

Town of Clifton Park

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

PLANNING BOARD

Rocco Ferraro
Chairman

Paul Pelagalli
Attorney

Meg Springli
Acting Secretary



MEMBERS

Michael Hale

Joel Koval

Eric Ophardt

Sandra Pace

Kim Paulsen

Tom Werner

(alternate) Emad Andarawis

Planning Board Minutes

March 13, 2012

Those present at the March 13, Planning Board meeting were:

Planning Board: R. Ferraro, Chairman, J. Koval, M. Hale, E. Ophardt, S. Pace,

Those absent were: T. Werner, K. Paulsen

Those also present were: J. Scavo, Director of Planning
R. Milano, M.J. Engineering
M. Montague, ECC
P. Pelagalli, Counsel
E. Andarawis – Alternate Member
M. Springli, Secretary

Mr. Ferraro, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:03p.m. All in attendance stood for recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Ferraro named Mr. Andarawis as a voting member for the meeting.

I. Public Hearings

7:00 [2012-006] Hicks, Lands of Thomas and Sue Proposed (2) lot subdivision, 160 Sugar Hill Rd, Zoned: CR, Preliminary public hearing with possible determination, SBL: 282.-1-30.1 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Metzger Last Seen on: 2/15/2012

Mr. Ferraro opened the Public hearing for the Hicks, Lands of Thomas and Sue subdivision at 7:04pm. The Planning Board Secretary read the public hearing notice as it was published in The

Daily Gazette on March, 8, 2012.

Presentation:

Mr. Fred Metzger discussed the subdivision as proposed stating that the applicant is proposing to subdivide 3.6 acres from the parent's farm of more than 100 acres. The proposal remains basically unchanged from its concept submittal last heard on February 15, 2012.

Staff Comments

Building and Zoning read by Planning Director

- No comment

Planning Director's comments

- A note should be added to the plan prior to final stamping which states, "The subdivision has utilized the one-time, single-lot exemption for a family member in accordance with Section 208-16E (2) (d) of the Town Code.
- A \$500.00 parkland fee for the new residential lot shall be paid prior to the stamping of the final plans.

MJE Comments

- Since the applicant is proposing to subdivide the property and make no improvements at this time, we suggest that the following sentence be added to note 9 on the plan: "Prior to any development of the parcel, a Proposed Site Plan that incorporates and addresses any outstanding prior comments shall be submitted to the Town for review and approval."

ECC Comments

No comment

Public Discussion - no comment

There being no additional public comment, Mr. Ferraro asked for a motion to close the public hearing at 7:06 pm.

So moved: Pace

Seconded by: Ophardt

Ayes: all

Opposed: none

The motion is: unanimously carried

Planning Board Discussion

Mr. Ophardt mentioned that when he drove by the property in question he had noticed the clearing of some trees was occurring on the property. Mr. Barnett, the applicant said that the town had taken some down that were in the right of way and the owner has asked for the

hardwoods to be left decided to use for some split rail fences and pines were hauled away. The applicant also explained that he would be doing some landscaping including the addition of trees for some privacy screening and grass.

Mr. Ferraro explained that the applicant would be using the one-time family exemption option for this subdivision.

Motion SEQR

Mr. Ferraro asked for a motion to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

So moved by: Ophardt

Seconded by: Andarawis

Ayes: all

Opposed: none

This motion is: unanimously carried

Resolution #3 of 2012

The chairman asked for a motion to waive the final hearing for this application and to grant preliminary and final subdivision approval to this application conditioned upon satisfaction of the comments offered by the Planning Board, Planning Department, and Town Designated Engineer.

So moved by: Koval

Seconded by: Hale

Roll call: Ayes: Mrs. Pace, Mr. Ophardt, Mr. Andarawis, Mr. Hale, Mr. Koval, Mr. Ferraro

Noes: None

The resolution is: unanimously passed

A Notice of Decision and Resolution are attached at end of these minutes and the applicant will also receive a Review Letter from the Planning Department prior to stamping of the plans.

