

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

PLANNING BOARD

ROCCO FERRARO
Chairman

ANTHONY MORELLI
Attorney

JANIS DEAN
Secretary



MEMBERS

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

(alternate) Teresa LaSalle

Planning Board Minutes
October 10, 2018

Those present at the October 10, 2018 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, E. Andarawis, D. Bagramian, J. Jones, A. Neubauer,
E. Ophardt, G. Szczesny

Those absent were: T. LaSalle – Alternate Member

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

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

Minutes Approval:

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, approval of the minutes of the September 25, 2018 Planning Board meeting as written. Ayes: Neubauer, Bagramian, Szczesny, Jones, Ophardt, Ferraro. Noes: None. Abstained: Andarawis.

Public Hearings:

There were no public hearings scheduled for this evening's meeting.

Old Business:

Though originally scheduled for review at the September 25, 2018 meeting, this application was deferred to this evening's meeting at the request of the applicant.

[2018-038] **Sunshine Landscaping** – Proposed landscaping materials supply and storage facility with 52,260 SF of building coverage – Preliminary site plan review and possible determination. SBL: 263.-1-41

Mr. Scott Lansing, consultant for the applicant, introduced Ms. Wendy Holzberger, traffic consultant, who was also present at the meeting before he presented the updated site plan for the Board's consideration. He specifically called out revisions made in response to comments and recommendations made at the August 14, 2018 Planning Board meeting. Plans now show the proposed concrete fuel storage area protected with bollards, a 15' wide conveyance of land provided along Route 146, a 15' wide easement provided along Tanner Road for future roadway improvements or trail development, access from 21st Century Drive now labeled as "a potential access," "landbanking" of fifty-two (52) parking spaces have been until deemed necessary to accommodate customers, and an increased amount of green space on site. The speaker explained that, although the applicant is continuing to discuss the establishment of a cross-easement with the adjoining property owner to the west to obtain access onto 21st Century Park Road, the site plan currently proposes access to the site via two curb cuts onto Tanner Road. The southern-most access point will align with Vista Court which provides access to a residential subdivision on the opposite side of the road. Other significant revisions include the relocation of the "gothic houses" to the center of the site, allowing for elimination of the stormwater management area along Route 146 and a reduction in the length of the required fire access roadway. Copies of licenses for those applying pesticides at the site have been provided to the Planning Department. Additional landscaping has been shown on the plan along the parcel's Route 146 and Tanner Road frontages.

Ms. Wendy Holzberger, traffic engineer, explained that the traffic study conducted for this site focused on the two access points provided along Tanner Road and the Tanner Road – Route 146 intersection. She noted that the evaluation of traffic impacts were made easier by the fact that the applicant currently operates from a site located on nearby Waite Road. Ms. Holzberger reported that the landscaping company's employees use pick-up trucks provided by the business and are often exiting the site at approximately 6:00a.m. with return trips occurring about 6:00p.m. An analysis of information gathered regarding traffic patterns indicates that due to the high volume of traffic on Route 146, delays occur during peak hours at the Tanner Road – Route 146 intersection. A crash analysis of the seventeen crashes that have occurred at the intersection within the past three years indicates that the crashes were "random in nature." Ms. Holzberger stated that the traffic study concluded that no improvements to the Tanner Road – Route 146 intersection were warranted by the proposed site development.

Mr. Jones commented that the excessive number of accidents at the Tanner Road – Route 146 intersection indicates an inherent problem. In response to his question regarding whether or not "customer trips" as opposed to only commercial traffic were considered in the traffic study, Ms. Holzberger explained that the "small retail component" was considered, though focus was

placed on visits to the site by “commercial clients.” Mr. Lansing, when asked about business hours, stated that he anticipated the business would operate between 10:00a.m. and 6:00p.m. Mr. Jones noted that the business website currently shows that the business operates until 4:00p.m. Mr. Ferraro observed that the number of parking spaces provided for retail customers appears significant and he believes that, should the business increase marketing of its products to the general public, there will be an increase in the number of customer trips generated. Ms. Holzberger stated that there may be “some mix of traffic,” particularly during the evening peak hour, though she pointed out that traffic along the Route 146 corridor dropped substantially on weekends when retail customers would be more likely to visit the site and that the business operated “seasonally.” She stated that “traffic numbers speak to an average number of trips.” In response to Mr. Ophardt’s question regarding whether or not the traffic study considered an access onto 21st Century Park Road, Ms. Holzberger stated that the study was limited to the two curb cuts proposed on Tanner Road. When he questioned the impacts of “desperate drivers” who may become impatient with long waiting times to initiate turns from Tanner Road onto Route 146, Ms. Holzberger stated that the study factors in cumulative growth within the corridor and that, even considering the anticipated traffic impacts, no additional traffic mitigation measures are indicated at this time. Mr. Ferraro reiterated that fact that he views this site development as well as others along the Route 146 corridor as significant incremental changes that will further reduce the level of service at the Route 146 – Tanner Road intersection, particularly for those drivers attempting to execute a left turn onto Route 146 from Tanner Road. Ms. Holzberger commented that the traffic study findings will be forwarded to the NYSDOT for their review and determination as to whether or not some type of signal is warranted at the intersection. When questioned by Mr. Ferraro about consideration of impacts of the proposed roundabout at the Route 146 – Route 146A intersection, Ms. Holzberger stated that the study did not specifically address the impacts of the proposed roundabout, considering “random arrivals” at the intersection rather than the “platooning of vehicles.” Mr. Ferraro again focused on the negative impacts of this development and of cumulative growth within the corridor on traffic flow, though he acknowledged that this applicant has willingly provided right-of-way lands and easements for future traffic improvements and/or trail development. Mr. Scavo explained that the town is working with NYSDOT to design and implement various traffic improvements through the state’s TIP (Traffic Improvement Program) and that it is likely in the near future that the Route 146 – Tanner Road intersection will be one of those considered for upgrades.

Mr. Scavo stated that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, reported that all previously-issued comments have been satisfactorily addressed.

Mr. Scavo reported that the ECC issued the following comments after review of the project plan at its September 18, 2018 meeting. The limits of the LC zone, 100-foot buffer zone, DEC Wetlands, Federal Jurisdictional Wetlands shall be identified on the plot plan. The ECC recommends that the P. Arnold Historic Site and the existing wetlands be delineated by split rail fencing in order to prevent access to the sensitive areas.

Mr. Scavo stated that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, reported that all of his issues of concern have been addressed.

Mr. Scavo explained that the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee recommended that the note on the plan regarding the 15' conveyance along the property's Route 146 frontage indicate that it is provided for "future trail development" as well as roadway improvements. The Subcommittee also recommended that, if possible, the applicant consider relocation of the "bulk bins" to the back of the property since this would "be more visually appealing from Tanner Road."

Mr. Scavo offered the following comments prepared by the Planning Department. In a letter dated August 22, 2018, the Saratoga County Planning Board noted the project will have, "No Significant County-Wide or Inter-Community Impact." Documentation should be provided by the applicant to the Planning Board, to confirm if NYS DOT accepts the conclusions of the traffic analysis. The following notes must be added to the plan:

1. The bulk storage bins depicted on this site plan shall be limited to the area depicted.
2. No hazardous materials shall be stored within the Bulk Bin Area.

The applicant should describe the material type for the bulk bins (i.e. cinder block), proposed height of the bins, and note the direction the opening for the bins will face (east or west). The area of mature vegetation shown to remain within the southeastern most portion of the site near the intersection of Route 146 and Tanner Road should be clearly labeled on the site plan as "Mature Vegetation to Remain."

