill be reduced."
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	The limits of (the LC Zone and 100-foot buffer zone, DEC Wetlands, Federal Jurisdictional Wetlands) shall be clearly with hatch marking identified on the plot plan.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	ECC Review	Scott Reese	05/28/2026	The ECC notes that there is no reference notes or legend for the proposed slope stabilization fabric on the proposed fill slopes on the erosion and sediment control plans.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	The applicant should confirm it is understood that all future proposed tenant activities remain consistent with permitted uses and do not include any prohibited heavy industrial processes (e.g., hazardous material production, petroleum refining, etc.) per Town Code Section 208-64C.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	Greenspace ranges from 41.46% to 84.42% across lots, which generally meets or exceeds requirements.

		Subdivision and Site Plan					
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	Clarify whether stormwater management areas are counted toward greenspace, and demonstrate compliance with Town Code Section 208-65B requirements regarding integration into landscaping.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	Clearly dimension all building and parking setbacks on the plan sheets.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	The Planning Board should discuss and determine the adequacy of the detailed buffer planting plans demonstrating compliance with the required 25-foot vegetated buffer along the side and rear property lines pursuant to Section 208-65(C) of the Town Code.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	Provide truck circulation analysis demonstrating safe maneuvering for warehouse operations.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Planning Director Plans Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	The applicant should consider foundation plantings in the front of proposed building,
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	SEQR Review	John Scavo	06/04/2026	I concur with the comments offered by MJ Engineering relative to SEQR and have no additional comments to offer at this time.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	There shall be a designed swale between the back of the proposed structures and the slopes to the Dwaas Kill. There has been roof gutter failures and runoff from the rooftops eroded soils behind the

		and Site Plan					structures in the Synergy complex. The applicant has just a note on the plans for the drainage system contractor to place quantity and locations of downspouts. The stormwater design should show the locations and sizes of downspouts required to handle the proper designated storm events.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	The stormwater management design should depict the predevelopment sub-catchments and corresponding curve numbers as they existed prior to any excavation in this area. Currently, Appendix B of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), specifically the Existing Conditions Plan, reflects conditions after disturbance has already occurred. The existing conditions must instead represent the site as it existed before any development-related disturbances.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Stormwater Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	The plans indicate retaining walls located in close proximity to both the 100-foot NYSDEC Adjacent Area and federally regulated wetlands. The notes specify, "Proposed retaining wall to be designed by a licensed professional engineer (typ.)." Given that a wall up to twenty (20) feet in height is proposed within only a few feet of a federal wetland, it is recommended that the licensed professional engineer responsible for the design provide a written statement confirming that the retaining walls can be constructed as shown without encroaching upon or disturbing the wetlands or adjacent regulated areas.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	The Town of Clifton Park Zoning Board of Appeals granted an area variance on December 2, 2025 from Town Code Chapter 208-65 E (2) Side yards/rear yards. A twenty-five-foot minimum side and rear yard setback, which shall be considered a buffer area, and which shall contain natural or planted vegetation for the purpose of screening uses from adjacent properties. No parking shall be permitted in the buffer area. The proposed parking setback along the side yard setback is 0 feet. An area variance of a 25-foot relief from the side yard setback is

							being requested from the 25-foot buffer area.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	The applicant shall make a reasonable effort to align the proposed lot lines with existing zoning district boundaries. If achieving this alignment presents practical difficulties, the Planning Board may recommend to the Town Board, in its Notice of Decision, that the zoning boundaries be adjusted to match the proposed lot lines during the next zoning map revision.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	For the parcels in the Corporate Commerce Zoning District per Town Code Chapter 208-54 C. 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. As a multibuilding complex, the Planning Board can determine the internal buffering, by possibly increasing the buffering along Interstate 87.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	The June 2, 2026 Lansing Engineering Response Letter Item #17 is incorrect. The variance was for side and rear yard setbacks. For the parcels in the Corporate Commerce Zoning District per Town Code Chapter 208-54 E (1) No parking or maneuvering area shall be allowed in the front yard unless the Planning Board finds that, in the case of keyhole lots or lots with similar configuration, the intent of this chapter is better met by allowing construction within the front yard setback. The Planning Board may consider since the lots are on a private road this can be viewed as a similar configuration as a keyhole lot.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	The June 2, 2026 Lansing Engineering Response Letter Item #16 is incorrect. The variance was for side and rear yard setbacks. For the parcels in the Light Industrial 2 Zoning District per Town Code Chapter 208-65 E (1) No parking or maneuvering area shall be allowed in the front yard unless the Planning Board finds that, in the case of keyhole lots or lots with similar configurations, the intent of this