II. Old Business

- A. **[2005-060] Waite Meadows Subdivision** Proposed (3) Phase Plan for building of stamped subdivision plan, 626 Waite Road, Zoned: CR, Final & Stamped SBL: 270.-1-19.1 To be reviewed by: N/A Consultant: D. Arico Last Seen on: 2/24/2009

Presentation: Mr. Dominick Arico from Boswell engineering presented this phasing plan for the previously approved subdivision plan. Mr. Ferraro stated that the next time it appears will require a public hearing. Mr. Arico gave an overview of the subdivision as it was approved. The consultant explained that water and sewer are going to be brought in through the entire subdivision and there are no changes to the approved plats and boundary lines. Mr. Arico also remarked that the first phase would consist of two homes on large lots along the Waite road frontage with well and septic to be connected to water and sewer at Phase II. January 2013 is a deadline for starting building based on the other permits that have been granted.

Mr. Ferraro asked for clarification of some lines shown on the phase plan. Mr. Arico explained that it would be a supplemental page to be added to the entire subdivision plan and that when reviewed with the subdivision plan, those lines would make more sense.

Staff Comments

Building and Zoning read by Planning Director

- Completion of all infrastructures should be required prior to approval of any CO's. If allowed to install septic and wells, another review of site plan should occur to determine if the required separations of well and septic is present, separation to wetlands as required is present, and any effect change may have on the SWPP.

Planning Director's comments

- A note shall be added to the plan which states "No additional building permits for the construction of new homes will be allowed for the Waite Meadows subdivision until the two homes under Phase I have been connected to both water and sewer services."
- A detail showing the lateral connects should be shown on the plans.
- It should be noted on this plan the construction of homes for Phase II can only commence once all infrastructure improvements of water, sewer, roadway, and trail system have been completed to the satisfaction of the Town's Engineer and professional staff.

MJE Comments

- none

ECC Comments

- The Applicant should provide better identification, through labeling and shading, of the wetlands located on-site.
- Applicant should clarify the purpose of the four (4) ponds
- Applicant should show the location of the wells for the houses in Phase I

Public Discussion

Dan Hartnett with Trails Subcommittee expressed concern that the trail should not necessarily be limited to a dollar amount that was stated in 2009. Mr. Belmonte stated that construction costs have declined and he has an issue with changing infrastructure costs and said that adding more finances could cause the project to be aborted in the future. Mr. Pelagalli asked for assurance that the first two lots would actually be connected when water and sewer is available. Mr. Belmonte stated that the lateral piping would be done and capped at the right of way at time of construction of each lot, and that it would be connected without disruption of property, lawns, etc. when sewer is available within the right of way.

Planning Board Discussion

It was decided that this phasing sheet could be added as a signed addendum to the full plans. Mr.

Hale expressed agreement to the phased plan. The Planning Board seemed in agreement as well. The project will be reviewed next at a public hearing.

- B. **[2012-003] Residence Inn by Marriott** Proposed construction of 4-story 57,000 SF Hotel and 5,200 SF Restaurant with 163 parking spaces. Previously approved/expired as 2007-056, 1740 Rt 9, Zoned: B-4A, PB Prelim Review - Poss. Determination SBL: 272.1-1-14 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Osterhout Last Seen on: 1/24/2012

Presentation:

Melanie Osterhout of OSPA Engineering presented the project which has some minor changes in response to professional and staff comments. She showed the latest site plan as it addresses the issues and stated that adjustments have been made in parking in order to fit the necessary turning radius and landscaped islands.

Ms. Osterhout added that sidewalks were mapped after a meeting in the field and addresses logical termini from south edge of driveway to the driveway of a nearby business on the Southern end of the site plan. Ms. Osterhout handed out copies of most recent plans and estimated that it would cost \$136,000 to construct. Dan – from the hotel added that it was felt that it was a fairly expensive addition to the overall cost of the hotel construction. Mr. Ferraro expressed concern about the estimate as it was presented and also stated that it was a public benefit that was identified in the Exit 9 corridor study. Mr. Ophardt agreed that it was something that was going to benefit patrons as well as general public and stated that it was an area of town where safety should be looked at very closely. Mr. Koval also stated that foot traffic with surrounding neighbors is of real concern and that it was something that was agreed to from the earliest days of the project proposal and needs to be done. Mr. Ophardt asked for overall cost of project and the reply was approximately \$10 million. It was then estimated that it would be about 1.5% of the overall cost of the project.