Mr. Bianchi reported that, after review of the materials submitted for review, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. provided the following comments. The engineering firm offered a single general comment. As noted in Comment 4 of the July 6, 2018 review letter, while appearing to have a minimal amount of peak hour vehicle trips, it represents the third development near the Route 146 - Miller Road – Tanner Road intersection within the past 12 to 18 months and may have a cumulative impact on the level of service of the adjacent roadways or mentioned intersection. Further, NYSDOT is planning a roundabout at the intersection of Route 146 and Route 146A to the east. This improvement can alter noted gaps in traffic at the Tanner Road - Route 146 intersection. The applicant has indicated that a traffic study will be completed but has yet to furnish it for review. As previously noted, given the proximity to NYS Route 146, the findings of the study should be provided to the Region 1 office of the NYSDOT for input.

Mr. Bianchi identified issues with the Full Environmental Assessment Form submitted by the applicant. Comments on the initial FEAF submitted were issued as part of the July 6, 2018 review letter. An updated FEAF has yet to be submitted for review. The following comments have yet to be addressed:

- a. Under Part B. list Saratoga County Planning Board as an additional agency having jurisdiction.
- b. Under Part D.2.k.i, provide the anticipated electrical demands of the project once known.
- c. Under Part D.2.t, the response indicated hazardous materials will be generated, treated or stored. Additional information shall be provided explaining the nature of the hazardous materials to be generated, stored and treated.

Several comments related directly to the site plan. On COV-1, Parking Space Note 2 needs to be modified to reflect the requirement of Section 1106.1.1 of the 2017 Uniform Code Supplement as amended by New York State which requires all accessible access aisles to be at least 8 feet in width. On COV-1, Parking Space Note 13 shall clarify that the accessible symbol shall be the New York State mobile accessible symbol. On Sheet LM-1, the applicant is asked to provide additional information regarding the fuel storage area adjacent to the garage to determine whether it requires secondary containment and/or fire suppression. At some point prior to the business becoming operational, the proposed easement being offered to the Town along Tanner Road and as shown on Sheet LM-1 should be filed with the Town and County. On Sheet LM-1, the applicant is asked to illustrate the turning patterns for the largest vehicles anticipated to arrive and depart the site. The analysis shall be conducted at both site driveways as well as for vehicles entering and exiting Tanner Road from and to Route 146. Should the vehicle paths extend into the opposite lanes of travel, it may be necessary to make improvements at those intersections. On Sheet UG-1 the location of the one on-site fire hydrant shall be reviewed with the Town's emergency services to confirm it is properly located for their needs. On Sheet UG-1, plans should indicate that the hydrant just east of the garage is a yard hydrant and not available for fire protection, it needs to be labeled as such. If it is for fire protection, the 4-inch main servicing it is likely insufficient to provide substantive or required fire flows. On Sheet UG-1, the on-site gravity sewer between the office and garage has a section that is over 400 feet in length without manholes or cleanout. For the purposes of maintenance and cleaning it is recommended that at least one manhole/cleanout be provided to limit the distance between them to be under 400 feet. On Sheet UG-1, the applicant is asked to provide inverts for the gravity sanitary sewer system to confirm there are no vertical conflicts with the site storm drains. On Sheet UG-1, ES1A and the associated riprap outfall extend into the existing trees/shrubs. This clearing area shall be noted on Sheet ED-1. Sheets ESCP-1 shows Phase 1 through 3 with disturbance areas extremely close to the 5 acre threshold. This phase should be further reduced as it is unrealistic to expect the contractor to work within these tolerances. Sheet LS-1 shows a modified landscaping along the Route 146 frontage. At prior presentations, the Planning Board recommended adding some level of landscaping at this location. The Planning Board shall comment on the general concept shown to ensure it addresses prior comments provided. Sheet LT-1 shows the proposed site lighting and corresponding footcandle values. It appears that additional lighting may be warranted from the site entrance at Tanner Road and extending into the primary parking lot as none is shown presently. Detail sheets DT-2 and DT-3 have not been reviewed as they are under the jurisdiction of Clifton Park Water Authority and Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1. On Sheet DT-5, Details 6 and 7 specify different size riprap for the same condition at the overflow weirs: this discrepancy should be corrected. The applicant is asked to show how the entering and exiting pipes associated with the cistern physically connect to this system. The maintenance access to the stormwater basin shall be modified to provide adequate room for vehicles to turn around pursuant to Section 6.1.6 of the NYSSMDM. Section 6.1.6 of the NYSSMDM required that, except where local slopes prohibit this design, the pond shall have a drain pipe that can completely or partially drain the pond. The operation and maintenance manual shall describe how the pond can be drained for maintenance absent the drains being provided. Section 6.1.6 of the NYSSMDM requires warning signs to be posted prohibiting swimming, wading, and skating, warning of possible contamination or pollution of pond water, and indicating maximum depth of pond. The plans shall provide a detail for and show where these signs will be posted for each P-1 practice. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of the NYSSMDM,

the proposed stormwater practice needs to have a conspicuous and legible sign posted. The plans need to provide the standard sign with the applicable language as well as the location.

Mr. Bianchi explained that several comments related to the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. On Page 17, in the paragraph describing Conservation of Natural Areas, the last sentence appears to be missing information and should be corrected. The Conservation of Natural Areas requires an acceptable conservation easement instrument that ensures perpetual protection of the proposed area pursuant to Section 5.3 of the NYSSMDM. The easement must clearly specify how the natural area vegetation shall be managed and boundaries will be marked. This information should be provided prior to site disturbances or at a time agreeable to the Town. On Page 18, there is a discussion of the use of porous asphalt, yet the plans and green infrastructure calculations do not show this practice being used: correct as necessary. Appendix H which included post construction maintenance requirements shall be modified to include the following:

- a. Any maintenance activities associated with the cistern.
- b. Specify how the natural area vegetation within the Conservation of Natural Areas shall be managed (this would also be part of the required easement).
- c. Post construction maintenance associated with soil restoration. Appendix J, which included the NOI needs to be completed.

Appendix J, which included the NOI, needs to be completed. Under existing conditions, the HydroCAD model applies CN values for pasture/grassland/range for B and D soils. Portions of the site currently have planted corn and would exhibit potential different hydraulic conditions. It is believed that the existing conditions model needs to be modified to reflect the row crop conditions for the areas of the site that currently have active fields. This condition is anticipated to increase the curve numbers and resulting discharge from the subcatchments. The applicant is asked to confirm that the primary outflow from each pond has velocities between 3 and 5 fps. If the velocities are greater than 5 fps, forms of dissipating this to be within the 3 to 5 fps range shall be provided.

Mr. Bianchi offered several comments on the Traffic Impact Study. The applicant is asked to provide an accident analysis for the intersection of Tanner Road/NY Route 146/Miller Road. This project has the potential to increase the accident rate for this intersection. As result of this project, the volumes on the Tanner Road approach to 146 during the PM peak hour is increased from 32 to 61 vehicles almost doubling the approach volume. The left turns increased from 4 to 15 vehicles. Although the LOS for this approach is an F in the no-build condition and is maintained, this approach delay increases from 59 to 292 seconds per vehicle. This delay increased five times because of this project. The combination of increases in volumes and delay raises the likelihood of unsafe turning maneuvers onto NY Route 146 and also the potential for accidents. Mr. Bianchi posed three questions to the applicant:

1. What is the benefit of the addition of a right turn lane on the Tanner Road approach to the NY Route 146 intersection?
2. There is a roundabout that will be constructed at the intersection of NY Route 146 and NY Route 146A anticipated to be completed around the same time as this project. Was the change in frequency of vehicles

arriving at the intersection of Tanner Road/NY Route 146/Miller Road from the east accounted for in the traffic analysis?