							article is better met by allowing construction within the front yard setback. The Planning Board may consider since the lots are on a private road this can be viewed as a similar configuration as a keyhole lot.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Zoning Plans Review	Scott Reese	06/08/2026	The majority of the proposed lots building envelope are within the slopes along the Dwaas Kill. Phase 2 Synergy included a Safe Slope Setback Line, I believe this subdivision should also look into a Safe Slope Setback Line as well and modify the building envelope.
25-001739	SPR26-000015	#2025-045 Synergy Park Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan	Site Plan Review - Preliminary	Fire Marshall Plans Review	John DeSimone	06/08/2026	No additional comments or concerns. Please reference comments from 11/07/2025



June 3, 2026

Mr. Yates Scott Lansing, PE
Lansing Engineering
2452 NYS Route 9, Suite 301
Malta, New York 12020

Sent Via Email: ysl@lansingengineering.com

Re: Synergy Phase 4 Subdivision and Site Plan
Tax Map ID 250-2-48
CP File: 2025-045
MJ File: 700.433

Dear Mr. Lansing:

MJ Engineering, Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Land Surveying, P.C. (MJ) has reviewed the submission for the above referenced project. Documents received for our review included the following:

- Full Environmental Assessment Form, signed and dated October 6, 2025
- Preliminary Site Plan titled "Synergy Phase IV", (36 Sheets) no revised date, prepared by Lansing Engineering.
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan as prepared by Lansing Engineering dated May 11, 2026.
- Sewer Report as prepared by Lansing Engineering dated May 11, 2026.
- Water Letter as prepared by Lansing Engineering dated May 11, 2026.
- Geotechnical Report as prepared by Renaissance Geotechnical Engineering dated May 8, 2026.
- Various Renderings

Based upon our review of the above documents, we offer the following comments for consideration.

STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW

1. The Synergy Technology Park was previously reviewed by the Planning Board as part of a master plan development. As part of that review, the Planning Board completed a comprehensive review and issued a negative declaration under SEQRA. This application represents a detailed site plan application for one of the lots within the park. The Planning Board shall continue with its review. However, the Board may rely upon its prior SEQRA findings, confirming that this application does not present impacts not previously considered and mitigated, if mitigation was required.
2. Should the Board not initiate an independent and new SEQRA review, but rather validate and confirm its prior findings, it still will be a requirement that the application is referred to Saratoga County Planning under a 239m due to the project's proximity to U.S. Route 9, County Route 109 and Interstate 87.
3. Based upon our review of Part 617.4.b.i of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Type I" action. Assuming the Clifton Park Planning Board is to request Lead Agency status under SEQRA, a coordinated review is required for Type I actions. Under a



21 Corporate Drive
Clifton Park, NY 12065



518.371.0799
mj@mjteam.com
mjteam.com



Fishkill, NY
Levittown, NY
Picatinny, NJ
Melbourne, FL



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: 239-m County Referral
 - c. Clifton Park Water Authority: Water Connection
 - d. Saratoga County Sewer District #1: SCSD Connection
 - e. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation: Stormwater Permit
 - f. NYS Historic Preservation Office: Archeological sensitive area
 - g. NYS Department of Transportation: Proximity to a State Route (Route 9)
4. Part 1. D.1.b(b) – The applicant indicates that the action will disturb 30 acres of land. As such, it will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-25-001.
 5. Part 1. D.1.h- The applicant indicates that the proposed action includes the impoundment of water for the purpose of stormwater management. The applicant shall provide details on the impoundment structure and the approximate volume of stormwater to be impounded and peak capacities.
 6. Part 1. D.2.c - The response indicates the project will connect to an existing public water supply/ The applicant will need to prepare the appropriate technical studies to confirm adequate capacity exists to service the project. It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the Clifton Park Water Authority is willing and capable of service this project.
 7. Part 1. D.2.d - The response indicates that the project will connect to existing wastewater facilities. The applicant will need to prepare the appropriate technical studies to confirm adequate capacity for this project. It is recommended that the Town be furnished with documentation that the Clifton Park Water Authority is willing and capable of servicing this project.
 8. Part 1. D.2.j - The response indicates the proposed action will result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services. A project-specific traffic impact study may be required.
 9. Part 1. D.2.m - The applicant indicates that the project is anticipated to produce noise that will exceed the ambient noise levels during construction. The applicant should ensure compliance with state and local noise regulations and standards.
 10. Part 1. E.2.h – The response indicates that a portion of the site or lands adjoining the site of the proposed action, contains wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency. The applicant should provide documentation that confirms the presence or absence of federally or state regulated wetlands adjacent to the project site. Additionally, a 100' wetland buffer should be clearly shown on plan to confirm.
 11. Part 1. E.2.l - The response indicates that the project site is located over, or immediately joining a Principal and Primary Aquifer, please identify the names of the aquifers.