Staff Comments

Building and Zoning read by Planning Director

- Variance for building height required (43' actual, 35' allowed). Setback variance for building also needed as a result (2' additional setback required for every 1' over 35') (Variance #80688 was for lot width only.)
- Wetlands permits required for intrusion(s).
- Parking for restaurant appears very close to minimum required.
- Hotel parking appears to be well below required.
- Emergency vehicle access around building appears insufficient. Required turning radius not available.
- Sheet C-130 states no fertilizers etc. and sheet C-513 Specifies fertilizers? SWPP
- States project designed to NYSDEC criteria prior to August 2010 due to the prior approvals received. I believe since the site plan has expired all prior approvals are void and the project must be designed to the current standards including stormwater.

- The SWPPP does not discuss any green infrastructure practices as currently required. The SWPPP also incorrectly states runoff reduction was not required due to previously received approvals.
- The SWPPP is unacceptable.

Planning Director's comments

- Professional staff with M.J. Engineering met with the applicant's engineer to discuss outstanding stormwater concerns. These concerns have been satisfied.
- Construction projects subject to local government subdivision or site plan review and approval requirements where the owner or operator made application to the local government for preliminary approval, or made application for final approval to a local government with no preliminary approval phase, prior to March 1, 2011 and the application included a SWPPP developed in accordance with the 2008 version of the Design Manual.

MJE Comments

Site Plans:

- All handicap accessible parking areas and access aisles are to be graded at a maximum of 2.0% (1 :48) in all directions.
- The landing areas at the top of the accessible curb ramps are required to be a minimum of 36 inches long and appear to be currently shown at 12 to 24 inches. All curb ramps are to be revised to meet current ADA standards.
- The handicap parking space shown to the northeast of the sport court should be relocated as the current location will not allow for installation of the required "no parking" sign at the access aisle.
- The handicap parking signs for the hotel should be relocated out of the sidewalk into the lawn areas behind the sidewalk.
- The "no parking fire lane" sign shown at the southern side of the hotel should be relocated out of the sidewalk into the lawn area behind the sidewalk.
- M.J. suggests the curb at the dumpster enclosure area at the northwest corner of the site be revised to provide a radius at the curb line.
- The three (3) existing wells shown near the main access drive should be shown to be removed and depicted such that they do not appear as proposed items.
- Provide clarification on the ROW monument shown within the footprint of the proposed gatehouse.
- DMH#1 shown at the western side of the hotel should be relocated outside of the limits of curbing.
- Slope stabilization should be shown behind the proposed retaining wall to the south of the restaurant.
- Water service size for the hotel and restaurant is not included. The service size for each facility should be indicated.
- Hydrant leads off the proposed 8 inch water main should not include bends (Le. 45-

degree bend) in order to avoid increased headloss during high flow rate events with the hydrants.

- Connection to the existing 12 inch water main on west side of NYS Route 9 should be completed via a 12"x8" tapping sleeve and valve. The callout refers to tapping sleeve only. A gate valve symbol at the connection point should be shown.
- The water valve at the southwestern corner of the hotel falls partially within the flared side of the curb ramp and should be relocated.
- The water valves at the northwestern corner of the hotel appear to fall partially within the sidewalk and partially within the lawn area and should be relocated.
- The hydrant valve near CB#6 is in conflict with the storm line from CB#6A to CB#6. We suggest moving the hydrant to the east to avoid the conflict, remove the 45 degree bend from the hydrant lead, and provide the required 10 feet of horizontal separation between the storm and water lines.
- The CPWA A easement should be revised to encompass all components of the water system including hydrants, hydrant leads, and associated valves.
- The 10' dimension line shown near the southwestern corner of the hotel should indicate a typical 10' minimum separation between the water and storm lines. We suggest a similar dimension be shown along the northern and southern sides of the hotel as well.
- The length of the sanitary sewer lateral from the hotel and the length of the sewer line from SMH #1 to Pump Station #1 should be corrected.
- The length, type of material, and slope should be shown for all sanitary sewer lines.
- Label all inverts (in and out) for the sanitary system components (i.e. manholes, grease trap, pump stations) on the Utilities Plan.
- The invert out for all gravity sanitary sewer manholes should be 0.1 feet lower than the invert in.
- Label all inverts (in and out) for the sanitary system components (i.e. manholes, pump stations) on the Forcemain Plan and Profile.
- Consideration should be given to modifying the high level alarm elevation on the Pump Station Detail such that the alarm is not activated each time the lag pump on elevation is reached. Currently the high level alarm elevation is set at the lag pump on elevation.
- Different symbols should be used to identify gate valves, curb stops, cleanouts.
- Two curb stops are shown on the downstream side of Pump Station #2 prior to the connection with the existing force main within 20 feet of each other. Verify whether both are necessary in this close proximity.
- Detail 4 on sheet C-513 should be revised to be ADA compliant.
- Section 3.0 - Existing Conditions & Projected Wastewater Generation:
 - The daily wastewater generation (gpd) values outlined in Table 1 are inconsistent with regards to the 20% flow reduction for water saving fixtures. The flow rate for the restaurant (28 gpd/seat) appears to include the 20% reduction as the flow rate per seat is typically 35 gpd without water savings fixtures. However the flow rate for the extended stay hotel does not appear to include the 20% flow reduction. Review the flow rates and revise all associated sections of the report