3. With the modification of this intersection from a traffic signal to a roundabout, the platooning that occurs today and provides gaps for turning movements from side roads onto NY Route 146 will be more limited. Was the effect of delivery vehicles and contractor vehicles accessing the site taken into consideration in the traffic study?

With the change in business to include a retail component, there is the potential for an increase in contractors visiting the site to pick up materials. These vehicles are larger and have lower acceleration and deceleration rates and will have a greater impact on traffic operations than passenger vehicles.

Mr. Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive, thanked that applicant for providing a 15' wide strip of land along Route 146 and a 15' wide easement along Tanner Road for future roadway improvements and possible trail installation. In response to his question regarding the distance of the proposed plantings along Route 146 from the roadway, Mr. Lansing estimated the distance at approximately 100'. When questioned by Mr. LaFleche about any structures that may be constructed along Tanner Road that would "impede" roadway improvements, Mr. Lansing explained that no such structures were proposed.

In response to Mr. Jones' question regarding the location and preservation of the archeological site to be protected, Mr. Lansing explained that remnants of a structure were discovered about 50' from Tanner Road in the southeasterly portion of the site and that the area – consisting of mature trees - will not be disturbed. Though Mr. Ferraro asked if the installation of split-rail fencing along the wetland boundary might be considered, Mr. Scavo noted that the concerns for disturbance of a wetland were limited on a commercial site and Mr. Lansing explained that the stormwater management areas would offer a buffer between site development and delineated wetlands. In response to Ms. Bagramian's question regarding the types of construction materials for the parking and maneuvering areas, Mr. Lansing stated that the access roadways and parking areas would be paved with asphalt: the driving areas providing access to the bulk bins and gothic houses would consist of crusher run. Mr. Ferraro asked about the materials to be used in within the "display areas." Mr. Lansing speculated that the areas would have wood chip bases on which to place seasonal displays. In response to Mr. Ophardt's question regarding proposed landscaping along Route 146, Mr. Lansing stated that the current proposal calls for a mix of hydrangeas, daylilies, and grasses. Mr. Ferraro called for the preparation of a formal planting plan. Mr. Neubauer recommended that "some taller" landscaping materials be included in the planting design along Route 146 to "create a composition" and he called for grass seeding along that roadway since the stormwater management area will no longer be located there. Mr. Ferraro again noted the importance of the conveyance of land along Route 146 and Tanner Road by this applicant as he acknowledged the impacts to the Tanner Road – Route 146 intersection by this project and others slated for development within the corridor. He called for consideration of the transportation costs of development projects by the Planning Board, town, and state agencies as applications are reviewed. Mr. Ferraro expressed his appreciation for the applicant's "sensitivity to the Tanner Road viewshed," the attractive identification sign design at the southeasterly corner of the parcel, and the willingness to include taller tree species along the property's Route 146 frontage.

Ms. Bagramian moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA conditioned upon NYSDOT's acceptance of the traffic report and official sign-off on the project. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Andarawis moved, seconded by Mr. Szczesny, to grant preliminary and final site plan approval to this application conditioned upon the addition of a note to the plan stipulating that mature vegetation will be preserved to the greatest extent practicable, that NYSDOT accepts and "signs-off" on the project plan, acceptance of the landscaping and planting plan by town staff members, the conveyance of a 15' wide strip of land along Route 146, the establishment of a 15' wide easement along Tanner Road, and satisfaction of all items listed in the final comment letter issued by the Planning Department. The motion was unanimously carried.

Old Business:

[2017-057] **Shenendehowa Medical Park** – Proposed demolition of three (3) existing 4,800 SF single-story medical office buildings and the construction of three (3) new medical office buildings, 989 Route 146 – Revised conceptual site plan review. SBL: 271.6-1-44

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, consultant for the applicant, introduced Mr. Richard Rosen, project developer, who was also in attendance at the meeting. Mr. Vuillaume explained that modifications of a proposed site plan that called for the demolition of the existing three (3) buildings on the site and the construction of three (3) new, larger, more functional buildings was necessary because the variances required for such a project were denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The buildings will now be restricted in size to the 4,800 SF permitted within the B-1 zoning district. The redesigned site plan now calls for the buildings to be centrally located on the parcel, relocation of parking spaces provided and an increase in the number of spaces to ninety-seven (97), improved accessibility, modification of stormwater management areas, minimization of drainage to the rear to prevent impacts to existing vegetation, and installation of a 6' high vinyl fencing along the rear property line.

Mr. Scavo read the comments prepared by Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development. The applicant appears to be proposing removal and replacement of all buildings on a parcel located within the B-1 zoning district. Due to the close proximity of buildings #1 and 3, additional fire protection requirements may be needed. Significant stormwater practices are proposed within the NYSDOT right-of-way: this agency should be consulted about the acceptability of this design. Section 208-35D(3) of the Town Code states that "buildings, parking areas, including maneuvering areas, and stormwater retention areas shall not occupy more than 50% of the total lot area." It is unclear how the stormwater retention areas are included in this. A more detailed breakdown of the areas is needed to determine if the 50% is exceeded. Mr. Myers noted that, per the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, the parcel is 2.8 acres in size and will have 1.8 acres of impervious surface which totals 64%. There does not appear to be a soil boring information provided. Clarification on the use of swales is required in the Green Infrastructure Table. It states that vegetative swales are not feasible. In the conclusion it states that open swales

will collect sediment. Mr. Myers notes that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, will also provide comments on the stormwater management plan.

Mr. Scavo read the comments issued by the ECC after review of the application at its October 2, 2108 meeting. There should be additional plantings proposed for the northern border of the property adjacent to the residential lots. Additional plantings should be proposed along the southern portion of the stormwater management areas along Route 146 as the basins will remove most of the existing mature vegetation that buffers the building site. The ECC recommends that the applicant incorporate lighting that is directional and limited.

Mr. Scavo explained that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, offered the following comments regarding this application in a memo dated October 5, 2018. Mr. Reese questioned whether or not a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required for this project since it does not discharge stormwater to surface waters of the state. If a SWPPP is required, the following comments apply:

- a. Project is within an archeologically sensitive area and will require a letter of no effect from the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.
- b. SWPPP states that soil test pits and infiltration tests are being scheduled and an updated report will be provided. Please supply updated information to the Town once recorded.
- c. Provide rainfall data source used for this project in the Stormwater Report.
- d. Provide standard HydroCAD calculations in the Stormwater Report per GP-0-15-002 Part III.B.2.c.(iii).
- e. The stormwater report states that all green areas were assigned with higher hydrological soil group to account for frozen ground conditions. This method is not per the New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual 6.3.7 Cold Climate Design Considerations.
- f. An Operations and Maintenance Plan shall be included in the SWPPP that will include inspection and maintenance schedules and actions to ensure continuous and effective operation of the Stormwater Management Practices.

Mr. Scavo read the comments provided by the Trails Subcommittee of the Open Space, Trails, and Riverfront Committee. The site plan should have an overall pedestrian circulation plan – all three office buildings should be connected with an ADA accessible route that includes sidewalks and crosswalks. In order to have a complete pedestrian circulation plan and an ADA accessible route, sidewalks and crosswalks should be installed by the applicant in the following locations:

1. In front of the existing office building.
2. If possible, on the property frontage along Route 146 as part of the town's pedestrian plan for sidewalks on the north side of Route 146.
3. A connecting sidewalk should be provided from the proposed one story medical office building sidewalk/crosswalk on the west side of the complex to the recommended sidewalk along Route 146. If sidewalks are not installed on this property along Route 146, the connecting sidewalk should taper to the shoulder on Route 146.

