

Clifton Park Planning Board Meeting Minutes

June 11, 2002

Those present at the June 11, 2002 Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: K. O'Brien, S. Bulger, B. Czub, R. d'Amico, J. Larkin, J. Marzola, J. Russell

Those also present: J. Kemper, Director of Planning, J. Grasso, Clough, Harbour, and Associates, M. O'Brien, Environmental Specialist, P. Pelagalli, Counsel

Mr. O'Brien, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:10p.m.

Old Business

[1999-023] Carnevale, Frank – 49,000 SF Comfort Suites Hotel, Route 146 and Fire Road – Amended site plan review – Preliminary determination from public hearing held May 29, 2002.

Mr. O'Brien moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to grant preliminary and final amended site plan approval to this amended site plan application pursuant to the following prepared statement:

The Planning Board has considered the following facts in reaching a determination regarding the application of Clifton Motel II, LLC for a modification of an approved site plan:

1. The Planning Board's site plan approval required the structure to have a green mansard roof and brick on the first floor façade. The plans were marked "Comfort Suites";
2. The applicant submitted plans to the Building Department which varied from the approved site plan in that the roof was changed to have three (3) gables instead of the green mansard roof. The brick face was included in these plans. The plans indicated that the structure would be a Comfort Suites hotel. The plan was approved by the Building Department;
3. The applicant proceeded to eliminate the brick face in the course of construction;
4. The applicant did not seek or obtain Planning Board approval for the change to the roof which was reflected in the plans filed with the Building Department. The applicant did not seek or obtain Planning Board approval for the change from the plans filed with the Building Department which eliminated the brick façade on the first level;
5. The Town of Clifton Park's procedures and process failed to ascertain the change in the plans for the hotel until a representative of the Building Department observed that the brick façade had been deleted;
6. The applicant constructed the roofline in conformity with the plans filed with the Building Department. The applicant constructed a ledge to support the brick façade in conformity with the plans submitted to the Building Department.

Based upon all of the foregoing, upon the Planning Board record of the site plan approval process, the record created in the course of the Article 78 proceeding in this matter, and upon the record of the public hearing regarding the applicant's request for modification of the site plan, it is this Board's determination that the application for the modification of the site plan approval obtained by Clifton Motel II, LLC is approved to the extent that the roof line may be constructed consistent with the plans filed with the Building Department; and the application is denied to the extent that the applicant seeks to eliminate the first floor brick façade which was included in the plans submitted to the Building Department and in all other respects is denied.

Mr. O'Brien explained that there was an error in communication between the Planning Board and the Building Department and that the roofline was completed as presented in the renderings approved by the Building Department. Since the first-floor brick was shown on the plans submitted to the Building Department, the Planning Board will continue to require that the hotel be constructed with the brick first floor. He added that he believes that the applicant did not adequately substantiate the need to build the "standard prototype" design and that he views this as a viable and fair compromise.

Mr. Larkin spoke in support of Mr. O'Brien's statement, stating that he believes that the compromise offered in motion ensures the welfare of Clifton Park's residents. It shows respect for due process provided by established laws. The approval benefits both the applicant and the Town by allowing construction to continue.

Mr. Marzola stated that he believes that the offer is very fair. He did not understand why the applicant pursued the Article 78 proceeding and hopes that the applicant will readily accept the approval and continue construction at the hotel site.

Mr. Russell spoke in support of the compromise, pointing out that the brick was a small portion of the cost of construction.

Mr. O'Brien, moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to withdraw the motion since the SEQRA determination had not been made. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. O'Brien moved, seconded by Mr. Larkin, to establish the Planning Board as the Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. O'Brien moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger the project approval as presented previously. Ayes: Bulger, Marzola, Russell, Larkin, d'Amico, O'Brien. Noes: Czub.

In response to Mr. Heller's request for clarification, Mr. O'Brien stated that construction will be allowed to continue consistent with the plans submitted to the Building Department. The Building Department will be responsible for enforcement of the of the approvals.

Grooms Road – Preliminary site plan review and possible determination.

This application was withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

[2002-008] Corpus Christi Church – Proposed 18,030 SF addition, 2001 Route - Preliminary site plan review and possible determination.