accordingly, including the pump station calculations and available capacity review, such that the total wastewater generation includes the 20% flow reduction.

- 29. Section 4.3 - Proposed Restaurant Pump Station:
 - The discharge manhole listed for Pump Station #2 indicates the Town of Poughkeepsie sanitary system. This should be revised to indicate the Saratoga County Sewer District.

ECC Comments

No comment

Public Discussion

No comments

Planning Board Discussion

Mr. Hale voiced support of keeping with the previously approved SWPP plan. Mr. Hale and Mr. Ferraro stated that they would like some kind of crossing of island in parking lot.

Motions

Motion SEQR

Mr. Ferraro asked for a motion to establish the Planning Board as Lead Agency for this application, an unlisted action, and to issue a negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

So moved by: Koval

Seconded by: Ophardt

Ayes: all

Opposed none:

This motion is: *unanimously carried*

Motion SPR

The chairman asked for a motion to waive the final hearing for this application and to grant preliminary and final site plan approval to this application conditioned upon satisfaction of the comments offered by the Planning Board, Planning Department, and the Town Designated Engineer.

So moved by: Hale

Seconded by: Ophardt

Ayes: all

Opposed: none

This motion is: *carried*

A Notice of Decision is attached at the end of these minutes and the applicant will also receive a Review Letter from the Planning Department prior to stamping of the plans.

III. New Business

- C. [2012-010] **Northside Drive** Proposed (2) lot commercial subdivision, each lot to retain one existing building., 3-5 Northside Dr (Pvt), Zoned: B-4, PB Concept Review SBL: 272.9-1-38 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: EDP

Presentation:

Gavin Vuillaume presented the project which is a commercial subdivision allowing for two existing businesses to be separated from the previously approved site plan on the corner of Fire Road and Route 146 which currently houses Chili's Restaurant and an existing vacant building that had been constructed but never occupied. Mr. Vuillaume explained that a third building had been originally proposed on the site in the rear of the vacant building but that building will not be pursued and an amended site plan will be submitted in the future. The consultant added that this subdivision as proposed would allow for sale and financing of the occupant although any variances would likely be required will be pursued presently.

Staff Comments

Building and Zoning read by Planning Director

- Agreements/Easements for cross access and stormwater management may be needed.
- Landscaping variances appear to be required as a result of subdivision (208-48).

Planning Director's comments

- An amendment to the existing area variance should be made to the ZBA so the variance can be tracked with both parcels of land once subdivided.
- Is the applicant anticipating an amendment to the site plan in the near future to potentially eliminate the drive-thru lane?