4. Crosswalks connecting all internal sidewalks should be provided across all parking lot entranceways and at the medical park's entranceway on Route 146.
5. A crosswalk should be provided to connect the sidewalk in front of the proposed medical office building on the east side of the complex to the proposed sidewalk on the west side. Based on the length of this crosswalk span across the parking lot, the Subcommittee recommends construction of a pedestrian island in the center of the parking lot where a proposed planter/tree is shown on the site plan. The pedestrian island in the middle of the parking lot will provide the pedestrian with a safer path across the parking lot with two shorter crosswalks.

Mr. Scavo explained that the Planning Department provided the following comments. The project has been revised to propose the demolition of three existing buildings of 4,800 SF each and the construction of three new buildings of 4,800 SF each. Pursuant to Town Code §208-99 Off Street Parking and Automobile Storage Space, the minimum parking spaces required is 1 for each 150 square feet of gross floor area. The required number of spaces for this proposal is 96 parking spaces with 97 proposed. Prior concept layouts for the site were previously discussed at Planning Board meetings held on November 14, 2017 and May 23, 2018. The applicant also appeared before the Clifton Park Zoning Board of Appeals for consideration of area variances needed on a prior layout that seem to have been eliminated based on the current plan. The current conceptual site plan will be sent to the Saratoga County Planning Board for a recommendation in accordance with GML §239 (m) and (n).

Mr. Bianchi reported that M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. provided the following comments regarding this application. As noted in Comment 5 of the May 18, 2018 review letter, the existing tree buffer along Route 146 will be removed from the development. There should be an attempt to replenish this landscaped area, which may include a more substantive plan than what is been shown on the Landscaping Plan, Sheet 6 of 9. This may include a combination of ground cover, shrubs and/or additional trees. As noted in Comment 9 of the May 18, 2018 review letter, there should be consideration given to providing pedestrian accommodations and linkages to the public right-of-way. This may include a sidewalk along Route 146 and a connecting sidewalk to the internal areas of the site. Any sidewalks planned along Route 146 shall be coordinated with the Town's Trails Committee. As noted in Comment 14 of the May 18, 2018 review letter, the Planning Board has considered the inclusion of cross lot access easements to adjacent properties along Route 146 as part of sound access management strategy. There should be a discussion as to whether the inclusion of a cross lot access easement is viable at this location. It does appear it is possible at both front parking areas connecting to the adjacent properties to the east and west. Elevations for the proposed building have been provided. The Planning Board shall provide the applicant comments as to how the buildings comply with Section 208-33(D) of the Town Zoning Code. Specific attention should be paid to the scale and style being proposed. The applicant is asked to provide a site-specific illumination plan that shows foot-candle values at pavement level for review. Buildings 1 and 3 are shown as being 10 feet apart. The applicant is asked to confirm that this horizontal distance does not require a higher standard of care for building construction due to fire separation. The bicycle rack location should be shifted away from the

normal route of pedestrian traffic. The following notation should be added to the Planting Note on the Planting Plan, Sheet 6 of 9:

Should a substitution be offered, it shall be the design professional's responsibility to confirm that the substituted species are not regulated or prohibited species as identified by the NYSDEC Part 575 Invasive Species Regulations.

The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Sheet 7 of 9, shall note the following:

a. Provide notation that all upstream construction shall be completed and stabilized before connecting to the downstream infiltration practice(s) pursuant to Section 6.3.5 of the NYSSMDM.

b. Provide notation that the infiltration practice(s) shall not be used as a sediment control device during site construction phase pursuant to Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM.

The Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, Sheet 7 of 9, shows a temporary sediment basin at the southwest corner of the site and within an infiltration basin. As noted above and described in Section 6.3.6 of the NYSSMDM, infiltration basins shall not be used for sediment control devices. The applicant is asked to relocate the temporary sediment basin or provide appropriate descriptive means to address how the basin will be reconditioned to function in the finished state. Calculations confirming that the size for the temporary sediment basin shown is appropriate for the contributory area must be provided. Detail 1/8 refers to a bollard detail on the same sheet, but none is provided: the noted bollard detail needs to be provided. Detail 9/8 shall state the proposed color of the vinyl privacy fence. Site Detail sheet 9 of 9 has not been reviewed as they are under the jurisdiction of Clifton Park Water Authority and Saratoga County Sewer District No. 1.

Several of Mr. Bianchi's comments related to the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Section II.G of the SWPPP shall consider federally listed species and will require a review of the USFW Ipac database. This is a requirement used to illustrate eligibility for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.4 of the General Permit. Section II.H of the SWPPP notes that the project is within an archeologically sensitive area. It also further notes that a majority of the site has been previously disturbed. Notwithstanding, the SWPPP shall include documentation illustrating eligibility for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.8 of the General Permit. The Notice of Intent included in Section 3 of the SWPPP is incomplete and needs to be filled in with project specific design information for review. The Stormwater Management Narrative notes that a site-specific soil investigation will be completed to support the design assumption made. It also states that a 7 in/hr rate has been utilized for design and that 8.5 to 60 in/hr rates have been observed on site or in close proximity. Once the actual site soil infiltration rates have been determined, the design rate shall have a factor of safety of 2 to account for long term degradation of the soils. The WQv and RRv calculation sheets for each practice selected need to be provided.

Mr. Anthony LaFleche, 21-Wheeler Drive, expressed his support for the development of a trail link along the property's Route 146 frontage, recommending that the trail be placed as far from the edge of pavement as possible to make snow removal more efficient. He also asked that any lighting proposed for the site be limited and directed away from the existing homes located directly behind the site.

In response to Mr. Andarawis' question regarding the amount of clearing proposed, Mr. Vuillaume explained that to accommodate design changes, nearly all of the site will be disturbed, though an attempt will be made to preserve the trees along the perimeter. Many of the existing trees along the property's Route 146 frontage will be removed to provide for installation of stormwater management facilities. Mr. Ferraro called upon the applicant to "maintain a less urban type environment" and stated his displeasure with the plan to remove existing trees along Route 146. Mr. Vuillaume agreed to consider a reduction in the proposed stormwater management area in an attempt to retain more of the existing vegetation. Addressing the call for installation of porous pavement on the site, Mr. Vuillaume stated that the applicant was not enthusiastic about the use of such pavement due to its cost and maintenance demands. Mr. Ferraro reiterated his concerns with the "significant loss of trees" which would result in greater visibility of the buildings and parking areas from Route 146 and he noted that some trees should be preserved along the western border that abuts a residential property. Mr. Neubauer found clear-cutting of the site unacceptable and encouraged the use of green infrastructure practices on the site. Mr. Vuillaume agreed to consider "different techniques" to manage stormwater. Mr. Ferraro also supported the use of green practices such as rain gardens. Mr. Vuillaume responded to Ms. Bagramian's question regarding snow storage, stating that snow would be stored in the rear of the site, the front of the site, or trucked to an off-site location. Building elevations were presented for review. Mr. Neubauer stated that he found the architectural designs acceptable though he asked that contrasting colors be used to define the various structural articulations. Mr. Vuillaume responded positively to Mr. Jones' question regarding the applicant's willingness to install the sidewalk connection from the site to Route 146. The applicant also agreed to install sidewalks on the north side of Route 146 as noted on the Trails plan. A note will be placed on the plan noting such a requirement. Mr. Ophardt asked whether or not the applicant would be amenable to providing floating easements which would allow for possible future connections to properties to the east and west of the site. After Mr. Scavo explained that the cross-easements would be simply provide "placeholders" on the plan should connection to future development on either side of the site seem reasonable, Mr. Rosen stated that he would provide the requested easements. Mr. Jones recommended that the building plans provide conduit and electrical equipment to service charging stations for electric vehicles.