12. Part 1. E.2.j - The response indicates that the project site is located within the 100-yr flood plain a such is required to comply with any design standards and best practices associated with construction in the 100-yr floodplain.
13. Part 1. E.2.o – The response indicates that the project site contains species of plant or animal listed by NYS as rare or as a species of special concern, including the Frosted Elfin and Karner Blue. The applicant should ensure that this response is inclusive of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service IPaC tool to ensure no federally identified species of concern.
14. No further comments at this time.

SITE PLANS/SUBDIVISION

General

15. In reviewing the proposed site plan, it appears to be deficient in regards to meeting the minimum bulk lot requirements outlined in LI-2 Light Industrial Section 208-65 of the Town's Zoning. The noted deficiencies are as follows:
 - a. Section 208-65(E)(1) No parking or maneuvering area shall be allowed in the front yard.
16. In reviewing the proposed site plan, it appears to be deficient in regards to meeting the minimum bulk lot requirements outlined in B-5 Corporate Commerce Section 208-54 of the Town's Zoning. The noted deficiencies are as follows:
 - a. Section 208-54(E)(1) No parking or maneuvering area shall be allowed in the front yard.

Cover Sheet, CV-1

17. Revise the titleblock to include the latest submission date.

Subdivision Plat

18. No comments.

Subdivision Plan, SUB-1

19. Identify the Lot numbers on the plan.

Index Plan, ID-1

20. No comments.

Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan, ECD-1

21. Identify the date and by whom the existing wetlands on-site were delineated.



22. Show the two zoning districts to identify which areas are located within the LI-2 Light Industrial and B-5 Corporate Commerce.

Layout & Material Plan, LM-1 through LM-4

23. Show the location of all points of ingress and egress doors from the building.
24. The following comments are specific to the site layout and compliance with the Fire Code of New York State (FCNYS).
- a. The FEAF notes the maximum proposed building height of 30-feet. Should there be any building height that exceeds 30-feet, inclusive of parapet roofs, Section D104 of the Fire Code of New York State will apply which dictates aerial fire apparatus access around the building and the number of fire apparatus accesses to the site.
 - b. The location and layout of the fire apparatus access shall include turning templates for the largest responding emergency vehicle and shall be reviewed by the responding agency(s).
 - c. Confirm whether the building will require an automatic sprinkler. If the building is to be sprinklers, show the location of the fire department connection.
 - d. Show the location of the required Knox Box.
25. There do not appear to be any sidewalks proposed within the industrial park. The Planning Board may consider requesting that the applicant incorporate a designated pedestrian travel way.

Utilities and Grading Plan, UG-1 through UG-4

26. Show the locations of all soil test pit and infiltration test locations.
27. Show all the existing and proposed watermain on site. It appears several sections of the watermain are missing.
28. Consider providing bollard protection around hydrants, especially adjacent to parking areas for example on the west side between Lots 14 and 15.
29. Provide existing and proposed contours to verify tie in connections and cut/fill areas.
30. It appears there are several areas where grading is proposed outside the slope setback line. This should be verified if it is cut or fill as the geotechnical report recommended no fill in these areas.
31. There is a label for a bioretention area #1 however the contours simulate a ditch line, revise accordingly.
32. Label all proposed contours.
33. Show how roof drainage from each building will be collected and conveyed into the site drainage system.
34. Provide access to the outlet control controls.



35. Identify the proposed structures along the force main (cleanout, air relief, MH, etc.) as they are labeled as just "Structure".
36. It appears the infiltration basin on Lot 13 only provides a gravel diaphragm and a filter strip as pretreatment. Verify this is an acceptable pretreatment practices as identified in Section 6.3.3 of the NYSSWDM.
37. The water and sanitary sewer improvements are subject to the review and approval of the Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1 and Clifton Park Water Authority.
38. Show on the plans the bioslope locations and underdrain piping.