MJE Comments

- The proposed project appears to be an "Unlisted" action pursuant to SEQR, and as such a coordinated review is optional. The Planning Board may wish to accept lead agency status. Involved agencies are expected to include, but are not limited to the following:
 - Town of Clifton Park Planning Board - Subdivision Approval
 - Saratoga County Planning Board - Section 239 Referral
- The Concept Subdivision Plan appears to meet B-4 District zoning, space, and bulk standard requirements with the exception of the following:
 - Lot 3 does not have the required 150 feet of lot frontage.
 - Lot 3 and Lot 5 do not have the required 15 foot wide landscape buffer along portions of the eastern and western sides of both individual lots.
- Provide verification that the variances referenced on the plan to allow for a 10 foot wide landscape buffer and parking setback of 10 feet along the west side of the property to be subdivided is still valid when the lot is subdivided.
- Provide verification that Lot 5 still has the required 35% green space.

- It appears that cross access, storm sewer, and stormwater management easements will be required.
- Provide the limits of the existing sanitary sewer easement at the southern end of the parcels.
- All existing and proposed utilities should be shown on the plan.
- Provide clarification if the dashed line along the eastern side of Lot 3 represents a proposed extension of the Saratoga County Sewer District sewer easement.
- Provide clarification on future plans for the parking expansion area shown for Lot 3.

ECC Comments

No comment

Public Discussion

No comment

Planning Board Discussion

Mr. Hale asked that the previously planned cross connection stay and possibly scale back parking in front especially if the drive-thru is not needed. It was asked if the once discussed connection to Route 9 was going to be readdressed. The consultant said this is not currently being pursued

The consultant stated they will go to zoning next then come back for public hearing. The Planning Board appeared in general agreement with the plan adding that a pedestrian connection should be considered in any future submittals.

- D. **[2012-008] Bordeau Builders** Proposed (36) lot cluster subdivision, 1234 Rt 146, Zoned: R-1, PB Concept Review SBL: 270.-2-28 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: Ingalls

Presentation:

John Anders from Ingalls and Associates presented that application which is located west of North Country Commons and Gold's Gym, east of Brookhaven and across from Sterling Heights. The consultant explained that it requests (36) lots in two cul-de-sacs with two entrances on Rt. 146. The speaker also added that the existing historical residence is to be restored and preserved. Then, Mr. Anders stated that there will be a cross-access route available to Brookhaven which could be utilized and possibly eliminate the second Rt. 146 entrance (eastern most). The consultant explained that a conventional subdivision would allow for (25) lots but with a cluster subdivision, there is potential for (39) lots with the calculations as per Town Code. Mr. Anders explained that the developer is asking for (36) at the outset, but that number may be adjusted as the site is further reviewed. The speaker noted that there is public water and sewer on Rt. 146 but that the site is lower than the road, so homes will likely need grinder pumps and/or forced mains.

Staff Comments

Building and Zoning read by Planning Director

- Lead agency (Town) part of Environmental Assessment not completed.
- No SWPPP provided.
- Wetlands and stream buffers impacted by proposal. Stormwater management area shown in stream buffer and directly adjacent to stream, not allowed.
- Land to be dedicated to town is unusable.
- Setbacks will need to be reduced significantly to allow space to construct homes
- (Lots 2,3,4,9 & 10)
- Development appears too intense, too many lots for available property.

Planning Director's comments

- Lots 23 & 24 are shown as keyhole lots which will require 50' setbacks on the front, rear and side setbacks. In addition, keyhole lots are only allowed within R-1 & R-3 Zoning Districts in rare instances due to unusual conditions of the area.
- The Planning Board may consider in its deliberations, when a cluster preference is applied for, factors or features of the property which shall be guidelines in its determination as to whether cluster preference shall be granted. Among those factors to be considered as guidelines are the following:
 - Freshwater wetlands as mapped pursuant to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the Town of Clifton Park Local Wetlands Protection Map and federal wetlands pursuant to § 404 of the Clean Water Act. [Amended 4-6-1998 by L.L. No. 2-1998]
 - Watercourses as classified pursuant to the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Stream Classification System or as mapped on the town's Official Stream Protection Map.
 - Language for the preservation and rehabilitation of the historic home should be incorporated into the approval process. I will draft language for the Planning Board to consider with the applicant on future submittals. There is an expense to restoring a historic structure and as such I feel the consideration of a cluster subdivision is justified to help offset the associated expenses.