[2018-034] **Synergy Technology Park, Lot 4 – Site Plan** – Proposed three-story self-storage building with truck rental company, 7 Synergy Park Drive – Preliminary site plan review and possible determination. SBL: 265.-5-5

Mr. John Hitchcock, consultant for the applicant presented this project plan that was reviewed by the Board at its June 26, 2018 meeting, explaining that the project plan remains generally as presented at that time. Façade renderings of the building were presented for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, offered the following comments regarding this application in a memo dated October 1, 2018. The property is situated within the B-5 (Corporate Commerce) zoning district and, as such, the proposed building, with storage and accessory retail uses, is permitted per the Zoning Code. All other zoning requirements appear to have been met. The roadway must be a minimum of 26' wide: the roadway

width is not indicated on the site plan. The private roadway and pavement on the property shall be certified to be able to hold a 75,000 lb. vehicle by a licensed engineer. Access around the building shall be 26' wide and the area in the rear of the building shall meet the turnaround requirements of the fire code. The 2010 soils report should be updated. A maintenance agreement with the town shall be required since the owner shall maintain control of the stormwater practices. Further Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan comments will be provided by Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician.

Mr. Scavo read comments received from the ECC after review of the project plan at its October 2, 2018 meeting. The concept of the display pad that is visible to the Northway is a conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. In keeping with the recommendations and goals of the Town Comprehensive Plan, the applicant should retain existing vegetation and/or use landscaping and grading to provide visual and auditory buffering between the project and the Northway. The ECC recommends substantial vegetation buffering along the entire western property boundary to provide adequate screening of the industrial park. The applicant shall explain the function of the rental vehicle cleaning area. If this is where the vehicles will be washed, then the runoff should be directed to a location where it will be treated accordingly. The design should ensure that no runoff will reach the wetlands. The limits and type of LC zone, 100-foot buffer zone, NYSDEC, Federal Jurisdictional wetlands shall be identified on the plot plan.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, provided numerous comments regarding this application. The applicant shall indicate how much of Synergy Park Drive will be constructed and show how the stormwater runoff will be treated for the roadway. Erosion and Sediment Controls shall be shown in the drainage swale along the northeastern portion of the parking area that outlets into the wetland buffer by CB#4. Installation of a grass swale that starts by CB #6 and drains into the Stormwater Management Area Forebay in case there is overflow at the driveway's low point is recommended. The Concrete Washout Area shall be clearly located on the Grading, Utilities, and Erosion Control Plan. The washout area should be properly sized for this 53,000 square foot building. The plans show silt fencing around the perimeter of the disturbed area. Silt fencing shall be placed at the separation distances per the Standard and Specifications for Silt Fence in the NYS Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control. The applicant is asked to show all other erosion and sediment control practices on the plans that include Temporary Sediment Basins, Construction Entrances, Topsoil Stockpile Areas, etc. In part follow GP-0-15-002, Part III.B. SWPPP Contents 1.a. – 1.1 are required. On page 2 of the Stormwater Management Report under Analysis, the applicant is asked to verify the soil type classification used. The project is using a bio-retention practice to treat the water quality as well as handle the water quantity.

- a. If the standard SMPs with RRv capacity are going to be used to address the RRv criteria, the practices must be designed to capture runoff near the source. The practices must be localized systems that are installed throughout the site at each runoff source, thereby minimizing the use of traditional "end-of-pipe" treatment systems.

The stormwater management report shows one sub-catchment for both pre-development and post-development each at 4.55 acres in size. This appears to be conceptual, as there are several flow paths that enter protected wetlands to the south of the project area or enter earlier into the northern

wetlands. The report should show how overflow from the 100-year storm will still reach the Stormwater Management Area and not into the adjacent wetlands. An Operations and Maintenance Plan shall be included in the SWPPP that will include inspection and maintenance schedules and actions to ensure continuous and effective operation of the Stormwater Management Practices.

Mr. Scavo reported that the Trails Subcommittee of the Trails, Open Space, and Riverfront Committee forwarded the following recommendations to the Planning Board for consideration. The approved Synergy Technology Park site plan stamped on November 18, 2016 shows a multi-use path along the property boundary parallel to Kinns Road. The Subcommittee recommends that this trail be constructed at the same time the proposed Phase 1 3-story self-storage facility is constructed. There should be a sidewalk or multi-use pathway constructed from the 8' multi-use pathway shown on the site plan along Synergy Park Drive to the front entrance of the proposed storage building so that pedestrians do not have to walk through the middle of the parking lot to get to the building. A bicycle rack should be provided in close proximity to the front entrance of the proposed storage facility.

Mr. Scavo provided comments issued by the Planning Department. In a letter dated August 22, 2018, the Saratoga County Planning Board noted the project will have “no significant county-wide or inter-community impacts.” The applicant should provide documentation to verify that the original wetland delineation is still valid. A note should be added to the plan stating when and by whom the delineation was conducted. The applicant is asked to add a note to the plan stating the following:

This site plan is bound by all covenants, restrictions, and conditions of the subdivision plan approval for Planning Board Project #2011-011 titled, ‘Synergy Technology Park’, stamped on November 18, 2016.

A detail for the required handicapped parking space, access isle, and curb drop compliant with NYS Building Code should be added to the plan. The detail should include the sign and mounting detail for the “Handicapped Parking” and “No Parking Anytime” sign. The Planting Schedule shows a quantity of 7 Red Maples to be planted. The site plan appears to show 2 at the south east corner of the building front and 6 adjacent to the front driveway entrance from Synergy Park Drive, with 1 of the 6 missing the label “RM”. The applicant should ensure that all work and stock piling of materials during construction occur within proposed areas for disturbance and do not extend beyond the protected areas beyond the limits of disturbance. Mr. Scavo noted that he received an email this afternoon from Mr. Duane Rabideau of Gilbert VanGuilder Land Surveyors indicating that a site investigation conducted on this date verified that there were no changes to the wetland delineation prepared for the original Synergy Tech Park application.

Mr. Bianchi explained that, after review of all materials submitted for this application, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. provided the following comments. Initial comments related directly to the site plan. The cross slope of the pedestrian crossing at the site entrance appears to be greater than 2%. This shall be modified to meet the requirements of ADAAG 2010 for accessible routes. The project requires on-site hydrants to provide appropriate fire protection coverage. The applicant is asked to clarify whether or not the Clifton Park Water Authority will own any of the on-site water system. If so, the plans shall show the required easements that would be conveyed to that entity. The Lighting and Landscaping Plan shows

little in the form of proposed site landscaping to illustrate conformance with 208-55(B) of the Town's Zoning Code. The intent of Section 208-55(B) is to achieve, where possible, a well-landscaped site that takes into consideration the surroundings and the total environment. Consideration shall be given to the preservation of natural and existing vegetation as well as new plantings throughout the entire site plan. There should be consideration given to providing additional landscaping at the street frontage, at the front of the building, and elsewhere within the site. Where existing vegetation is preserved, the plan should generally describe the nature of this existing vegetation. The light pole based detail on the Lighting and Landscaping Plan covers light poles up to 20feet in height. The lighting schedule indicates light poles will be 30 feet in height in some instances. The detail needs to be updated based upon the conditions proposed. The type of retaining wall being proposed that faces Interstate 87 should be identified. Given this is a prominent viewshed, there should be a focus on a more aesthetically pleasing material. Construction details for the curbing proposed at the front parking area should be provided. A detail for all components of the bioretention facility must be provided. This shall include, but is not limited to, a cross section of overall system showing various media requirements, plantings, outfall structure, pretreatment structures, and emergency spillway. As shown, the bioretention facility is receiving runoff by a storm drain pipe or along the main conveyance system. Pursuant to Section 6.4.2 of the NYSSMDM, the filtering practice shall be designed off-line. The arrangement of the bioretention facility shall be modified to meet the requirements of Section 6.4.2 of the NYSSMDM. Pursuant to Section 3.5 of the NYSSMDM, the proposed stormwater practice needs to have a conspicuous and legible sign posted. The plans need to provide the standard sign with the applicable language as well as the location. The applicant has provided elevations but no listing of the materials of construction for the proposed building. The Planning Board shall review the information submitted to ensure it satisfies the requirements of Section 208-55(C) of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Bianchi reported that a number of comments related to the Stormwater Management Report. The predevelopment watershed map found in Exhibit 2 shows offsite discharges to the north and south that do not appear reflected in the HydroCAD model. The post-development subcatchment map found in Exhibit 3 does not appear to include all areas that are contributory to the stormwater management system and requires minor adjustment. North of the parking lot, there is a graded swale that discharges back into the site's storm sewer and should be included in the drainage areas and calculations. The water quality calculations appear to be taking credit for disconnecting rooftops with a reduction in impervious areas: the applicant is asked to confirm this is a correct application. Calculations that the appropriate pretreatment is being provided prior to the bioretention facility pursuant to Section 6.4.3 of the NYSSMDM need to be provided. The HydroCAD models for pre- and post-development conditions shall be modified to reflect the direction of flow leaving the site as illustrated on the pre- and post- development watershed maps, respectively.