Mr. Gordon Nicholson, Environmental Design Partnership, explained that the Board reviewed this project on February 12, 2002 at which time a number of issues were raised. These included the amount and location of parking areas, adequacy of fire flow in the area, the viability of the proposed on-site septic system, wetland disturbance and traffic impacts. Mr. Nicholson stated that the proposal calls for the development of approximately 7.2 acres of the 14.5 acre site owned by the church. He stated that shade trees and landscaping will be provided along Ushers Road and that the plan now calls for connection to the Saratoga County Sewer District facilities to the south. An additional 140 parking spaces will be added to the existing 200 spaces now available and the dumpster pad and enclosure has been relocated to allow for the revised parking plan. Mr. Nicholson has met with representatives of the ACOE and expects a sign-off from that agency within the week. A traffic study prepared by Creighton-Manning and Clough was reviewed by Clough, Harbour, and Associates and found to be acceptable. The required standard notes have been added to the plan.

Mr. Kemper offered a number of comments on the project proposal. The Saratoga County Planning Board reviewed the project at its February 21, 2002 Planning Board Meeting and required further information. Several items remain to be addressed from the February 12, 2002 Planning Board meeting. Mr. Clemen's comments regarding variances for the parking in the front yard setback along Rt. 9, the 2 access drives on Ushers Road, and the front yard setback along Rt. 9 and Ushers Road must be addressed. Due to the proposed wetland disturbance, a signoff will be required from the ACOE. Sheryl Reed's comments regarding the turning radius for emergency vehicles and required fire flow must also be addressed. Verification should be submitted that there are no N.Y.S.D.E.C. wetlands on the site. Since the applicant is proposing significantly more parking than that which is required by Town Code, consideration should be given to expanding the parking lot in the future if deemed necessary. Details should be provided on the 24' x 24' storage garage, including whether or not this building will be served by water and sewer. The necessary variances that will be required by the ZBA must be received prior to a Board decision on the application. The "Handicap Parking" and "No Parking" signs should be depicted on the plot plan. The proposed plantings should be increased to 3" to 3.5" caliper for deciduous trees, minimum of 6 ft. for evergreen plantings, and a minimum spread or height of 24" for ornamental plantings.

Mr. Grasso offered several comments. A Full Environmental Assessment Form should be submitted for review. According to the parking summary, only 200 parking spaces are required, yet 399 are proposed. Construction of the large parking lot will require substantial removal of trees and vegetation, grading, and wetland disturbance. Justification should be provided for the 199 parking spaces above what is required by

Town Code. Consideration should be given to constructing the minimum required parking initially with additional parking provided if warranted. According to the Section 208-65 E. of the Town Code, no parking or maneuvering area shall be allowed in the front yard which is eighty feet along Route 9 and 130 feet from the centerline of Ushers Road. Parking is proposed within ten feet of the Route 9 right of way and within twenty feet of the Ushers Road right of way. Given the constraints of the site and the fact that it is a corner lot, consideration may be given to waiving the setback restriction along Ushers Road, however, the existing wooded area along Route 9 should be preserved to mitigate visual impacts of the parking lot. Consideration should be given to the elimination or redesign of the cul-de-sac area, as this area significantly encroaches into the parking setback area and will not allow an emergency vehicle to exit the area. It does not appear that an emergency vehicle can access the east side of the site when the parking lot is full. The location of the dumpster pad and enclosure should be shown on the plans.

Mr. Grasso offered several additional comments. The parking spaces proposed in front of the internal connection between the two parking lots should be removed. This aisle was recommended to facilitate movement between the parking areas. The plans indicate that 0.35 acres of wetlands will be impacted but do not include any wetland mitigation areas. Any such areas should be shown on the plans. Consistent with what is provided on other development projects that include environmentally sensitive features, we recommend that the limits of the land conservation area be expanded to include all remaining wetland areas. The traffic study does not include a background growth rate. Although NYSDOT historical data has shown traffic growth on this section of Route 9 to be less than 1% per year, there is significant warehouse/distribution facilities planned along the Route 9 corridor in the Town of Halfmoon and significant residential development (over 4,000 residential lots) is anticipated in the northern part of Halfmoon over the next twenty years. This should be taken into consideration for the traffic projections. Assuming that the change in the background growth rate does not significantly alter anticipated traffic volumes, we concur with the results of the traffic study that the signal timing adjustments would mitigate the traffic impacts at the Route 9/Ushers Road intersection. A letter should be provided from NYSDOT indicating that these adjustments are acceptable and the applicant should identify who will be responsible for the adjustments. The traffic study indicates that the available sight distance is 250 feet shorter than recommended when looking right out of the western site driveway and 165 feet shorter than recommended when looking left out of the eastern site driveway. Grading and clearing is proposed to improve the sight distance from the western driveway but the report does not indicate that adequate sight distance will result. In addition, the report does not propose any improvements to rectify the shortfall for the eastern site driveway. If adequate sight distance can not be provided, elimination or relocation of the driveway appears warranted.