MJE Comments

- The proposed project appears to be an "Unlisted" action pursuant to SEQR, and as such a coordinated review is optional. The Planning Board may wish to accept lead agency status.
- Involved agencies are expected to include, but are not limited to the following:
 - Town of Clifton Park Planning Board - Subdivision Approval
 - Clifton Park Water District #1 - Water Connection Permit
 - Saratoga County Sewer District # 1 - Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit
 - Saratoga County Planning Board - Section 239 Referral
 - NYSDOH - Water Service Approvals

- NYSDEC - Sanitary Sewer Approvals
- NYSDOT - Highway Work Permit for Non Utility Work (Curb Cut)
- The Concept Subdivision Plan appears to meet the Town's Cluster Subdivision requirements with respect to allowable density and minimum lot areas. However, the Planning Board will need to discuss the proposed reduced setbacks, reduced lot frontages, and the two (2) proposed keyhole lots. Based upon the current plan, it appears that Lots 2, 3, and 4 may be difficult to develop and may require additional relief from proposed setbacks.
- Based on the amount of proposed disturbance a full SWPPP will be required for the project and will need to incorporate green infrastructure practices. The narrative provided indicates the project will be constructed in a single phase. As such, clarification should be provided if the applicant will be applying for a five acre waiver.
- The current stormwater management area will require relocation as the current location is within the 100 foot buffer area and immediately adjacent to the Dwaas Kill. As part of the overall stormwater management plan for the site, the Planning Board should consider the modification of standard road requirements to reduce impervious area.
- The overall density of the subdivision may need to be scaled back as it appears there is minimal area available for stormwater management.
- Correspondence from USACOE and/or NYSDEC should be provided to confirm agreement of the wetland delineation identified on the Concept Subdivision Plan.
- Verification should be provided that the isolated wetland boundary depicted on the plans is not regulated by NYSDEC and/or USACOE.
- The results of the Phase 1 archaeological investigation should be provided.
- A future preliminary submission should include the following:
 - The limits of proposed clearing.
 - All building setback lines.
 - Names of owners of all adjacent property.
 - All existing and proposed utilities.
 - An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
 - Plan and profile for each street.
 - A Grading Plan that indicates positive drainage away from all structures.
 - Traffic, Sewer, and Water Reports.

ECC Comments

- The Applicant should move the property boundary lines so as not to intrude into the Dwaas Kill buffer area.
- The Applicant should use landscaping and grading to provide visual and auditory buffering between the project and Route 146.

Mark Kazmierczak – Historic Preservation Commission prepared a letter that will be kept in Planning Board files recommending restoration of the existing farmhouse. The HPC did not find any historical significance to the barns on the site.

Public Discussion

Dan Hartnett from the Trails subcommittee of the Open Space and Trails Committee suggested construction of a path from Brookhaven across the front of the property to improve access to Gold's Gym and North Country Commons. Mr. Hartnett also remarked that residents have requested a crosswalk across 146 from Sterling Heights to any new subdivision across the street.

Planning Board Discussion

Mr. Koval stated that pump stations might be preferred over individual grinder pumps. It was mentioned that the project will be submitted to both the county and town sewer departments for review and recommendations as the project progresses.

Mr. Ophardt stated that the one road way entrance would be most likely more desirable. Mr. Koval added that the connection to Brookhaven would be preferable and could provide the needed second entrance to count towards the (18) lots for a cul-de-sac limit from a Fire/safety standpoint and lot-lines may need to be adjusted to make that work. Mr. Koval expressed that he was concerned about lots #16 and #18 with backyard buffers that could be readjusted to get trail access and to make yards a better configuration. Mr. Ophardt asked if berms from Brookhaven subdivision were being extended. The consultant stated that the builder would prefer landscaping rather than big mounds of dirt. Mr. Koval expressed a transition of some elevation with landscaping on top of it would help with headlights and aesthetics. It was agreed by planning board members and staff that a park district or homeowner's association could own first 50' along 146 so that uniformity of landscaping could be maintained by one owner. Mr. Scavo suggested that the neighborhood entrance sign should be owned by the park district and as well. Mr. Koval stated that he felt owners are going to put up 6' privacy fences along Rt. 146 so landscaping could be an attractive addition to plan. Mr. Hale stated that the higher density here is a good use of the area. Mr. Hale stated that he felt that condominiums or multi-family dwellings would be good planning in such a transitional area between rural and commercial properties and he added that connectivity is also necessary to the well-planned use of the area.