Additional comments concerned the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Section 5.1 of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan shall be modified to note the increased frequency of site inspections pursuant to Part IV.C.2.e of the General Permit due to the site's stormwater being directed to the Dwaas Kill. Section 7.0 of the SWPPP which included post-construction maintenance requirements shall be modified to include the post-construction maintenance

associated with soil restoration. The SWPPP shall provide documentation illustrating eligibility for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.4 of the General Permit with respect to threatened and endangered species. This shall include both state and federally listed species. The SWPPP shall provide documentation illustrating eligibility for permit coverage pursuant to Part I.F.8 of the General Permit with respect to cultural and archeological resources. Prior to site disturbances, the Notice of Intent shall be signed by the applicant.

Mr. Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive, asked that the applicant provide a trail connection along the northerly side of Kinns Road. Mr. Bianchi pointed out that multi-use pathway and trail designs related to the Synergy Tech Park were accepted as part of the original subdivision approval. Mr. LaFleche asked that the Board members consider securing lands for the possible future development of Exit 9A from the Northway.

Mr. Andarawis commented that although he found the easterly and westerly building elevations attractive, the southerly elevation appeared to be a large, long mass with no distinguishing architectural features to make it visually appealing from Kinns Road. He also encouraged the applicant to provide landscaping to provide more interest and color. In response to Mr. Jones question regarding signage on the south side of the building, Mr. Rekucki reported that no signage was proposed for that side of the structure. Mr. Ferraro pointed out that the proposed display area along the Northway conflicts with the Town of Clifton Park Comprehensive Plan goal of maintaining a green corridor along that roadway. Noting that the Board found the proposed display area too large at its June 26, 2018 meeting, Mr. Neubauer again stated his distaste for the 40' x 90' display area on which "6 to 9" vehicles would be exhibited. Mr. Rekucki explained that the national truck rental company seeking to establish a franchise here requires that 6 to 9 trucks be visible from the Northway as part of its marketing strategy and the lease agreement. Mr. Neubauer said that he would probably approve of the "tasteful display" of one or two trucks. Mr. Ferraro called for a "minimal to 0" vehicles due to the visual impact along the corridor, explaining that approval of the application could be precedent-setting. He urged adherence to the standards set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Jones stated that he would consider approval of a "smaller" display area. Mr. Ferraro called specifically for clarification of the total amount of grading that would be required and the placement of additional landscaping around the stormwater management areas. Mr. Jones expressed his displeasure that the applicant appeared unwilling to work with Board members to create a mutually satisfying site design and commented that, with the exception of the display area, he found the project acceptable. Both Mr. Andarawis and Mr. Neubauer called for the display of "a limited number of trucks." Mr. Szczesny found that one to two display vehicles would be fine; Mr. Jones stated that he would be satisfied with two to three vehicles; Mr. Ferraro believes that no trucks parked in the "natural setting" would most appeal to him, again expressing his fear that approval of the display area would be an "intrusion into the viewshed" and precedent setting. Mr. Jones asked that the applicant provide a visual simulation of the display area from the Northway, with Mr. Neubauer recommending that additional landscaping in the front and parking area be used to enhance the overall site design. Mr. Ferraro also briefly commented about the need to consider pedestrian connections from Synergy Drive to the building.

New Business:

[2018-057] **Ellis Medical Center, Phase 2** – Proposed 62,100 SF addition to an existing medical facility, 103 Sitterly Road – Conceptual site plan review. SBL: 272.-1-49.1

Mr. Ferraro noted for the record that his daughter is a neurologist who works within the Ellis Health Care System. Mr. Morelli has advised him that this relationship in no way compromises his ability to review and act upon the pending application.

Mr. Gavin Vuillaume, consultant for the applicant, introduced Mr. Randy Cole, architect, and Ms. Wendy Rosher, Ellis Medical Center representative, who were in attendance at the meeting. The parcel slated for development is located on the northerly side of Sitterly Road just east of its intersection with Clifton Park Center Road. The site lies within the TC-1 zoning district. The speaker explained that shortly after the existing medical center was developed on the site, the governing body recognized that expansion would soon be necessary and lands directly north of the urgent care facility were purchased. Plans now call for development of that parcel with a 62,100 SF ambulatory and surgery center that will be directly connected to the existing health care facility. In addition to the existing access from Sitterly Road, a new driveway along the westerly side of the existing Stewart's Shop will provide access to the site and its accessory parking areas. During construction, it is estimated that 150 of the existing 190 parking spaces will be relocated. Upon completion, the site will contain five hundred twenty-seven (527) spaces. It is possible that some parking spaces may be "landbanked" until use of the site warrants their construction. A traffic report will be prepared. Pedestrian accommodations will be provided throughout the site. Connection will be made to an existing Clifton Park Water Authority line and an existing sewer line located along the Northway.

Mr. Randy Cole, architect, explained that the new three-story building will provide a new ambulatory and surgery center on the first floor to support the occupants of the medical offices located on the second and third floors of the building. Ms. Wendy Rosher commented that the existing building has been very successful and that there is a need for the health care system to provide a surgical component to serve the Clifton Park community.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, offered a number of comments on this application in a memo dated October 1, 2018. The parcel slated for additional development is situated within a B-4 (Highway Business) zoning district. [This was corrected, noting that the parcel is zoned TC-1] A hospital is an allowed use. There appears to be parking variances required for proposed parking areas along the northwesterly rear and northeasterly side portions of the site. The site plan shows parking installed over a sewer force main easement. The building height is noted to be 48', though 35' is the maximum height permitted within the zoning district. A variance may be required for setback. Elevation views will be required to make the final determination. A full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required.

Mr. Scavo read the comments prepared by Ms. Reed, Chief of the Bureau of Fire Prevention, for this application. The applicant is asked to show the locations of all existing and proposed fire hydrants. The turning radius provided at the westerly side of the building appears to

be “tight for emergency vehicles:” the applicant is asked to evaluate the island configuration. The proposed clear height under the porte cocheres should be indicated on the plan.

Mr. Scavo reported that the ECC provided the following comments after review of this application at its October 2, 2018 meeting. The ECC recommends that this project maximize green infrastructure practices. With the expanse of the impervious area of the parking, it would be beneficial to use porous pavement if soil conditions are favorable. The design should incorporate increased tree buffers and landscaping along the Northway frontage to maintain an attractive presence along the Northway. The present design proposes a single row of vegetation along the parking area and no vegetation along the Northway adjacent to the surgery center and existing building. This appears to be inadequate according to the TC1 Highway Zone Requirements. The applicant must indicate the proposed amount of greenspace for this project. Per Section 208-22.1.A of the Town Code the minimum amount is 20%.