Mr. O'Brien left the meeting during this discussion and Mr. Bulger, Vice-Chairman, assumed the chair.

Clough, Harbour, and Associates also recommends the installation of hay bales or stone check dams in the drainage swales connecting the stormwater management areas. All

slopes steeper than one on three slope shall receive erosion control blankets. The drainage swale between basin #3 to basin #2 does not appear deep enough to prevent runoff from discharging to the adjacent wetland. The stormwater basins should be over-excavated to account for sedimentation for construction and following construction. The locations of the “Handicap” and “No Parking” signs should be shown on the site plan.

Mr. O’Brien, Environmental Specialist, reported that, after review of the data presented, the ECC reiterates the comments made at the February 5, 2002 meeting and also recommends that any new proposed lighting shall be directional and limited. The applicant was also advised at the meeting to add the following standard statement: No salts, fertilizers, pesticides or other materials may be used on this property where they will contaminate any wetland areas or surface water through runoff, leaching, or in any other manner which violates the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (ECL).

Mr. d’Amico expressed his concern regarding the “cul-de-sac” parking area shown on the southwestern portion of the site. He suggested that substantial evergreen buffering be added in order to screen the parking lot from the road.

Mr. John Fortune, owner of warehouses across Ushers Road from the church, addressed the issue of water availability for fire fighting. He stated that a 20,000-gallon water tank that was installed during warehouse construction protects warehouses located on his property. Although the Emergency Services Advisory Board noted the existence of this supply during consideration of the Corpus Christi expansion application, Mr. Fortune informed that Board that this water supply has been purchased, installed, and maintained by the Fortunes and will not be available for others to use. He recommended that the church be required to supply a separate tank. Mr. Fortune also commented on the traffic study provided by the consultant. He said that since the study was conducted in the month of December counts might not reflect usual vehicle activity. In addition, the study failed to consider the proposed additional warehouse on the Fortune site.

Though Father Pratt, Corpus Christi, explained that he had spoken with the manager of the pipe supplier on the Fortune site who gave him permission to access the water supply, Mr. Fortune noted that a representative of the company leasing the site had no authority to give such approval.

Mr. Nicholson noted that the ESAB did not state that the water available on the Fortune site would be used during a fire at the church. He pointed out that the ESAB had simply noted that the supply was available in the area. Board members asked that water availability be clarified and that the ESAB comments be reviewed.

Mr. Bill Engleman, 6 Partridge Plateau, submitted a letter for the Board’s consideration and commented that, as a resident of Clifton Park and a parishioner of Corpus Christi, he was extremely troubled by this application. He asked the church to scale back the plan that would require massive impacts to trees, forests, wetlands, natural habitats, and visual buffers. He questioned the ability of Town officials to monitor grading and earth-

disturbance on the site to ensure protection of natural resources. He appealed to the church parishioners to encourage “stewardship of the earth” rather than its endless consumption and he read a poem in support of his position.

Mr. Engleman also noted that the Saratoga County Planning Board has requested additional information prior to rendering a decision on the application and he questioned the Town Planning Board’s ability to consider the application prior to county approval. Mr. Kemper responded to Mr. Engleman’s concerns, stating that he has been working cooperatively with the County Planning Department and the applicant’s consultant to develop an acceptable project plan.

Father Pratt outlined the need for the proposed expansion, stating that projections for the parish indicate a that about 2000 families – 4800 residents - will be included in the parish within the next several years. Though faith formation programs and other activities are scheduled throughout the day every day, there is a pressing need for additional space. He said that the proposed parking would be needed to accommodate all churchgoers.

Mr. Bill Malloy, Co-chairman of the Building Committee, explained that designation and protection of the wetlands has been an on-going issue since 1998. The committee has been diligently working to reduce or eliminate impacts to wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas since the expansion project was first considered. He emphasized the need for expansion and additional parking facilities.