Plan & Profile, PP-1

39. The force main is labeled however is not shown on the profile.

Spot Grading Plan, SG-1 through SG-4

40. No comments.

Landscaping Plan, LS-1 through LS-4

41. There is no on-site landscaping shown around proposed buildings or at key points through the site. While this is an industrial setting, there are opportunities to provide some level of aesthetic landscaping to enhance the site. MJ defers to the Planning Board on whether any additional landscaping should be provided.
42. A landscaping plan for the bioretention area shall be prepared to indicate how the practice bottom surface area and side slopes will be stabilized and established with vegetation and show the selection and layout of corresponding plant species.

Lighting Plan, LT-1

43. Show the photometric values on the plans.

Erosion and Sediment Control, ESC-1 through ESC-4

44. The sheet notes the intent to disturb more than 5-acres of ground at one time. As such, a disturbance waiver request would need to be submitted to the Town for review and approval. Note that the granting of such a waiver is a discretionary approval and one that may be disapproved or rescinded at any time with cause. Subsequent submissions shall include a detailed waiver request indicating justification, duration and additional BMPs to be employed to ensure site disturbances to not become unmanageable.
45. At the following note: Infiltration/bioretention practice areas shall be clearly marked before any site work begins and heavy equipment traffic shall be restricted to avoid soil disturbance and compaction.



- 46. At the following note: Permanent vegetative cover with 80% uniform density shall be established over the entire contributing pervious drainage area before runoff is directed into the facility.
- 47. At the following note: Infiltration practices shall never serve as a sediment control device during site construction phase and shall be installed at the end of the construction sequence, to the greatest extent practical.
- 48. Show the location of any required slope protection of areas graded at 3 on 1 or greater.
- 49. Specify the location of any proposed wetland protection fence to be installed.

Erosion and Sediment Control Details, DT-1

- 50. Show on plans the location of the erosion control blanket.
- 51. Provide a detail for the wetland protection fencing.

Sanitary Sewer Details, DT-2

- 52. No comments.

Water Detail, DT-3

- 53. No comments.

Miscellaneous Details, DT-3

- 54. No comments.

Basin Details, DT-5

- 55. It is noted that this sheet should be DT-4 in the sequencing.
- 56. Detail, Detention Basin #1, confirm all storm elevations with both the SWPPP text on page 27 and Hydro CAD model. It appears there are three different values, revise accordingly.
- 57. Detail, Detention Basin #2, confirm all storm elevations with both the SWPPP text on page 28 and Hydro CAD model. It appears there are three different values, revise accordingly.

Basin Details, DT-6

- 58. Provide the storm elevations on the filtration bioretention cross section detail.
- 59. Show on the plans the bioslope locations and underdrain piping.



60. Detail 1, Bioretention the bottom contour is labeled as 295 and 294.50, I believe they should read 225 and 224.50, revise accordingly.

GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

61. Section 5.8, notes that no building structure should be located any closer than the setback line and that no fill be placed on or near the slopes past the slope stability setback. The grading plan appears to show fill over the setback line, this should be verified and revised accordingly.

WATER REPORT

62. This report and the associated plans should be reviewed by the Clifton Park Water Authority, and any comments provided should be incorporated into the final plan set.

SEWER REPORT

63. This report and the associated plans should be reviewed by the Saratoga County Sewer District #1, and any comments provided should be incorporated into the final plan set.

STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN

64. Since it appears the on-site stormwater management facilities will be privately owned, a maintenance agreement and easement for access executed with the Town of Clifton Park will be required.

65. Confirm the water quality elevation of the bioretention to ensure 12" maximum ponding depth.

66. Provide the pretreatment calculations for each subcatchment to ensure the correct percentage of is being treated at each practice.

67. The SWPPP indicated three bioretention basins are proposed however only one is shown on the plans, revise accordingly.

68. Section 9.1 notes that the conveyance piping has been sized to accommodate the peak flows from the 10-year, 24-hour design storm. The HydroCAD model does not include discrete pipe segments. Therefore provide the design information to support the statement of the system being capable of accommodating the peak flows from the 10-year, 24-hour design storm.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 371-0799.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'MJ' followed by a stylized flourish.



Walter F. Lippmann, P.E.
Associate, Land Development Group Manager

ecc: Clifton Park Planning Board
 John Scavo, Director of Planning
 Scott Reese, Zoning Administrator/Stormwater Management Officer
 Jennifer Viggiani, Open Space Coordinator
 Melinda Acker