Mr. Scavo explained that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, provided the following comments regarding this application. There appears to be a large amount of proposed impervious surfaces. The applicant should clarify whether or not, if soil conditions warrant, porous pavement will be used for the remote/overflow parking areas. When a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan is submitted with future submissions, it needs to include drainage characteristics from the Northway and the drainage area and purpose of the 12” HDPE culvert located at the northeastern corner of the project site.

Mr. Scavo read comments issued by the Trails Subcommittee of the Trails, Open Space, and Riverfront Committee after its review of the project plan. The applicant should construct an 8’ wide multi-use path on the property along Clifton Park Center Road – a multi-use path at this location on Clifton Park Center Road is part of the Town of Clifton Park Trails Concept Plan and is an important segment in providing a pedestrian connection to the commercial center. The sidewalk shown along the entrance roadway on the proposed site plan should continue to Clifton Park Center Road and connect with the multi-use path recommended on this property along Clifton Park Center Road. Addressing the issue of parking lot pedestrian accessibility and safety the Subcommittee notes that the applicant proposes parking lots with 215 and 140 parking spaces. Based on the size of these parking lots and consideration of pedestrian safety, the following pedestrian accessibility options should be considered in the parking lot design including:

1. A pedestrian walkway in the area/green space between the parking lots and adjacent to the Stormwater Management Area.
2. A pedestrian aisle located in the larger 215 parking space lot which can be accomplished with simple and low cost pavement striping demarcating a pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Scavo read comments provided by the Planning Department. The applicant should provide a completed Form Based Code TC-1 Project Checklist for the Planning Board’s consideration. The project is located within the limits of the Exit 9 Area GEIS: conformance with the associated Statement of Findings should be verified. A traffic study should be prepared evaluating the potential impacts associated with the additional traffic. The study should include an evaluation of the impacts at the existing traffic signal at the intersection of Sitterly Road and

Clifton Park Center Road. The required building build-to-line and parking setback distances should be depicted on the plan. The Code Enforcement Officer should determine if the property line adjacent to the Northway will be considered a front yard. The Site Statistics Table should include the existing green space and proposed calculation. New York State Building Code states, "Required number of accessible parking spaces for an outpatient medical unit or facility, a minimum of 10% of the total number of parking spaces service each such unit or facility." The applicant should break out the calculations of the outpatient surgical area square footage from general medical offices proposed within the addition to ascertain the required number of accessible parking spaces. A project narrative should be provided that describes the proposed use, hours of operation, number of employees, shifts, etc. The narrative should include a discussion on the frequency of ambulances, emergency access routes to the facility, and the potential associated impacts. The applicant should address whether or not an additional service area is proposed for the site beyond the location previously approved with the existing emergent care facility. Future submittals should show the existing service area and parking stalls along the southeastern edge of the existing building. Additional comments will follow once a more detailed site plan is submitted that includes a traffic analysis, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, Lighting Plan, building elevations, and other design features.

Mr. Bianchi explained that, after review of the site plans and accompanying documents submitted for this application, M J Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C. provided numerous comments. The project proposes to service the building expansion with public water from the Clifton Park Water Authority. The applicant shall provide the Town documentation of the CPWA's ability and willingness to service the project with potable water. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the CPWA. The project proposes to service the building expansion with public sewer from the Saratoga County Sewer District. The applicant shall provide the Town documentation of the SCSD's ability and willingness to service the project with public sewer. Any action on the application should be conditioned upon receipt of plan approval from the SCSD. The project will disturb more than 1 acre of land. As such, it will be subject to the NYSDEC Phase II Stormwater Regulations and General Permit GP-0-15-002. Therefore, a full Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required that addresses water quantity and quality controls. As the project proceeds through the Town's regulatory review process, a fully conforming SWPPP shall be provided for review. Special attention shall be paid to the reported historical flooding that has occurred at the northern areas of the site and adjacent parcel and how this project will not adversely impact this condition. It is recommended that a traffic impact study be completed that assesses peak hour vehicle trips at the parcel site drives and the adjacent Sitterly Road and Clifton Park Center Road Intersection. The assessment shall also examine site distances at the site drives, accident history as well as level of service impacts.

Several comments related to the State Environmental Quality Review Act. Based upon review of Part 617 of NYS Environmental Conservation Law, the project appears to be an "Unlisted" action. Assuming 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 are not necessarily limited to the following: Clifton Park Water Authority – public water supply plan approval; NYS Department of

Environmental Conservation – permit coverage under stormwater SPDES, identification of threatened and endangered species, potential taking of additional water, impacts within a wetland buffer area; NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation – identification of cultural or historic resources; Saratoga County Planning Board – 239m referral due to the parcel’s proximity to Interstate 87; United States Army Corps of Engineers – potential wetland disturbance permit of regulated Waters of the U.S. Additional involved/interested agencies may be defined as the project proceeds through the Town’s regulatory review. Referencing the Full Environmental Assessment Form submitted, Mr. Bianchi identified the following issues:

- Under Part D.2.c.ii, additional information must be furnished to substantiate the response that the existing water district is capable of servicing the project.
- Under Part D.2.d.iii, additional information must be furnished to substantiate the response that the existing sewer water district is capable of servicing the project.
- Under Part D.2.j, additional information must be furnished to substantiate the response that the project will not result in traffic that is substantially above present levels.
- Under Part E.2.1, the response indicates that site is located over the Niskayuna/Schenectady Sole Source Aquifer. The Proposed stormwater management systems shall provide the additional vertical separation associated with being located over a sole source aquifer.
- Under Part E.2.o, the response indicates the site does not contain any species of plants or animals that are listed by the federal government or NYS as endangered or threatened. Confirm that the response is inclusive of a search of the USFW Ipac database.
- Under Part E.3.f, the response indicates that the site is located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archeologically sensitive sites on the SHPO site inventory. Additional information is required to demonstrate there will be no adverse impacts to these resources.

Many comments related to the site plan submitted for review. The project is located within the Town’s TC-1 Highway Zone of the Form Based Code (FBC). The proposal for medical offices and outpatient services are permitted principal uses within the TC1 District pursuant to Section 208-22.4.A of the Town’s Zoning Code. The project site was originally developed prior to the adoption of the FBC. The current expansion intends to continue with the original site layout which may be a substantial departure from the requirements of the TC-1 district with respect to site layout and building placement. For the purposes of assisting the Planning Board in its review with respect to compliance with Section 208-22.1 Zone Overviews and Section 208-24, Form Standards of the Town’s Zoning Code, the applicant shall prepare the Town’s Form Based Development Code Project Review sheet. It is suggested that the applicant meet with the TAC independently, if not already completed, to review the site plan, building architecture, and modifications that may be required. The proposed building is subject to the Architectural Standards outlined in Section 208-25 of the Town Code. No proposed building elevations have been furnished to complete an architectural review. Clifton Park Center Road is defined as a perimeter street in the Future Streets Map found in Section 208 -23 of the Town Code. The following modifications may be necessary and shall be addressed as part of the next submission.

a. Lighting shall be provided within the 9 foot planter areas. The plans do not appear to show any lighting. This may require updated existing street lighting within the site.

b. A sidewalk or multi-use trail shall be provided, paralleling the existing roadway.