Mr. Fortune believes that the increased traffic will interfere with traffic on Ushers Road and asked the applicant and the Board to consider an access to Route 9. Mr. Grasso supported the access as proposed, explaining that access to Route 9 would not be permitted by NYSDOT. In his opinion, traffic generated by warehouse activities at the Fortune site would not impact area traffic flow.

Board members discussed the ESAB decision, the amount of parking, and buffering to limit visual impacts along Route 9. Mr. Kemper will review ESAB approvals for the adjoining properties regarding fire protection requirements and the recent approval for the church. Mr. Nicholson will work with the Planning Department to develop and acceptable parking and landscaping plan.

Mr. Engleman questioned the rationale for the proposed number of parking spaces, pointing out that that 1 space for every 2 seats is double the amount required by Town Code.

Mr. Bulger summarized the issues to be addressed as follows: the ESAB’s position on the cul-de-sac parking area and water supply must be clarified; justification for the number of parking spaces will be considered; the feasibility of a connection between parking areas will be evaluated; additional buffering to mitigate visual impacts should be provided. The project review will be tabled until a later date.

New Business:

[2002-028] Powmat Limited – Proposed 2,600 SF addition to technical facility, 312 Ushers Road – Conceptual site plan review.

Mr. Gordon Nicholson, Environmental Design Partnership, presented this application that calls for an addition of 2,602 SF to the north side of the existing building at the Northway 10 Technical Park. The proposed expansion of the warehouse use will be fully compliant with existing bulk and density requirements. The consultant explained that this expansion was indicated on the plan for the original 2,600 SF building approved for the site in 1991. The Clifton Park Water Authority and the Saratoga County Sewer District #1 currently serve the building. The existing stormwater detention basin will be moved further east to accommodate expansion.

Mr. Kemper advised that a signoff would be required from CK Sanitary.

Mr. Grasso had no comments.

Mr. O'Brien, Environmental Specialist, requested that the following standard statements be added to the plot plan: the borders of all lands to remain undisturbed shall be clearly marked on the site before site preparation begins and these on-site boundary markers shall remain until construction is completed and soils are stabilized; all erosion and water quality controls shall be put in place and maintained at the initial phase of site preparation; the applicant will control fugitive dust and debris during the construction/demolition phase of the project. The ECC also recommends that any proposed lighting shall be directional and limited.

In response to Mr. d'Amico's inquiry, Mr. Nicholson reported that the current tenant would use the building. Parking is sufficient for the use proposed.

Board members agreed that the plan was acceptable.

[2002-026] Quarry Development – Proposed (6) lot subdivision, Crescent Road – Conceptual review.

This item was withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

[2002-024] Capital District YMCA – Proposed temporary 24' x 60' modular unit, 1 Wall Street – Preliminary site plan review and determination.

Mr. Barry Relyea, representative of the Capital District YMCA, presented this application that calls for the placement of a temporary 24' x 60' modular unit on property owned by the YMCA adjacent to its existing facility at 1 Wall Street. The closing of a childcare facility currently leased by the facility has created a need for additional space. Since the YMCA plans to construct a 5,000 SF "childcare services wing" at the south end of the existing building, the modular unit will be used only through August 31, 2003. Accommodation will be made for parking near this building and a handicap ramp will be

provided pursuant to A.D.A. standards. The Clifton Park Water Authority will provide water service and a wastewater storage tank is to be located under the building.

Mr. Kemper recommended the addition of a note to the plans indicating the maximum amount of time that the temporary building will remain on the site. He reported that since the required 500-foot notifications have not been sent, preliminary approval can not be granted at this meeting.

Mr. Grasso reported that the proposed project is located within the Exit 9 Commercial Area GEIS, and as such, may be subject to the Findings Statement of the GEIS. In order for the project to be deemed consistent with the Findings Statement, the plan should identify the amount of greenspace and the project shall contribute to the mitigation fees established in the Findings Statement of \$0.18 per square foot. Based on a 1,440 square foot building, the mitigation fee will be \$259. Because the location that the building will be located is previously developed, it does not appear that an investigation into wetlands, cultural resources, or threatened or endangered species is warranted. The building proposes the use of a wastewater holding tank that will be periodically pumped as the method of wastewater disposal. NYSDOH regulations restrict the use of holding tanks; however, waivers are allowed on a case by case basis if the facilities will be temporary. If the building will be used for two years or less, the holding tank appears to be an acceptable option. If the building will be used longer than two years, connection to the existing sanitary sewer system is recommended. If a holding tank is used, it should be provided an alarm and float control system that alerts the owner when pumping is required and the owner shall enter into a contract with a local licensed septic service company that will be available for pumping on short notice. Water service is provided from the existing building. NYS Building Code requires each lot to be provided its own water supply system, however, if both parcels are in the same ownership, use of a combined water service may be permitted. A handicapped accessible parking space and access aisle will be required. The parking space will require a handicapped accessible parking sign and the access aisle will require a "No Parking" sign per NYS Building Code. Setbacks from the adjoining property lines should be shown.