Mr. Ferraro asked Mrs. Pace if the Historic Preservation Commission felt that issues were satisfactorily addressed and she replied that it was. Mr. Kazmierczak also agreed but recommended that the side lot on parcel one be adjusted into lot 7 to give more of a buffer to the existing home. Mr. Ophardt asked if stormwater was only on west side. The consultant stated that at this point it was strictly conceptual and is going to be addressed for the eastern side also as the plan is further reviewed. Mrs. Pace stated that the Historic Preservation was hoping that a garage on existing house's lot could be built that fits the character of the house as the current plan shows demolition of two existing accessory buildings and she added that the letter written by the commission will be forwarded to the consultant and the applicant. Mr. Andarawis asked about the value of the barns. Mr. Kazmierczak said that it had been determined that they were not original barns, but were built much later and had been changed and had no real historic value. It was discussed that with the loss of barns, a detached garage fitting in would be desirable so cars can be parked in them.

Mr. Ferraro stated that a trail connection should be considered with consultation with Jen Viggiani, Town of Clifton Park Open Space Coordinator.

Mr. Anders asked if setbacks, and/or keyhole lots were okay with the Planning Board and if it is okay to proceed as shown. Mr. Ferraro said that the adjustments as discussed pertaining to curbs on to Rt. 146 may make that null. Mr. Ophardt stated that he is not a fan of berms adding that he also felt the realignment may make the keyholes unnecessary.

Mr. Milano said modifications to standard roadways was a potential issue, but the Planning Board felt that it was worth looking at a reduced road width of 20' + 2' either side. The Planning Board expressed general agreement with the cluster design

- E. **[2012-009] Rekucki Office Building** Proposed 4800 SF office building and removal of existing building., 5 Longkill Rd, Zoned: B-3, PB Concept Review SBL: 259.9-1-13 To be reviewed by: MJE Consultant: ABD

Presentation: Tom Andress ABD Engineers, consultant for M.J. Properties, presented the project after reviewing the history of past proposed but withdrawn projects. Mr. Andress noted that there is a building on site with a looped driveway. Mr. Koval asked why the applicant couldn't accommodate parking in the rear. The consultant says it would be too expensive to do that. Mr. Rekucki felt that business owners want a presence and the back of the building on the road does not bring tenants to a business and aesthetically it is not really appealing. Next he stated that if that is where the project is going, Mr. Rekucki would not continue with the project. Mr. Rekucki added that he feels the proposal would be appealing and a nice addition to the Jonesville area and agreed that the facade rendering as shown could easily be made more Greek-revival-like rather than colonial.

Mr. Ferraro commented that parking could be in the back and the entrance in the front or there need to be two entrances. Mr. Rekucki said if Board is going to insist on the back parking, he will walk away.

Mr. Andress would ask Planning Board to send a letter stating unacceptability of concept so he can satisfy breaking his contract. Mr. Hale asked to be shown alternatives.

Mr. Rekucki stated that he could consider bringing some other concepts before the board to show if anything else can work.

Staff Comments

Building and Zoning read by Planning Director

- Several variances previously approved for property (Variance #80679 attached)

Planning Director's comments

- A memo from the Town's Historic Preservation Commission has been shared with the applicant. The Planning Department fully supports the commission's recommendations at this time in regards to the application which is in for conceptual consideration only.

MJE Comments

None

ECC Comments

- The Applicant should install a green infrastructure solution to mitigate stormwater runoff from the parking lot toward the Long Kill.

Historic Preservation

- Found no historic significance to existing structure on the site.

Public Discussion

Planning Board Discussion

Minutes Approval – February 28, 2012

So moved by: Hale

Seconded by: Pace

Ayes: all

Opposed: none

This motion is: *carried*

V. Discussion Items: None

Next Submittal Date: 3/21/2012

Next Meeting Date: 3/27/2012 (from submissions on 3/7/2012)

Mr. Ferraro asked for a motion to close the Planning Board Meeting at 9:26pm.

So moved by: Hale

Seconded by: Pace

Ayes: all

Opposed: none

This motion is: *carried*

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Springli
Acting Planning Board Secretary

DRAFT