There should be consideration of providing a cross lot easement to the adjacent parcel to the north for a greater level of access management. This is also a requirement of Section 208-26(1)(F) of the Town Code. The applicant is asked to show where snow storage is being provided within the project site. If an additional garbage refuse area is required, its location needs to be shown on the plan. The plan shows 527 parking spaces. Section 208-26, Table 7-1 of the Town Code requires 4 spaces per 1,000 SF of building for a medical office building. Rational for the need for the additional spaces proposed should be provided. If possible, spaces above the number required should be considered for banking to reduce excess parking that may not be necessary. The applicant is asked to confirm that additional accessible parking is not required based upon the medical uses that may be proposed. This would include a review of Section 1106.3 and 1106.4 of the International Building Code for hospital outpatient and rehabilitation facilities, respectively. Subsequent plans shall provide additional information to demonstrate conformance with 208-26(3) of the Town Code with respect to parking lot landscaping. Subsequent plans shall provide additional information to demonstrate conformance with 208-26(6) of the Town Code with respect to site lighting. Information and/or a narrative summary of the pedestrian amenities that are to be provided consistent with Section 208-26(7) of the Town Code need to be provided. Plans should indicate whether or not the proposed buildings will be equipped with automatic sprinklers. A determination as to whether a Knox Box is required based upon the building arrangements, occupancy and materials of construction must be made. If one is required, its location is subject to the review and approval of the Fire Chief. The detailed site plans need to illustrate how hydrant spacing satisfies the requirements of Table C102.1 of the International Fire Code (IFC). Locations of any hydrants shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Chief. Should proposed hydrants be proposed on any of the designated fire apparatus access roads, the fire apparatus roads shall conform to Appendix D, Section D103.1 of the IFC. The proposed buildings will be in excess of thirty feet in height. As such, appropriate aerial apparatus access roads shall be provided conforming to Appendix D, Section D105 of the IFC. It appears that the appropriate aerial access is being provided on the east side of the building expansion. These conditions shall be reviewed by the Fire Department. During detailed design, confirmation that the proposed fire department connection will be within 100feet of a hydrant (existing or proposed) pursuant to Section 912.2 of the IFC is required. Subsequent submissions shall include information as outlined in Section 208-115 of the Town Code specific to lighting, site grading, landscaping, erosion control and stormwater management to fully assess the design and its compliance to the applicable standards.

Mr. Anthony LaFleche, 21 Wheeler Drive, asked about the height of the sidewalks. Mr. Vuillaume explained that the sidewalks adjoining handicapped spaces would be flat, while others providing linkage through the site would be installed in accordance with trail committee recommendations. He stated his support for the installation of a trail connection along the property's Clifton Park Center Road frontage.

In response to Ms. Bagramian's question regarding the location and visibility of "building mechanicals," Mr. Cole explained that such equipment would be placed on the roof but would be hidden by a parapet. In answer to Mr. Ferraro's question regarding the most likely location for landbanked parking, Mr. Cole stated that it was likely that the spaces farthest from the building would not be installed. In response to Mr. Ferraro's question regarding visibility from the Northway, Mr. Vuillaume explained that there was substantial existing vegetation screening the building for those traveling south on the Northway. Mr. Neubauer noted that the existing building was approved and constructed in 2012, long before form-based code guidelines were established which would call for the proposed building to be oriented either toward the Northway or the Town Center. Mr. Cole explained that design of the existing building anticipated future expansion and that the design presented for consideration is "basically an attempt to place the proposed building along an existing line." Mr. Neubauer pointed out that it may be reasonable to utilize the form-based code section outlining the guidelines for "preferred incremental change," rather than to require total compliance with TC1 standards when evaluating the project design. Mr. Ferraro stated his appreciation for the applicant's willingness to minimize paved areas and provide "more green" on the site and asked that pedestrian accommodations be provided where practicable. Mr. Jones recommended that the applicant incorporate a "small minipark" in the center of the site, that sidewalks be provided through the parking areas, and that a traffic study be completed. The project was referred to the TAC for review.

Mr. Neubauer, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Ferraro volunteered to serve as members of the TAC that will review this project.

[2018-058 **Fraser Properties** - Special Use Permit #81186 for approval to construct a residential duplex with the R-1 zoning district, 454 Clifton Park Center Road – Conceptual review. SBL: 271.-3-59.1

Mr. Duane Rabideau, consultant for the applicant, presented this application for the Board's consideration, explaining that the owner/applicant owns a vacant 1.50 acre parcel at 454 Clifton Park Center Road. The property is situated on the southerly side of Clifton Park Center Road approximately ¼ mile east of its intersection with Moe Road. It lies within the R-1 zoning district. Mr. Rabideau explained that the lot is an approved lot as shown on a subdivision map entitled Subdivision of the Lands of Joyce E. Hunter, as Trustee of the Joyce E. Hunter Revocable Trust as approved by the Town of Clifton Park Planning Board in 2017. The applicant proposes to construct a residential duplex on the lot with connection to the Clifton Park Water Authority system and an existing sanitary sewer line located at the rear of the property. The proposed duplex would be accessed via a single curb cut onto Clifton Park Center Road. Construction of the duplex is predicated on approval by this Board of Special Use Permit #81186, requested pursuant to Section 208-10(9)(a)[7] of the Town Code which would allow its construction within the R-1 zone. Mr. Rabideau described site conditions, reporting that the site is quite heavily wooded and contains a portion of an existing cemetery in the northeasterly corner. Minimum clearing of less than ½ acre is proposed, with the duplex situated approximately 125' from the edge of pavement. Building elevations indicate that the structure will be brown in color with a side-loading garage on the westerly side of the building and a front-loading garage on the easterly side.

Mr. Scavo read the comments issued by Mr. Myers, Director of Building and Development, in a memo dated October 1, 2018. The applicant requests approval of a Special Use Permit to construct a two family residence within the R-1 zoning district. Recent history suggests that separate water and sewer lines may be necessary. The driveway shall be 16' wide and able to support a 75,000 lb. vehicle.

Mr. Scavo explained that the ECC provided the following comments regarding this application. In reviewing this application, the Planning Board should consider the potential impact of three additional lots requesting Special Use Permit approvals for two-family residences and the potential impact that this would have to the character of the neighborhood including the single-family home under construction.

Mr. Scavo reported that Mr. Reese, Stormwater Management Technician, provided the following comment regarding this application. Since there has been a change in ownership of the 4 remaining lots to one owner, and the existing and proposed disturbance will be over an acre. The owner shall provide an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and file a Notice of Intent for the Basic Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for this plan.

Mr. Rabideau explained that this lot has now been transferred to another owner. The current owner of record is The Fraser Properties, LLC.

Mr. Scavo provided the following comments issued by the Planning Department. The parcel is located in the R-1 zoning district which permits the consideration of a 2-family dwelling through the granting of a Special User Permit by the Planning Board. It should be noted that any further subdivision of the parcel would result in a self-created hardship for the minimum lot width requirement measured at the front building setback line. A notation should be added to the plan to that states, "No additional curb cut beyond the shared driveway shall be granted."

It appeared that a majority of the Board members opposed approval of the Special Use Permit. Though Ms. Bagramian noted that the project lies "just down the road" from a large apartment complex, Mr. Jones argued that the duplex did not reflect the existing single-family residential character of the neighborhood. Mr. Ferraro expressed his concerns that granting such an approval in this location would be "precedent setting." Mr. Neubauer agreed, stating that approval of this application could encourage additional requests for duplex approvals on the remaining adjoining four (4) lots of the (5) lots recently approved. Mr. Andarawis noted that the lot is already constrained by wetlands to the rear and an existing cemetery to the north. Mr. Ophardt stated that he finds construction of a single-family home on the property "more reasonable."

Mr. Jones moved, seconded by Mr. Ophardt, adjournment of the meeting at 11:10p.m. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held as scheduled on October 23, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis Dean, Secretary