Mr. Relyea assured Mr. Larkin that the area would be restored to its original condition following removal of the modular unit. At Mr. d'Amico's request, Mr. Relyea outlined the plans for expansion of the office wing of the current facility to accommodate childcare facilities. Increased parking and a separate entrance will be included in future project plans.

Board members responded favorably to the plans for locating a modular unit temporarily on the site in order to accommodate childcare activities.

[2002-027] Liberty Canine Care Center – Proposed 1,680 SF addition to existing kennel, 2108 Route 9 – Conceptual site plan review.

Messrs. Donald and Jeff Opie, sons of Ms. Nancy Opie, applicant for this project, presented this proposal that calls for a 70' x 24' addition to the existing canine care

center. The 1.53-acre parcel is located in a L-I zone at the intersection of Route 9 and Wood Road. The facility is serviced by an existing on-site well and septic system. Expansion will provide additional space for a reception area, grooming room, and “day care” space.

Mr. Kemper stated that a site location map should be added on the plot plans. Under the General Notes section of the plot plan the applicant indicates that the zoning on the parcel is B-2, however, this area is zoned as Light Industrial. The plan should be revised accordingly.

Mr. Grasso noted that the proposed project is located within the limits of the Wood Road Corridor GEIS Study Area. As such, if the proposed project is deemed consistent with the findings of the GEIS, no additional SEQR action may be required. Involved agencies are anticipated to include the Clifton Park Planning Board and Saratoga County Planning Board with a Section 239 Referral required. Pursuant to the Findings Statement for the FGEIS for the Wood Road Corridor, the following issues should be addressed:

Per Finding No. 34, traffic mitigation fees are required to address cumulative impacts of the proposed development. The fee is \$723.09 per trip generated during the highest peak hour, as defined by appropriate facility codes in the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 5th Edition. The applicant’s consultant should submit an analysis of the projected trip generation so that the respective mitigation fee can be assessed.

A mitigation fee is due for the original review of the DGEIS in the amount of \$74.28 per acre. Because the area to be developed is previously developed, it would appear that no fee is required.

Per Finding No. 67, a visual buffer of approximately 250 feet is recommended to avoid and minimize significant visual impacts to travelers on NYS Route 9. Accommodation of this buffer requirement does not appear to be feasible; however, alternative buffering should be proposed on the final site plans to satisfy this requirement.

Per Finding No. 73, a Phase I Environmental Audit shall be conducted and submitted at the initiation of site plan review. Because the area of the improvements has already been developed, an additional audit may not be required.

Per Finding No. 78, the applicant shall contact NYSOPRHP regarding historic sites and archeologically sensitive resources near the project area. Because the area of the improvements has already been disturbed, confirmation from NYSOPRHP does not appear warranted.

The plan indicates the site is located in a B-2 Highway Business district; however, the site appears to be located in the L-1 (Light Industrial) District. Pursuant to 208-64 of the zoning code, a special use permit is required for animal care facilities in this district. A special use permit may already exist for the existing dog kennel. Pursuant to section 208-98 of the zoning code, a minimum 130-foot setback from the centerline of Route 9 is required. Since it is unclear if the addition meets this requirement, accurate required and proposed setbacks should be shown. Future plan submittals should include a site location map and location of the existing well. The method and location of proposed connection to the sanitary sewer system must be indicated on the plan. Proposed striping and signage for the parking lot should be shown. The method of stormwater management must be

indicated on the plans. Existing and proposed contours at two-foot intervals should be added to the drawings. Limits of existing vegetation, wetlands, and proposed landscaping must also be added to the site plan.

Mr. O'Brien, Environmental Specialist, offered the comments from the ECC. The following standard statements should be added to the plot plan: the borders of all lands to remain undisturbed shall be clearly marked on the site before site preparation begins and these on-site boundary markers shall remain until construction is completed and soils are stabilized. All erosion and water quality controls shall be put in place and maintained at the initial phase of site preparation. The applicant will control fugitive dust and debris during the construction/demolition phase of the project.

Mr. d'Amico noted that, in addition to the proposed kennel expansion, the plan also indicates that a garage will be built to the south east of the house. The applicants explained that the garage was associated with the residential use of the parcel, not with the business. Mr. d'Amico asked that the parking area be more defined on the plan.

Board members found the plan acceptable and requested that the consultant prepare more detailed preliminary plans for review.

[2002-029] Brock, John – Proposed 170,100 SF office park, Glenridge Road and Route 146 – Conceptual site plan review.

Mr. John Montaigne, Chazen Engineering, described the proposed project plans. He stated that the applicant proposes the construction of 170,100 SF of office space in a B-2 zone. Over 50% of the parcel will be retained as green space. Water has been extended to the area and sanitary facilities will be provided on site with eventual connection to the sewer system anticipated. A SPEDES permit will be required. Since widening of Route 146 is planned, NYSDOT has been consulted about future right-of-way takings and buildings have been located away from proposed right-of-way boundaries. Information regarding stormwater management has been submitted and both a detention basin and a retention basin have been shown on the concept plan. Buildings have been sized for adequate fire prevention. Flow tests conducted on the water system indicate that the fire protection is adequate.

Mr. Kemper noted that the narrative submitted with the application states that the applicant is proposing a commercial subdivision. If this is the case, a subdivision application should precede any site plan applications. The applicant should clarify whether the proposed road within the site will be a private or public road. The Town of Clifton Park Planning Department should be copied on all correspondence between the applicant and N.Y.S.D.O.T., and the N.Y.S. Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation. The date and firm and that performed the wetland delineation should be added to the plot plan. The applicant should begin correspondence with N.Y.S.D.O.T. since improvements are proposed for Balltown Road. The Board should consider the density of the site (170,000 S.F.) and whether a proposed septic system will be a viable

option for the site. The precedent set by allowing a septic tank to serve this large of a commercial project should also be considered. Since the proposed road layout will create a shortcut from Glenridge Road to Balltown Road and from Balltown Road to Glenridge Road in the evenings, it is unacceptable. Due to the proximity of the proposed buildings to Glenridge Road, substantial buffering should be provided along the north side of the project. Sheryl Reed notes that emergency services accessibility to the site and fire flow issues will have yet to be resolved.

Mr. Grasso stated that the proposed project appears to be a Type I action pursuant to SEQR, and as such, coordinated review is required. Involved agencies are expected to include the following: Town of Clifton Park Planning Board for site plan and subdivision approval; Saratoga County Planning Board for Section 239 referral; NYSDOT for curb-cut permits and traffic review; NYSDEC for 401 Water Quality Certification, wastewater disposal system approval and SPDES permit; NYSDOH for water supply system approval. A Full Environmental Assessment Form should be submitted for review prior to the issuance of SEQR notices for Lead Agency. An ACOE wetland jurisdictional determination should be provided. Based upon the internal lots proposed, it is assumed that the internal roadway is proposed as a Town road to be dedicated to the Town. As such, the road must comply with the Town's Design and Construction Standards. The following items appear to be substandard: Town right-of-way width is proposed at 50 feet: 60 feet is required. Centerline radii for roads is 300 feet minimum, several appear to be less (125 feet, 160 feet, 175 feet). The required tangent length between reverse curves is 150 feet, while 100 feet appears proposed in two locations. The proposed road width appears to be 24 feet. Based upon the intensity of use proposed the road would logically be a collector requiring a 40-foot road width. Since Lots A, B, C, and G all have frontage on public roads, it does not appear that the proposed cul-de-sac is required to be a town road. We suggest that it be a private drive within a common access easement, to reduce the amount of roadway maintenance required by the Town.

In light of the future improvements being considered by NYSDOT for NYS Route 146, and to accommodate potential improvements to Glenridge Road, the Town may want to require the dedication of additional land for future highway right-of-way use. The proposed lot layouts, with parking provided behind the buildings as seen from the existing roads, are a preferred approach; however, berming and landscaped buffering should still be provided along Route 146 and Glenridge Road. As indicated in the narrative, a traffic impact study should be prepared and coordinated with NYSDOT. The need for off-site traffic improvements is anticipated.

Pursuant to Section 208-34A of the Town Zoning Ordinance, existing vegetation on the site should be considered and preserved to the greatest extent possible. In addition, the applicant should agree that the development would connect to sanitary sewers as soon as they become available. Pursuant to Section 208-35D, no parking is allowed within the required front setback (70 feet) or the required side and rear yards (25 feet). This requirement is not met on the internal roads and on several lots. Per Section 208-35C, Lot F where the proposed sanitary disposal system is located, cannot be counted as green space as it is an area required for utility purposes. In addition, the stormwater

management area cannot be considered as green space unless the Planning Board agrees that it will be maintained as a landscaped area. As such, it is not clear if the overall subdivision meets the 50% green space required as outlined in the site statistics. Proposed Lot J (with the Stormwater management area) should either have frontage on the town road or be combined with Lot I. Access to the basin should also be required. Both utility lots (F and J) should be owned and maintained by a Development Association or the developer, not the Town. The estimated sewage flows from the project is expected to be 17,000 gallons per day and an on-site community wastewater disposal system is proposed. On-site subsurface sanitary disposal is generally undesirable for developments this large. They are, however, considered by NYSDEC and NYSDOH. Site specific soil testing and sizing, and a letter from NYSDEC regarding the feasibility of the system is required before even conceptual consideration should be given to the proposal.

As noted in several comments above, some of the individual site plans shown do not comply with the Town Zoning Ordinance. As such, either the size of buildings or the number of lots may need to be reduced to decrease the density. Additional comments will be forthcoming as the conceptual plans are modified to address the comments.

Mr. O'Brien, Environmental Specialist, recommended that the following standard statements should be added to the plot plan: the borders of all lands to remain undisturbed shall be clearly marked on the site before site preparation begins and these on-site boundary markers shall remain until construction is completed and soils are stabilized. All erosion and water quality controls shall be put in place and maintained at the initial phase of site preparation. The applicant will control fugitive dust and debris during the construction/demolition phase of the project. Federal jurisdictional wetlands have been identified on this site. The Town of Clifton Park Building Department shall be notified before undertaking any land disturbance activities in Federal wetlands. No salts, fertilizers, pesticides or other materials may be used on this property where they will contaminate any wetland areas or surface water through runoff, leaching or in any other manner which violates the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (ECL). Any proposed lighting shall be directional and limited.

Mr. Montaigne explained that NYSDEC has been contacted, that the project will be constructed in phases, that the plan will allow for monitoring of the sanitary facilities, and that the greenspace calculations excluded the detention/retention areas.

Board members expressed several concerns regarding this application. Mr. Bulger was concerned about the time frame for connection of the sewer to the County system and asked that the applicant provide for maintenance of the system on a single parcel should the property be subdivided. He also asked that existing and proposed grades be added to the plan since the land slopes significantly to the west. Mr. Russell commented that traffic accessing and exiting the site might encounter difficulties since the sun is often very bright at the Glenridge Road-Route 146 intersection during the morning hours. He asked that a traffic study be prepared. Mr. Larkin noted that the practicability of the proposed sanitary system might limit development potential. Mr. d'Amico was pleased with the building locations, noting that substantial buffering was provided along the

perimeters of the property. Board members agreed that this was a very ambitious project that would require numerous approvals and detailed project plans.

Minutes Approval:

Ms. Czub moved, seconded by Mr. Larkin, approval of the minutes of May 29, 2002 as written. The motion was unanimously carried.

Mr. Larkin moved, seconded by Ms. Czub, adjournment of the meeting at 9:15p.m. The motion was unanimously carried. The next meeting of the Planning Board is scheduled for June 25, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

Janis L. Dean,
Secretary

cc: Planning Board Members, Planning Department, Clough, Harbour, and Associates, Supervisor, Town Administrator, Assessor, Zoning Board, Department of Building and Development, Town Clerk, Town Board Members, Highway Superintendent, Joel Peller, Town Attorney, Oscar Schreiber, Town Attorney, Jim Trainor, Town Attorney, Paul Pelagalli, Town Attorney, Department of Parks and Recreation, ECC, Saratoga County Planning Board, Shenendehowa Central School, Clifton Park Water Authority, Fire Districts.